

On Streaming Codes for Burst and Random Errors

Shobhit Bhatnagar and P. Vijay Kumar

Department of Electrical Communication Engineering, IISc Bangalore
 {shobhitb97,pvk1729}@gmail.com

Abstract

Streaming codes (SCs) are packet-level codes that recover erased packets within a strict decoding-delay deadline. Streaming codes for various packet erasure channel models such as sliding-window (SW) channel models that admit random or burst erasures in any SW of a fixed length have been studied in the literature, and the optimal rate as well as rate-optimal code constructions of SCs over such channel models are known. In this paper, we study error-correcting streaming codes (SC_{ERRS}), i.e., packet-level codes which recover erroneous packets within a delay constraint. We study SC_{ERRS} for two classes of SW channel models, one that admits random packet errors, and another that admits multiple bursts of packet errors, in any SW of a fixed length. For the case of random packet errors, we establish the equivalence of an SC_{ERR} and a corresponding SC that recovers from random packet erasures, thus determining the optimal rate of an SC_{ERR} for this setting, and providing a rate-optimal code construction for all parameters. We then focus on SCs that recover from multiple erasure bursts and derive a rate-upper-bound for such SCs. We show the necessity of a divisibility constraint for the existence of an SC constructed by the popular diagonal embedding technique, that achieves this rate-bound under a stringent delay requirement. We then show that a construction known in the literature achieves this rate-bound when the divisibility constraint is met. We further show the equivalence of the SCs considered and SC_{ERRS} for the setting of multiple error bursts, under a stringent delay requirement.

I. INTRODUCTION

Erasure-correcting streaming codes, or simply streaming codes (abbreviated as SCs) as they are called in the literature, are packet-level FEC codes that recover erased packets within a strict decoding-delay constraint. They are thus relevant to the current emphasis on low-latency communication. Streaming codes were first studied by Martinian et al. [1], [2] for the setting of a sliding-window (SW) channel model that allowed a single erasure burst within any sliding-window of a fixed length. They also introduced the technique of diagonal embedding (DE) which allows one to construct packet-level codes from scalar block codes. This work was then extended in [3] where the authors considered a SW channel model that allowed either a single erasure burst, or else a few random erasures, in any sliding-window. The optimal rate and rate-optimal code constructions employing DE for this channel model are known for all valid parameters [4], [5]. Since scalar block codes can be used to construct packet-level codes via DE, authors in [6] studied the rate-delay trade-off for a class of linear block codes that recover from multiple erasure bursts within a delay constraint. They also presented a code construction that achieves this trade-off. We refer the reader to [7]–[25] for the study of streaming codes for various settings and channel models.

In this paper, we study streaming codes for errors, i.e., packet-level codes that recover erroneous packets within a decoding-delay deadline. We will refer to such streaming codes as error-correcting streaming codes (abbreviated as SC_{ERRS}).

Our Contribution: We study SC_{ERRS} for burst and random errors. We establish the equivalence of an SC_{ERR} for a SW channel model that allows $\leq a$ random packet errors in any SW of length w , and a corresponding SC for a SW channel model that allows $\leq 2a$ random packet erasures in any SW of length w . Through this equivalence, and results known in prior literature, we characterize the maximum rate of an SC_{ERR} for this setting and also provide a linear field size, rate-optimal code construction for all parameters. We then focus on SCs that recover from multiple erasure bursts. The code construction that




Fig. 1: An admissible erasure pattern of the $(3, 2, 7)$ -MBSW channel. Colored squares denote erasures.

achieves the rate-delay trade-off established in [6] is causal only under a divisibility constraint. We show the necessity of this divisibility constraint. We then derive an upper-bound to the rate of an SC for a SW channel model that allows multiple erasure bursts within any SW of length w , and show that under a stringent delay requirement, one can achieve this bound via DE iff the parameters of the SW channel satisfy the corresponding divisibility constraint. Then, again for the case of a stringent delay requirement, we show the equivalence of SC_{ERRS} for SW channels that admit multiple burst errors in any SW of length w , and SCs for SW channels that admit double the number of burst erasures in any SW of length w .

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section II we provide the necessary background on SCs and describe the framework for SC_{ERRS} . In Section III we determine the optimal rate of an SC_{ERR} that recovers from random packet errors. We discuss SC_{ERRS} for multiple bursts of packet errors Section IV.

II. BACKGROUND AND RELATED PRIOR WORK

Notation: Given integers m, n , we will use $[m : n]$ to denote the set $\{m, m + 1, \dots, n\}$. We will use $\underline{0}_n$ to denote the zero vector of length n , and I_n to denote the $(n \times n)$ identity matrix. For matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$, and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [0 : m - 1]$, $\mathcal{J} \subseteq [0 : n - 1]$, $A(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ denotes the sub-matrix of A consisting of the rows indexed by \mathcal{I} and the columns indexed by \mathcal{J} . For $i \in [0 : m - 1]$ and $j \in [0 : n - 1]$, $A(i, :)$ and $A(:, j)$ denote the i -th row and the j -th column of A , respectively. Similarly, $A(\mathcal{I}, :)$ and $A(:, \mathcal{J})$ denote the sub-matrices of A consisting of the rows indexed by \mathcal{I} and the columns indexed by \mathcal{J} , respectively. We will at times use A_j to denote the j -th column of A . For a vector $\underline{v} = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}]^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, we will use $\text{supp}(\underline{v})$ to denote the support of \underline{v} , i.e., $\text{supp}(\underline{v}) = \{i \mid v_i \neq 0\}$. We will use $w_H(\underline{v})$ to denote the Hamming weight of \underline{v} , i.e., $w_H(\underline{v}) = |\text{supp}(\underline{v})|$.

We will say that an $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} is systematic if its generator matrix G is of the form $G = [I_k \mid P] \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k \times n}$. We will call a parity-check matrix H of a systematic code to be in systematic form if it is of the form $H = [P' \mid I_{n-k}] \in \mathbb{F}_q^{(n-k) \times n}$. An $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} is said to be causal if its generator matrix G is of the form $G = [U_{k \times k} \mid P] \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k \times n}$, where U is upper-triangular. Clearly, a systematic code is always causal.

In the context of an $[n, k]$ block code \mathcal{C} , an erasure pattern $\underline{e} = [e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}]^T \in \{0, 1\}^n$ signifies that c_i , $i \in \text{supp}(\underline{e})$ is erased, and c_i , $i \in [0 : n - 1] \setminus \text{supp}(\underline{e})$ is not erased, from a codeword $\underline{c}^T = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}] \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\underline{c}^T = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}]$ be the codeword corresponding to the message vector $\underline{u} = [u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}]^T$. Then, for $i \in [0 : k - 1]$, u_i is said to be recoverable from \underline{e} within delay τ if it can be recovered using the non-erased code symbols in $\{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{\min\{i+\tau, n-1\}}\}$. Similarly, for $i \in [0 : n - 1]$, c_i is said to be recoverable from \underline{e} within delay τ if it can be recovered using the non-erased code symbols in $\{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{\min\{i+\tau, n-1\}}\}$. The code \mathcal{C} is said to be delay- τ decodable for \underline{e} if for all $\underline{u} = [u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}]^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^k$ and for all $i \in [0 : k - 1]$, u_i is recoverable from \underline{e} within delay τ .

Whenever we talk about an $[n, k]$ systematic code \mathcal{C} being delay- τ decodable for an erasure pattern(s), where $\tau \in [k : n - 1]$, we will use the notation $H^{(i)} \triangleq H([0 : \tau - k + i], [0 : \tau + i])$, $i \in [0 : n - \tau - 2]$, and $H^{(i)} \triangleq H$, $i \in [n - \tau - 1 : n - 1]$, where H is the parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} in systematic form.

A. Erasure-Correcting Streaming Codes

a) Framework [1]: At each time instant $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, the encoder of a streaming code receives a message packet $\underline{u}(t) = [u_1(t), u_2(t), \dots, u_k(t)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^k$, and produces a coded packet $\underline{x}(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. In other words, a message packet contains k symbols from \mathbb{F}_q , and a coded packet contains n symbols from \mathbb{F}_q . We will assume that $\underline{u}(t) = \underline{0}_k$, for $t < 0$. The streaming code encoder is causal, i.e., $\underline{x}(t)$ is

a function of only prior message packets $\underline{u}(0), \underline{u}(1), \dots, \underline{u}(t)$. The coded packet $\underline{x}(t)$ is then transmitted over a packet erasure channel, so that at time t , the receiver receives

$$\underline{y}(t) = \begin{cases} \underline{x}(t), & \text{if } \underline{x}(t) \text{ is not erased,} \\ \wedge, & \text{if } \underline{x}(t) \text{ is erased.} \end{cases}$$

Here, we use the symbol \wedge to denote an erased packet. A delay-constrained decoder at the receiver must recover $\underline{u}(t)$ using $\{\underline{y}(0), \underline{y}(1), \dots, \underline{y}(t + \tau)\}$ only, where τ denotes the decoding-delay constraint, for all $t \geq 0$. Packet-level codes satisfying this requirement will be called erasure-correcting streaming codes, or simply, streaming codes (abbreviated as SCs). The rate of the SC is defined to be $\frac{k}{n}$.

In the context of packet-level codes, an erasure pattern $\underline{e} = (e_0, e_1, \dots)$, where $e_t \in \{0, 1\}$ for all t , denotes that $\underline{x}(t)$ is erased if $e_t = 1$, and $\underline{x}(t)$ is not erased if $e_t = 0$. We will also use the notation $\text{supp}(\underline{e})$ to denote the set of time indices of erased packets, i.e., $\text{supp}(\underline{e}) = \{t \mid e_t = 1\}$.

b) (a, w) -SW Channel: An (a, w) -SW channel is a packet erasure channel that produces only those erasure patterns having the property that any sliding window of w time slots contains $\leq a$ erased packets, i.e., $\forall t \geq 0, w_H([e_t, e_{t+1}, \dots, e_{t+w-1}]) \leq a$ for any erasure pattern $\underline{e} = (e_0, e_1, \dots)$ of the (a, w) -SW channel. Such erasure patterns will be called admissible erasure patterns of the (a, w) -SW channel. We will denote a streaming code for the (a, w) -SW channel under delay constraint τ by an (a, w, τ) -streaming code (abbreviated as (a, w, τ) -SC). Following the arguments in [3], one can assume $\tau \geq (w - 1)$ w.o.l.o.g., and that an (a, w, τ) -SC of non-zero rate can be constructed iff $a < w$, which we will assume throughout to be the case. The optimal rate of an (a, w, τ) -SC is given by $\frac{w-a}{w}$ [3], [4]. Further, the streaming code constructed via diagonal embedding (described later) of a $[w, w - a]$ MDS code results in a linear field size, rate-optimal $(a, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC for all valid parameters [3], [4].

c) Multiple Burst-Erasure Sliding Window Channel: By a (z, b, w) -Multiple Burst-Erasure Sliding-Window channel (abbreviated as (z, b, w) -MBSW channel), we will mean a packet erasure channel that allows only those erasure patterns having the property that the pattern observed in any sliding window of length w can be described as a (z, b) -burst, by which we mean that the pattern observed in any sliding window of length w can be described as consisting of $\leq z$ (non-overlapping) erasure bursts, each of length $\leq b$. Erasure patterns which satisfy this requirement will be called admissible erasure patterns of the (z, b, w) -MBSW channel (see Fig. 1 for an example). We remark here that the definition of burst erasures considered in this work does not restrict a burst erasure to necessarily consist only of consecutive erasures, i.e., there can be unerased packets within a burst.

We will denote a streaming code for the (z, b, w) -MBSW channel under delay constraint τ by a (z, b, w, τ) -streaming code (abbreviated as (z, b, w, τ) -SC). Once again, one can assume w.o.l.o.g. that $\tau \geq (w - 1)$. Rate-optimal $(1, b, w, \tau)$ -SC constructions are known for all valid parameters [1], [2], and hence we will consider the case $z > 1$ throughout the paper. Further, a streaming code of non-zero rate over the (z, b, w) -MBSW channel can be constructed only if $w > zb$, which we will assume throughout the paper. Finally, we will consider the case $b > 1$, since the case $b = 1$ corresponds to random erasures so that the $(z, 1, w)$ -MBSW channel reduces to the (z, w) -SW channel.

Prior work on constructing linear codes that recover from multiple erasure bursts within a delay constraint was done in [6]. The authors showed that one can construct an $[n = (k + zb), k]$ code \mathcal{C} that is delay- τ decodable for any (z, b) -burst iff $\tau \geq \tau^* \triangleq \max\{k + (z - 1)b, zb\}$. They also provided a code construction that matches this delay bound. However, a close examination of this construction shows that the constructed code is causal only if $b \mid \tau^*$, and further that in this case, one can construct a systematic code. The authors also showed, in particular, that it is not possible to construct an $[n = k + zb, k]$ causal block code that is delay- τ^* decodable for all (z, b) -bursts, when $z > 1$ and $k = (b + 1)$. In Theorem 3 below, we will generalize this result to all $k > b$ such that $b \nmid k$.

d) Diagonal Embedding: In diagonal embedding, codewords of an $[n, k]$ systematic code \mathcal{C} are placed diagonally in the coded packet stream. See Fig. 2 for an example. More formally, if $G = [I_k \mid P]$ is a generator matrix of \mathcal{C} , then a stream of n packets in a rate $\frac{k}{n}$ streaming code constructed via DE of

$x_1(t)$	$x_1(t+1)$	$x_1(t+2)$				
	$x_2(t+1)$	$x_2(t+2)$	$x_2(t+3)$			
		$x_3(t+2)$	$x_3(t+3)$	$x_3(t+4)$		
			$x_4(t+3)$	$x_4(t+4)$	$x_4(t+5)$	
				$x_5(t+4)$	$x_5(t+5)$	$x_5(t+6)$

Fig. 2: DE of a $[5, 2]$ systematic code \mathcal{C} . Each column is a coded packet and every diagonal of the same color is a codeword of \mathcal{C} .

\mathcal{C} is of the form $[x_1(t), x_2(t+1), \dots, x_n(t+n-1)] = [u_1(t), u_2(t+1), \dots, u_k(t+k-1)]G$. Thus, DE translates packet erasures to codeword symbol erasures. In this paper, we will mostly focus on DE-based code constructions since it is the most popular technique in streaming code literature.

B. Error-Correcting Streaming Codes

a) Framework: At each time $t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, the encoder receives a message packet $\underline{u}(t) = [u_1(t), u_2(t), \dots, u_k(t)] \in \mathbb{F}_q^k$, and produces a coded packet $\underline{x}(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t), \dots, x_n(t)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. We will assume that $\underline{u}(t) = \underline{0}_k$, for $t < 0$. Once again, the encoder is causal, i.e., $\underline{x}(t)$ is a function only of prior message packets $\underline{u}(0), \underline{u}(1), \dots, \underline{u}(t)$. The coded packet $\underline{x}(t)$ is then transmitted over a packet error channel, so that at time t , the receiver receives

$$\underline{y}(t) = \underline{x}(t) + \underline{e}(t),$$

where $\underline{e}(t) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ (See Fig. 3). A delay-constrained decoder at the receiver must recover $\underline{u}(t)$ using $\{\underline{y}(0), \underline{y}(1), \dots, \underline{y}(t+\tau)\}$ only, where τ denotes the decoding-delay constraint, for all $t \geq 0$. Packet-level codes that satisfy this requirement will be called error-correcting streaming codes (abbreviated as SC_{ERR}). The rate of the SC_{ERR} is defined to be $\frac{k}{n}$.

An error pattern $E = (\underline{e}(0), \underline{e}(1), \dots)$ signifies that $\underline{y}(t) = \underline{x}(t) + \underline{e}(t)$, $\forall t$. We will use the notation $\text{supp}(E)$ to denote the set of time indices at which non-trivial packet errors occur, i.e., $\text{supp}(E) = \{t \mid \underline{e}(t) \neq \underline{0}\}$.

b) (a, w) -Error SW Channel: An (a, w) -Error SW channel (abbreviated as (a, w) - SW_{ERR} channel) is a packet error channel that produces only those error patterns having the property that any sliding window of w time slots contains $\leq a$ packet errors. Alternatively, one can define an (a, w) - SW_{ERR} channel as a packet error channel that allows only those error patterns E having the property that the erasure pattern $\underline{e} = (e_0, e_1, \dots)$ defined as $e_t = 1$ if $t \in \text{supp}(E)$, and $e_t = 0$, otherwise, is admissible in the (a, w) -SW channel.

We will denote a streaming code for the (a, w) - SW_{ERR} channel under delay constraint τ by an (a, w, τ) -error-correcting streaming code (abbreviated as (a, w, τ) - SC_{ERR}). Following similar arguments as in [3], one can assume w.o.l.o.g. that $\tau \geq (w-1)$. From the equivalence of an (a, w, τ) - SC_{ERR} and a $(2a, w, \tau)$ -SC that we will show later in Theorem 1, it follows that one can construct a streaming code of non-zero rate over the (a, w) - SW_{ERR} channel only if $2a < w$, which we will assume throughout the paper.

c) Multiple Burst-Error Sliding Window Channel: By a (z, b, w) -Multiple Burst-Error Sliding-Window channel (abbreviated as (z, b, w) - MBSW_{ERR} channel), we will mean a packet error channel that allows only those error patterns E having the property that the erasure pattern $\underline{e} = (e_0, e_1, \dots)$ defined as $e_t = 1$ if $t \in \text{supp}(E)$, and $e_t = 0$, otherwise, is admissible in the (z, b, w) -MBSW channel. We will denote a streaming code for the (z, b, w) - MBSW_{ERR} channel under delay constraint τ by a (z, b, w, τ) -error-correcting streaming code (abbreviated as (z, b, w, τ) - SC_{ERR}). Once again, one can assume w.o.l.o.g. that $\tau \geq (w-1)$. We will also assume $b > 1$, since the case $b = 1$ corresponds to random errors so that the $(z, 1, w)$ - MBSW_{ERR} channel reduces to the (z, w) - SW_{ERR} channel.




Fig. 3: Setting of error-correcting streaming codes.

C. Preliminaries

We will use the following straightforward lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]$ code and let H be an $(n-k) \times n$ parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} . Let the coordinates in $\mathcal{E} \subseteq [0 : n-1]$ be erased from \mathcal{C} , and let $i \in \mathcal{E}$. Then, the i -th code symbol in any codeword can be recovered from the code symbols corresponding to the coordinates in $[0 : n-1] \setminus \mathcal{E}$ iff*

$$H_i \notin \text{span}(\{H_j \mid j \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{i\}\}).$$

It follows from Lemma 1 that an $[n, k]$ code \mathcal{C} can recover from an erasure pattern \underline{e} whose support is given by $\mathcal{E} \subseteq [0 : n-1]$ iff $\{H_j \mid j \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is a linearly independent set, where H is a parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} . As explained in [4], if \mathcal{C} is a delay- τ decodable code for an error pattern(s), and $\underline{c}^T = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}] \in \mathcal{C}$, then to recover code symbol c_i such that $i + \tau < n-1$, one must consider the parity-check matrix of the code obtained by puncturing \mathcal{C} on the coordinates $[i + \tau + 1 : n-1]$, i.e., the parity-check matrix of the code obtained from \mathcal{C} by deleting the coordinates $[i + \tau + 1 : n-1]$ from every codeword of \mathcal{C} . Since the dual of a punctured code is a shortened code, as explained in [4], to find a parity-check matrix of the punctured code, we first find a basis for the subspace of the row-space of H which has the property that for every $\underline{v}^T = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}]$ in the subspace, $v_\lambda = 0$, $\lambda \in [i + \tau + 1 : n-1]$, and then we delete the coordinates $[i + \tau + 1 : n-1]$ from every vector in the basis. Specifically, if \mathcal{C} is a systematic code, and H is its parity-check matrix in systematic form, then the parity-check matrix of the code obtained from \mathcal{C} by puncturing \mathcal{C} on the coordinates $[i + \tau + 1 : n-1]$ is given by $H^{(i)}$, when $\tau \geq k$. Thus, c_i is recoverable from \underline{e} within delay τ iff $H_i^{(i)} \notin \text{span}(\{H_j^{(i)} \mid j \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{i\}\})$.

Lemmas 2 and 3 below are proved in the appendix. Lemma 2 below uses Lemma 1 to identify certain full-rank sub-matrices of the parity-check matrix in systematic form, of an $[n = k + zb, k]$ systematic code that can recover from any (z, b) -burst.

Lemma 2. *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n = k + zb, k]$ systematic code that can recover from any (z, b) -burst, and let H be its parity-check matrix in systematic form. Then, $\text{rank}(H([l b : (l+1)b - 1], [j : j + b - 1])) = b$, $l \in [0 : (z-1)]$, $j \in [0 : k - b]$.*

The lemma below establishes the equivalence of a class of causal and systematic codes that are delay- τ decodable for any (z, b) -burst.

Lemma 3. *An $[n = k + zb, k]$ causal block code that is delay- τ decodable for any (z, b) -burst exists iff an $[n = k + zb, k]$ systematic code that is delay- τ decodable for any (z, b) -burst exists.*

Lemma 4 below will be useful for establishing a divisibility constraint in Theorem 3.

Lemma 4. *Let $b \geq 2$ and $m \geq 2$ be positive integers. Consider a matrix $A \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2 \times mb}$ that satisfies the following properties:*

- P1: $A(i, [0 : b-2]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$.
- P2: In any row of A , no more than $(b-1)$ consecutive entries can be 0.
- P3: For $j \in [b-1 : (m-1)b]$, $\text{rank}(A(:, [j : j + b - 1])) = 1$.
- P4: For $j \in [0 : (m-2)b]$, $\text{rank}(A(:, [j : j + 2b - 1])) = 2$.

Then, $A(i, mb-1) \neq 0$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$.

Proof. From P1 and P2, it follows that $A(i, b-1) \neq 0$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $A(1, b-1) = \beta \cdot A(0, b-1)$, where $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$. Suppose that $A(i_1, j_1) \neq 0$ for some $i_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $j_1 \in [b : 2b-2]$. Then, considering $A(\cdot, [b-1 : 2b-2])$, from P3 we have $A(1, j_1) = \beta \cdot A(0, j_1)$. Again, from P3 we have $A(1, [b : 2b-1])^T = \beta \cdot A(0, [b : 2b-1])^T$. Combining $A(1, [b-1 : 2b-2])^T = \beta \cdot A(0, [b-1 : 2b-2])^T$ and $A(1, [b : 2b-1])^T = \beta \cdot A(0, [b : 2b-1])^T$, we get $A(1, [0 : 2b-1]) = \beta \cdot A(0, [0 : 2b-1])^T$, which violates P4. Thus, we have $A(i, [b : 2b-2]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$. From P2 we get $A(i, 2b-1) \neq 0$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Proceeding similarly, the lemma follows. \square

III. OPTIMAL RATE OF (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR}S

In this section, we will drive the optimal rate of an (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR} by establishing the equivalence of an (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR} and a $(2a, w, \tau)$ -SC. In the following, at times we will consider error packets in an error pattern as symbols over $\mathbb{F}_{q^n} \cong \mathbb{F}_q^n$, and define the vector $\underline{V}_E(t) = [\underline{e}(t), \underline{e}(t+1), \dots, \underline{e}(t+\tau)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_{q^n}^{\tau+1}$ for an admissible error pattern $E = (\underline{e}(0), \underline{e}(1), \dots)$ of the (a, w) -SW_{ERR} channel, where τ is the decoding-delay constraint. We remark here that even while considering an error packet $\underline{e}(t)$ as a symbol over \mathbb{F}_{q^n} , we will retain the underline under the letter e . However, it will be clear from context whether we are considering error packets as elements of \mathbb{F}_{q^n} or \mathbb{F}_q^n .

The lemma below (proved in the appendix) relates admissible error patterns of the (a, w) -SW_{ERR} channel to admissible erasure patterns of the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel.

Lemma 5. *Let $E = (\underline{e}(0), \underline{e}(1), \dots)$ and $\tilde{E} = (\tilde{e}(0), \tilde{e}(1), \dots)$ be two admissible error patterns of the (a, w) -SW_{ERR} channel. Let $\underline{e}' = (e'_0, e'_1, \dots)$ be the erasure pattern defined as $e'_t = 1$ iff $(\underline{e}(t) - \tilde{e}(t)) \neq 0$. Then \underline{e}' is an admissible erasure pattern of the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel. Conversely, every admissible erasure pattern of the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel can be expressed in this way.*

The theorem below establishes the equivalence of an (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR} and a $(2a, w, \tau)$ -SC.

Theorem 1. *An (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR} is a $(2a, w, \tau)$ -SC and the converse is also true.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C}_{Stf} be an (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR}. Let $\{\underline{u}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the sequence of message packets transmitted by the source and $\{\underline{x}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the corresponding sequence of coded packets. In the following, we will consider coded packets $\underline{x}(t)$ as scalar symbols over \mathbb{F}_{q^n} , and define the vector $\underline{X}(t) \triangleq [\underline{x}(t), \underline{x}(t+1), \dots, \underline{x}(t+\tau)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_{q^n}^{\tau+1}$. Let $\mathcal{E}(a, w) = \{E \mid E \text{ is admissible in the } (a, w)\text{-SW}_{\text{ERR}} \text{ channel}\}$ denote the set of admissible error patterns of the (a, w) -SW_{ERR} channel.

We will now show that $\underline{u}(0)$ can be recovered from any admissible erasure pattern of the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel by time slot τ . Then, one can use induction to prove that $\underline{u}(t)$ for any $t > 0$ can be recovered from any erasure pattern admissible in the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel by time slot τ , since while recovering $\underline{u}(t)$, one can assume that $\{\underline{u}(0), \underline{u}(1), \dots, \underline{u}(t-1)\}$ have been correctly recovered. We remark here that while we keep the proof general, it is sufficient to consider only those error and erasure patterns whose support is a subset of $[0 : \tau]$, because while recovering the message packet $\underline{u}(0)$ the decoder can only access coded packets received until time slot τ .

A necessary and sufficient condition for recovery of $\underline{u}(0)$ by time slot τ is that for any sequence $\{\tilde{x}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ of coded packets corresponding to some sequence $\{\tilde{u}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ of message packets such that $\tilde{u}(0) \neq \underline{u}(0)$,

$$\mathcal{B}(\underline{X}(0)) \cap \mathcal{B}(\tilde{\underline{X}}(0)) = \phi,$$

where $\tilde{\underline{X}}(t) \triangleq [\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{x}(t+1), \dots, \tilde{x}(t+\tau)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_{q^n}^{\tau+1}$, $\mathcal{B}(\underline{X}(0)) = \{\underline{X}(0) + \underline{V}_E(0) \mid E \in \mathcal{E}(a, w)\}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\tilde{\underline{X}}(0)) = \{\tilde{\underline{X}}(0) + \underline{V}_{\tilde{E}}(0) \mid \tilde{E} \in \mathcal{E}(a, w)\}$. Equivalently, we must have

$$\underline{X}(0) - \tilde{\underline{X}}(0) \notin \{\underline{V}_{\tilde{E}}(0) - \underline{V}_E(0) \mid E, \tilde{E} \in \mathcal{E}(a, w)\}. \quad (1)$$

Now suppose that there exists an admissible erasure pattern $\underline{e} = (e_0, e_1, \dots)$ of the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel such that \mathcal{C}_{Stf} can not recover $\underline{u}(0)$ by time slot τ . Then, it must be the case that there exists a sequence

of message packets $\{\tilde{u}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ such that $\tilde{u}(0) \neq \underline{u}(0)$, and $\{\tilde{u}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ yields the same set of unerased coded packets in the window $[0 : \tau]$ when the erasure pattern \underline{e} occurs, i.e., $\tilde{x}(t) = \underline{x}(t)$, $t \in [0 : \tau] \setminus \text{supp}([e_0, e_1, \dots, e_\tau])$, where $\{\tilde{x}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is the sequence of coded packets corresponding to $\{\tilde{u}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. Hence, $\text{supp}(\underline{X}(0) - \tilde{X}(0)) \in \text{supp}([e_0, e_1, \dots, e_\tau])$. Using Lemma 5, one can show that there exist error patterns $E, \tilde{E} \in \mathcal{E}(a, w)$ such that $\underline{X}(0) - \tilde{X}(0) = \underline{V}_{\tilde{E}}(0) - \underline{V}_E(0)$.

Similarly, one can use (1) and Lemma 5 to show that a $(2a, w, \tau)$ -SC is an (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR}. \square

The theorem below characterizes the optimal rate of an (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR}, and follows from [3], [4] and Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *The optimal rate of an (a, w, τ) -SC_{ERR} is given by*

$$R_{\text{opt}} = \frac{w - 2a}{w}.$$

Further, DE of a $[w, w - 2a]$ MDS code yields a rate-optimal $(a, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC_{ERR}.

Clearly, an $(a, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC_{ERR} is also an $(a, w, \tau' > w - 1)$ -SC_{ERR}. Thus, the theorem above provides a rate-optimal code construction for all parameters.

IV. STREAMING CODES FOR MULTIPLE ERASURE AND ERROR BURSTS

A. Streaming Codes for Multiple Erasure Bursts

We will first establish the necessity of a divisibility constraint for the existence of an $[n = k + zb, k]$ causal block code that is delay- τ^* decodable for any (z, b) -burst. Recall that $\tau^* = (k + (z - 1)b)$ if $k \geq b$.

Theorem 3. *It is possible to construct an $[n = k + zb, k]$ causal block code that is delay- τ^* decodable for any (z, b) -burst, where $k \geq b$, iff $b | \tau^*$.*

Proof. (The proof for an illustrative example case is provided here; the general proof is contained within the appendix.) If $b | \tau^*$, one can construct such a code via the construction provided in [6]. Therefore, we will focus on necessity here. We will show necessity for an example case. From Lemma 3, it suffices to show necessity for systematic codes. Let \mathcal{C} be a $[9, 5]$ systematic code that is delay- τ^* decodable for any $(2, 2)$ -burst, where $\tau^* = 7$. Let $\underline{c}^T = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_8]$ be an arbitrary codeword of \mathcal{C} , and let H be the parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} in systematic form. We will first identify the rank of certain sub-matrices of H . Then, we will invoke Lemma 4 to show that a certain entry of H must be non-zero, using which we will contradict the fact that \mathcal{C} is delay-7 decodable for any $(2, 2)$ -burst.

Consider the recovery of code symbol c_0 . We focus on $H^{(0)}$, which is of size (3×8) . Note that the last 3 columns of $H^{(0)}$ form the (3×3) identity matrix, i.e., $H^{(0)}(:, [5 : 7]) = I_3$. Consider the erasure pattern whose support is given by $[0 : 1] \cup [6 : 7]$. We must have $H^{(0)}(0, 0) \neq 0$ and $H^{(0)}(0, 1) = 0$, because otherwise one could add a (possibly 0) scalar multiple of $H_1^{(0)}$ to $H_0^{(0)}$ to get a vector $\underline{v} = [v_0, v_1, v_2]^T$, where $v_0 = 0$, and such a vector lies in the span of $\{H_6^{(0)}, H_7^{(0)}\}$. Similarly, considering the erasure pattern whose support is given by $[0 : 1] \cup [5 : 6]$, we get that $H^{(0)}(2, 0) \neq 0$ and $H^{(0)}(2, 1) = 0$.

Now consider recovery of the symbol c_1 . Note that $H^{(1)} = H$. Consider the erasure pattern whose support is given by $[1 : 2] \cup [7 : 8]$. Noting that $H^{(1)}(0, 1) = 0$, we get $H^{(1)}(1, 1) \neq 0$. Similarly, considering the erasure pattern whose support is given by $[1 : 2] \cup [6 : 7]$, we get $H^{(1)}(3, 1) \neq 0$.

Once again consider the recovery of symbol c_0 . Note that in $H^{(0)}$, $H^{(0)}(0, 2) \neq 0$, since from Lemma 2, $H^{(0)}([0 : 1], [1 : 2])$ must be full-rank. Similarly, $H^{(0)}(2, 2) \neq 0$. Now suppose that $H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, [2 : 3])$ is full-rank. Then, $H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, 0) \in \text{span}\langle \{H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, 2), H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, 3)\} \rangle$. Since $H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, 1) = \underline{0}_2^T$ and $H^{(0)}(1, 1) \neq 0$, it follows that $H_0^{(0)} \in \text{span}\langle \{H_1^{(0)}, H_2^{(0)}, H_3^{(0)}\} \rangle$. Thus, $\text{rank}(H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, [2 : 3])) = 1$ must hold ($\text{rank}(H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, [2 : 3])) = 0$ violates Lemma 2). Similarly, $\text{rank}(H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, [3 : 4])) = 1$ must hold. In the proof for the general case, this argument has been called Argument 1. We must also have $\text{rank}(H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, [1 : 4])) = 2$ from Lemma 1. It follows that $H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, [1 : 4])$ satisfies all the properties of Lemma 4. Hence we get $H^{(0)}(2, 4) \neq 0$. However, since $H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, 5) = [1, 0]^T$, the rank




Fig. 4: An admissible periodic erasure pattern of the (z, b, w) -MBSW channel.

of $H^{(0)}(\{0, 2\}, \{4, 5\})$ is 2, and the code symbol c_0 can not be recovered from the $(2, 2)$ -burst whose support is given by $[0 : 1] \cup [4 : 5]$, within delay 7. \square

In the following theorem (for proof see appendix), we derive a rate-upper-bound for a (z, b, w, τ) -SC and show that it can be achieved via DE iff a divisibility constraint is met.

Theorem 4. *The rate R of a (z, b, w, τ) -SC is upper-bounded as*

$$R \leq \frac{w - 1 - (z - 1)b}{w - 1 + b}. \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC that achieves the bound (2) can be constructed via DE iff $b|(w - 1)$.

Proof. Consider the periodic erasure pattern shown in Fig. 4. It can be verified that this erasure pattern is admissible in the (z, b, w) -MBSW channel. A period of this erasure pattern has length $(w - 1 + b)$, and in each period there are $(w - 1 - (z - 1)b)$ non-erased packets. Following similar arguments as in [3], it follows that the rate R of a (z, b, w, τ) -SC is upper-bounded as (2).

One can construct a systematic $[w - 1 + b, w - 1 - (z - 1)b]$ code that is delay- $(w - 1)$ decodable for any (z, b) -burst using the construction in [6] (since $\tau^* = w - 1$ for this case) if $b|(w - 1)$. DE of this code yields a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC whose rate matches (2).

Now suppose that \mathcal{C} is an $[n, k]$ systematic code such that DE of \mathcal{C} results in a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC \mathcal{C}_{Str} whose rate matches (2). Since \mathcal{C} recovers from zb erasures, it follows that $n - k \geq zb$. Since the rate of \mathcal{C}_{Str} matches (2), we must have $k \geq (w - 1 - (z - 1)b)$. Suppose that a diagonally embedded codeword $\underline{c}^T = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}] \in \mathcal{C}$ is affected by the (z, b) -burst whose support is given by $I = [0 : b - 1] \cup [w - (z - 1)b : w - 1]$. Clearly, if $k > (w - 1 - (z - 1)b)$, there are no parity symbols in $[0 : w - 1] \setminus I$, and the code symbol c_0 can not be recovered within delay $(w - 1)$. Thus, \mathcal{C} is a $[w - 1 + b, w - 1 - (z - 1)b]$ systematic code that is delay- $(w - 1)$ decodable for any (z, b) -burst. From Theorem 3, it follows that $b|(w - 1)$. \square

As mentioned before, $(1, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SCs whose rate matches the bound (2) can be constructed by DE for all parameters [1], [2]. Theorem 4 then in particular shows that a $(1, zb, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC is not necessarily a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC.

B. Streaming Codes for Multiple Error Bursts

It can be shown that admissible error patterns of the (z, b, w) -MBSW_{ERR} channel whose support is a subset of $[0 : w - 1]$ are related to admissible erasure patterns of the $(2z, b, w)$ -MBSW channel whose support is a subset of $[0 : w - 1]$ in a way that is similar to the one described in Lemma 5. It follows that one can construct a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC_{ERR} of non-zero rate only if $w > 2zb$, which we will assume in the following. The theorem below establishes the equivalence of a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC_{ERR} and a $(2z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC, and can be proved analogous to Theorem 1.

Theorem 5. *A $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC_{ERR} is a $(2z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ -SC and the converse is also true.*

We can now combine Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 to get the following theorem analogous to Theorem 2.

Theorem 6. *The rate R' of a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ - SC_{ERR} is upper-bounded as*

$$R' \leq \frac{w - 1 - (2z - 1)b}{w - 1 + b}. \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, a $(z, b, w, \tau = w - 1)$ - SC_{ERR} that achieves the bound (3) can be constructed via DE iff $b|(w - 1)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Martinian and C. W. Sundberg, "Burst erasure correction codes with low decoding delay," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 2494–2502, 2004.
- [2] E. Martinian and M. Trott, "Delay-Optimal Burst Erasure Code Construction," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory, Nice, France, June 24-29, 2007*, pp. 1006–1010.
- [3] A. Badr, P. Patil, A. Khisti, W. Tan, and J. G. Apostolopoulos, "Layered Constructions for Low-Delay Streaming Codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 111–141, 2017.
- [4] M. N. Krishnan, D. Shukla, and P. V. Kumar, "Rate-optimal streaming codes for channels with burst and random erasures," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 4869–4891, 2020.
- [5] E. Domanovitz, S. L. Fong, and A. Khisti, "An explicit rate-optimal streaming code for channels with burst and arbitrary erasures," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 47–65, 2022.
- [6] Z. Li, A. Khisti, and B. Girod, "Correcting erasure bursts with minimum decoding delay," in *2011 Conference Record of the Forty Fifth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers (ASILOMAR)*, 2011, pp. 33–39.
- [7] V. Ramkumar, S. Bhatnagar, and P. V. Kumar, "Near-optimal streaming codes with linear field size," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2023, pp. 1118–1123.
- [8] M. Rudow and K. V. Rashmi, "Learning-augmented streaming codes for variable-size messages under partial burst losses," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, June 2023, pp. 1101–1106.
- [9] A. Badr, A. Khisti, W.-t. Tan, and J. Apostolopoulos, "Streaming codes with partial recovery over channels with burst and isolated erasures," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 501–516, 2015.
- [10] S. Bhatnagar, B. Chakraborti, and P. V. Kumar, "Streaming codes for handling a combination of burst and random erasures," in *2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [11] J. Cloud and M. Médard, "Multi-path low delay network codes," in *Proc. IEEE Global Communications Conference, GLOBECOM 2016, Washington, DC, USA, December 4-8, 2016*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–7.
- [12] S. L. Fong, A. Khisti, B. Li, W. Tan, X. Zhu, and J. G. Apostolopoulos, "Optimal streaming erasure codes over the three-node relay network," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 5, pp. 2696–2712, 2020.
- [13] M. Rudow and K. V. Rashmi, "Online versus offline rate in streaming codes for variable-size messages," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2020, pp. 509–514.
- [14] N. Adler and Y. Cassuto, "Burst-Erasure Correcting Codes With Optimal Average Delay," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 2848–2865, 2017.
- [15] M. Haghifam, M. N. Krishnan, A. Khisti, X. Zhu, W. Tan, and J. G. Apostolopoulos, "On streaming codes with unequal error protection," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Inf. Theory*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 1165–1179, 2021.
- [16] P. Su, Y. Huang, S. Lin, I. Wang, and C. Wang, "Random linear streaming codes in the finite memory length and decoding deadline regime," in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2021, Melbourne, Australia, July 12-20, 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 730–735.
- [17] M. N. Krishnan, G. K. Facenda, E. Domanovitz, A. Khisti, W. Tan, and J. G. Apostolopoulos, "High rate streaming codes over the three-node relay network," in *Proc. IEEE Information Theory Workshop, ITW 2021, Kanazawa, Japan, October 17-21, 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [18] V. Ramkumar, M. Vajha, and P. V. Kumar, "Locally recoverable streaming codes for packet-erasure recovery," in *Proc. IEEE Information Theory Workshop, ITW 2021, Kanazawa, Japan, October 17-21, 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [19] M. Rudow and K. Rashmi, "Learning-augmented streaming codes are approximately optimal for variable-size messages," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2022, pp. 474–479.
- [20] A. Frank, "Delay-optimal coding for secure transmission over parallel burst erasure channels with an eavesdropper," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2020, pp. 960–965.
- [21] A. Frank, H. Aydinian, and H. Boche, "Delay optimal coding for secure transmission over a burst erasure wiretap channel," in *2019 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [22] A. Badr, D. Lui, and A. Khisti, "Streaming codes for multicast over burst erasure channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 8, pp. 4181–4208, 2015.
- [23] R. Mahmood, A. Badr, and A. Khisti, "Streaming codes for multiplicative-matrix channels with burst rank loss," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 5296–5311, 2018.
- [24] M. Vajha, V. Ramkumar, M. N. Krishnan, and P. V. Kumar, "Explicit rate-optimal streaming codes with smaller field size," in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2021, Melbourne, Australia, July 12-20, 2021*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 736–741.
- [25] M. Nikhil Krishnan, V. Ramkumar, M. Vajha, and P. Vijay Kumar, "Simple streaming codes for reliable, low-latency communication," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 249–253, 2020.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. Since H is the parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} in systematic form, $H(:, [k : n - 1]) = I_{zb}$. Consider the erasure pattern \underline{e} whose support is given by $\mathcal{E} = [k : n - 1] \setminus [lb : (l + 1)b - 1]$, for some $l \in [0 : z - 1]$. It is easy to check that \underline{e} is a $(z - 1, b)$ -burst. Also, any vector $\underline{v} = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}]^T$ such that $v_\lambda = 0$, $\lambda \in [lb : (l + 1)b - 1]$ lies in the span of $\{H_i \mid i \in \mathcal{E}\}$. Now, if for some $j \in [0 : k - b]$, $\text{rank}(H([lb : (l + 1)b - 1], [j : j + b - 1])) < b$, one can linearly combine $\{H_i \mid i \in [j : j + b - 1]\}$ to get a vector \underline{v} of the form described above. Then, $\{H_i \mid i \in \mathcal{E} \cup \{j : j + b - 1\}\}$ becomes a linearly dependent set, and the code can not recover from the (z, b) -burst \underline{e}' whose support is given by $\mathcal{E} \cup \{j : j + b - 1\}$. \square

B. Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. An $[n = k + zb, k]$ systematic block code that is delay- τ decodable for any (z, b) -burst is also a causal code, hence sufficiency follows. Now suppose that \mathcal{C} is an $[n = k + zb, k]$ causal block code that is delay- τ decodable for any (z, b) -burst. Let $G = [U_{k \times k} \mid P]$ be the generator matrix of \mathcal{C} . Since \mathcal{C} can recover from the (z, b) -burst whose support is given by $[n - zb : n - 1]$, $U_{k \times k}$ must be full-rank. Let $\underline{c}^T = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}]$ be the codeword corresponding to the message vector $\underline{u} = [u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{k-1}]^T$. Since \mathcal{C} recovers message symbol u_i , $i \in [0 : k - 1]$ from any (z, b) -burst within delay τ , and c_j , $j \in [0 : k - 1]$ is a function of $\{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_j\}$ only (because $U_{k \times k}$ is upper-triangular), it follows that c_j , $j \in [0 : k - 1]$ is recoverable within delay τ . Now consider the systematic code $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ whose generator matrix $\hat{G} = [I_k \mid \hat{P}]$ is obtained by performing row operations on G . Since the code $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ also has the property that for any $\hat{\underline{c}}^T = [\hat{c}_0, \hat{c}_1, \dots, \hat{c}_{n-1}] \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$, \hat{c}_j , $j \in [0 : k - 1]$ is recoverable within delay τ , the claim follows. \square

C. Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. Considering the error packets in the admissible error pattern E as symbols over $\mathbb{F}_{q^n} \cong \mathbb{F}_q^n$, we define the vector $\underline{U}_E(t) = [\underline{e}(t), \underline{e}(t + 1), \dots, \underline{e}(t + w - 1)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_{q^n}^w$. Similarly, we define the vector $\underline{U}_{\tilde{E}}(t) = [\tilde{\underline{e}}(t), \tilde{\underline{e}}(t + 1), \dots, \tilde{\underline{e}}(t + w - 1)]^T \in \mathbb{F}_{q^n}^w$ for the error pattern \tilde{E} . Now, since E and \tilde{E} are admissible error patterns of the (a, w) -SW_{ERR} channel, we have $w_H(\underline{U}_E(t)) \leq a$ and $w_H(\underline{U}_{\tilde{E}}(t)) \leq a$, $\forall t \geq 0$. Thus, $w_H([\underline{e}'_t, \underline{e}'_{t+1}, \dots, \underline{e}'_{t+w-1}]) = w_H(\underline{U}_E(t) - \underline{U}_{\tilde{E}}(t)) \leq 2a$, $\forall t \geq 0$, which implies that \underline{e}' is admissible in the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel.

We now prove the converse. Let \underline{e}' be an admissible erasure pattern of the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel, and let $\mathcal{I} = \{i_0, i_1, \dots\}$ be the (possibly finite) support of \underline{e}' . Now define two sets $I_1 = \{i_j \mid j \text{ is even}\}$ and $I_2 = \{i_j \mid j \text{ is odd}\}$. Note that $I_1 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$ and $I_1 \cup I_2 = \mathcal{I}$. Define the error pattern $E = (\underline{e}(0), \underline{e}(1), \dots)$ as $\underline{e}(t) = [1, 0, \dots, 0] \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ (or any other non-zero vector in \mathbb{F}_q^n) if $t \in I_1$, and $\underline{e}(t) = \underline{0}_n$, otherwise. Define the error pattern $\tilde{E} = (\tilde{\underline{e}}(0), \tilde{\underline{e}}(1), \dots)$ as $\tilde{\underline{e}}(t) = [1, 0, \dots, 0] \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ (or any other non-zero vector in \mathbb{F}_q^n) if $t \in I_2$, and $\tilde{\underline{e}}(t) = \underline{0}_n$, otherwise. We will now show that E is admissible in the (a, w) -SW_{ERR} channel, the proof for \tilde{E} is analogous. Suppose that E is not admissible in the (a, w) -SW_{ERR} channel. Then, there must exist some $t \geq 0$ such that $w_H(\underline{U}_E(t)) > a$. In this case, we must have $w_H([\underline{e}'_t, \underline{e}'_{t+1}, \dots, \underline{e}'_{t+w-1}]) > 2a$, which violates the fact that \underline{e}' is an admissible erasure pattern of the $(2a, w)$ -SW channel. It is easy to verify that \underline{e}' can be obtained from E and \tilde{E} as described in the lemma. \square

D. Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. We will now show necessity for the general case. From Lemma 3, it suffices to show necessity for systematic codes. Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n = k + zb, k]$ systematic block code that is delay- τ^* decodable for any (z, b) -burst, where $k \geq b$, and $\tau^* = k + (z - 1)b$. It follows that $b \nmid \tau^* \iff b \nmid k$. Let $k = ub + a$, $a \in [1 : b - 1]$. Let H be the parity-check matrix of \mathcal{C} in systematic form, and let $\underline{c}^T = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}]$ be any arbitrary codeword of \mathcal{C} . Consider the following two cases:

a) *Case $z = 2$:* We will first show that $H^{(0)}([0 : b - 1], [0 : b - 1])$ is lower triangular with $H^{(0)}(i, i) \neq 0$, $i \in [0 : b - 1]$.

Consider recoverability of code symbol c_0 . Focus on $H^{(0)}$. Note that $H^{(0)}$ is of size $(b + 1) \times (n - b + 1)$, and the last $(b + 1)$ columns of $H^{(0)}$ form an identity matrix. Consider the $(2, b)$ -burst whose support is given by $[0 : b - 1] \cup [n - 2b : n - b] \setminus \{n - 2b\}$. We must have $H^{(0)}(0, 0) \neq 0$ and $H^{(0)}(0, [1 : b - 1]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$, since otherwise it will be possible to add a scalar multiple of $H_l^{(0)}$ for some $l \in [1 : b - 1]$ to $H_0^{(0)}$ to get a vector $\underline{v} = [v_0, v_1, \dots, v_b]^T$ such that $v_0 = 0$, and such a vector lies in the span of $\{H_j^{(0)} \mid j \in [n - 2b : n - b] \setminus \{n - 2b\}\}$. Similarly, considering the $(2, b)$ -burst whose support is given by $[0 : b - 1] \cup [n - 2b : n - b] \setminus \{n - b\}$, we get $H^{(0)}(b, 0) \neq 0$ and $H^{(0)}(b, [1 : b - 1]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$.

Now consider recoverability of the symbol c_1 . Consider the $(2, b)$ -burst whose support is given by $[1 : b] \cup [n - 2b + 1 : n - b + 1] \setminus \{n - 2b + 1\}$. Following a similar argument as above, and noting that $H^{(1)}(0, [1 : b - 1]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$, we get $H^{(1)}(1, 1) \neq 0$, and, if $b > 2$, $H^{(1)}(1, [2 : b - 1]) = \underline{0}_{b-2}^T$. Noting that $H^{(0)}([0 : b - 1], [0 : b - 1]) = H^{(1)}([0 : b - 1], [0 : b - 1])$, we get $H^{(0)}([0 : 1], [0 : 1])$ is lower-triangular, with $H^{(0)}(i, i) \neq 0$, $i \in [0 : 1]$. Proceeding similarly, we consider recoverability of c_2, c_3, \dots, c_{b-1} to get that $H^{(0)}([0 : b - 1], [0 : b - 1])$ is lower triangular, with $H^{(0)}(i, i) \neq 0$, $i \in [0 : b - 1]$.

Now, we again focus on recovery of c_0 .

Argument 1. Suppose there exists an index $s \in [b : n - 3b + 1]$ such that $H^{(0)}(\{0, b\}, [s : s + L - 1])$ has rank 2, where $L \leq b$. Then, $H^{(0)}(\{0, b\}, 0) \in \text{span}\langle \{H^{(0)}(\{0, b\}, j) \mid j \in [s : s + L - 1]\} \rangle$. Since $H^{(0)}(0, [1 : b - 1]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$, $H^{(0)}(b, [1 : b - 1]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$ and $H^{(0)}([1 : b - 1], [1 : b - 1])$ is lower triangular with $H^{(0)}(i, i) \neq 0$, $i \in [1 : b - 1]$, we get that $H_0^{(0)} \in \text{span}\langle \{H_j^{(0)} \mid j \in [1 : b - 1] \cup [s : s + L - 1]\} \rangle$. The erasure pattern whose support is given by $[0 : b - 1] \cup [s : s + L - 1]$ is a $(2, b)$ -burst, hence no such s should exist.

We will now show that such an s exists by invoking Lemma 4. Since $H^{(0)}(0, [1 : b - 1]) = \underline{0}_{b-1}^T$, from Lemma 2, it follows that $H^{(0)}(0, b) \neq 0$. Similarly, $H^{(0)}(b, b) \neq 0$. If $u \geq 2$, from Argument 1 as well as by noting that \mathcal{C} is an $[n = k + zb, k]$ systematic block code that is delay- τ^* decodable for any $(2, b)$ -burst, it follows that $H^{(0)}(\{0, b\}, [1 : ub])$ satisfies all the properties stated in Lemma 4, and thus $H^{(0)}(b, ub) \neq 0$. Thus, $H^{(0)}(b, ub) \neq 0$ for $u \geq 1$. Observing that $H^{(0)}(\{0, b\}, n - 2b) = [1, 0]^T$, we get $H^{(0)}(\{0, b\}, \{ub, n - 2b\})$ is full-rank. The burst erasure whose support is given by $[ub : n - 2b]$ is of length $\leq b$.

b) *Case $z > 2$:* Consider the code $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ obtained by puncturing \mathcal{C} on the coordinates $\mathcal{P} = [n - zb : n - 2b - 1]$, i.e., the code $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is obtained by deleting all the coordinates in \mathcal{P} from every codeword of \mathcal{C} . Then, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is a linear block code of dimension $\tilde{k} = k$, and length $\tilde{n} = k + 2b$. Let $\tilde{c}^T = [\tilde{c}_0, \tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_{\tilde{n}-1}]$ be any arbitrary codeword of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. Define a map f from $[0 : \tilde{n} - 1]$ to $[0 : n - 1]$ as follows:

$$f(i) = \begin{cases} i, & \text{if } i \in [0 : \tilde{k} - 1], \\ (z - 2)B + i, & \text{if } i \in [\tilde{k} : \tilde{n} - 1]. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

For a set $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t\} \subseteq [0 : \tilde{n} - 1]$, let $f(I)$ denote the set $\{f(i_1), f(i_2), \dots, f(i_t)\}$. Suppose that for some $i \in [0 : \tilde{k} - 1]$ there exists a $(2, b)$ -burst \underline{e} whose support is given by $J \in [0 : \tilde{n} - 1]$, such that \tilde{c}_i is not recoverable within delay $(\tilde{n} - b)$ when \underline{e} occurs. Then, with regard to \mathcal{C} it follows that $c_{f(i)}$ is not recoverable within delay $(n - b)$ when the (z, b) -burst \underline{e}' whose support is given by $f(J) \cup \mathcal{P}$ occurs. Since \mathcal{C} is delay- $(n - b)$ decodable for any (z, b) -burst, such an i does not exist. Thus, $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is a causal $[\tilde{n} = \tilde{k} + 2b, \tilde{k}]$ block code that is delay- $(\tilde{n} - b)$ decodable for any $(2, b)$ -burst, where $\tilde{k} \geq b$, which as we have shown in the previous case can not exist. \square

Remark 1. The proof presented here shows a stronger result than the statement of the theorem, by showing that the 0-th code symbol itself can not be decoded within delay τ^* if $b \nmid \tau^*$.