

Idempotents, Mattson-Solomon Polynomials and Binary LDPC codes

R. Horan, C. Tjhai, M. Tomlinson, M. Ambroze and M. Ahmed

Fixed and Mobile Communications Research

University of Plymouth, PL4 8AA, United Kingdom

October 28, 2018

Abstract

We show how to construct an algorithm to search for binary idempotents which may be used to construct binary LDPC codes. The algorithm, which allows control of the key properties of sparseness, code rate and minimum distance, is constructed in the Mattson-Solomon domain. Some of the new codes, found by using this technique, are displayed.

1 Introduction and Background

The use of idempotents in the construction of cyclic error correcting codes is well established and the resulting literature is extensive (for example, see [1], [3], [7]). The basic building blocks for this theory are the primitive idempotents. Any cyclic code may be described by a unique idempotent and this idempotent is a sum of primitive idempotents. For binary cyclic codes, efficient algorithms exist for the calculation of these primitive idempotents.

Another way of constructing idempotents in the binary case is by using cyclotomic cosets and it was this property which was exploited by Shibuya and Sakaniwa in [4]. Their goal was to use idempotents to construct parity check matrices for LDPC codes which have no cycles of length 4 in their factor graphs. At the heart of their technique is a lemma which is a variation of a result used by Weldon [8], for the construction of difference set cyclic codes. Using this lemma and a subsequent theorem, they were able to simplify the problem of determining which of the idempotents that are constructed, using a single cyclotomic coset, do not have cycles of length 4. They then extended this theory to more general idempotents.

This approach to the construction of LDPC codes has the great advantage of simplicity, the parity check matrices depend only upon the correct choice of cyclotomic cosets and these are very easily calculated. However, we believe that this advantage is offset by some fundamental weaknesses.

Whilst the absence of 4 cycles is a desirable objective in the construction of LDPC codes it is not mandatory [5], since there are some good codes which do not have this property. An example of such a code is included in this paper. The code rate is also an important property of codes but, as Shibuya and Sakaniwa admit in their conclusion, the codes which they construct in this way are “*expected to have a large minimum distance at the expense of rate*” (our italics). The minimum distance of a code is a crucial property but there is no indication in [4] of how either a single cyclotomic coset, or combinations of more than one cyclotomic cosets, should be chosen to guarantee that the code constructed has a large minimum distance.

In order to address the question of how to choose idempotents which will produce good LDPC codes we propose an entirely different route. As in [4], we shall deal exclusively with binary cyclic codes. Making effective use of the Mattson-Solomon polynomial, we produce an algorithm which not only allows us to choose, in a systematic way, idempotents with low weight, and therefore a correspondingly sparse parity check matrix, but also with the desirable features that the corresponding codes have a high code rate and a large minimum distance.

This paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we shall review the necessary theory and explain how it will be used to provide an algorithm for the determination of idempotents which may be used to construct good codes. In section 3 the design and implementation of this algorithm is given and then, in section 4, some of the results are displayed. Finally, in section 5, we draw our conclusions on this approach.

2 Binary Idempotents

Let $F = GF(2)$, n be a positive integer and \mathcal{F} be the splitting field for $x^n - 1$ over F . Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ be a primitive n th root of unity and let $T(x)$ be the polynomials in $\mathcal{F}[x]$ of degree $\leq n - 1$. If $a(x) \in T(x)$ then the map $\Phi : T \rightarrow T$ is defined by

$$[\Phi(a)](z) = \sum_{j=1}^n a(\alpha^j) z^{n-j} \quad (1)$$

and $\Phi(a)$ is the Mattson-Solomon polynomial of a (see [1]). (We use x and z for the polynomial variables to distinguish between the polynomials in the domain and codomain of Φ .) If \circ is multiplication of polynomials mod $(x^n - 1)$ and $*$ is defined on $T(z)$ by the rule $(\sum a_i z^i) * (\sum b_i z^i) = \sum a_i b_i z^i$ then it is well known [1],[7], that

$$\Phi : (T, +, \circ) \rightarrow (T, +, *)$$

is an isomorphism of rings, in particular it is an isomorphism of the additive groups.

If $S(x)$ is the subset of $T(x)$ consisting of polynomials with coefficients in $GF(2)$ (binary polynomials) and $E(x)$ is the subset of $T(x)$ consisting of idempotents, both of these subsets are *additive subgroups* of $T(x)$. It is easy to show (see [1]) that

$$\Phi : (S(x), +) \rightarrow (E(z), +) \quad (2)$$

$$\Phi : (E(x), +) \rightarrow (S(z), +) \quad (3)$$

are both isomorphisms and from this it is obvious that

$$\Phi : (S(x) \cap E(x), +) \rightarrow (E(z) \cap S(z), +) \quad (4)$$

is also an isomorphism.

Suppose that $u(x)$ is a binary idempotent which is used to construct a parity check matrix for a cyclic code. The parity check matrix is constructed from the n -cyclic shifts of $u(x)$ [2], and so for the resulting code to be a LDPC code, $u(x)$ must have low weight.

If $h(x) = \gcd(x^n - 1, u(x))$ and $g(x) = (x^n - 1)/h(x)$, then $g(x)$ is the generator of the cyclic code. If the generator, $g(x)$, has degree $n - k$, the dimension of the code is k and the larger the value of k , the better the code rate. Since $g(x)$ is a divisor of $x^n - 1$, all of the zeros of $g(x)$ are n th roots of unity, and there are $n - k$ of these.

Further, $\gcd(g(x), h(x))=1$ and $x^n - 1 = h(x)g(x)$, so that the number of distinct n th roots of unity which are also roots of $u(x)$ is k . The dimension of the code is therefore the number of n th roots of unity which are also roots of $u(x)$.

The BCH bound of the code is determined by the number of consecutive powers of α , taken cyclically $(\text{mod } n)$, which are also roots of $g(x)$. For the reasons outlined in the previous paragraph, this is precisely the same as the number of consecutive powers of α , taken cyclically $(\text{mod } n)$, which are *not* roots of $u(x)$.

The important features of the code are therefore determined by:

- (a) the weight of the idempotent $u(x)$,
- (b) the number of n th roots of unity which are roots of $u(x)$,
- (c) the number of consecutive powers of α which are *not* roots of $u(x)$.

Take $u(x) \in S(x) \cap E(x)$ and let $\Phi(u) = \theta$ be its MS polynomial. The inverse mapping

$$\Phi^{-1} : (S(z) \cap E(z), +) \rightarrow (E(z) \cap S(x), +) \quad (5)$$

is defined as follows: If $A(z) = [\Phi(a)](z)$ is the Mattson-Solomon polynomial of the polynomial $a(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_nx^{n-1}$ then, for $i = 0, \dots, n-1$,

$$a_i = \frac{1}{n}A(\alpha^i) \quad (6)$$

(see [1]). Let $h(z) = \gcd(\theta(z), z^n - 1)$ and let $f(z) = (z^n - 1)/h(z)$. The three key properties relating to the idempotent $u(x)$, listed above, are easily gleaned from its Mattson-Solomon polynomial $\theta(z)$, and $f(z)$, as follows:

2.1 The weight of $u(x)$

The weight of $u(x)$ is the number of n th roots of unity which are zeros of $f(z)$. To see this note that $f(\alpha^i) = 0$ if and only if $\theta(\alpha^i) = 1$, since idempotents take only the values 0 and 1 in \mathcal{F} . Now $u = \Phi^{-1}\theta$ and the coefficients of $u(x) = u_0 + u_1x + \dots + u_{n-1}x^{n-1}$ are given by

$$u_i = \theta(\alpha^i) \pmod{2} \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, n-1 \quad (7)$$

(*cf* equation (6)). Thus $u_i = 1$ precisely when $f(\alpha^i) = 0$, giving the weight of $u(x)$ as the degree of the polynomial $f(z)$.

2.2 The zeros of $u(x)$.

From the definition of the MS polynomial, (1),

$$\theta(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n u(\alpha^j)z^{n-j} \quad (8)$$

and the number of zeros of $u(x)$ which are roots of unity is clearly $n - \text{wt}(\theta(z))$.

2.3 The BCH bound of the code.

The BCH bound of the code is the largest number of consecutive powers of α which are *not* roots of $u(x)$, i.e. the number of consecutive i , taken (mod n), such that $u(\alpha^i) = 1$. From (8), this is the largest number of consecutive non-zero coefficients in θ , taken cyclically (mod n).

Using this information, a systematic search for idempotents can now be made in increasing order of weight, with accompanying knowledge of the number of roots which are n th roots of unity and the corresponding BCH bound. This algorithm is constructed in the Mattson-Solomon domain.

Let the decomposition of $z^n - 1$ into irreducible (over $F = GF(2)$) polynomials be $z^n - 1 = f_1(z)f_2(z)\dots f_t(z)$. For $i = 1, \dots, t$, let $k_i(z) = (z^n - 1)/f_i(z)$ and let $\theta_i(z)$ be the associated primitive idempotent (see [1] or [7]). These are displayed below in an array, together with other idempotents:

$$\left. \begin{array}{ccc} u_1(x) & \theta_1(z) & f_1(z) \\ u_2(x) & \theta_2(z) & f_2(z) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_t(x) & \theta_t(z) & f_t(z) \end{array} \right\} \quad (9)$$

Here $u_1(x), u_2(x), \dots, u_t(x)$ are the idempotents whose Mattson-Solomon polynomials are $\theta_1(z), \theta_2(z), \dots, \theta_t(z)$, respectively. Let $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and let u, θ and f be defined as $u = \sum_{i \in I} u_i$, $\theta = \sum_{i \in I} \theta_i$ and $f(z) = \prod_{i \in I} f_i(z)$. From the properties of primitive idempotents, if $h(z) = \gcd(\theta(z), z^n - 1)$ then it follows that $\gcd(f(z), h(z)) = 1$ and $z^n - 1 = f(z)h(z)$. The idempotent u will now have the following properties.

$$\text{wt}(u) = \sum_{i \in I} \deg(f_i), \quad (10)$$

$$\text{number of zeros of } u = n - \text{wt}(\theta). \quad (11)$$

The BCH bound is determined from $\theta(z)$ as explained in 2.3.

Since methods for finding the θ_i and f_i are well documented (see e.g. [6]) a search algorithm can be built around this observation to find a suitable weight idempotent with a known number of zeros and a known BCH bound. The rows of the array (9), are ordered by the degree of the polynomials, i.e. $\deg(f_i) \leq \deg(f_{i+1})$ for all i , and a search can be made in increasing order of weight. When a successful outcome has been obtained, *only at this stage* is the *inverse Fourier transform* (MS^{-1}) evaluated to find the corresponding idempotent. All of the information which is required will already be known.

3 Design and Implementation

If t denotes the number of cyclotomic cosets modulo n , the complexity of an exhaustive search algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(2^t)$. We reduce this search complexity by targeting the search on the three key parameters:

3.1 Sparseness of the parity-check matrix

In [8], Weldon introduced difference-set cyclic codes. These codes have the desirable property that the parity check equations are orthogonal on all bits and have no cycles of length 4 in their factor graphs. A necessary condition for this is that if $v(x)$ is the polynomial which generates the parity check matrix then the weight of $v(x)$ must satisfy the inequality

$$\text{wt}(v(x))(\text{wt}(v(x)) - 1) \leq n, \quad (12)$$

where n is the code length. Since the weights of the idempotents $u(x)$ are related to the degrees of the f_i by (10), a reasonable bound is

$$\sum_{i \subseteq I} \deg(f_i) \leq \sqrt{n}. \quad (13)$$

In practice we have gone a little beyond this limit and this has enabled us to find some good codes which do have cycles of length 4 in their factor graph.

3.2 Code-rate

The code-rate is directly proportional to the number of roots of $u(x)$. If we let R_{min} represent our minimum desired code-rate then, following equation (11), we can refine our search bound to

$$\text{wt}(\theta) \leq (1 - R_{min})n. \quad (14)$$

3.3 Minimum distance

Let d be the lowest desired minimum distance and let r_θ be the largest number of consecutive non-zero coefficients, taken cyclically mod n , of θ . Then, following the discussion of 2.3, we restrict our search algorithm to those θ for which

$$r_\theta > d \quad (15)$$

We develop an efficient, but exhaustive recursive tree-search based on the above bounds. The developed search algorithm, Algorithm 1, is initialised by setting \mathbf{V} and $index$ to \emptyset and -1 respectively.

4 Code Example and Performance

Since the algorithm is an exhaustive search, the code construction method presented in this paper is able to produce, in addition to new codes, many well-know cyclic codes, for example the Difference-Set Cyclic codes and the Euclidean and Projective Geometry codes. Some of the new codes which we have found using this technique are presented in Table 1. All codes in Table 1, except those labelled with *, have orthogonal parity-check equations.

Algorithm 1 CodeSearch(\mathbf{V} , $index$, $\mathbf{F}(x)$, $\mathbf{Q}(z)$)

Input: $R_{min} \leftarrow$ minimum code-rate of interest $d \leftarrow$ lowest expected minimum distance $\delta \leftarrow$ small positive integer $\mathbf{F}(x) \leftarrow \{f_i(x)\} \forall i \in I$ sorted in ascending order of the degree $\mathbf{Q}(z) \leftarrow \{\theta_i(z)\} \forall i \in I$ **Output:** CodeList contains set of codes

```
1:  $\mathbf{T} \leftarrow \mathbf{V}$ 
2: for ( $i=index+1$ ;  $i \leq \text{Size}(I)$ ;  $i++$ ) do
3:    $\mathbf{T}_{prev} \leftarrow \mathbf{T}$ 
4:   if ( $\sum_{j \in \mathbf{T}} \deg(f_j(x)) + \deg(f_i(x)) \leq \sqrt{n} + \delta$ ) then
5:     Append  $i$  to  $\mathbf{T}$ 
6:      $\theta(z) \leftarrow \sum_{j \in \mathbf{T}} \theta_j(z)$ 
7:     if ( $\text{wt}(\theta(z)) \leq (1 - R_{min})n$  and  $r_\theta > d$ ) then
8:        $u(x) \leftarrow \text{MS}^{-1}(\theta(z))$ 
9:       if  $u(x)$  is non-degenerate then
10:         $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow$  a cyclic code defined by  $u(x)$ 
11:        if ( $\mathcal{C} \notin \text{CodeList}$ ) then
12:          Add  $\mathcal{C}$  to CodeList
13:        end if
14:      end if
15:    end if
16:    CodeSearch( $\mathbf{T}$ ,  $index$ ,  $\mathbf{F}(x)$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}(z)$ )
17:  end if
18:   $\mathbf{T} \leftarrow \mathbf{T}_{prev}$ 
19: end for
```

| (n, k) | $u(x)$ | d_{min} |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| (51,26)* | $1+x^3+x^6+x^{12}+x^{17}+x^{24}+x^{27}+x^{34}+x^{39}+x^{45}+x^{48}$ | 10 |
| (63,44)* | $1+x^7+x^9+x^{14}+x^{18}+x^{27}+x^{28}+x^{35}+x^{36}+x^{45}+x^{49}+x^{54}+x^{56}$ | 8 |
| (93,47) | $1+x^2+x^8+x^{31}+x^{32}+x^{35}+x^{47}$ | 8 |
| (105,53) | $1+x^4+x^{30}+x^{32}+x^{45}+x^{46}+x^{53}$ | 8 |
| (117,72)* | $1+x+x^2+x^4+x^8+x^{11}+x^{16}+x^{22}+x^{32}+x^{44}+x^{59}+x^{64}+x^{88}$ | 12 |
| (127,84)* | $1+x+x^2+x^4+x^8+x^{16}+x^{32}+x^{55}+x^{59}+x^{64}+x^{91}+x^{93}+x^{109}+x^{110}+x^{118}$ | 10 |
| (219,101) | $1+x^2+x^8+x^{32}+x^{73}+x^{74}+x^{77}+x^{89}+x^{110}+x^{128}+x^{137}$ | 12 |
| (255,135) | $1+x^4+x^{13}+x^{21}+x^{39}+x^{54}+x^{55}+x^{91}+x^{121}+x^{123}+x^{148}+x^{195}$ | 13 |
| (255,175) | $1+x+x^3+x^7+x^{15}+x^{26}+x^{31}+x^{53}+x^{63}+x^{98}+x^{107}+x^{127}+x^{140}+x^{176}+x^{197}+x^{215}$ | 17 |
| (341,205) | $1+x^{29}+x^{87}+x^{92}+x^{94}+x^{114}+x^{122}+x^{156}+x^{202}+x^{203}+x^{213}+x^{217}+x^{234}+x^{257}+x^{273}$ | 16 |
| (511,199) | $1+x+x^3+x^7+x^{15}+x^{31}+x^{63}+x^{82}+x^{100}+x^{127}+x^{152}+x^{165}+x^{201}+x^{255}+x^{296}+x^{305}+x^{331}+x^{403}$ | 19 |
| (511,259) | $1+x^{31}+x^{42}+x^{93}+x^{115}+x^{217}+x^{240}+x^{261}+x^{360}+x^{420}+x^{450}+x^{465}$ | 13 |
| (819,435) | $1+x+x^3+x^7+x^{15}+x^{31}+x^{63}+x^{127}+x^{204}+x^{255}+x^{409}+x^{511}$ | 13 |
| (819,447) | $1+x+x^3+x^7+x^{15}+x^{31}+x^{63}+x^{127}+x^{204}+x^{255}+x^{350}+x^{409}+x^{511}+x^{584}+x^{701}$ | 16 |

Table 1: Examples of the constructed codes




Figure 1: Frame error performance of the (127, 84) cyclic code

Throughout the paper, it is assumed that the codewords are transmitted across a noisy communication channel with BPSK modulation and at the receiving end is the modified Belief-Propagation decoder which approximates the Maximum-Likelihood decoder [9].

Figure 1 shows the frame-error-rate (FER) performance of the (127, 84) cyclic code, which is a code which does have cycles of length 4. Nevertheless, the performance of this code is outstanding and, at 10^{-3} FER, it is within 0.2dB of the sphere-packing-bound constraint for binary transmission.




Figure 2: Frame error performance of the (255, 175) codes

Figure 2 shows the performance of two (255, 175) codes, one constructed using our method and one an irregular computer generated code. We can see that our code, which achieves a coding gain of around 0.4dB compared to the equivalent irregular code, performs approximately within 0.15dB of the sphere-packing-bound constraint for binary transmission.




Figure 3: Frame error performance of the (341, 205) codes

Our construction method can produce LDPC codes with high minimum distance and therefore they do not suffer from error-floor. Figure 3 demonstrates the performance of our (341, 205) code, which is inferior to the equivalent irregular code in the low signal-to-ratio region, but the irregular code exhibits early error-floor due to its low minimum distance.

5 Conclusions

A method of constructing binary cyclic codes from the finite-field transform (Mattson-Solomon) domain is able to produce a large number of codes which have high minimum-distance and code-rate. These codes have sparse parity-check matrix and thus are applicable as LDPC codes. Due to their cyclic property these LDPC codes have n parity-check equations instead of $n - k$ equations as in the case of random LDPC codes. With these extra parity-check equations to iterate with, the performance of the iterative decoder is improved.

In designing cyclic LDPC codes of length n , our new method allows one to increase the d_{min} of the code by combining additional irreducible factors of $1 + z^n$ which, in turn, reduces the sparseness of the parity-check matrix. The ability to control the sparseness of the parity-check matrix is a trade-off against the minimum distance of the code.

Simulation results have shown that our cyclic codes have outstanding performance which are superior to the equivalent irregular LDPC codes. The high d_{min} of these codes ensures the absence of an early error-floor in their performance.

References

- [1] F.J.MacWilliams and N.J.A.Sloane, *The Theory of Error Correcting Codes*, North Holland, 1977
- [2] V.S.Pless, W.C.Huffman and R.A.Brualdi, "An introduction to algebraic codes", in *Handbook of Coding Theory*, (V.S.Pless and W.C.Huffman, eds.), Elsevier, North Holland, 1998
- [3] S.Roman, *Coding and Information Theory*, Springer Verlag, 1992
- [4] T.Shibuya and K.Sakaniwa, Construction of cyclic codes suitable for iterative decoding via generating idempotents, *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, **E86-A**, No.4, April 2003.
- [5] T.Tian, C.Jones, J.Villasenor, and R. Wesel, Selective Avoidance of Cycles in Irregular LDPC Code Construction, *IEEE Transaction on Communications*, August 2004
- [6] J.H.van Lint, *Coding Theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 201, Springer-Verlag, 1971
- [7] J.H.van Lint, *Introduction to Coding Theory*, second ed., Springer-Verlag, 1991
- [8] E. J. Weldon, Difference-Set Cyclic Codes, *Bell System Technical Journal*, September (1966)
- [9] C. Tjhai, E. Papagiannis, M. Tomlinson, M. Ambroze and M. Ahmed, "Improved Iterative Decoder for LDPC Codes with Performance Approximating to a Maximum-Likelihood Decoder", UK Patent Application 0409306.8