

Multilevel expander codes

Alexander Barg* and Gilles Zémor

ABSTRACT. We define multilevel codes on bipartite graphs which have properties analogous to multilevel serial concatenations. A decoding algorithm is described that corrects a proportion of errors equal to half the Blokh-Zyablov bound on the minimum distance. The error probability of this algorithm has exponent similar to that of serially concatenated multilevel codes.

1. Introduction

Codes on graphs are presently actively studied both from the standpoint of their parameters and the convergence properties of various decoding algorithms. The codes on graphs studied in the present work originate in Tanner's paper [14] which suggested to index code bits with the edges of the graph and impose local constraints on the bits indexed by the edges incident to any given vertex. Following [14], the local constraints are given by a set of parity-check equations of a small error-correcting code which may be different for every vertex of the graph.

In [12], codes on graphs were shown to correct a proportion of errors growing linearly with block length under a simple iterative decoding algorithm whose convergence region is related to the expansion of the graph. Following [12], the term "expander codes" was adopted for this class of codes. The line of work started by [12] was continued in several directions. Studying codes on bipartite graphs, [16] introduced a new linear-time iterative decoding algorithm of expander codes which provided a better estimate of the fraction of errors correctable by expander codes and linked these codes with other concatenated code constructions (this link was furthered in [1]). Paper [3] showed that expander codes reach capacity of the binary symmetric channel under the iterative decoding algorithm of [16]. The same paper also put forward the idea of using two different codes as local constraints for the two parts of the graph, which led to the construction of a family of expander codes that match the performance of serially concatenated codes in the sense of Forney [8]. Independently, closely related results were obtained in [10]. Code families with improved parameters and improved estimates of the error probability under iterative decoding were also studied in [3, 2, 5, 11, 13].

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 94B25.

Key words and phrases. Bipartite-graph codes, error exponent, multilevel concatenations.

* Supported in part by NSF grant CCR 0310961.

The purpose of the present paper is to extend the expander code construction to the context of multilevel concatenations in the sense of Blokh and Zyablov [6]. This generalization pursues several goals. First, the asymptotic relative distance of the expander code family defined below is shown to match the so-called Blokh-Zyablov bound $\delta_{BZ}(R)$ [6], which represents a substantial improvement over the distance-rate tradeoff of single-level concatenations [17, 3]. An extension of the decoding algorithm of [3] enables one to correct a fraction of errors that is arbitrarily close to $(1/2)\delta_{BZ}(R)$. The same algorithm guarantees a decrease of the error probability of decoding which approaches the error exponent of multilevel concatenations of [6]. The main idea behind the construction of [6] is the use of a tower of nested codes in the inner level of concatenation which simultaneously reach the typical performance of random linear codes. Accommodating this idea to the bipartite-graph construction and setting up a proper multilevel decoding algorithm are performed in a way different from the standard approach.

The plan of the paper is as follows. Sect. 2 is devoted to some basic notation. Relevant background from multilevel serial concatenations is reviewed in Sect. 3. A construction of multilevel parallel concatenations (multilevel expander codes) is introduced in Sect. 4. The relative distance of the codes asymptotically approaches the Blokh-Zyablov bound. A multistage decoding algorithm of the codes defined suggested in Sect. 4.4 corrects a proportion of errors that approaches $\delta_{BZ}(R)/2$ in time $O(N)$, where N is the code length. The error exponent of the algorithm approaches the error exponent attainable by the multilevel serial concatenations of [6].

2. Notation

We assume transmission over a binary symmetric channel with transition probability p , denoted below by $\text{BSC}(p)$. Let $h(x) = -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$ denote the binary entropy function (the base of the logarithms is 2 throughout). Let $\delta_{\text{GV}}(R) = h^{-1}(1-R)$ denote the Gilbert-Varshamov (GV) relative distance for the rate R .

Below we will consider probabilities of different events expressed in the form $\exp(-NE)$ where N is a large positive number and E a nonnegative function of the code parameters. In such situations E will be called the *exponent* of the probability or the error exponent if the event we have in mind is a decoding error.

Let $E_0(R, p)$ be the “random coding exponent” [9]. For $R_{\text{crit}} \leq R \leq \mathcal{C}$ we have $E_0(R, p) = E_{\text{sp}}(R, p) := D(\delta_{\text{GV}}(R) \| p)$, where

$$D(x \| y) := x \log(x/y) + (1-x) \log((1-x)/(1-y)),$$

$R_{\text{crit}} = 1 - h(\rho_0)$, $\rho_0 = \sqrt{p}/(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{1-p})$ is the critical rate and $\mathcal{C} = 1 - h(p)$ is the channel capacity. For rates $0 \leq R \leq R_{\text{crit}}$ the random coding exponent has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} E_0(R, p) &= -\delta_{\text{GV}}(R) \log 2\sqrt{p(1-p)} \quad (0 \leq R \leq R_x) \\ E_0(R, p) &= D(\rho_0 \| p) + R_{\text{crit}} - R \quad (R_x \leq R \leq R_{\text{crit}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $R_x = 1 - h(2\rho_0(1-\rho_0))$. It is well known that for large code length, typical codes from the random code ensemble asymptotically achieve the GV bound and have error probability of maximum likelihood decoding behaving as

$$\exp(-N(E_0(R, p) - o(1))).$$

Let $q = 2^t$ for some $t \geq 1$. Given a binary code $A[n_0, k_0 = 2^t]$ and a q -ary code $B[n_1, k_1]$, their concatenation is a linear code (mapping) defined as follows [8]:

$$\mathbb{F}_2^{k_1} \xrightarrow{B} \mathbb{F}_2^{n_1} \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{F}_2^{k_0})^{n_1} \xrightarrow{A} (\mathbb{F}_2^{n_0})^{n_1}.$$

We write $C = A \square B$ to denote the concatenation of codes A and B and note the parameters $[N = n_0 n_1, K = k_0 k_1]$ of the code C .

3. Multilevel serial concatenations

We begin with recalling the construction and properties of serially concatenated multilevel codes. These results are due to Blokh and Zyablov [6]. We review them here to emphasize analogies and differences between multilevel serial and parallel concatenations. Then we proceed to a description of multilevel concatenations defined on bipartite graphs, study their parameters and suggest a decoding algorithm.

3.1. Code construction. A linear m th order concatenated code construction involves the following ingredients: a binary $[n_0, k_0 = n_0 R_0, d_0]$ “inner” code A and a set of m “outer” codes B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m , where the code $B_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ is defined over an alphabet of size $q_i = 2^{t_i}$. We assume that $k_0 = \sum_{i=1}^m t_i$ and that each of the codes B_i has parameters $[n_1, k_{1,i} = n_1 R_{1,i}, d_{1,i}]$.

The length of the code C equals $N = n_0 n_1$ and its dimension is $K = \sum_{i=1}^m k_{1,i} t_i$. The code maps an information sequence $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_K)$ to the corresponding codeword by first mapping \mathbf{u} to a vector in $(\mathbb{F}_{q_1})^{k_{1,1}} \times \dots \times (\mathbb{F}_{q_m})^{k_{1,m}}$, then encoding it with the codes B_i , then mapping the symbols of the obtained codewords back to binary digits, and finally encoding them with the code A . The details are as follows: let $K_0 = 0$ and for $i = 1, \dots, m$, let $K_i = \sum_{j=1}^i k_{1,j} t_j$. Write the data vector \mathbf{u} in the form $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_m)$, where $\mathbf{u}_i = (\mathbf{u}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{i,j}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{i,k_{1,i}}) \in (\mathbb{F}_2)^{k_{1,i} t_i}$ is a vector such that

$$\mathbf{u}_{i,j} = (u_{K_{i-1} + (j-1)t_i + 1}, \dots, u_{K_{i-1} + jt_i})$$

(see Fig. 1). Next for $i = 1, \dots, m$, map \mathbf{u}_i to a $k_{1,i}$ -vector \mathbf{m}_i over \mathbb{F}_{q_i} (this mapping is an extension of the natural isomorphism) and encode the result with the code B_i . We obtain an (mn_1) -vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_{q_1}^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_{q_m}^{n_1}$. For the second stage of concatenated encoding, this vector is treated as a vector in F^{n_1} , where $F = \mathbb{F}_{q_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_{q_m}$, and mapped onto \mathbb{F}_2 using the isomorphism of additive groups $F \cong \mathbb{F}_2^{k_0}$. Denoting by $\langle \cdot \rangle_b$ the binary representation of a vector, we can write $\langle \mathbf{b} \rangle_b = \langle \mathbf{b}^1, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{n_1} \rangle_b$, where $\langle \mathbf{b}^i \rangle_b, i = 1, \dots, n_1$ is a binary k_0 -vector. Finally, each of these binary vectors is encoded with the code A . The resulting vector $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n_0 n_1}$ is a codeword of the m -th order concatenated code C .

The choice of the component codes and decoding of multilevel concatenations rely upon a decomposition of the code A into a tower of nested binary codes

$$(1) \quad (\mathbb{F}_2)^{n_0} \supset A = A_1 \supset A_2 \supset \dots \supset A_m \supset A_{m+1} = \{0\},$$

where A_i is an $[n_0, \sum_{j=i}^m t_j, d_{0,i}]$ binary linear code. Let

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{G}_{0,1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{G}_m \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{G}_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

be a generator matrix of A , where $\mathbf{G}_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ is a binary $(t_i \times n_0)$ -matrix. Then the code $A_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ is generated by the matrix $\mathbf{G}_{0,i} = (\mathbf{G}_m^T \dots, \mathbf{G}_i^T)^T$.




FIGURE 1. Construction of multilevel concatenations: codewords of A are read off vertically, horizontal rectangles of width t_i make up binary versions of the codes B_i

Denote by $k_{0,i} = \sum_{j=i}^m t_j$ the dimension of the code A_i and by $R_{0,i}$ its rate. Note that the rate of the code C equals

$$(3) \quad R = \sum_{i=1}^m (R_{0,i} - R_{0,i+1}) R_{1,i} \quad (R_{0,m+1} := 0).$$

Note also that if all the outer alphabets q_i are the same and equal to $q = 2^t$, i.e., $t_i = t$ for all i , then the code A_i has dimension $t(m - i + 1)$ and the rate of the code C can be written as

$$(4) \quad R = \frac{R_0}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m R_{1,i}.$$

The distance of the code C is bounded below by $d(C) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} d_{0,i} d_{1,i}$.

A view of multilevel concatenations as *direct sums* of single-level concatenated codes is particularly helpful for a multilevel generalization of expander codes. Let us introduce codes $A^{(i)} \cong A_i/A_{i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $A^{(i)}$ is generated by \mathbf{G}_i . Then the code A can be represented as a direct sum

$$(5) \quad A = A^{(1)} \oplus A^{(2)} \oplus \dots \oplus A^{(m)}.$$

We have the following theorem (see, e.g., [7]).

$$\text{THEOREM 1. } C = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m A^{(i)} \square B_i.$$

By definition of the codes $A^{(i)}$, the direct-sum decomposition of the code A enables us to write explicitly the cosets in the quotient spaces A_i/A_{i+1} , $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$. Namely, let $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}_m, \dots, \mathbf{a}_1)$ be a message vector of the code A_1 , where $\mathbf{a}_i \in (\mathbb{F}_2)^{t_i}$ is the corresponding message vector of the code $A^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Then the codeword $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a}\mathbf{G}_{0,1}$ can be written as

$$(6) \quad \mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{a}_m, \dots, \mathbf{a}_2)\mathbf{G}_{0,2} + \mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{G}_1.$$

This representation is useful in decoding of multilevel concatenations.

ROSTER OF COMPONENT CODES.

1. The first-level (inner) binary codes

$$A_i[n_0, k_{0,i} = \sum_{j=i}^m t_j, d_{0,i}], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

2. The second-level (outer) q_i -ary codes, $q_i = 2^{t_i}$,

$$B_i[n_1, k_{1,i}, d_{1,i}], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

3. Binary codes

$$A^{(i)}[n_0, k_0^{(i)} = t_i], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

These codes are not used directly in the code construction. They are helpful in analyzing the decoding.

We still have to specify which codes are used as components in this construction. This choice is related to the complexity restrictions. If the overall objective is polynomial construction and decoding complexity, then the codes are chosen as follows. We assume that each of the codes $A_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ attains the GV bound, i.e., that $R_{0,i} \geq 1 - h(\delta_{0,i}) - \varepsilon$, and that its error exponent under maximum likelihood decoding approaches the random coding exponent $E_0(R_{0,i}, p)$. That such a tower of codes exists is established by a standard technique, see [6, 7]. The codes B_1, \dots, B_m are taken to be some algebraic q -ary codes that afford a decoding algorithm of complexity polynomial in the length n_1 , typically Reed-Solomon or algebraic geometry codes.

3.2. Decoding. Decoding proceeds in m stages. Every stage consists of two steps, namely, applying maximum likelihood decoding to the code A_j and then decoding B_j by an algebraic procedure.

Let $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_1$ be the vector received from the channel. We will write $\mathbf{y}_1 = (\mathbf{y}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{1,n_1})$, where for every j the vector $\mathbf{y}_{1,j} \in (\mathbb{F}_2)^{n_0}$. In stage one, every vector $\mathbf{y}_{1,j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, n_1$ is decoded with the code A_1 , employing one of the possible decoding procedures for this code. Next, for every j , t_1 information bits are extracted from the decoded message sequence (we will assume that the decoding algorithm of the codes A_i always outputs a codeword; if not, the procedure is easily modified to handle erasures). The n_1 groups of these message bits, viewed as an n_1 -vector over $F_{2^{t_1}}$ constitute a “received” word of the code B_1 . This word is decoded with the code B_1 ; denote the outcome of this decoding by $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1 = (\tilde{b}_{1,1}, \dots, \tilde{b}_{1,n_1})$. Note that if $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1 \neq \mathbf{b}_1$, the overall decoding procedure has ended in error; this will be a part of the error event.

Stage two (and every subsequent stage) is not much different from stage one; however we have now to decode the pair of codes A_2, B_2 . This requires a transformation of the received word \mathbf{y}_1 to a vector $\mathbf{y}_2 = (\mathbf{y}_{2,1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{2,n_1})$ which relates to the code A_2 in the same way as \mathbf{y}_1 relates to A_1 . We compute

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{y}_{2,j} = \mathbf{y}_{1,j} + \mathbf{z}_{1,j},$$

where $\mathbf{z}_{1,j} = \langle \tilde{b}_{1,j} \rangle_b \mathbf{G}_1$, and where $\langle \tilde{b}_{1,j} \rangle_b \in (\mathbb{F}_2)^{t_m}$ is the binary representation of the symbol $b_{1,j}$. This transformation is easily understood in the absence of errors: in that case this is simply the coset decomposition of the nested codes of (6). The rest of this decoding stage is the same as in stage one, with (A_1, B_1) replaced with (A_2, B_2) .

3.3. Error probability and the choice of parameters. While we have chosen the component codes in the construction of C , we still have some freedom in choosing the parameters of these codes. This choice is optimized relying on performance estimates of decoding. Let us focus on the error probability. Decoding the i th level of the code C is not very different from decoding a standard (one-level) concatenated code. We assume maximum likelihood decoding of the code A_i and Generalized Minimum Distance decoding of the code B_i [8]. The error exponent upon decoding of the code A_i can be assumed to approach $E_0(R_{0,i}, p)$, and the overall error exponent obtained upon GMD decoding of the code B_i then equals $E_i = E_0(R_{0,i}, p)(1 - R_{1,i})$. The overall error exponent for the code C then equals

$$(8) \quad E^{(m)}(R, p) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} (E_0(R_{0,i}, p)(1 - R_{1,i})).$$

which can be further optimized on the choice of the rates $R_{0,i}, R_{1,i}$ given that they must satisfy relation (3).

Let us assume that all the t_i are equal and denote their common value by t , in which case $R_{0,i} = t(m - i + 1)/n_0$. The following results [6] are derived under the assumption that all the terms under the minimum in (8) are the same and equal to $E^{(m)}(R, p)$. We then have the following proposition whose proof is included for later use.

PROPOSITION 2. [6]

$$(9) \quad E^{(m)}(R, p) = \max_{R \leq R_0 \leq C} \frac{R_0 - R}{\frac{R_0}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (E_0(\frac{i}{m} R_0, p))^{-1}}.$$

Proof : From (8) and the assumptions above,

$$R_{1,i} = 1 - \frac{E^{(m)}(R, p)}{E_0(R_{0,i}, p)} \quad (i = 1, \dots, m);$$

together with (4) this gives

$$Rm = R_0 \left[m - E^{(m)}(R, p) \sum_{i=1}^m (E_0(R_{0,i}, p))^{-1} \right].$$

Solving for $E^{(m)}$ and using the expression for $R_{0,i}$, we obtain the claim. ■

For $m = 1$ this bound turns into the so-called Forney bound [8]

$$(10) \quad E^{(1)}(R, p) = \max_{R \leq R_0 \leq C} E_0(R_0, p)(1 - R/R_0).$$

For all rates $R \in (0, 1)$, increasing the order of concatenation improves the bound on the error exponent, namely

$$E^{(m)}(R, p) < E^{(m+1)}(R, p), \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ in (9), we obtain the error exponent of concatenated codes of infinite order:

$$(11) \quad E^{(\infty)}(R, p) = \max_{R \leq R_0 \leq \mathcal{C}} (R_0 - R) \left[\int_0^{R_0} \frac{dx}{E_0(x, p)} \right]^{-1}.$$

This is the *Blokh-Zyablov exponent* [6]. Note an alternative, parametric expression for it, obtained upon performing the maximization:

$$E^{(\infty)}(R, p) = E_0(\alpha, p)$$

$$R = \alpha - E_0(\alpha, p) \int_0^\alpha \frac{dx}{E_0(x, p)} \quad (0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 - h(p)).$$

The convergence of $E^{(m)}$ to $E^{(\infty)}$ is uniform for $R \in [0, \mathcal{C} - \varepsilon]$. In the neighborhood of capacity the function under the integral in (11) has a singularity: a little analysis shows that for $E^{(m)}$ to approximate well $E^{(\infty)}$, the order m has to grow faster than $1/\varepsilon$.

3.4. Minimum distance. The minimum (relative) distance of an m -level code for $N \rightarrow \infty$ approaches the bound [6]

$$(12) \quad \delta^{(m)}(R) = \max_{R \leq R_0 \leq 1} \frac{m(R_0 - R)}{R_0 \sum_{i=1}^m (\delta_{\text{GV}}(\frac{i}{m} R_0))^{-1}}.$$

For $m = 1$ this expression turns into the so-called *Zyablov bound* [17]

$$(13) \quad \delta_{\text{Z}}(R) = \max_{R \leq R_0 \leq 1} \delta_{\text{GV}}(R_0)(1 - R/R_0),$$

and for $m \rightarrow \infty$ it becomes the *Blokh-Zyablov bound*, which is easier to write expressing the rate R as a function of the relative distance. We obtain

$$(14) \quad R_{\text{BZ}}(\delta) = 1 - h(\delta) - \delta \int_0^{1-h(\delta)} \frac{dx}{\delta_{\text{GV}}(x)}.$$

The Blokh-Zyablov bound can be improved by using long algebraic geometry codes as the outer codes B_1, \dots, B_m . The results have been computed only for $m = 1$ [15].

3.5. Complexity of multilevel concatenated codes. The decoding complexity of one-level concatenated codes that meet the Forney bound is $O(n^2)$. The same complexity estimate is valid for decoding of one-level concatenations that correct the proportion of errors that asymptotically approaches δ_{Z} . Turning to the complexity of m -level concatenations with outer Reed-Solomon codes, we set $n_1 = 2^{R_0, 1 n_0/m}$. Let m grow as $\log n_0$ and consider codes of relative distance δ and rate R , where R and δ are related by (14). Their decoding complexity for correcting a $\frac{1}{2}\delta_{\text{BZ}}$ proportion of errors, where δ_{BZ} is the solution of (14) with respect to δ , or for achieving the error exponent $E^{(\infty)}$ can be bounded above as $n^{1+\log \log n/(1-h(\delta))}$.

4. Parallel concatenations

4.1. Single-level constructions. In its basic version, a bipartite-graph (BG) code is defined as follows. Let $G(V = V_0 \cup V_1, E)$ be a Δ -regular bipartite graph with $|V_0| = |V_1| = n$. Let $A[\Delta, R_0 \Delta], B[\Delta, R_1 \Delta]$ be additive binary or q -ary codes. Let us fix an ordering of the edges of E and construct a bipartite-graph code $C(G; A, B)$ of length $N := |E| = n\Delta$ whose coordinates are in a one-to-one correspondence

with the edges in E . For a vector $\mathbf{x} \in C$ denote by \mathbf{x}_v a projection of \mathbf{x} on the edges incident to a vertex $v \in V$: in other words, if $E(v)$ denotes the set of edges incident to v , then $\mathbf{x}_v = (x_j)_{j \in E(v)}$.

A vector \mathbf{x} is a code vector of C if

- (1) for every $v \in V_0$, the vector $\mathbf{x}_v \in A$,
- (2) for every $w \in V_1$, the vector $\mathbf{x}_w \in B$.

The basic iterative procedure used to decode expander codes was introduced in [16] and further studied in [3, 13]. It is described as follows.

Basic decoding scheme. Given a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^N$, a left decoding round L consists of decoding in parallel with the code A the subvectors \mathbf{y}_v for all $v \in V_0$. Likewise, a right decoding round R applies decoding with the code B to the subvectors \mathbf{y}_w for every $w \in V_1$. Decoding of the component codes is assumed maximum likelihood. The *basic expander decoding* scheme consists of performing successive decoding steps of the form $\mathbf{y}_{i+1} = R(L(\mathbf{y}_i))$, $i = 0, 1, \dots$. Decoding terminates by either encountering a fixed point or performing $O(\log n)$ decoding steps.

In each level of the multilevel construction we will use a modified definition of bipartite-graph codes. Introducing this modification enables one to match the performance of serial concatenations in the parallel case both for single-level concatenations [1] and multilevel codes as described below. Let $G(V, E)$ be a bipartite graph whose parts are V_0 (the left vertices) and $V_1 \cup V_2$ (the right vertices), where $|V_i| = n$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. We will choose both subgraphs $G_i = (V_0 \cup V_i, E_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ to be regular, of degrees Δ_1 and Δ_2 respectively. Thus, the degree of the left vertices is Δ , the degree of the vertices in V_1 is Δ_1 , and the degree of vertices in V_2 is $\Delta_2 - \Delta_1$. Let λ be the second largest eigenvalue of the subgraph G_1 spanned by the vertex sets V_0 and V_1 . We will assume that λ is small compared to Δ_1 , for instance, that $\lambda = O(\sqrt{\Delta_1})$.

Let us fix an arbitrary ordering of the edges in E . Note that $|E| = n\Delta$. We are going to construct a linear code C of length $N = n\Delta t$, where t is an integer constant, in such a way that every edge in E corresponds to t coordinates of C .

For a given vertex $v \in V_0$ we denote by $E(v)$ the set of all edges incident to it and by $E_i(v) \subset E(v)$, $i = 1, 2$ the subset of edges of the form (v, w) , where $w \in V_i$. The ordering of the edges on v defines an ordering on $E_i(v)$.

Let A be a $[t\Delta, R_0 t\Delta, d_0 = t\Delta\delta_0]$ linear binary code of rate $R_0 = \Delta_1/\Delta$. The code A can be also viewed as a q -ary additive $[\Delta, R_0\Delta]$ code, $q = 2^t$. Let B be a q -ary $[\Delta_1, R_1\Delta_1, d_1 = \Delta_1\delta_1]$ additive code. We will also need an auxiliary q -ary code A_{aux} of length Δ_1 . Every edge of the graph will be associated with t bits of the codeword of the code C of length $N = nt\Delta$. The code C is defined as the set of vectors $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ such that

- (1) For every vertex $v \in V_0$ the subvector $(x_j)_{j \in E(v)}$ is a $(q$ -ary) codeword of A and the set of coordinates $E_1(v)$ is an information set for the code A ;
- (2) For every vertex $v \in V_1$ the subvector $(x_j)_{j \in E(v)}$ is a codeword of B ;
- (3) For every vertex $v \in V_0$ the subvector $(x_j)_{j \in E_1(v)}$ is a codeword of A_{aux} .

This code family was introduced in [4] and studied extensively in [1, 2]. In particular, [1] introduced a modified iterative decoding algorithm of the code C that uses expansion properties of the graph G_1 together with passing reliability

information gathered from decoding of the left codes to the right code decoders. More precisely, the algorithm is described as follows.

Modified decoding scheme. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ be the vector received from the channel. In the first step, for every vertex $v \in V_0$, the left decoder computes, for every neighboring vertex $w \in V_1$ and for every q -ary symbol b , the quantity $d_{\{v,w\}}(b)$ which is the minimum distance of \mathbf{y}_v to a codeword of A with symbol b in coordinate $\{v, w\}$. Then this quantity is passed on through edge $\{v, w\}$ to the right decoder at vertex w .

In the second step, for every right vertex w , the right decoder finds the codeword $\mathbf{c} = (c_j)_{j \in E(w)}$ of B that minimizes $\sum_{j \in E(w)} d_j(c_j)$ (this is an iteration of min-sum decoding). The right decoder then writes the symbols of \mathbf{c} on its edge set $E(w)$.

The decoder then reverts to the basic iterative procedure applied to the basic bipartite-graph code $C((V_0 \cup V_1, E_1); A_{\text{aux}}, B)$, using the decoding results of the second step as its starting values. If this procedure succeeds, then an information set of A is recovered at every left vertex, and the whole original codeword \mathbf{x} can be rederived.

The complexity of the algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(N)$, similarly to the basic expander decoding scheme. The properties of this algorithm together with the parameters of the code family are summarized as follows.

THEOREM 3. [1] *The code C has the parameters $[N = nt\Delta, RN, D]$, where $R \geq R_0R_1 - R_0(1 - R_{\text{aux}})$ and*

$$D \geq \delta_0\delta_1 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{d_{\text{aux}}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{2d_1}\right) N.$$

Let $n \rightarrow \infty$ and let R be fixed. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists sufficiently large but constant values of Δ and t such that $D/N \geq \delta(R) - \varepsilon$, where $\delta(R)$ is the Zyablov bound (13). The decoding algorithm of [1] has error exponent given by (10). The algorithm corrects a proportion of errors that approaches $\delta_Z(R)/2$.

Correcting a fraction $\delta_Z(R)/2$ of errors in linear time was independently obtained in [10]. An alternative view of the above code construction was suggested in [13]. The approach of [13] also made it possible to use Generalized Minimum Distance decoding of [8] in the iterative expander decoding procedure. Thereby [13] obtained a different proof of the error correction radius and the error exponent for the above code construction.

4.2. A multilevel construction. Let G be a bipartite graph with the vertex set V and the edge set E . The sets V and E are partitioned respectively as

$$\begin{aligned} V &= V_0 \cup V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m \cup V_{m+1} \\ E &= E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_m \cup E_{m+1} \end{aligned}$$

where E_i is the set of edges between V_0 and V_i , $i = 1, \dots, m+1$. The cardinalities of the sets V_i , $i = 0, \dots, m+1$, are all taken to be the same, $|V_0| = |V_1| = \dots = |V_{m+1}| = n$, and each edge set E_i , $i \geq 1$, is taken to define a regular bipartite expander graph G_i on $V_0 \cup V_i$ of degree Δ_i . Every vertex $v \in V_0$ has therefore degree $\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Delta_1 + \dots + \Delta_m + \Delta_{m+1}$ in the resulting graph, and the total number of edges equals $|E| = n\Delta$. We will assume that each edge in E carries t bits of

the codeword of the multilevel BG code C for some positive constant t , so the code length is $N = tn\Delta$.

As above, let us fix an arbitrary order of the edges in E . The edges $E(v)$ adjacent to a vertex $v \in V_0$ are partitioned into disjoint subsets as follows

$$E(v) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+1} (E(v) \cap E_i).$$

To define the code C , we need several component codes. Let A be a binary linear code of length $t\Delta$ and dimension $R_0 t\Delta$. Referring to the representation of the graph G shown in Figure 1 below, we call this code the “left” code. The code A can be also viewed as a q -ary additive code of length Δ and dimension $R_0 \Delta$, where $q = 2^t$.

Suppose again that A affords a nested decomposition

$$(15) \quad A = A_1 \supset A_2 \supset \dots \supset A_m \supset A_{m+1} = \{0\},$$

where this time the codes A_i are viewed as binary or q -ary depending on the context. The rate of the code A_i (binary or q -ary) is $R_{0,i} = \sum_{j=i}^m \Delta_j / \Delta$. The decomposition (15) is chosen to have properties similar to those of (1); in particular, each code A_i is assumed to approach the GV bound on the relative distance. The binary version of the code A_i is assumed to have error exponent close to the random coding exponent $E_0(R_{0,i}, p)$ under maximum likelihood decoding on the BSC.

As above, let A be decomposed into a direct sum

$$A = A^{(1)} \oplus A^{(2)} \oplus \dots \oplus A^{(m)}$$

where each $A^{(i)}$ is a $[t\Delta, t\Delta_i]$ binary linear code. This decomposition is similar to the decomposition (5). The codes A_i and $A^{(i)}$ can be also viewed as q -ary additive codes, with obvious adjustments to their parameters. Having the q -ary representation in mind, denote by \mathbf{G}_i a generator matrix of the code $A^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. We will assume that these matrices are chosen in some fixed way. The code A_i is generated by $\mathbf{G}_{0,i} = (\mathbf{G}_i^T, \mathbf{G}_{i+1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{G}_m^T)^T$ and therefore can be written as a direct sum

$$A_i = A^{(i)} \oplus A^{(i+1)} \oplus \dots \oplus A^{(m)}.$$


For any $\mathbf{c} \in A_i$, let $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}^{(i)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{c}^{(m)}$ be a direct sum decomposition of \mathbf{c} and let $\mathbf{a}^j \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\Delta_j}$, $j = i, \dots, m$ be the q -ary message vector that corresponds to $\mathbf{c}^{(j)}$, i.e., the unique vector such that $\mathbf{a}^j \cdot \mathbf{G}_j = \mathbf{c}^{(j)}$.

We will also need m auxiliary q -ary codes $A_{i,\text{aux}}$ of lengths Δ_i and rates $R_{\text{aux},i}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. For each i , the value $R_{\text{aux},i}$ is assumed to be close to one, in particular, $R_{\text{aux},i} = 1 - \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\Delta})$.

Finally, we need m “right” q -ary codes $B_i[\Delta_i, R_{1,i}\Delta_i, d_{1,i}]$.

DEFINITION 1. *An m -level bipartite-graph code C of length $N = nt\Delta$ is a set of vectors $\mathbf{x} \in (\mathbb{F}_2)^N$ that satisfies the following conditions.*

- (1) *For every $v \in V_0$, $\mathbf{x}_v \in A$.*
- (2) *For every $v \in V_0$, let $\mathbf{x}_v = \mathbf{x}_v^{(1)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{x}_v^{(m)}$ be the direct-sum decomposition of the vector \mathbf{x}_v . For $i = 1, \dots, m$, let the q -ary message vector \mathbf{a}_v^i be defined by the equality $\mathbf{a}_v^i \cdot \mathbf{G}_i = \mathbf{x}_v^{(i)}$. Then \mathbf{a}_v^i is a code vector of $A_{i,\text{aux}}$.*
- (3) *Let \mathbf{a} be the q -ary vector of length $nR_0\Delta = n\sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i$ deduced from \mathbf{x} by writing, for every $v \in V_0$, the vector \mathbf{a}_v^i on the edge set $E(v) \cap E_i$. Then for every $i = 1, \dots, m$ and every $w \in V_i$, the vector $\mathbf{a}_w \in B_i$.*

FIGURE 2. Coding of m -level bipartite-graph codes

The construction of multilevel bipartite-graph codes is illustrated in Fig. 2.

ROSTER OF COMPONENT CODES.

1. The “left” binary codes

$$A_i[t\Delta, tk_{0,i} = t \sum_{j=i}^m \Delta_j, d_{0,i}], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

that form a tower of nested codes (15). These codes can be also viewed as additive codes over \mathbb{F}_{2^t} with parameters $[\Delta, k_{0,i}]$.

2. The “right” codes

$$B_i[\Delta_i, k_{1,i} = R_{1,i}\Delta_i, d_{1,i} = \delta_{1,i}\Delta_i] \quad \text{over } \mathbb{F}_{2^t}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

3. Binary codes

$$A^{(i)}[t\Delta, t\Delta_i], \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m$$

such that $A_i = \bigoplus_{j=i}^m A^{(j)}$. The rate of the code $A^{(i)}$ equals $R_0^{(i)} = R_{0,i} - R_{0,i+1}$, where $R_{0,m+1} := 0$. These codes can be also viewed as additive codes over \mathbb{F}_{2^t} with the parameters $[\Delta, \Delta_i]$.

4. q -ary codes $A_{i,\text{aux}}[\Delta_i, R_{i,\text{aux}}\Delta_i]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.

4.3. Parameters. The rate of the code C is determined in the following

PROPOSITION 4. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a graph G and a choice of component codes of the code C such that its rate satisfies*

$$R(C) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m (R_{0,i} - R_{0,i+1}) R_{1,i} - \varepsilon,$$

where $\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\Delta})$.

Proof : From the definition of the code C ,

$$tn\Delta(1 - R(C)) \leq tn\Delta(1 - R_0) + tn \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i(1 - R_{i,\text{aux}}) + tn \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i(1 - R_{1,i}),$$

from which,

$$R \geq \sum_{i=1}^m (R_{0,i} - R_{0,i+1})R_{1,i} - R_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m (R_{0,i} - R_{0,i+1})R_{i,\text{aux}}.$$

Choosing the values of Δ_i and the auxiliary codes so that $\min_i R_{i,\text{aux}} \geq 1 - \varepsilon/R_0$, we obtain the claim. ■

Observe that the rate of multilevel parallel concatenations comes close to the value of the rate of their serial counterparts (3).

The distance of the code C is estimated from the distances of expander codes supported by the graphs $G_i, i = 1, \dots, m$. Extending the proof of Theorem 3 to the m -level case, we obtain

THEOREM 5. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist a graph G and a choice of the component codes of the multilevel construction such that the distance D of the code C satisfies*

$$\frac{D}{N} \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \delta_{0,i} \delta_{1,i} - \varepsilon.$$

In particular, the results of this section imply that for $n \rightarrow \infty$ the family of multilevel parallel concatenations approaches the Blokh-Zyablov bound (14). More precisely, given an $\varepsilon > 0$ and a value of the rate R , it is possible to find large (but independent of n) values of Δ, t, m , a set of codes $A, B_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, and a family of graphs $G_{\{n\}}$ with n vertices in each component such that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the relative distance of the multilevel bipartite graph code will be within ε of the quantity $\delta_{\text{BZ}}(R)$.

4.4. Decoding. Let \mathbf{x} be the transmitted codeword and let $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_1$ be the vector received from the channel. For every vertex $v \in V_0$, let $\mathbf{x}_v = \mathbf{x}_v^{(1)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{x}_v^{(m)}$ be the direct sum decomposition of \mathbf{x}_v . The decoding proceeds in m stages, the purpose of stage i being the recovery of the vector $\mathbf{x}_v^{(i)}$.

The first stage consists of three steps, similar to the three steps of the modified decoding scheme of single-level constructions.

In the first step, given the vectors $\mathbf{y}_v, v \in V_0$, the decoder computes for every neighboring vertex $w \in V_1$ and for every q -ary symbol b , the quantity $d_{\{v,w\}}(b)$ which is the minimum distance of \mathbf{y}_v to a codeword

$$\mathbf{c}_{1,v} = \mathbf{c}_{1,v}^{(1)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{c}_{1,v}^{(m)}$$

of A such that the vector \mathbf{a}_v defined by

$$\mathbf{a}_v \cdot \mathbf{G}_1 = \mathbf{c}_v^{(1)}$$

has symbol b in coordinate $\{v, w\}$. Then this quantity is passed on along edge $\{v, w\}$ to the right decoder at vertex w .

In the second step, for every right vertex $w \in V_1$, the right decoder finds the codeword $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_1 = (\hat{b}_{1,j})_{j \in E(w)}$ of the code B_1 that minimizes $\sum_{j \in E(w)} d_j(\hat{b}_{1,j})$ (this

is an iteration of min-sum decoding). The right decoder then writes the symbols of $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_1$ on its edge set $E(w)$.

The decoder then reverts to the basic iterative decoding scheme applied to the basic bipartite-graph code $C((V_0 \cup V_1, E_1); A_{1,aux}, B_1)$. If this procedure succeeds, then an information vector of $A^{(1)}$ is recovered at every left vertex, i.e. for every $v \in V_0$, the decoder has found \mathbf{a}_v^1 such that $\mathbf{a}_v^1 \cdot \mathbf{G}_1 = \mathbf{x}_v^{(1)}$.

Call $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_v^1$ the vector actually recovered at vertex v at this point of the decoding procedure. Next for every $v \in V_0$ we compute

$$(16) \quad \mathbf{y}_{2,v} = \mathbf{y}_v + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_v^1 \mathbf{G}_1.$$

The vectors $\mathbf{y}_{2,v}$ form a vector \mathbf{y}_2 which is submitted to the second stage of the decoding procedure. Note that if this first stage of decoding was successful, then every vector \mathbf{y}_2 is such that $\mathbf{y}_{2,v}$ is equal to the channel error vector added to

$$\mathbf{x}_v^{(2)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{x}_v^{(m)}.$$

The second (and every subsequent) stage is now the same as stage one except that we use the code A_2 to decode \mathbf{y}_2 . Let us elaborate.

In step one of stage 2 (respectively i), the vectors $\mathbf{y}_{2,v}$ ($\mathbf{y}_{i,v}$) compute, for every neighboring vertex $w \in V_2$ ($w \in V_i$) and for every q -ary symbol b the quantity $d_{\{v,w\}}^2(b)$ ($d_{\{v,w\}}^i(b)$) which is the minimum distance of $\mathbf{y}_{2,v}$ ($\mathbf{y}_{i,v}$) to a codeword

$$\mathbf{c}_{2,v} = \mathbf{c}_{2,v}^{(2)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{c}_{2,v}^{(m)} \quad (\mathbf{c}_{i,v} = \mathbf{c}_{i,v}^{(i)} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{c}_{i,v}^{(m)})$$

of A_2 (A_i) such that the vector \mathbf{a}_v defined as

$$\mathbf{a}_v \cdot \mathbf{G}_2 = \mathbf{c}_v^{(2)} \quad (\mathbf{a}_v \cdot \mathbf{G}_i = \mathbf{c}_v^{(i)})$$

has symbol b in coordinate $\{v, w\}$. This quantity is passed on through edge $\{v, w\}$ to the right decoder at vertex w .

In step two of stage 2 (stage i), the right decoder at $w \in V_2$ ($w \in V_i$) writes on its edge set $E(w)$ the codeword $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_2 = (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{2,j})_{j \in E(w)}$ ($\hat{\mathbf{b}}_i = (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j})_{j \in E(w)}$) of B_2 (B_i) that minimizes $\sum_{j \in E(w)} d_j(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{2,j})$ ($\sum_{j \in E(w)} d_j(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j})$).

In step three of stage 2 (stage i), the decoder reverts to the basic decoding scheme applied to the basic bipartite-graph code $C((V_0 \cup V_2, E_2); A_{2,aux}, B_2)$ (resp., $C((V_0 \cup V_i, E_i); A_{i,aux}, B_i)$). Call $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_v^2$ ($\hat{\mathbf{a}}_v^i$) the vector recovered at vertex v at the end of the basic decoding procedure. For every $v \in V_0$ we then compute

$$\mathbf{y}_{3,v} = \mathbf{y}_{2,v} + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_v^2 \mathbf{G}_2 \quad (\text{resp., } \mathbf{y}_{i+1,v} = \mathbf{y}_{i,v} + \hat{\mathbf{a}}_v^i \mathbf{G}_i)$$

and name \mathbf{y}_3 (\mathbf{y}_{i+1}) the vector formed by the $\mathbf{y}_{3,v}$ ($\mathbf{y}_{i+1,v}$), $v \in V_0$.

The intuition behind the code construction and its decoding is as follows. In the i th stage of decoding we would like to perform iterations of expander decoding for some expander code relying on the coordinates of the vector output by the $(i-1)$ th stage on the coordinates of E_i . This forms a difference with serial concatenations: there in the i th decoding stage we did not need to operate separately on the subset of coordinates of the code A_1 ; for expander codes this is in the core of error correction. Note an analogy of (16) with (7): every vector $\mathbf{y}_{1,v}$ can be written as $\mathbf{y}_{1,v} = \mathbf{c}_{1,v} + \mathbf{e}_v$ where $\mathbf{c}_{1,v} \in A_1$ is the code vector transmitted at the vertex v and \mathbf{e}_v is the error vector added by the channel. Both procedures (16) and (7) serve the goal of revealing a code vector $\mathbf{y}_{2,v} = \mathbf{c}_{2,v} + \mathbf{e}_v$, which is in the same relation to the code A_2 as $\mathbf{y}_{1,v}$ is to A_1 .

4.5. Performance. The error probability of decoding for multilevel codes on bipartite graphs is estimated analogously to the serial case. In particular, the probability that the algorithm described in the previous section will result in a decoding error in the i th stage, $i = 1, \dots, m$ is estimated in Theorem 3. Choosing the component codes as in the one-level parallel construction, we conclude that the exponent of this probability approaches (10) as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We will choose the code A of sufficiently large length Δ (independent of n) so that every code in the tower of codes (15) has error exponent of max-likelihood decoding approaching the random coding exponent E_0 .

The complexity of the whole procedure is essentially m times that of the single-level case. To estimate the probability of decoding error \mathcal{D} , let \mathcal{D}_i denote the event that decoding is incorrect in the i th stage of the multistage procedure. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{D}) &= P(\mathcal{D}_m \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_1) \\ &= P(\mathcal{D}_m | \overline{\mathcal{D}_{m-1} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_1}) + P(\mathcal{D}_m (\mathcal{D}_{m-1} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_1)) \\ &\leq P(\mathcal{D}_m | \overline{\mathcal{D}_{m-1} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_1}) + P(\mathcal{D}_{m-1} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_1) \\ &\leq P(\mathcal{D}_m | \overline{\mathcal{D}_{m-1} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{D}_1}) + \dots + P(\mathcal{D}_2 | \overline{\mathcal{D}_1}) + P(\mathcal{D}_1). \end{aligned}$$

As remarked above, Theorem 3 implies that for all $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$P(\mathcal{D}_i | \overline{\mathcal{D}_{i-1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{D}_1}) \leq 2^{-n\Delta t(E_0(R_{0,i})(1-R_{1,i})-\varepsilon)}$$

(for $i = 1$ the condition is empty). Choosing $\Delta_i = R_0\Delta/m$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ and repeating the argument that led to Proposition 2, we obtain the main result of this paper.

THEOREM 6. *Suppose that the m -level bipartite-graph codes are used on a BSC(p). For any rate $R < 1-h(p)$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a family of graphs G of sufficiently large degrees $\Delta, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m$ and a choice of component codes such that the multistage decoding algorithm of Sect. 4.4 has the error exponent $E^{(m)}(R, p) - \varepsilon$, where $E^{(m)}(R, p)$ is the error exponent of serially concatenated codes (9). For large m the error exponent approaches the Blokh-Zyablov bound (11). The proportion of errors corrected by the algorithm approaches $(1/2)\delta_{\text{BZ}}$.*

References

- [1] A. Barg and G. Zémor, *Concatenated codes: Serial and parallel*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, to appear.
- [2] ———, *Distance properties of expander codes*, preprint arxiv.org/cs.IT/0409010.
- [3] ———, *Error exponents of expander codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **48** (2002), no. 6, 1725–1729.
- [4] ———, *Error exponents of expander codes under linear-complexity decoding*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **17** (2004), no. 2, 426–445.
- [5] Y. Bilu and S. Hoory, *On codes from hypergraphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics **25** (2004), 339–354.
- [6] E. L. Blokh and V. V. Zyablov, *Linear concatenated codes*, Nauka, Moscow, 1982, (In Russian).
- [7] I. Dumer, *Concatenated codes and their multilevel generalizations*, Handbook of Coding Theory (V. Pless and W. C. Huffman, eds.), vol. 2, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 1998, pp. 1911–1988.
- [8] G. D. Forney, Jr., *Concatenated codes*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1966.
- [9] R. G. Gallager, *Low-density parity-check codes*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1963.
- [10] V. Guruswami and P. Indyk, *Near-optimal linear-time codes for unique decoding and new list-decodable codes over smaller alphabets*, Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC), 2002, pp. 812–821.
- [11] H. Janwa and A. K. Lal, *On Tanner codes: minimum distance and decoding*, Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput. **13** (2003), no. 5, 335–347.

- [12] M. Sipser and D. A. Spielman, *Expander codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **42** (1996), no. 6, 1710–1722.
- [13] V. Skachek and R. Roth, *On nearly MDS expander codes*, Proc. IEEE Internat. Sympos. Information Theory, Chicago, IL (2004), p. 8.
- [14] M. Tanner, *A recursive approach to low-complexity codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **27** (1981), no. 5, 1710–1722.
- [15] S. G. Vlăduț, G. L. Katsman, and M. A. Tsfasman, *Modular curves and codes with a polynomial construction complexity*, Problems of Information Transmission **20** (1984), no. 1, 47–55.
- [16] G. Zémor, *On expander codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **47** (2001), no. 2, 835–837.
- [17] V. V. Zyablov, *An estimate of complexity of constructing binary linear cascade codes*, Problems of Information Transmission **7** (1971), no. 1, 3–10.

DEPT. OF ECE, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742

E-mail address: `abarg@ieee.org`

ÉCOLE NATIONALE SUPÉRIEURE DES TÉLÉCOMMUNICATIONS, 46 RUE BARRAULT, 75 634 PARIS
13, FRANCE

E-mail address: `zemor@enst.fr`