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## ORIGINAL PAGE IS <br> OF POOR QUALTTY

A minimum distance $d_{\text {min }}=4$ extended Reed-Solowon (RS) code over GF ( $2^{b}$ ) is constructed. The code can be used to correct any single-byte-error and simultaneously detect any double-byte-error. Fast encoding and decoding can be achieved due to some nice features of the code described in the following.

## I. CODE CONSTRUCTION

Consider the RS code with generator polynomial given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(x)=(x+1)(x+\alpha)\left(x+\alpha^{2}\right), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha$ is a primitive element of $\operatorname{GF}\left(2^{b}\right)$. The code has minimum distance $d_{\text {min }}=4$, and the parity-check matrix takes the form

$$
\underline{H}_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots \cdots & 1  \tag{2}\\
1 & \alpha & \alpha^{2} & \alpha^{3} & \ldots \cdots & \alpha^{n_{1}-1} \\
1 & \alpha^{2} & \alpha^{4} & \alpha^{6} & \ldots \ldots & \alpha^{2 n_{1}-2}
\end{array}\right],
$$

where $n_{1}=2^{b}-1$. The matrix $\underline{H}_{1}$ is modified by adding the identity matrix $\underline{I}_{3 \times 3}$ on the left. This forms a new matrix $\underline{H}$

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
\underline{\mathrm{H}} & =\left[\begin{array}{lllllllll}
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & \alpha & \alpha^{2} & \alpha^{3} & \ldots & \alpha^{n_{1}-1} \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \alpha^{2} & \alpha^{4} & \alpha^{6} & \ldots \ldots & \alpha^{2 n_{1}-2}
\end{array}\right] \\
& =\left[\underline{I}_{3 \times 3}\right.  \tag{3}\\
\underline{H}_{1}
\end{array}\right] . ~ l
$$

This is a $3 \times n\left(n=n_{1}+3=2^{b}+2\right)$ matrix. Now we show that the above $\underline{H}$ matrix is a parity-check matrix for an ( $n, n_{1}$ ) extended RS code with minimum distance $d_{\text {min }}=4!$
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The following theorem regarding the H matrix of a binary block code still holds true in the case of a nonbinary code [1]. We repeat it here.

Theorem: A code defined by a parity-check matrix $\underline{H}$ will correct single-byteerrors and simultaneously detect any combination of two byte-errors if and only if every combination of three or fewer columns of $\underline{H}$ is linearly independent.

Consider the $\underline{H}$ matrix in (3). It is obvious that

1) $\underline{H}$ contains no zero columns,
2) No two columns of $\underline{H}$ are linearly dependent.

Now we show that
3) No three columns of $\underline{H}$ are linearly dependent.

First note that every conbination of three columns of ${\underset{-1}{1}}$ are linearly independent. Then for $\mathrm{i} \neq \mathrm{j}$ we have
i)

$$
\operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & \alpha^{i} & \alpha^{j} \\
0 & \alpha^{2 i} & \alpha^{2 j}
\end{array}\right|=\operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{cc}
\alpha^{i} & \alpha^{j} \\
& \\
\alpha^{2 i} & \alpha^{2 j}
\end{array}\right|=\alpha^{i+j}\left(\alpha^{i}+\alpha^{j}\right) .
$$

Because $\alpha$ is assumed to be primitive, $\alpha^{i}+\alpha^{j} \neq 0$ for $i \neq j$. Therefore

$$
\operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & \alpha^{i} & \alpha^{j} \\
0 & \alpha^{2 i} & \alpha^{2 j}
\end{array}\right| \neq 0
$$

Similarly,

$$
\operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & \alpha^{i} & \alpha^{j} \\
0 & \alpha^{2 i} & \alpha^{2 j}
\end{array}\right|=\alpha^{2 i}+\alpha^{2 j}=\left(\alpha^{i}+\alpha^{j}\right)^{2} \neq 0
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & \alpha^{i} & \alpha^{j} \\
1 & \alpha^{2 i} & \alpha^{2 j}
\end{array}\right|=\alpha^{i}+\alpha^{j} \neq 0
$$

ii)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & \alpha^{i} \\
0 & 0 & \alpha^{2 i}
\end{array}\right|=\alpha^{2 i} \neq 0 . \\
& \operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \alpha^{i} \\
0 & 1 & \alpha^{2 i}
\end{array}\right|=\alpha^{i} \neq 0 . \\
& \operatorname{det}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & \alpha^{i} \\
0 & 1 & \alpha^{2 i}
\end{array}\right|=1 \neq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefure no three columns of $\underline{H}$ are linearly dependent.
4) Not all combinations of four columns in $\underline{H}$ are linear independent. For exainple,

$$
\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}\right]+\alpha^{i}\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
1 \\
0
\end{array}\right]+\alpha^{2 i}\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
0 \\
1
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
\alpha^{i} \\
\alpha^{2 i}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}\right]
$$

From 1), 2), 3), and 4) we conclude that the extended ( $n, n_{1}$ ) = ( $\mathrm{n}=2^{\mathrm{b}}+2, \mathrm{n}_{1}=2^{\mathrm{b}}-1$ ) RS code defined by the parity-check matrix in (3) has $d_{\text {min }}=4$.

From (3) we see that the $\underline{H}$ matrix satisfies the following important considerations for an optimum code that can be used for correcting single-byteerrors and detecting double-byte-errors.

1) $\underline{H}$ is in systematic form, hence $\underline{G}$ - the generat - matrix is also in the systematic form:

$$
\underline{G}=\left[\underline{H}_{1}{ }^{\mathrm{T}}: \underline{\mathrm{I}}\right]
$$

This suggests that encoding and decoding can be implemented in parallel.
2) The first nonzero element of every column of $\underline{H}$ is the unit element $\alpha^{0}=1$. (The advantage of this will be seen later.)
3) For a systematic code with $d_{\text {min }}=d$, each column of ${\underset{H}{1}}$ must contain at least d-l nonzero elements. In (3), each column of ${\underset{H}{1}}^{\text {contains ex- }}$ actly $d-1=4-1=3$ nonzero elements. So $\underline{H}$ con ains the minimum possible number of nonzero elements.
4) The number of nonzero elements in each row of $\underline{H}$ is equal.
3) and 4) simplify the implementation of the encoder and the decoder.
II. ERROR CORRECTION AND ERROR DETECTION.

The code described above has $d_{\min }=4$. Therefore it can correct single-byte-errors and simultaneously detect any double-byte-error.

1) Single byte error correction

Suppose a single error of value e occurs at byte position i. Then the syndrome is given by

$$
\underline{s}_{i}=\underline{e}^{\mathrm{h}}=\left[\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{s}_{0}  \tag{4}\\
\mathrm{~s}_{1} \\
\mathrm{~s}_{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $\underline{h}_{i}$ is the $i-$ th column of $\underline{H}, 0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Note that the first nonzero element of every column of $\underline{H}$ is a unit element $\alpha^{0}$, and e $\alpha^{0}=$ e. Therefore the error value e is given directly hy the first nonzero element of the syndrome. The location of the error byte is reduced to finding a column $\underline{h}_{i}$ of $\underline{H}$ which satisfies the identity

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{e}_{-\mathrm{h}}=\underline{s}_{\mathrm{i}} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This can be done in the following way.

Check the elements of the syndrome $\underline{s}_{i}$ to see

1) if $s_{0} \neq 0, s_{1}=s_{2}=0$, then $i=0$,
2) if $s_{1} \neq 0, s_{0}=s_{2}=0$, then $i=1$,
3) if $s_{2} \neq 0, s_{0}=s_{1}=0$, then $i=2$.

Otherwise, from

$$
\underline{e h}_{i}=e\left[\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\alpha(i-3) \\
\alpha^{2(i-3)}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{l}
s_{0} \\
s_{1} \\
s_{2}
\end{array}\right],
$$

we have

$$
\alpha^{i-3}=\frac{s_{1}}{s_{0}}=\frac{s_{2}}{s_{1}},
$$

and $i$ gives the error byte location, $3 \leqq i \leqq n-1$.
2) Double-byte-error detection

Because the code is double-byte-error detecting, the sum of any two syndromes corresponding to two single-byte-errors $e_{i}$ and $e_{j}(i \neq j)$ is not equal to any single-byte-error syndrome $s_{k_{k}}$, that is,

$$
\underline{s}_{i}+\underline{s}_{j} \neq \underline{s}_{k} \quad \text { for } \quad i \neq j
$$

Using this property, double-byte-error detection can be done in the following way. If

$$
s_{i_{1}}=0, s_{i_{2}} \neq 0, s_{i_{3}} \neq 0, \quad \text { where } i_{1}, i_{2}, i_{3} \varepsilon(0,1,2),
$$

or if

$$
s_{0} \not \equiv 0, s_{1} \neq 0, s_{2} \neq 0 \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{s_{1}}{s_{0}} \neq \frac{s_{2}}{s_{1}}
$$

then a double-byte-error is detected.
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