

Vector Network Coding Based on Subspace Codes Outperforms Scalar Linear Network Coding

Tuvi Etzion and Antonia Wachter-Zeh

Department of Computer Science

Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

{*etzion, antonia*}@*cs.technion.ac.il*

Abstract

This paper considers vector network coding based on rank-metric codes and subspace codes. The main result of this paper is that vector network coding can significantly reduce the required field size compared to scalar linear network coding in the same multicast network. The achieved gap between the field size of scalar and vector network coding is in the order of $q^{t^2/2} - q^t$, for any $q \geq 2$, where t denotes the length of the vectors in the vector solution. Previously, only a gap of constant size had been shown. Our gap can be achieved for any number k of inputs, where $k \geq 3$. Several networks are considered which are variations of the well-known combination network. Further, for all these networks, including the unmodified combination network, we show that our vector coding solution reduces the decoding complexity at the receivers.

Index Terms

vector network coding, field size, combination network, rank-metric codes, subspace codes.

I. INTRODUCTION

Network coding has been attracting increasing attention in the last fifteen years. The trigger for this interest was Ahlswede *et al.*'s fundamental paper [1] which revealed that network coding increases the throughput compared to simple routing. An up-to-date survey on network coding can be found in [9]. In [13], Kötter and Médard provided an algebraic formulation for the network coding problem: for a given network, find coding coefficients (over a small field) for each edge, which are multiplied with the symbols received at the starting node of the edge, such that each receiver can recover all its requested information by solving a linear system of equations. Such an assignment is called a *solution* of the network. If the coding coefficients are scalars, it is called a *scalar linear solution*. Ebrahimi and Fragouli [6] have extended this algebraic approach to vector network coding. Here, the received packets are vectors and the coding coefficients are matrices. A set of coding matrices such that all receivers can recover their requested information, is called a *vector solution*.

The *field size* of the solution is an important parameter that directly influences the complexity of the calculations at the network nodes. Jaggi *et al.* [12] have shown a deterministic algorithm for finding a network code (for multicast networks) of field size in the order of the number of receivers. In general, finding the minimum required field size of a network code for a certain multicast network is NP-complete [14].

Since *vector network coding* offers more freedom in choosing the coding coefficients than scalar linear coding, a smaller field size might be achievable [5]. To our knowledge, Sun *et al.*'s paper [17] is the only work which presents explicit networks where vector network coding reduces the field size compared to scalar linear network coding by a constant.

This paper considers multicast networks, in particular a widely studied network, the combination network, and several variations of it. We analyze the scalar linear and vector solutions of these networks. The proposed vector solutions are based on rank-metric codes and subspace codes. For all the investigated networks, we reduce the *decoding complexity* significantly. Namely, when the solutions are of field size q^t , the decoding complexity for scalar linear coding grows exponentially in t while our scheme requires at most cubic complexity in t . The main result of our paper is that for several of the analyzed networks, our vector solutions significantly reduces the required *field size*. In these networks, the scalar solution requires a field size in the order of $q^{t^2/2}$, while we provide a vector solution of field size q and dimension t . Therefore, the achieved gap between the scalar and the vector field size is in the order of $q^{t^2/2} - q^t$. This improves on [17], where only a constant gap was shown. Further, the network of [17] has a large number of inputs whereas our results are based on a small and simple network and hold for a large range of number of inputs. In [6] (in contrast to ours), the coding matrices of vector network coding have to be commutative.

This paper is structured as follows. Section II provides notations and definitions and Section III defines the combination network. In Section IV, we present a vector solution for the combination network that reduces the decoding complexity. In Sections V and VI, we present scalar linear and vector solutions to combination networks with an additional link (and, in the second case, less receivers). For both networks, the required field size is significantly reduced and the gaps in the field sizes are derived. In Section VII, we show that all our constructions which are based on rank-metric code can be seen as constructions based on subspace codes. Moreover, using subspace codes, some results can be improved and additional networks might be improved by vector coding. Concluding remarks are given in Section VIII.

Some proofs can be found in the appendix. Further, the long version of the paper will contain more details and solutions for additional networks based on generalized constructions.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Finite Fields and Subspaces

Let q be a power of a prime and let \mathbb{F}_q denote the finite field of order q and \mathbb{F}_{q^m} its extension field of order q^m . We use $\mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$ for the set of all $m \times n$ matrices over \mathbb{F}_q . Let \mathbf{I}_s denote the $s \times s$ identity matrix and $\mathbf{0}_s$ the $s \times s$ all-zero matrix.

The triple $[n, k, d]_q$ denotes a linear code over \mathbb{F}_q of length n , dimension k , and minimum Hamming distance d .

Let $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle$ denote the space spanned by the rows of a matrix \mathbf{A} . The *Grassmannian* of dimension r is the set of all subspaces of \mathbb{F}_q^n of dimension $r \leq n$. It is denoted by $\mathcal{G}_q(n, r)$. The cardinality of $\mathcal{G}_q(n, r)$ is the q -binomial:

$$|\mathcal{G}_q(n, r)| = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix}_q \triangleq \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} \frac{q^n - q^i}{q^r - q^i},$$

with the upper and lower bounds $q^{r(n-r)} \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix}_q < 4q^{r(n-r)}$. For two subspaces \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} , we denote by $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}$ the smallest subspace containing the union of \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} . The *subspace distance* between \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} is $d_s(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \triangleq 2 \dim(\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}) - \dim(\mathcal{U}) - \dim(\mathcal{V})$.

B. Rank-Metric Codes

Let $\text{rk}(\mathbf{A})$ be the rank of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$ over \mathbb{F}_q . The *rank distance* between $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$ is $d_R(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) \triangleq \text{rk}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})$. A linear $[m \times n, k, \delta]_q^R$ rank-metric code \mathcal{C} is a k -dimensional linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$. It consists of q^k matrices of size $m \times n$ over \mathbb{F}_q with minimum rank distance:

$$\delta \triangleq \min_{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathbf{A} \neq \mathbf{0}} \{ \text{rk}(\mathbf{A}) \}.$$

The Singleton-like upper bound for rank-metric codes [10] implies that for any $[m \times n, k, \delta]_q^R$ code, we have $k \leq \max\{m, n\}(\min\{n, m\} - \delta + 1)$. Codes which attain this bound with equality are called *maximum rank distance* (MRD) codes. $\mathcal{MRD}[m \times n, \delta]_q$ denotes an MRD code.

There is an $\mathcal{MRD}[t \times t, t]_q$ code of q^t commutative matrices, see Theorem 5 in the appendix.

III. THE COMBINATION NETWORK

The $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,s}$ -combination network is shown in Fig. 1 (see also [16]). The source transmits k messages to r middle nodes. Any s middle nodes are connected to a receiver, and each of the $\binom{r}{s}$ receivers requests all k messages. For vector coding, $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ are vectors of length t ; for scalar coding, the messages are scalars, denoted by x_1, \dots, x_k .




Figure 1. The $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,s}$ -combination network, drawn for $s = 2$.

The $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}$ -combination network has a scalar solution of field size q_s if and only if an $[r, k, d = r - k + 1]_{q_s}$ MDS code exists [16]. Thus, $q_s \geq r - 1$ and when $k \in \{3, q - 1\}$ and q_s is a power of two, then $q_s \geq r - 2$ is sufficient [15, p. 328]. The symbols transmitted to and from each of the middle nodes all-together form a codeword of the MDS code (encoded from the k message symbols) and each receiver obtains k symbols. Each receiver can correct $r - k$ erasures and can reconstruct the k message symbols. The complexity of erasure decoding MDS codes can be done in $\mathcal{O}(r \log^2 r)$ operations [3]. For small k , it can be done by inverting a $k \times k$ -matrix over a field of size q_s , which has complexity $\mathcal{O}(k^{2.37})$ with the Coppersmith–Winograd algorithm [11].

Corollary 1 *If $k = 3$ and $r - 2$ is a power of two, let $q^* = r - 2$, else let $q^* = r - 1$. For the $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}$ -combination network, a scalar linear solution of field size q_s exists if and only if $q_s \geq q^*$. The decoding complexity is at least in $\min\{\mathcal{O}(r \log^2 r), \mathcal{O}(k^{2.37})\}$ over a field of size q^* .*

IV. VECTOR CODING IN THE COMBINATION NETWORK

This section presents a vector solution based on MRD codes for the $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}$ -combination network. The case $k = 2$ was implicitly already solved in a similar way in [17].

A. Vector Linear Solution

Theorem 1 Let \mathcal{C} be an $\text{MRD}[t \times t, t]_q$ code. Let \mathbf{C}_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$, be distinct codewords of \mathcal{C} . Define the following $kt \times kt$ block matrix:

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{C}_1^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_1^{k-1} \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_2 & \mathbf{C}_2^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_2^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_k & \mathbf{C}_k^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_k^{k-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, any $\ell t \times \ell t$ submatrix consisting of ℓ^2 blocks of **consecutive columns** has full rank ℓt , for any $\ell = 1, \dots, k$.

Construction 1 Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{q^t}\}$ be an $\text{MRD}[t \times t, t]_q$ code and let $r \leq q^t + 1$. Consider the $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}$ -combination network with input vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$. One middle node receives and transmits $\mathbf{t}_r = \mathbf{x}_k$ and the other $r - 1$ middle nodes receive and transmit $\mathbf{t}_i = \left(\mathbf{I}_t \ \mathbf{C}_i \ \mathbf{C}_i^2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{C}_i^{k-1} \right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{x}_k \right)^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^t$, for $i = 1, \dots, r - 1$.

The matrices $\mathbf{I}_t, \mathbf{C}_i, \mathbf{C}_i^2, \dots, \mathbf{C}_i^{k-1}$ are the coding coefficients of the incoming and outgoing edges of the middle nodes.

Theorem 2 Construction 1 provides a vector linear solution of field size q and dimension t to the $\mathcal{N}_{k,q^t+1,k}$ -combination network, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ can be reconstructed at all receivers.

Proof: Each receiver obtains

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t}_{i_1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{t}_{i_{k-1}} \\ \mathbf{t}_{i_k} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_{i_1} & \mathbf{C}_{i_1}^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{i_1}^{k-1} \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_{i_2} & \mathbf{C}_{i_2}^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{i_2}^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_{i_k} & \mathbf{C}_{i_k}^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{i_k}^{k-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_k \end{pmatrix}$$

or

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t}_{i_1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{t}_{i_{k-1}} \\ \mathbf{t}_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_{i_1} & \mathbf{C}_{i_1}^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{i_1}^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_{i_{k-1}} & \mathbf{C}_{i_{k-1}}^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_t & \mathbf{0}_t & \mathbf{0}_t & \dots & \mathbf{I}_t \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_k \end{pmatrix},$$

for some distinct $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{2, \dots, r\}$. Due to Theorem 1, in both cases, the corresponding matrix has full rank and there is a unique solution for $(\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{x}_k)$. \blacksquare

The decoding at each receiver consists of solving a linear system of equations of size $kt \times kt$. If we take the MRD codes from Theorem 5 (appendix), we can calculate the inverse of the matrices of the proof of Theorem 2 with quadratic complexity.

Corollary 2 For the $\mathcal{N}_{k,q^t+1,k}$ -combination network, a vector linear solution of field size q and dimension t exists. The decoding complexity is in $\mathcal{O}((kt)^2)$ over \mathbb{F}_q for each receiver.

Further, for the $\mathcal{N}_{3,q^t+2,3}$ -combination network and when q^t is a power of two, we can use the matrices from Construction 1 and additionally transmit $\mathbf{x}_2 = (\mathbf{0}_t \ \mathbf{I}_t \ \mathbf{0}_t) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2 \ \mathbf{x}_3)^T$ to obtain a vector linear solution. All the corresponding matrices have full rank due to Theorem 6 in the appendix.

B. Comparison of the Solutions

We can construct a vector linear solution of size q and dimension t for the $\mathcal{N}_{k,q^t+1,k}$ -combination network, where a scalar solution from an MDS code exists for $q_s \geq q^t$. Thus, the solutions have equivalent field sizes.

However, the vector solution reduces the complexity significantly compared to the scalar solution, from exponential in t over \mathbb{F}_{q^t} to quadratic in kt over \mathbb{F}_q .

V. A COMBINATION NETWORK WITH AN EXTRA LINK

In this section, we first consider the $\mathcal{N}_{3,r,3}$ -combination network with *extra links* from the source to each receiver and then generalize it to $k > 3$. Notice that this network is different from many networks in literature since the min-cut $k + 1$ incoming edges instead of k (see Section VIII for how to transform this to an equivalent network with min-cut k). The extra link is used to transmit the missing information of the first k links.

A. Scalar Linear Solution

Lemma 1 *There is a scalar linear solution of field size q_s for the $\mathcal{N}_{3,r,3}$ -combination network with additional links if and only if $2 \cdot (q_s^2 + q_s + 1) \geq r$.*

Proof: Let \mathbf{R} be a $3 \times r$ -matrix. From the r middle nodes of the network, transmit the r entries of the vector $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \cdot \mathbf{R}$. On each extra link, transmit a symbol $p_i = \sum_{j=1}^3 p_{ij}x_j$, for $i = 1, \dots, \binom{r}{3}$, which is chosen such that the 3×3 -submatrix of \mathbf{R} with the additional row (p_{i1}, p_{i2}, p_{i3}) has full rank. Clearly, the extra link can increase the rank only by one and therefore any three columns have to form a rank-two matrix. Thus, if and only if a matrix \mathbf{R} with the property that any submatrix of three columns has rank at least two over a field of size q_s exists, there is a scalar solution of size q_s .

The largest such matrix is the parity-check matrix of a $[\frac{q_s^3-1}{q_s-1}, \frac{q_s^3-1}{q_s-1} - 3, 3]_q$ Hamming code, repeated twice. Thus, there is a scalar solution of field size q_s if and only if $2 \cdot \frac{q_s^3-1}{q_s-1} \geq r$. ■

B. Vector Linear Solution

Lemma 2 *Let \mathcal{C} be an $\text{MRD}[t \times t, \delta]_q$ code. Let $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}$ be distinct codewords of \mathcal{C} . Then, for the following $3t \times 3t$ block matrix:*

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{B}^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{C}^2 \end{pmatrix} \geq 3\delta.$$

Construction 2 *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{q^{t^2/3+t}}\}$ be an $\text{MRD}[t \times t, \delta = \frac{2}{3}t]_q$ code. Let $r \leq q^{t^2/3+t}$. Consider the $\mathcal{N}_{3,r,3}$ -combination network with an additional link from the source to each receiver and input vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3$. The i -th middle node receives and transmits:*

$$\mathbf{t}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_i & \mathbf{C}_i^2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_q^t, \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

The extra link, which ends in the same receiver as the middle nodes i, j, ℓ , $\forall i, j, \ell = 1, \dots, r$, transmits the vector $\mathbf{z}_{ij\ell} = \mathbf{P}_{ij\ell} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2 \ \mathbf{x}_3)^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^t$, where the $t \times 3t$ matrix $\mathbf{P}_{ij\ell}$ is chosen such that

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_i & \mathbf{C}_i^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_j & \mathbf{C}_j^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_\ell & \mathbf{C}_\ell^2 \\ \mathbf{P}_{ij\ell} \end{pmatrix} = 3t.$$

Since Lemma 2 guarantees that the rank of the block matrix is at least $3\delta = 2t$, the matrix $\mathbf{P}_{ij\ell}$ can be chosen such that the overall rank is $3t$. Since $\mathbf{z}_{ij\ell}$ has length at most t , the smallest possible value for δ is $\frac{2}{3}t$. Larger values can be chosen as well, but will decrease r . Note that the left-most t columns of $\mathbf{P}_{ij\ell}$ are all-zero and that the matrices \mathbf{I}_t , \mathbf{C}_i , \mathbf{C}_i^2 are the coding coefficients.

Theorem 3 Construction 2 provides a vector solution of field size q and dimension t to the $\mathcal{N}_{3,r,3}$ -combination network with extra links from the source to each receiver for $r \leq q^{t(t-\delta+1)}$.

C. Comparison of the Solutions

Field size: We obtain a significant improvement in the field size for vector coding compared to scalar coding. The required field size for vector coding is equivalent to q^t while with scalar coding, the smallest field size q_s is in the order of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{r})$. For $\delta = \frac{2}{3}t$, we have $r = q^{t^2/3+t}$ and thus, $q_s \in \mathcal{O}(q^{t^2/6})$.

Complexity: The decoding complexity for vector solution is reduced from exponential in t to less than cubic in t , by inverting the $3t \times 3t$ -matrix.

D. Arbitrary Number of Inputs k

For $k = 2$, there is a scalar solution for any $q_s \geq 2$ since we can simply transmit one message symbol on the extra link and the other one from all middle nodes. Therefore, for $k = 2$, there is no improvement with vector coding.

For $k > 3$, the solutions are shortly outlined as follows. For a *lower bound* on the size of the scalar solution, we have to use the parity-check matrix of an $[N, N - k, k]_q$ code. This is a Near-MDS code [4]. Let $\mu(k, q)$ denote the maximal length for which there exists an $[N, N - k, k]_q$ code. Then, [2, Lemma 1] states that $\mu(k, q) \leq \mu(k - 1, q) + 1$. Since $\mu(3, q) = \frac{q^3 - 1}{q - 1}$ from the Hamming code, we have $N \leq \mu(k, q) \leq \frac{q^3 - 1}{q - 1} + (k - 3)$. We can repeat some of the columns of this parity-check matrix, but not more than duplicate each column. Thus:

$$r \leq 2N \leq 2(q^2 + q_s + 1) + 2(k - 3).$$

For small k , we have $q_s \in \mathcal{O}(r^{1/2})$. For the vector solution, the restriction on δ depends on the rank of $\mathbf{M}(k)$ (see Theorem 7, appendix), which can be lower bounded by Δ_k . Thus, the matrix $\mathbf{P}_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$ has $kt - \Delta_k$ rows and $r \leq q^{t(t-\delta+1)}$. The smallest possible δ is $\delta = t(1 - \frac{2}{k(k-1)})$, in which case we have a vector solution of size q and dimension t for $r = q^{2t^2/(k(k-1))+t}$. For this choice of r , the scalar solution is at least in the order of $q^{t^2/(k(k-1))}$. Thus, there is a large enough t for which $k(k-1) < t$ and the vector solution outperforms the scalar linear solution. The largest improvement is achieved for $k = 3$.

VI. A GENERALIZATION OF THE COMBINATION NETWORK WITH AN EXTRA LINK

A. Considered Network

In this section, we further modify the combination network. We consider the $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}^*$ -network, shown in Fig. 2, at first for $\ell^2 = k = 4$. It has an additional link from the source to each receiver and $\binom{r}{\ell}$ receivers such that each receivers gets ℓ^2 links in total; namely, from ℓ middle nodes, it gets from each ℓ links.




Figure 2. The $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}^*$ -network, drawn for $k = 4$, $\ell = 2$.

Note that we can transform this network to an equivalent network without multiple edges.

B. Scalar Linear Solution

Lemma 3 *There is a scalar linear solution of field size q_s for $\mathcal{N}_{4,r,4}^*$ -network if and only if $(q_s^2 + 1)(q_s^2 + q_s + 1) \geq r$.*

Proof: Let \mathbf{R} be a $4 \times 2r$ -matrix, divided into r blocks of two columns, with the property that any two blocks together have rank at least three. From each of the r middle nodes of the network, transmit two symbols (from one block) of $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \cdot \mathbf{R}$. On each extra link, transmit a symbol $p_i = \sum_{j=1}^4 p_{ij}x_j$, for $i = 1, \dots, \binom{r}{2}$, which is chosen such that the 4×4 -submatrix of \mathbf{R} with the additional row $(p_{i1}, p_{i2}, p_{i3}, p_{i4})$ has full rank. Thus, iff such a matrix over a field of size q_s exists, there is a scalar solution of size q_s .

Define these blocks to be any 4×2 -matrix representation of all 2-dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}_q^4 . Any two blocks together form a 4×4 -matrix of rank at least three (since the two subspaces are distinct). From every middle node, there are two links to the receivers. Therefore, we associate each middle node with one block. The number of blocks is $\binom{4}{2}_q$ and therefore, a scalar solution exists if:

$$r \leq \binom{4}{2}_q = (q_s^2 + 1)(q_s^2 + q_s + 1) \in \mathcal{O}(q_s^4).$$

To prove the “only if”, we need to show that there is no scheme that provides more blocks. Assume, one block is a rank-one matrix. Then, all other blocks must have rank two and the space that they span has to be disjoint to the rank-one block. Therefore, with this scheme there are $1 + \binom{3}{2}_q < \binom{4}{2}_q$ blocks. Thus, all matrices should have rank two, and taking all 2-dimensional subspaces provides the maximum number of blocks. ■

C. Vector Linear Solution

Construction 3 *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{q^{2t^2+2t}}\}$ be an $\mathcal{MRD}[2t \times 2t, \delta = t]_q$ code. Let $r \leq q^{2t^2+2t}$. Consider the $\mathcal{N}_{4,r,4}^*$ -network with input vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_4 \in \mathbb{F}_q^t$. The i -th middle node receives and transmits:*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t}_{i_1} \\ \mathbf{t}_{i_2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_i \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \mathbf{x}_4 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2t}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r.$$

The extra link, which ends in the same receiver as the middle nodes i, j, ℓ , $\forall i, j, \ell = 1, \dots, r$, transmits the vector $\mathbf{z}_{ij} = \mathbf{P}_{ij} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3, \mathbf{x}_4)^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^t$, where the $t \times 4t$ matrix \mathbf{P}_{ij} is chosen such that

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_i \\ \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_j \\ & \mathbf{P}_{ij} \end{pmatrix} = 4t.$$

Since $\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_i \\ \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_j \end{pmatrix} \geq 2t + \delta$, it follows that $2t - \delta$ rows of \mathbf{P}_{ij} can be chosen such that the overall rank is $4t$. Since \mathbf{z}_{ij} has length at most t , we have $2t - \delta \leq t$ and thus, $\delta \geq t$, but $\delta = t$ provides the largest improvement.

Theorem 4 Construction 3 provides a vector solution of field size q and dimension t to the $\mathcal{N}_{4,r,4}^*$ -network for $r \leq q^{2t(2t-\delta+1)}$.

D. Comparison of the Solutions

Also for the $\mathcal{N}_{4,r,4}^*$ -network, we obtain a significant improvement in the field size for vector coding compared to scalar coding. The field size of vector coding is equivalent to q^t while in scalar coding, the field size q_s is at least in $\mathcal{O}(r^{1/4})$. For $\delta = t$ and $r = q^{2t^2+2t}$, we have $q_s \in \mathcal{O}(q^{t^2/2})$.

Further, the decoding complexity reduces as in Section V.

E. Arbitrary Number of Inputs k

Let us shortly outline the case of k inputs, where $k = \ell^2$, $\ell \geq 3$ (in the previous subsections, we had $k = 4$ and $\ell = 2$). We first derive a lower bound on the size of the scalar solution. Let \mathbf{H} be the parity-check matrix of an $[N, N - k, k]_q$ code, then as in Section V-D, we have $N \leq q^2 + q + k - 2$, [2, Lemma 1]. In order to obtain a matrix \mathbf{R} where any k columns form a matrix of rank at least $k - 1$, we can repeat some of the columns of \mathbf{H} . We define blocks of ℓ columns and associate each block with one middle node of the network. An upper bound on the number of blocks is to take any ℓ columns of \mathbf{H} as one block. Thus, we have at most $\binom{N}{\ell}$ blocks. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} r &\leq \binom{N}{\ell} \leq \binom{q_s^2 + q_s + k - 2}{\ell} \\ &\leq \frac{((q_s^2 + q_s + k - 2) \cdot e)^\ell}{\ell^\ell} \in \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{q_s^{2\ell}}{\ell^\ell}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For the vector solution, we transmit at each middle node:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t}_{i_1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{t}_{i_\ell} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{\ell t} & \mathbf{C}_i & \dots & \mathbf{C}_i^{\ell-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_k \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\ell t}.$$

The matrix \mathbf{P} has $\ell^2 t - \Delta_\ell$ rows and $r \leq q^{\ell t(\ell t - \delta + 1)}$. The smallest possible δ is $\delta = t(3 - \frac{2}{\ell(\ell-1)})$ (notice that this does not hold for $\ell = 2$ since Theorem 7 only holds for $k \geq 3$), in which case we have a vector solution of size q and dimension t for $r = q^{\ell t^2(\ell-3+2/(\ell(\ell-1)))+\ell t}$. For this choice of r and $k \geq 3$, the scalar solution is in the order of

$$q^{t^2[(\ell-3)/2+1/(\ell(\ell-1))]} \cdot \ell^{1/2},$$

so our vector solution outperforms the scalar solution for large t .

VII. VECTOR SOLUTIONS USING SUBSPACE CODES

Although our constructions from the previous sections are based on rank-metric codes, they can all be viewed as a special case of a more general construction based on subspace codes or subspace designs. In the sequel, we will explain the simple formulation of this construction, demonstrate how one of our constructions can be improved by using subspace codes, describe another variation of the combination network solved by so-called normal spreads, and present a general question on subspace codes which is derived from our discussion. The formulation with subspaces can be derived by noticing that

$$[\mathbf{I}_t \ \mathbf{C}_i \ \mathbf{C}_i^2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{C}_i^{k-1}]$$

is a basis for a subspace of dimension t and the set of all such matrices in the network code forms a code in $\mathcal{G}_q(kt, t)$. We have to understand what kind of code is required for each network.

We can improve the construction of Section VI-C by using a code in $\mathcal{G}_q(4t, 2t)$ with minimum subspace distance $2t$. A basis for a codeword is a $2t \times 4t$ matrix and these matrices can be used instead of the $2t \times 4t$ matrices of the form $[\mathbf{I}_{2t} \ \mathbf{C}_i]$ in Construction 3. Such a code will enable us to use more middle nodes in the network. Constructions of large codes for this purpose can be found for example in [7]. However, the improvement is not large as the upper bound from [8, Theorem 1] gives that there are at most

$$\frac{\begin{bmatrix} 4t \\ 2t \end{bmatrix}_q}{\begin{bmatrix} 2t+t-1 \\ t-1 \end{bmatrix}_q} < 4q^{2(t^2+t)}$$

subspaces in such a code. Hence, compared to Section VI-C, the order of the number of middle nodes does not change.

Also for the other constructions, subspace codes can be used. For these constructions and other variations, which will be discussed in the full version of this paper, the required large subspace code is described as follows: For a given ρ , $0 \leq \rho \leq \ell - 2$, find a large code in $\mathcal{G}_q(\ell t, t)$ such that the linear span of the rows of any ℓ codewords is a subspace with dimension $(\ell - \rho)t$. Such a code can be used when extra ρ links are used for the variation of the combination network. The constructions with rank-metric codes described in the previous sections can be used to construct some basic codes with these properties. Larger codes will improve on these constructions and will solve other networks, too. More generalizations which can be efficiently solved by subspace designs will be discussed in the full version of this paper.

VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FUTURE WORK

We have shown that vector network coding outperforms scalar linear network coding in both alphabet size and complexity for several variations of the combination network. The key was the use of subspace codes and in particular subspace codes derived from rank-metric codes. For the original combination network, we were only able to show that the advantage of

vector network coding is a complexity reduction of the encoding and the decoding. This was shown for any number of inputs, while in [17] it was shown only for two inputs.

It should be remarked that the min-cut in our modified combination networks is larger than the number of inputs k . This can be fixed easily as follows: replace the i -th receiver R_i by a node T_i from which there are k outgoing edges to k vertices P_{ij} , $1 \leq j \leq k$. From P_{ij} , $1 \leq j \leq k$, there is an outgoing edge to a new receiver R'_i . The new network is solvable if and only if the old network is solvable and the min-cut in the new one is k .

Some open questions for future research are briefly outlined as follows:

- Design a network with two inputs in which vector network coding outperforms scalar network coding in the alphabet size.
- To each number of inputs, find the largest possible advantage of vector network coding on scalar network coding with respect to the alphabet size.
- Is there a network with k inputs in which exactly k edge disjoint paths are used (for network coding) from the source to each receiver, and on which vector coding considerably outperforms scalar linear network coding w.r.t the field size?
- Construct subspace codes with the required properties outlined in Section VII.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A. Wachter-Zeh's work was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 655109.

T. Etzion's work was supported in part by the Israeli Science Foundation (ISF), Jerusalem, Israel, under Grant 10/12.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Ahlswede, N. Cai, S. Li, and R. Yeung, "Network Information Flow," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 1204–1216, Aug. 2000.
- [2] M. De Boer, "Almost MDS Codes," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 143–155, 1996.
- [3] F. Didier, "Efficient Erasure Decoding of Reed–Solomon Codes," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2009.
- [4] S. Dodunekov and I. Landgev, "On near-MDS codes," *Journal of Geometry*, vol. 54, no. 1-2, pp. 30–43, 1995.
- [5] R. Dougherty, C. Freiling, and K. Zeger, "Networks, Matroids, and Non-Shannon Information Inequalities," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 1949–1969, Jun. 2007.
- [6] J. B. Ebrahimi and C. Fragouli, "Algebraic Algorithms for Vector Network Coding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 996–1007, Feb. 2011.
- [7] T. Etzion and N. Silberstein, "Error-Correcting Codes in Projective Spaces Via Rank-Metric Codes and Ferrers Diagrams," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 2909–2919, Jul. 2009.
- [8] T. Etzion and A. Vardy, "Error-Correcting Codes in Projective Space," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 1165–1173, Feb. 2011.
- [9] C. Fragouli and E. Soljanin, *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10623-015-0155-6>
- [10] E. M. Gabidulin, "Theory of Codes with Maximum Rank Distance," *Probl. Inf. Transm.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 3–16, Mar. 1985.
- [11] J. Gathen and J. Gerhard, *Modern Computer Algebra*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [12] S. Jaggi, P. Sanders, P. Chou, M. Effros, S. Egnér, K. Jain, and L. M. Tolhuizen, "Polynomial Time Algorithms for Multicast Network Code Construction," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 1973–1982, Jun. 2005.
- [13] R. Kötter and M. Médard, "An algebraic approach to network coding," *IEEE/ACM Trans. on Networking*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 782–795, Oct. 2003.
- [14] A. Lehman and E. Lehman, "Complexity Classification of Network Information Flow Problems," in *15th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2004, pp. 142–150.
- [15] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. North Holland Publishing Co., 1988.

- [16] S. Riis and R. Ahlswede, "Problems in Network Coding and Error Correcting Codes," in *General Theory of Information Transfer and Combinatorics*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, vol. 4123, pp. 861–897.
- [17] Q. Sun, X. Yang, K. Long, and Z. Li, "Constructing Multicast Networks where Vector Linear Coding Outperforms Scalar Linear Coding," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2015.

APPENDIX

A. Omitted Proofs

Proof of Lemma 2: The rank is equal to

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{0}_t & \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B}^2 - \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{0}_t & \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{C}^2 - \mathbf{A}^2 \end{pmatrix} = t + \text{rk} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0}_t \\ \mathbf{0}_t & \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{rk} \geq 2\delta} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{rk} \geq t + \delta}.$$

Recall that for $n \times n$ matrices \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{N} , it holds that $\text{rk}(\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{N}) \geq \text{rk} \mathbf{M} + \text{rk} \mathbf{N} - n$. Thus, the rank of the block matrix is at least $t + 2\delta + t + \delta - 2t = 3\delta$. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1: First of all notice that when we want to calculate the determinant of an $\ell t \times \ell t$ submatrix of the following form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_1^i & \mathbf{C}_1^{1+i} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_1^{\ell-1+i} \\ \mathbf{C}_2^i & \mathbf{C}_2^{1+i} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_2^{\ell-1+i} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{C}_\ell^i & \mathbf{C}_\ell^{1+i} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_\ell^{\ell-1+i} \end{pmatrix},$$

we can always factor out $\det(\mathbf{C}_1^i) \cdot \dots \cdot \det(\mathbf{C}_\ell^i)$, which is non-zero and therefore, the determinant of the upper matrix is non-zero iff the determinant of the following one is non-zero:

$$\mathbf{M}(\ell) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{C}_1 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_1^{\ell-1} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{C}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_2^{\ell-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{C}_\ell & \dots & \mathbf{C}_\ell^{\ell-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Thus, w.l.o.g. we only need to investigate the determinant of matrices starting with power of 0 (i.e., the identity matrix) as in (1). Further, also w.l.o.g. we prove it only when we use the first ℓ rows, but it clearly holds for any ℓ rows of \mathbf{M} . The matrix $\mathbf{M}(\ell)$ is a block Vandermonde matrix. Thus, similar to the determinant of the usual Vandermonde matrix, its determinant is

$$\det \mathbf{M}(\ell) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq \ell} \det(\mathbf{C}_j - \mathbf{C}_i),$$

which is non-zero if and only if $\mathbf{C}_j \neq \mathbf{C}_i$ and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}_j - \mathbf{C}_i) = t$, $\forall i, j \in 1, \dots, \ell$. This is true since the \mathbf{C}_i 's are distinct full-rank codewords and the statement follows. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 3: On each receiver, we receive

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t}_i \\ \mathbf{t}_j \\ \mathbf{t}_\ell \\ \mathbf{z}_{ij\ell} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_i & \mathbf{C}_i^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_j & \mathbf{C}_j^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_\ell & \mathbf{C}_\ell^2 \\ \mathbf{P}_{ij\ell} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Due to the choice of $\mathbf{P}_{ij\ell}$, this linear system of equations has a unique solution for $(\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2 \ \mathbf{x}_3)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 4: On each receiver, we receive

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t}_{i_1} \\ \mathbf{t}_{i_2} \\ \mathbf{t}_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{t}_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{z}_{ij} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_i \\ \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_j \\ & \mathbf{P}_{ij} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \mathbf{x}_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Due to the choice of \mathbf{P}_{ij} , this linear system of equations has a unique solution for $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_4)$. ■

B. Additional Theorems

Theorem 5 Let $\mathcal{C} \triangleq \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}^2, \dots, \mathbf{C}^{q^t-2}, \mathbf{C}^{q^t-1}\}$, where \mathbf{C} is the companion matrix:

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ -p_0 & -p_1 & -p_2 & \dots & -p_{t-2} & -p_{t-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

and $p(x) = p_0 + p_1x + \dots + p_{t-2}x^{t-2} + p_{t-1}x^{t-1} + x^t \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ is a primitive polynomial. Then, \mathcal{C} is an MRD $[t \times t, t]_q$ code.

Proof: Notice that $\alpha^t = -p_0 - p_1\alpha - \dots - p_{t-2}\alpha^{t-2} - p_{t-1}\alpha^{t-1}$ and therefore $\alpha^{t+1} = -p_0\alpha - p_1\alpha^2 - \dots - p_{t-2}\alpha^{t-1} - p_{t-1}\alpha^t = p_0p_{t-1} + \alpha(-p_0 + p_1p_{t-1}) + \alpha^2(-p_1 + p_1p_{t-1}) + \dots + \alpha^{t-1}(-p_{t-2} + p_{t-1}^2)$. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ -p_0 & -p_1 & -p_2 & \dots & -p_{t-2} & -p_{t-1} \end{pmatrix}^2 \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ -p_0 & -p_1 & -p_2 & \dots & -p_{t-2} & -p_{t-1} \\ p_0p_{t-1} & -p_0 + p_1p_{t-1} & -p_1 + p_1p_{t-1} & \dots & -p_{t-2} + p_{t-1}^2 & \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_t(\alpha^2) \\ \phi_t(\alpha^3) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_t(\alpha^{t+1}) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{C}^i = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_t(\alpha^i) \\ \phi_t(\alpha^{i+1}) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_t(\alpha^{i+t-1}) \end{pmatrix}, \forall i = 1, \dots, q^t - 2.$$

Theorem 6 Let \mathcal{C} be the $\text{MRD}[t \times t, t]_q$ code from Theorem 5. Let \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{D} be distinct codewords of \mathcal{C} . Define the following $3t \times 3t$ block matrix:

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{B}^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{D} & \mathbf{D}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, the following holds:

- 1) any $t \times t$ block matrix of this matrix has rank t ;
- 2) any $2t \times 2t$ block submatrix consisting of four blocks from **consecutive columns** has rank $2t$;
If q is a power of 2, then **any** $2t \times 2t$ block submatrix consisting of four blocks has rank $2t$;
- 3) the matrix \mathbf{M} has rank $3t$.

Proof: Let us analyze the three claims step by step. Note that since \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{C}$, they can be written as powers of the companion matrix \mathbf{C} , i.e., $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}^i$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C}^j$, $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{C}^\ell$ and the multiplication of any of two codewords is commutative.

- 1) \mathbf{I}_t has rank t and \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , \mathbf{D} are codewords of rank t . Similarly, \mathbf{A}^2 , \mathbf{B}^2 and \mathbf{D}^2 are also codewords.
- 2) We distinguish three types of submatrices.
 - i) First,

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{B} \end{pmatrix} = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix} = t + \text{rk}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) = 2t.$$

- ii) Second, since the multiplication is commutative for these codewords,

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{B}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \det [\mathbf{B}^2 - \mathbf{A}^2] = \det [(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A})].$$

If q is a power of 2 and since $\mathbf{A} \neq \mathbf{B}$, the matrix has full rank t . Otherwise, it is not clear if $\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A} \neq \mathbf{0}$.

- iii) Third:

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{B}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \det [\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}] \neq 0,$$

since $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{B}$ is a non-zero codeword of \mathcal{C} .

- 3) Here,

$$\det(\mathbf{M}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B}^2 - \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{D}^2 - \mathbf{A}^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

is non-zero iff the following determinant is non-zero:

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B}^2 - \mathbf{A}^2 \\ \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{D}^2 - \mathbf{A}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \det(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}) \cdot \det(\mathbf{D} - \mathbf{A}) \cdot \det \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{D} + \mathbf{A} \end{pmatrix},$$

which in turn is non-zero since

$$\text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{B} \end{pmatrix} = 2t.$$

Thus, the overall rank of \mathbf{M} is $3t$.

■

Theorem 7 Let $k \geq 3$ and let \mathcal{C} be an $\text{MRD}[t \times t, \delta]_q$ code. Let \mathbf{C}_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$, be distinct codewords of \mathcal{C} . Define the following $kt \times kt$ block matrix:

$$\mathbf{M}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{C}_1^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_1^{k-1} \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_2 & \mathbf{C}_2^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_2^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_k & \mathbf{C}_k^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_k^{k-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\text{rk}(\mathbf{M}(k)) \geq \delta \binom{k}{2} - t \left[\binom{k-1}{2} - 1 \right] \triangleq \Delta_k.$$

Proof: Similar to the proof of Lemma 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rk}(\mathbf{M}(k)) &= t + \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_2 - \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{C}_2^2 - \mathbf{C}_1^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_2^{k-1} - \mathbf{C}_1^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{C}_k - \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{C}_k^2 - \mathbf{C}_1^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_k^{k-1} - \mathbf{C}_1^{k-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= t + \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_2 - \mathbf{C}_1 & & & \\ & \mathbf{C}_3 - \mathbf{C}_1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{C}_k - \mathbf{C}_1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_2 + \mathbf{C}_1 & \dots & \frac{\mathbf{C}_2^{k-1} - \mathbf{C}_1^{k-1}}{\mathbf{C}_2 - \mathbf{C}_1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_k + \mathbf{C}_1 & \dots & \frac{\mathbf{C}_k^{k-1} - \mathbf{C}_1^{k-1}}{\mathbf{C}_k - \mathbf{C}_1} \end{pmatrix}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{M}'(k-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{M}(k)) = t + (k-1)\delta + \text{rk}(\mathbf{M}'(k-1)) - (k-1)t$. We can decompose $\mathbf{M}'(k-1)$ in the same way recursively with this strategy until we obtain a 2×2 -matrix of the form:

$$\mathbf{M}'(2) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathbf{C}_i \\ \mathbf{I}_t & \sum_{i=1, i \neq k-1}^k \mathbf{C}_i \end{pmatrix}.$$

To understand why $\mathbf{M}'(2)$ has this form, let us observe the rightmost bottommost element throughout these recursions. After the first step, it becomes the rightmost bottommost element of $\mathbf{M}'(k-1)$:

$$\frac{\mathbf{C}_k^{k-1} - \mathbf{C}_1^{k-1}}{\mathbf{C}_k - \mathbf{C}_1} = \sum_{j_1=0}^{k-2} \mathbf{C}_k^{j_1} \mathbf{C}_1^{k-2-j_1}.$$

After the second step (the first row of $\mathbf{M}'(k-1)$ is subtracted and $\mathbf{C}_k - \mathbf{C}_2$ is factored out), it becomes:

$$\sum_{j_1=0}^{k-2} \frac{\mathbf{C}_k^{j_1} - \mathbf{C}_2^{j_1}}{\mathbf{C}_k - \mathbf{C}_2} \mathbf{C}_1^{k-2-j_1} = \sum_{j_1=0}^{k-2} \sum_{j_2=0}^{j_1-1} \mathbf{C}_k^{j_2} \mathbf{C}_2^{j_1-1-j_2} \mathbf{C}_1^{k-2-j_1}.$$

After $k-2$ steps, we are left with $\mathbf{M}'(2)$ and the rightmost bottommost element is

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j_1=0}^{k-2} \sum_{j_2=0}^{j_1-1} \dots \sum_{j_{k-2}=0}^{j_{k-3}-1} \mathbf{C}_k^{j_{k-2}} \mathbf{C}_{k-2}^{j_{k-3}-1-j_{k-2}} \dots \mathbf{C}_2^{j_1-1-j_2} \mathbf{C}_1^{k-2-j_1} \\ &= \sum_{j_1=k-3}^{k-2} \sum_{j_2=k-4}^{j_1-1} \dots \sum_{j_{k-2}=0}^{j_{k-3}-1} \mathbf{C}_k^{j_{k-2}} \mathbf{C}_{k-2}^{j_{k-3}-1-j_{k-2}} \dots \mathbf{C}_1^{k-2-j_1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1, i \neq k-1}^k \mathbf{C}_i, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds by observing that in each summand, all except for one exponent are zero and the other one is one. This can be done similarly for the other elements of $\mathbf{M}'(k-1)$ and the form of $\mathbf{M}'(2)$ follows. Further, this also proves that factoring out $\mathbf{C}_k - \mathbf{C}_i$ in the i -th step is possible.

Thus, from this decomposition, we obtain the following recursion:

$$\text{rk } \mathbf{M}'(i) \geq t + (i-1)(\delta - t) + \text{rk } \mathbf{M}'(i-1),$$

and since $\text{rk } \mathbf{M}'(2) \geq t + \delta$, we have

$$\text{rk } \mathbf{M}(k) \geq \sum_{i=3}^k [t + (i-1)(\delta - t)] + t + \delta = \delta \binom{k}{2} - t \left[\binom{k-1}{2} - 1 \right].$$

■