

# 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  $q^{(\ell-1)t^2/\ell} - q^t$ , for any  $q \geq 2$ , where  $t$  denotes the length of the vectors in the vector solution, and the number of inputs is  $2\ell$ ,  $\ell \geq 2$ . Previously, only a gap of constant size had been shown. 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 [8]. In [12], 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 [4] 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.* [11] 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 [13].

Since *vector network coding* offers more freedom in choosing the coding coefficients than scalar linear coding, a smaller field size might be achievable [3]. To our knowledge, Sun *et al.*'s paper [15] 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  $q^{(\ell-1)t^2/\ell}$ , while we provide a vector solution of field size  $q$  and dimension  $t$ , where the number of inputs is  $2\ell$ . Therefore, the achieved gap between the scalar and the vector field size is in the order of  $q^{(\ell-1)t^2/\ell} - q^t$ . This improves on [15], where only a constant gap was shown. Further, the network of [15] 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 [4] (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 Section V, we present scalar linear and vector solutions to combination networks with additional links and less receivers. For this networks, the required field size is significantly reduced and the gaps in the field sizes are derived. In Section VI, we show that the constructions which are based on rank-metric code can be seen as constructions based on subspace codes. Concluding remarks are given in Section VII.

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 [9] 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 4 in the appendix.

### III. THE COMBINATION NETWORK

The  $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,s}$ -combination network is shown in Fig. 1 (see also [14]). 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 complexity of erasure decoding MDS codes can be done in  $\mathcal{O}(r \log^2 r)$  operations [2]. 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 [10].

**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 [15].

### 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  $\ell^2$  blocks of **consecutive columns** has full rank  $\ell t$ , 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

$$\mathbf{t}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_t & \mathbf{C}_i & \mathbf{C}_i^2 & \dots & \mathbf{C}_i^{k-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{x}_k \end{pmatrix}^T \in \mathbb{F}_q^t, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r-1.$$

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  $(\mathbf{x}_1 \ \mathbf{x}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{x}_k)$ . ■

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 4 (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 5 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.

## V. A GENERALIZATION OF THE COMBINATION NETWORK WITH EXTRA LINKS

### A. Considered Network

In this section, we modify the combination network. We consider the  $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}^*$ -network, shown in Fig. 2, at first for  $2\ell = k = 4$ . It has an additional link from the source to each receiver and  $\binom{r}{2}$  receivers such that each receiver gets 4 links in total; namely, from two middle nodes, it gets from each 2 links. Notice that this network is different from many networks in literature since the min-cut  $k + 1$  incoming edges instead of  $k$  (see Section VII 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.




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 1** *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  $4 \times 4$ -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  $4 \times 2$ -matrix representation of all 2-dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^4$ . Any two blocks together form a  $4 \times 4$ -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 2** Let  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{q^{2t^2+2t}}\}$  be an 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  $i, j, \ell, \forall i, j, \ell = 1, \dots, r$ , 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 3** Construction 2 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 for vector solution is reduced from exponential in  $t$  to less than cubic in  $t$ , by inverting a  $4t \times 4t$  matrix.

### E. Arbitrary Number of Inputs $k$

Let us shortly outline the case of  $k = 2\ell$  inputs, where  $\ell \geq 2$  (in the previous subsections, we had  $k = 4$ ). The  $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}^*$ -network has an additional link from the source to each receiver and  $\binom{r}{2}$  receivers such that each receiver gets  $2\ell + 1$  links in total; namely, from two middle nodes, it gets from each  $\ell$  links. The scalar solution and the vector solution are very similar in this generalization to the solution for  $\ell = 2$ . The optimal scalar solution is obtained when we consider that the middle node is transmitting  $\ell$  blocks, each one with  $2\ell$  symbols from the alphabet  $q_s$ . In the optimal solution each of these  $\ell$  blocks forms an  $\ell$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{F}_{q_s}^{2\ell}$  such that two such  $\ell$ -dimensional subspaces intersect in at most an one-dimensional subspace. In other words, the subspace distance between two such sets is at least  $2\ell - 2$ . The size of the largest set with such  $\ell$ -dimensional subspaces in  $\mathbb{F}_{q_s}^{2\ell}$  is of the order  $q_s^{2\ell}$  [7]. On the other hand, for the vector

solution we can use an  $\mathcal{MRD}[\ell t \times \ell t, \delta = (\ell - 1)t]_q$  code whose size is of the order  $q^{\ell t^2 + \ell t}$ . Thus, we have again that  $q_s \in \mathcal{O}(q^{t^2/2})$ .

But, we can continue and generalize the network to obtain even a stronger result. Again, we have  $k = 2\ell$  inputs, where  $\ell \geq 2$  (in the previous subsections, we had  $k = 4$ ). The new  $\mathcal{N}_{k,r,k}^*$ -network has an additional  $\ell - 1$  links from the source to each receiver and  $\binom{r}{2}$  receivers such that each receiver gets  $3\ell - 1$  links in total; namely, from two middle nodes, it gets from each  $\ell$  links. The scalar solution and the vector solution are also very similar in this generalization to the solution for  $\ell = 2$ . The optimal scalar solution is obtained when we consider that the middle node is transmitting  $\ell$  blocks, each one with  $2\ell$  symbols from the alphabet  $q_s$ . In the optimal solution each of these  $\ell$  blocks forms an  $\ell$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{F}_{q_s}^{2\ell}$  such that two such  $\ell$ -dimensional subspaces intersect in at most an  $(\ell - 1)$ -dimensional subspace. In other words, the subspace distance between two such sets is at least 2, i.e. all  $\ell$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathcal{G}_q(2\ell, \ell)$  which has size  $\binom{2\ell}{\ell}_q$  which is of the order  $q^{\ell^2}$  [7]. On the other hand, for the vector solution we can use an  $\mathcal{MRD}[\ell t \times \ell t, \delta = t]_q$  code whose size is of the order  $q^{\ell(\ell-1)t^2 + \ell t}$ . Thus, we have an improved result such that  $q_s \in \mathcal{O}(q^{(\ell-1)t^2/\ell})$ .

## VI. VECTOR SOLUTIONS USING SUBSPACE CODES

Although large parts of 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. 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, 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 Subsection V-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 2. 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 [5]. However, the improvement is not large as the upper bound from [6, Theorem 1] gives that there are at most

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

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

Also for the other constructions, such as the generalization in Subsection V-E, 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  $\rho$ ,  $0 \leq \rho \leq \ell - 2$ , find a large code in  $\mathcal{G}_q(\ell t, t)$  such that the linear span of the rows of any  $\ell$  codewords is a subspace with dimension  $(\ell - \rho)t$ . Such a code can be used when extra  $\rho$  links are used for the variation of the combination network. Larger codes will improve on these constructions and will solve other networks, too. More generalizations which can be efficiently solved by subspace codes and subspace designs will be discussed in the full version of this paper.

## VII. 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 [15] 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  $k$ . In a similar way we can increase the number of middle node if we want that each node will obtain exactly one link and not  $\ell$  as in Section V.

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 VI.

Finally, we have considered several more related networks and their description together with performance with vector network coding compared to scalar network coding will appear in the full version of this paper.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

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.

The authors thank Ronny Roth for many helpful discussions.

## 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] F. Didier, "Efficient Erasure Decoding of Reed–Solomon Codes," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2009.
- [3] 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.
- [4] 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.
- [5] 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.
- [6] T. Etzion and A. Vardy, "Error-Correcting Codes in Projective Space," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 1165–1173, Feb. 2011.



- [7] T. Etzion and L. Storme, “Galois Geometries and Coding Theory,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10623-015-0156-5>
- [8] C. Fragouli and E. Soljanin, “(Secure) Linear Network Coding Multicast: A Theoretical Minimum and Some Open Problems,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10623-015-0155-6>
- [9] E. M. Gabidulin, “Theory of Codes with Maximum Rank Distance,” *Probl. Inf. Transm.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 3–16, Mar. 1985.
- [10] J. Gathen and J. Gerhard, *Modern Computer Algebra*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [11] S. Jaggi, P. Sanders, P. Chou, M. Effros, S. Egner, 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.
- [12] 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.
- [13] 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.
- [14] 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.
- [15] 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 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  $\ell$  rows, but it clearly holds for any  $\ell$  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

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t}_{i1} \\ \mathbf{t}_{i2} \\ \mathbf{t}_{j1} \\ \mathbf{t}_{j2} \\ \mathbf{z}_{ij} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_i \\ \mathbf{I}_{2t} & \mathbf{C}_j \\ & \mathbf{P}_{ij} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \mathbf{x}_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

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 4** 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,

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

**Theorem 5** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the  $MRD[t \times t, t]_q$  code from Theorem 4. 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  $3t$ .

■