

# Optimal codes for correcting a single (wrap-around) burst of erasures

Henk D.L. Hollmann and Ludo M.G.M. Tolhuizen \*

September 4, 2021

## Abstract

In 2007, Martinian and Trott presented codes for correcting a burst of erasures with a minimum decoding delay. Their construction employs  $[n, k]$  codes that can correct any burst of erasures (including wrap-around bursts) of length  $n - k$ . They raised the question if such  $[n, k]$  codes exist for all integers  $k$  and  $n$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and all fields (in particular, for the binary field). In this note, we answer this question affirmatively by giving two recursive constructions and a direct one.

---

\*The authors are with Philips Research Laboratories, Prof. Holstlaan 4, 5656 AA Eindhoven, The Netherlands; e-mail: {henk.d.l.hollmann,ludo.tolhuizen}@philips.com

# 1 Introduction

In [1], Martinian and Trott present codes for correcting a burst of erasures with a minimum decoding delay. Their construction employs  $[n, k]$  codes that can correct any burst of erasures (including wrap-around bursts) of length  $n - k$ . Examples of such codes are MDS codes and cyclic codes. The question is raised in [1] if such  $[n, k]$  codes exist for all integers  $k$  and  $n$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and all fields (in particular, over the binary field). In this note, we answer this question affirmatively by giving two recursive constructions and a direct one.

Throughout this note, all matrices and codes are over the (fixed but arbitrary) finite field  $\mathbb{F}$ , and we restrict ourselves to linear codes.

Obviously, a code of length  $n$  can correct a pattern  $E$  of erasures if and only if any codeword can be uniquely recovered from its values in the  $(n - |E|)$  positions outside  $E$ . As a consequence, if an  $[n, k]$  code can correct a pattern  $E$  of erasures, then  $n - |E| \geq k$ , *i.e.*,  $|E| \leq n - k$ . We call an  $[n, k]$  code *optimal* if it can correct any burst of erasures (including wrap-around bursts) of length  $n - k$ .<sup>1</sup> Equivalently, an  $[n, k]$  code is optimal if knowledge of any  $k$  (cyclically) consecutive symbols from a codeword allows one to uniquely recover that codeword, or, in coding parlance, if each of the  $n$  sets of  $k$  (cyclically) consecutive codeword positions forms an information set. We call a  $k \times n$  matrix *good* if any  $k$  cyclically consecutive columns of  $G$  are independent. It is easy to see that a code is optimal if and only if it has a good generator matrix.

Throughout this note, we denote with  $I_k$  the  $k \times k$  identity matrix, and with  $X^T$  the transpose of the matrix  $X$ .

## 2 A recursive construction of optimal codes

In this section, we give a recursive construction of good matrices, and hence of optimal codes. We start with a simple duality result.

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $C$  be an  $[n, k]$  code, and let  $C^\perp$  be its dual. If  $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  has size  $k$  and is an information set for  $C$ , then  $I^* = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I$  is an information set for  $C^\perp$ .*

**Proof:** By contradiction. Suppose that  $I^*$  is not an information set for  $C^\perp$ . Then there is a non-zero word  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $C^\perp$  that is zero in the positions indexed by  $I^*$ . As  $\mathbf{x}$  is in  $C^\perp$ , for any word  $\mathbf{c} \in C$  we have that

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i c_i = \sum_{i \in I} x_i c_i.$$

---

<sup>1</sup>A more precise terminology would be "optimal for the correction of a single (wrap-around) burst of erasures", but we opted for just "optimal" for notational convenience.

As a consequence, there are  $k$ -tuples that do not occur in  $I$  in any word of  $C$ , a contradiction. We conclude that  $I^*$  is an information set for  $C^\perp$ .  $\square$

As a consequence, we have the following.

**Corollary 2.2** *A linear code is optimal if and only if its dual is optimal.*

Our first theorem shows how to construct a good  $k \times (k + n)$  matrix from a good  $k \times n$  matrix.

**Theorem 2.3** *Let  $G = (I_k \ P)$  be a good  $k \times n$  matrix. Then  $G' = (I_k \ I_k \ P)$  is a good  $k \times (k + n)$  matrix.*

**Proof:** Any  $k$  cyclically consecutive columns in  $G'$  either are  $k$  different unit vectors, or  $k$  cyclically consecutive columns of  $G$ .  $\square$

Our next theorem shows how to construct a good  $n \times (2n - k)$  matrix from a good  $k \times n$  matrix.

**Theorem 2.4** *Let  $G = (I_k \ P)$  be a good  $k \times n$  matrix. Then the following  $n \times (2n - k)$  matrix  $G'$  is good*

$$G' = \begin{pmatrix} I_{n-k} & 0 & I_{n-k} \\ 0 & I_k & P \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Proof:** As  $G$  is good, Corollary 2.2 implies that the generator matrix  $(-P^T \ I_{n-k})$  of the dual of the code generated by  $G$  is good. By cyclically shifting the columns of this matrix over  $(n - k)$  positions to the right, we obtain the good matrix  $(I_{n-k} \ -P^T)$ .

Theorem 1 implies that  $(I_{n-k} \ I_{n-k} \ -P^T)$  is good, and so the matrix  $H = (I_{n-k} \ -P^T \ I_{n-k})$  obtained by cyclically shifting the columns of the former matrix over  $n$  positions, is good. Clearly, after multiplying the columns of a good matrix with non-zero field elements, we obtain a good matrix; as a consequence,  $H' = (-I_{n-k} \ -P^T \ I_{n-k})$  is good. As  $H'$  is a good full-rank parity check matrix of the code generated by  $G'$ , this latter matrix is good.  $\square$

**Remark** The construction from Theorem 2.4 also occurs in the proof of [1, Thm.1].

The construction from Theorem 2.3 increases the code length and fixes its dimension; the construction from Theorem 2.4 also increases the code length, but fixes its redundancy. These constructions can be combined to give a recursive construction of optimal  $[n, k]$  code for all  $k$  and  $n$ . The following definition is instrumental in making this explicit.

**Definition 2.5** *For positive integers  $r$  and  $k$ , we recursively define the  $k \times r$  matrix  $P_{k,r}$  as follows:*

$$P_{k,r} = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} I_r \\ P_{k-r,r} \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } 1 \leq r < k, \\ I_k & \text{if } r = k, \\ (I_k \ P_{k,r-k}) & \text{if } r > k. \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 2.6** For each positive integer  $k$ , the matrix  $I_k$  is good.

For all integers  $k$  and  $n$  with  $1 \leq k < n$ , the  $k \times n$  matrix  $(I_k P_{k,n-k})$  is good.

**Proof:** The first statement is obvious.

The second statement will be proved by induction on  $k + n$ . It is easily verified that it is true for  $k + n = 3$ . Now assume that the statement is true for all integers  $a, b$  with  $1 \leq a \leq b$  and  $a + b < k + n$ . We consider three cases.

If  $2k < n$ , then by induction hypothesis  $(I_k P_{k,n-2k})$  is good. By Theorem 2.3,  $(I_k I_k P_{k,n-2k}) = (I_k P_{k,n-k})$  is also good.

If  $2k = n$ , then  $(I_k P_{n-k}) = (I_k P_{k,k}) = (I_k I_k)$ , which obviously is a good matrix. If  $k < n$  and  $2k > n$ , the induction hypothesis implies that  $(I_{2k-n} P_{2k-n,n-k})$  is a good  $(2k - n) \times k$  matrix. By Theorem 2.4,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{n-k} & 0 & I_{n-k} \\ 0 & I_{2k-n} & P_{2k-n,n-k} \end{pmatrix} = (I_k P_{k,n-k})$$

is also good. □

**Example 2.7** Theorem 2.6 implies that  $(I_{28} P_{28,17})$  is a good  $28 \times 45$  matrix.

According to the definition,  $P_{28,17} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{17} \\ P_{11,17} \end{pmatrix}$ .

Again according to the definition,  $P_{11,17} = (I_{11} P_{11,6})$ .

Continuing in this fashion,  $P_{11,6} = \begin{pmatrix} I_6 \\ P_{5,6} \end{pmatrix}$ .

Finally,  $P_{5,6} = (I_5 P_{5,1})$ , and, as can be readily seen by induction on  $k$ ,  $P_{k,1}$  is the all-one vector of height  $k$ .

Putting this altogether, we find that the following  $28 \times 45$  matrix  $G$  is good:

$$G = \left( \begin{array}{ccc|cc|ccc} I_6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_6 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_6 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & I_6 & 0 & I_6 & 0 & I_6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_5 & 0 & I_5 & P_{5,6} \end{array} \right),$$

where  $P_{5,6} = (I_5 \mathbf{1})$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  denotes the all-one column vector.

To close this section, we remark that with an induction argument it can be shown that for all positive integers  $k$  and  $r$ , we have  $P_{k,r} = P_{r,k}^T$ .

### 3 Adding one column to a good matrix

In Theorem 2.3, we added  $k$  columns to a good  $k \times n$  matrix to obtain a good  $k \times (k + n)$  matrix. In this section, we will show that it is always possible to add a single column to

a good  $k \times n$  matrix in such a way that the resulting  $k \times (n + 1)$  matrix is good; we also show that in the binary case, there is a *unique* column that can be added. The desired result is a direct consequence of the following observation, which may be of independent interest.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be any field, and let  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2k-2}$  be a sequence of vectors in  $\mathbb{F}^k$  such that  $a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{i+k-1}$  are independent over  $\mathbb{F}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , let  $b_i$  be a nonzero vector orthogonal to  $a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{i+k-2}$ . Then  $b_1, \dots, b_k$  are independent over  $\mathbb{F}$ .*

**Proof:** For  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , we define

$$V_i := \text{span}\{a_i, \dots, a_{i+k-2}\}.$$

For an interval  $[i + 1, i + s] := \{i + 1, i + 2, \dots, i + s\}$ , with  $0 \leq i < i + s \leq k$ , we let

$$V_{[i+1, i+s]} = V_{i+1} \cap \dots \cap V_{i+s}$$

denote the intersection of  $V_{i+1}, \dots, V_{i+s}$ . Note that by definition

$$V_{[i, i]} = V_i = b_i^\perp.$$

We claim that

$$V_{[i+1, i+s]} = \text{span}\{a_{i+s}, \dots, a_{i+k-1}\}.$$

This is easily proven by induction on  $s$ : obviously, the claim is true for  $s = 1$ ; if it holds for all  $s' \leq s$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} V_{[i+1, i+s+1]} &= V_{[i+1, i+s]} \cap V_{i+s+1} \\ &= \text{span}\{a_{i+s}, \dots, a_{i+k-1}\} \cap \text{span}\{a_{i+s+1}, \dots, a_{i+s+k-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

hence  $V_{[i+1, i+s]}$  certainly contains  $a_{i+s+1}, \dots, a_{i+k-1}$  and does not contain  $a_{i+s}$ , since by assumption  $a_{i+s} \notin \text{span}\{a_{i+s+1}, \dots, a_{i+s+k-1}\}$ .

So by our claim it follows that

$$\{0\} = V_{[1, k]} = V_1 \cap \dots \cap V_k = b_1^\perp \cap \dots \cap b_k^\perp,$$

hence  $b_1, \dots, b_k$  are independent. □

As an immediate consequence, we have the following.

**Theorem 3.2** *Let  $M$  be a good  $k \times n$  matrix over  $\text{GF}(q)$ . There are precisely  $(q - 1)^k$  vectors  $x \in \text{GF}(q)^k$  such that the matrix  $(Mx)$  is good.*

**Proof:** Let  $M = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{n-1})$  have columns  $m_0, \dots, m_{n-1} \in GF(q)^k$ . We want to find all vectors  $x \in GF(q)^k$  with the property that the  $k$  vectors

$$m_{n-i}, \dots, m_{n-1}, x, m_0, \dots, m_{k-i-2} \quad (1)$$

are independent, for all  $i = k-1, k-2, \dots, 0$ . So, for  $i = k-1, k-2, \dots, 0$ , let  $b_i$  be a nonzero vector orthogonal to  $m_{n-i}, \dots, m_{n-1}, m_0, \dots, m_{k-i-2}$ ; since  $M$  is good, the  $k-1$  vectors  $m_{n-i}, \dots, m_{n-1}, m_0, \dots, m_{k-i-2}$  are independent, and hence the vectors in (1) are independent if and only if  $(x, b_i) = \lambda_i \neq 0$ . Again since  $M$  is good, the  $2k-2$  vectors

$$m_{n-k+1}, \dots, m_{n-1}, m_0, \dots, m_{k-2}$$

satisfy the conditions in Lemma 3.1, hence the vectors  $b_0, \dots, b_{k-1}$  are independent. So for each choice of  $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{k-1})$  with  $\lambda_i \neq 0$  for each  $i$ , there is a unique vector  $x$  for which  $(x, b_i) = \lambda_i$ , and these vectors  $x$  are precisely the ones for which  $(Mx)$  is good.  $\square$

## 4 Explicit construction of good matrices

By starting with the  $k \times k$  identity matrix, and repeatedly applying Theorem 3.2, we find that for each field  $\mathbb{F}$  and all positive integers  $k$  and  $n$  with  $n \geq k$ , there exists a  $k \times n$  matrix  $G$  such that

- (1) the  $k$  leftmost columns of  $G$  form the  $k \times k$  identity matrix, and
- (2) for each  $j$ ,  $k \leq j \leq n$ , the  $j$  leftmost columns of  $G$  form a good  $k \times j$  matrix.

Note that Theorem 3.2 implies that for the binary field, these matrices are unique. It turned out that they have a simple recursive structure, which inspired our general construction.

In this section, we give, for all positive integers  $k$  and  $n$  with  $k \leq n$ , an explicit construction of  $k \times n$  matrices over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , the field of integers modulo  $p$ , that satisfy the above properties (1) and (2). Note that such matrices also satisfy (1) and (2) for extension fields of  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

We start with describing the result for  $p = 2$ . Let  $M_1$  be the matrix

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

and for  $m \geq 1$ , let  $M_{m+1}$  be the given as

$$M_{m+1} = \begin{pmatrix} M_m & 0 \\ M_m & M_m \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Clearly,  $M_m$  is a binary  $2^m \times 2^m$  matrix. The relevance of the matrix  $M_m$  to our problem is explained in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.1** *Let  $k$  and  $r$  be two positive integers, and let  $m$  be the smallest integer such that  $2^m \geq k$  and  $2^m \geq r$ . Let  $Q$  be the  $k \times r$  matrix residing in the lower left corner of  $M_m$ . Then for each integer  $j$  for which  $k \leq j \leq k + r$ , the  $j$  leftmost columns of the matrix  $(I_k Q)$  form a good binary  $k \times j$  matrix.*

Theorem 4.1 is a consequence from our results for the general case in the remainder of this section.

We now define the matrices that are relevant for constructing good matrices over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

**Definition 4.2** *Let  $p$  be a prime number, and let  $k, r$  be positive integers. Let  $m$  be the smallest integer such that  $p^m \geq r$  and  $p^m \geq k$ . The  $k \times r$  matrix  $Q_{k,r}$  is defined as*

$$Q_{k,r}(i, j) = \binom{p^m - k + i - 1}{j - 1} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq r.$$

In Theorem 4.8 we will show that the matrix  $(I_k Q_{k,r})$  is good over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . But first, we derive a recursive property of the  $Q$ -matrices. To this aim, we need some well-known results on binomial coefficients modulo  $p$ .

**Lemma 4.3** *Let  $p$  be a prime number, and let  $m$  be a positive integer. For any integer  $i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq p^m - 1$ , we have that  $\binom{p^m}{i} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .*

**Proof:** The following proof was pointed out to us by our colleague Ronald Rietman. Let  $1 \leq i \leq p^m - 1$ . We have that

$$\binom{p^m}{i} = \frac{p^m \binom{p^m - 1}{i - 1}}{i}.$$

In the above representation of  $\binom{p^m}{i}$ , the nominator contains at least  $m$  factors  $p$ , while the denominator contains at most  $m - 1$  factors  $p$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4** *Let  $p$  be a prime number, and let  $m$  be a positive integer. Moreover, let  $i, j, k, \ell$  be integers such that  $0 \leq i, k \leq p - 1$  and  $0 \leq j, \ell \leq p^m - 1$ . Then we have that*

$$\binom{ip^m + j}{kp^m + \ell} \equiv \binom{i}{k} \binom{j}{\ell} \pmod{p}.$$

**Proof:** This is a direct consequence of Lucas' theorem (see for example [2, Thm. 13.3.3]). We give a short direct proof. Clearly,  $\binom{ip^m + j}{kp^m + \ell}$  is the coefficient of  $z^{kp^m + \ell}$  in  $(1 + z)^{ip^m + j}$ . Now we note that

$$(1 + z)^{ip^m + j} = (1 + z)^{ip^m} (1 + z)^j = [(1 + z)^{p^m}]^i (1 + z)^j.$$

It follows from Lemma 4.3 that  $(1 + z)^{p^m} \equiv 1 + z^{p^m} \pmod{p}$ , and so

$$(1 + z)^{ip^m + j} \equiv (1 + z^{p^m})^i (1 + z)^j \pmod{p}.$$

Hence, modulo  $p$ , the coefficient of  $z^{kp^m + \ell}$  in  $(1 + z)^{ip^m + j}$  equals  $\binom{i}{k} \binom{j}{\ell}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5** *Let  $p$  be a prime, and let  $m$  be a positive integer. Let  $a, b, c, d$  be integers such that  $0 \leq a, c \leq p - 1$  and  $1 \leq b, d \leq p^m$ . Then we have*

$$Q_{p^{m+1}, p^{m+1}}(ap^m + b, cp^m + d) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a \\ c \end{pmatrix} Q_{p^m, p^m}(b, d) \pmod{p}.$$

**Proof:** According to the definition of  $Q_{p^{m+1}, p^{m+1}}$ , we have that

$$Q_{p^{m+1}, p^{m+1}}(ap^m + b, cp^m + d) = \begin{pmatrix} ap^m + b - 1 \\ cp^m + d - 1 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } Q_{p^m, p^m}(b, d) = \begin{pmatrix} b - 1 \\ d - 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The corollary is now obtained by application of Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

In words, Theorem 4.5 states that  $Q_{p^{m+1}, p^{m+1}}$  can be considered as a  $p \times p$  block matrix, for which each block is a multiple of  $Q_{p^m, p^m}$ . For example, for  $p = 3$ , we obtain

$$Q_{3^{m+1}, 3^{m+1}} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \times Q_{3^m, 3^m} = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{3^m, 3^m} & 0 & 0 \\ Q_{3^m, 3^m} & Q_{3^m, 3^m} & 0 \\ Q_{3^m, 3^m} & 2Q_{3^m, 3^m} & Q_{3^m, 3^m} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For  $p = 2$ , we obtain the relation in (3).

Taking  $a = p - 1$  and  $c = 0$  in Theorem 4.5, we see that over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , the  $p^m \times p^m$  block in the lower left hand corner of  $Q_{p^{m+1}, p^{m+1}}$  equals  $Q_{p^m, p^m}$ . Definition 4.2 implies  $Q_{k, r}$  is the  $k \times r$  matrix residing in the lower left hand corner of  $Q_{p^m, p^m}$ , where  $m$  is the smallest integer that such that  $p^m \geq k$  and  $p^m \geq r$ . The above observations imply that whenever  $k' \geq k$  and  $r' \geq r$ , then over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , the matrix  $Q_{k, r}$  is the  $k \times r$  submatrix in the lower left hand corner of  $Q_{k', r'}$ . In particular,  $Q_{k, r+1}$  can be obtained by adding a column to  $Q_{k, r}$ .

We now state and prove results on the invertibility in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  of certain submatrices of  $Q_{k, r}$ , that will be used to prove our main result in Theorem 4.8.

**Lemma 4.6** *Let  $n \geq 0$  and  $b \geq 1$ . The  $b \times b$  matrix  $V_b$  with  $V_b(i, j) = \binom{n+i-1}{j-1}$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq b$  has an integer inverse.*

**Proof:** By induction on  $b$ . For  $b = 1$ , this is obvious.

Next, let  $b \geq 2$ . Let  $S$  be the  $b \times b$  matrix with

$$S(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ -1 & \text{if } i \geq 2 \text{ and } i = j + 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The matrix  $S$  has an integer inverse: it is easy to check that  $S^{-1}(i, j) = 1$  if  $i \geq j$ , and 0 otherwise. We have that

$$(SV_b)(1, j) = V_b(1, j) = \binom{n}{j-1}, \text{ and}$$



$$(SV_b)(i, j) = V_b(i, j) - V_b(i-1, j) = \binom{n+i-1}{j-1} - \binom{n+i-2}{j-1} = \binom{n+i-2}{j-2} \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq b.$$

In other words,  $SV_b$  is of the form

$$SV_b = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & A \\ 0 & V_{b-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By induction hypothesis,  $V_{b-1}$  has an integer inverse, and so  $V_b S$  has an integer inverse (namely the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -AV_{b-1}^{-1} \\ 0 & V_{b-1}^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$ ). As  $S$  has an integer inverse, we conclude that  $V_b$  has an integer inverse.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7** *Let  $p$  be a prime number, and let  $a \geq 0$  and  $b \geq 1$  be integers such that  $a + b \leq p^m$ . The  $b \times b$  matrix  $W_b$  with  $W_b(i, j) = \binom{p^m-1+i-b}{a+j-1}$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq b$  is invertible over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .*

**Proof:** Similarly to the proof of Lemma 4.6, we apply induction on  $b$ .

For  $b = 1$ , we have the  $1 \times 1$  matrix with entry  $\binom{p^m-1}{a}$ . By induction on  $i$ , using that  $\binom{p^m-1}{i} = \binom{p^m-1}{i-1} + \binom{p^m-1}{i-1}$  and employing Lemma 4.3, we readily find that  $\binom{p^m-1}{i} \equiv (-1)^i \pmod{p}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p^m - 1$ . As a consequence, the lemma is true for  $b = 1$ .

Now let  $b \geq 2$ . We define the  $b \times b$  matrix  $T$  by

$$T(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 1 & \text{if } j \geq 2 \text{ and } i = j - 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check  $T$  has an integer inverse, and that  $T^{-1}(i, j) = (-1)^{i-j}$  if  $i \leq j$  and 0 otherwise. In order to show that  $W_b$  is invertible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , it is thus sufficient to show that  $W_b T$  is invertible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . By direct computation, we have that  $(W_b T)(i, 1) = W_b(i, 1)$ , and

$$(W_b T)(i, j) = W_b(i, j) + W_b(i, j-1) = \binom{p^m-1+i-b}{a+j-1} + \binom{p^m-1+i-b}{a+j-2} = \binom{p^m+i-b}{a+j-1}.$$

In particular,  $(W_b T)(b, 1) = \binom{p^m-1}{a} \equiv (-1)^a \pmod{p}$ , and for  $2 \leq j \leq b$ , we have that  $(W_b T)(b, j) = \binom{p^m}{a+j-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . We thus have that

$$W_b T \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A & W_{b-1} \\ (-1)^a & 0 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p}.$$

As  $W_{b-1}$  is invertible over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , the matrix  $W_b T$  (and hence the matrix  $W_b$ ) is invertible over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .  $\square$

**Remark** The matrix in Lemma 4.7 need not have an integer inverse. For example, take  $p = 2, m = 2, a = 1$  and  $b = 2$ . The matrix  $W_2$  equals

$$\begin{pmatrix} \binom{2}{1} & \binom{3}{1} \\ \binom{2}{2} & \binom{3}{2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix},$$

and so  $W_2^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{2}{3} \end{pmatrix}$ . Note that modulo 2,  $W_2$  equals  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , confirming that  $W_2$  does have an inverse in the integers modulo  $p = 2$ .

We are now in a position to prove the main result of this section.

**Theorem 4.8** *Let  $k$  and  $r$  be positive integers. For  $j = k, k + 1, \dots, k + r$ , the matrix consisting of the  $j$  leftmost columns of the matrix  $(I_k Q_{k,r})$  is good over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .*

**Proof:** We denote the matrix  $(I_k Q_{k,r})$  by  $G$ , and the  $i$ -th column of  $G$  by  $\mathbf{g}_i$ . Let  $k \leq j \leq k + r$ . To show that the matrix consisting of the columns  $1, 2, \dots, j$  of  $G$  is good, we show that for  $1 \leq i \leq j$ , the vectors  $\mathbf{g}_i, \mathbf{g}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{i+k-1}$  are independent over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , where the indices are counted modulo  $j$ . This is obvious if  $j = k$  and if  $i = 1$ , so we assume that  $j \geq k + 1$  and  $i \geq 2$ . We distinguish between two cases.

(1)  $2 \leq i \leq k$ .

The vectors to consider are  $\mathbf{e}_i, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{g}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{i+k-1}$  (if  $i + k - 1 \leq j$ ), or  $\mathbf{e}_i, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{g}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{k-j+i-1}$  (if  $i + k - 1 \geq j + 1$ ). We define  $b := \min(i - 1, j - k)$ . The vectors under consideration are independent if the  $b \times b$  matrix consisting of the  $b$  leftmost columns of  $Q_{k,r}$ , restricted to rows  $i - b, i - b + 1, \dots, i = 1$ , is invertible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . This follows from Lemma 4.6.

(2)  $i \geq k + 1$ .

The vectors to consider are  $\mathbf{g}_i, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{i+k-1}$  (if  $i + k - 1 \leq j$ ), or  $\mathbf{g}_i, \dots, \mathbf{g}_j, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{k-j+i-1}$  (if  $i + k - 1 \geq j + 1$ ). We define  $b := \min(k, j - i + 1)$ . The vectors under consideration are independent if the  $b \times b$  matrix consisting of the  $b$  bottom entries of the columns  $i - k + 1, i - k + 2, \dots, i - k + b$  of  $Q_{k,r}$  is invertible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . This follows from Lemma 4.7.  $\square$

## References

- [1] E. Martinian and M. Trott, "Delay-Optimal Burst Erasure Code Construction", ISIT 2007, Nice, France, June 24-29, 2007, pp. 1006–1010.
- [2] R.E. Blahut, *Theory and Practice of Error Control Codes*, Addison Wesley, 1983.