## The bits between the bits



1. Error-correcting codes
2. Sphere packings and lattices
3. Sporadic simple groups

## 1947: Richard W Hamming (Bell Labs)...

Two weekends in a row I came in and found that all my stuff had been dumped and nothing was done. I was really aroused and annoyed because I wanted those answers and two weekends had been lost. And so I said 'Damn it, if the machine can detect an error, why can't it locate the position of the error and correct it?'

The problem:
Reliable transmission of data over a noisy channel
Reliable storage of data on fallible media

## SHANNON'S THEOREM

> As long as the information transfer rate over the channel is within the channel capacity (or bandwidth), then it is possible to construct a code such that the error probability can be made arbitrarily small.

Costs of increased reliability:

- transfer rate decreased
- code becomes more complex


## ERROR-DETECTING CODES

We want to be able to tell, upon receiving a message, whether the message has been corrupted in transit.

## Repetition codes

SSeenndd eeaacchh ccooddeewwoorrdd ttwwiiccee.
For example, encode '1100' (12) as ' 11001100 '
The first four bits are the message, and the next four are the check bits or check digits.

This code detects any one error in transmission and is the $(8,4)$ block repetition code.

Generalise to:

- $(r s, r)$ block repetition code
- $(n, r)$ block code

Define the information rate of an ( $n, r$ ) binary code with $w$ codewords to be:

$$
R=\frac{\log _{2} w}{n}
$$

If $w=2^{r}$, for example, then $R=\frac{r}{n}$.

So, the higher the number of check bits (and hence the more reliable the code), the lower the information rate.

The problem is now to devise a code which maximises reliability and information rate, while still allowing detection of transmission errors.

## PARITY CHECK CODES

Append to each 4-bit block ('nybble') another bit (the parity bit) making the sum of the bits even ( $\equiv 0$ mod 2).

Information rate: $R=\frac{4}{5}$ - much better than the $(8,4)$ block repetition code.

In general, the $(r+1, r)$ parity check code has information rate $R=\frac{r}{1+r}$.

## Error-correcting codes

Error-detection is all well and good, but not enough in certain circumstances (like a compact disc, or remote-piloting unmanned space probes). We need to be able to figure out what the message should have been.
[Hamming 1950]: Geometric approach.

Consider the unit cube in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ whose vertices are the $2^{n} n$-tuples of 0 s and 1 s ; the binary expansions of $0, \ldots, 2^{n}-1$.

The $(3,2)$ PARITY Check code

The codewords of this (single-error-detecting) code are the four 3-bit binary numbers with an even number of 1 s :


Hamming distance

The Hamming distance $D(x, y)$ is the number of bits which differ between the codewords $x$ and $y$.

This is the number of edges in a shortest path between the two vertices of the unit $n$-cube corresponding to the codewords.

The minimum distance $d$ of a code is the minimal distance between any two non-identical codewords. For the $(3,2)$ parity check code $d=2$.

The $(4,1)$ repetition code (consisting of codewords 0000 and 1111) has minimum distance 4 - any two errors can be detected. In addition, any single error can be corrected.

In general, a code with minimum distance $d$ will detect up to $\left[\frac{d}{2}\right]$ errors and will correct up to $\left[\frac{d-1}{2}\right]$ errors.

Hamming sphere

The Hamming sphere of radius $\varepsilon$ centred on a vertex of the unit cube in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is the set of all vertices at a Hamming distance of at most $\varepsilon$ from the given vertex.

A code of length $n$ is said to be perfect (or closepacked or lossless) if there is an $\varepsilon \geqslant 0$ such that:

- The $\varepsilon$-spheres centred on the codeword vertices are pairwise disjoint.
- Each vertex of the $n$-cube is contained in some $\varepsilon$-sphere

The ( $n, n-1$ ) repetition codes with $n$ odd are all perfect
(take $\varepsilon=\frac{n-1}{2}$ ).

The Hamming spheres of radius 1 for the $(3,1)$ repetition code are:


## The $(7,4)$ Hamming code $\mathcal{H}_{7}$

The requirements of this code are that the checking number (three bits) should locate any single error in a codeword. Rather than placing the check bits at the end, Hamming put the $i$ th check bit at the $2^{i-1}$ th position. This has the result that no two check bits check each other.

The essential idea is that the $i$ th parity bit should check the parity of the positions with a 1 in their $i$ th position.

So, the first check bit checks the parity of bits 1,3,5,7, the second checks bits $2,3,6,7$, and the third checks bits $4,5,6,7$, with the check bits themselves in positions 1,2 and 4.

The idea is that if no error occurs then the check number should be 000.

This $(7,4)$ code is perfect.
In fact, all the ( $\left.2^{k}-1,2^{k}-1-k\right)$ Hamming codes are perfect.

Suppose we wish to encode the number 0101:

| Position | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Message data <br> Check data | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Codeword | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

If, during transmission, this particular codeword is corrupted:

## $0101101 \mapsto 0001101$

The parity checks are then:
Bits $4,5,6,7: \quad 1+0+0+0 \equiv 1(\bmod 2)$
Bits $2,3,6,7: \quad 0+1+0+0 \equiv 1(\bmod 2)$ Bits $1,3,5,7: 1+1+0+0 \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$

The checking number is thus 110 , so the error is in the 6th position.

## LINEAR CODES

We can regard the ( $n, r$ ) Hamming codes as vector subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{n}$, since the sum of any two codewords is itself a codeword.

Any code which may be thought of in this way is said to be linear.

In fact, since only words with check digits 000 are valid codewords, we can regard the $(7,4)$ Hamming code as the kernel of some linear map $\mathbb{F}_{2}^{7} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2}^{3}$.

A suitable matrix for this map is:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{lllllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1
\end{array}\right]
$$

In general, if a code can be regarded as the kernel of some linear transformation with matrix $H$, then $H$ is the generating matrix or parity check matrix for the code.

## Golay codes

1950s: Marcel Golay extended Hamming's ideas to construct perfect single-error-correcting codes on $p$ symbols for any prime $p$.

A necessary condition for the existence of a perfect binary code which can correct more than one error, is the existence of three or more first numbers of a line of Pascal's triangle which add up to an exact power of two.

A possible candidate is:

$$
\binom{90}{0}+\binom{90}{1}+\binom{90}{2}=2^{12}
$$

This suggests the existence of a perfect, double-error-correcting $(90,78)$ code, but it was proved by Golay and Zaremba that no such code exists.

The second candidate that Golay found is:

$$
\binom{23}{0}+\binom{23}{1}+\binom{23}{2}+\binom{23}{3}=2^{11}
$$

This suggests the existence of a perfect 3-error-correcting $(23,12)$ binary code.

This code $\left(\mathcal{C}_{23}\right)$ does exist, and Golay constructed a generating matrix for it.

Golay also constructed an (11,6), double-error-correcting ternary code, $\mathcal{C}_{11}$, whose check matrix may be regarded as a map from $\mathbb{F}_{3}^{11} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{3}^{5}$.

No other perfect codes are known. In fact, the perfect error-correcting codes have been classified, and are:

1. Trivial codes (such as a code with one codeword, the universe code, or the binary repetition codes of odd length)
2. Hamming/Golay $\left(\frac{p^{k}-1}{p-1}, \frac{p^{k}-1}{p-1}-k\right)$ codes over $\mathbb{F}_{p}$ with minimum distance 3 .
3. Nonlinear codes with the same parameters as the Hamming/Golay codes (these haven't been completely enumerated).
4. The binary and ternary Golay codes $\mathcal{C}_{23}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{11}$

Sphere Packings and Lattices in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$

How may we pack disjoint, identical, open $n$-balls in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ so as to maximise the space covered?

Dates back to Gauss (1831): Notes that a problem of Lagrange (1773), concerning the minimum nonzero value assumed by a positive definite quadratic form in $n$ variables, can be restated as a spherepacking problem.

Lattice packings

If a packing $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ contains spheres centred at $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$, then there is also a sphere centred at $\mathbf{u}+\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{v}$.

- The set of sphere centres forms an additive group.


## A lattice is the $\mathbb{Z}$-span of some basis for $\mathbb{R}^{n}$.

(Or, a finitely-generated free $\mathbb{Z}$-module with an integervalued symmetric bilinear form.)

Density - the proportion $\Delta$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ which is covered by the spheres.
(Let $V_{n}=\frac{\pi^{(n / 2)}}{(n / 2)!}$ be the volume of the $n$-ball $\mathcal{B}^{n}$.)
Packing radius - half the minimal distance between lattice points.

Kissing number - The number of $n$-balls which can be arranged so that they all touch another of the same size.

Voronoi cell - Around each point $P$ in a discrete collection of points $\mathcal{P}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, this is the subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ composed of points which are closer to $P$ than any other point of $\mathcal{P}$.

The cubic lattices $\mathbb{Z}^{n}$
Density $\quad V_{n} 2^{-n}$
Packing radius
Kissing number $2 n$

Voronoi cells are $n$-cubes.

The $A_{n}$ root lattices
Density $\quad V_{n} \sqrt{2^{-n}(n+1)^{-1}}$ Packing radius $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$
Kissing number $n(n+1)$
$A_{2}$ is the hexagonal lattice in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$.
Voronoi cells are hexagons.
$A_{3}$ is the face-centred-cubic lattice in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.
Voronoi cells are rhombic dodecahedra.

## The $E_{6}$ Root lattice

| Density | $\frac{\pi^{3}}{48 \sqrt{3}} \approx 0.373$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Packing radius | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ |
| Kissing number | 72 |

## The $E_{7}$ Root lattice

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Density } & \frac{\pi^{3}}{105} \approx 0.295 \\ \text { Packing radius } & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\end{array}$ Kissing number 126

The $E_{8}$ root lattice

Density Packing radius Kissing number 240

The $D_{n}$ root lattices

The 'chessboard' lattices in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$.

Density
$V_{n} \sqrt{2^{-(n+2)}}$
Packing radius
Kissing number $2 n(n-1)$
Voronoi cell of $D_{4}$ is a regular self-dual 4-polytope called the $\mathbf{2 4}$-cell, composed of 24 regular octahedra glued together along their faces.

Take $D_{n}$ and fit another copy in the gaps, centred at $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, to get $D_{n}^{+}$.

This is a lattice iff $n$ is even.
$D_{3}^{+}$is the molecular structure of diamond.
$D_{4}^{+}$is congruent to $\mathbb{Z}^{4}$.
$D_{8}^{+}$is $E_{8}$.

What this has to do with codes

It turns out that (as suggested by Hamming's geometric approach) we can construct sphere packings from codes in a variety of ways.

First, define the coordinate array of a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ : Write the binary expansions of the coordinates of $x_{i}$ in columns beginning with the least-significant digit.

So $(2,7,11,9,8)$ is:

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
: & : & : & : & :
\end{array}\right] \begin{aligned}
& \text { 1s row } \\
& \text { 2s row } \\
& \text { 4s row } \\
& \text { 8s row }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Construction A

Given a binary ( $n, r$ ) code $\mathcal{C}$, we can construct a sphere packing in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ where $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ is a centre iff x is congruent $(\bmod 2)$ to a codeword of $\mathcal{C}$.

Or. . . a point of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ with integer coordinates is a centre iff the 1 s row of its coordinate array is a codeword of $\mathcal{C}$.

A lattice packing is obtained iff $\mathcal{C}$ is linear.
Applying this construction to the ( $n, n-1$ ) parity check code we get the $D_{n}$ lattice.

Applying this construction to the $(3,2)$ parity check code gives the face-centred cubic lattice.

Applying this construction to the $(7,4)$ Hamming code $\mathcal{H}_{7}$ we obtain the $E_{7}$ lattice.

Extend $\mathcal{H}_{7}$ by appending a parity check bit to each codeword, to get the extended Hamming code $\mathcal{H}_{8}$. Then apply construction $A$ to get the $E_{8}$ lattice.

## Construction B

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a binary code whose codewords have even parity.

Then x is a sphere centre iff x is congruent $(\bmod 2)$ to a codeword of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}$ is divisible by 4 .

Or... x is a centre iff its 1 s row is a codeword $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and its 2 s row has even parity if $c$ has weight divisible by 4 , or odd parity if $c$ has weight divisible by 2 but not 4 .

Again, this gives a lattice packing iff $\mathcal{C}$ is linear.
Apply this construction to the $(8,1)$ repetition code to get the $E_{8}$ lattice.

Apply to the extended Golay code $\mathcal{C}_{24}\left(\mathcal{C}_{23}\right.$ with an extra parity bit) to get a lattice in $\mathbb{R}^{24}$.

We can mesh two copies of this lattice together to get an unexpectedly good (dense) lattice packing in $\mathbb{R}^{24} \ldots$

The Leech Lattice $\wedge_{24}$

Consists of vectors of the form
$\frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(0+2 c+4 x)$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(1+2 c+4 y)$
Where $c \in \mathcal{C}_{24}, \mathbf{0}=(0, \ldots, 0), \mathbf{1}=(1, \ldots, 1)$, and $\mathbf{x}, \mathrm{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{24}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{24} x_{i} \equiv 0 \bmod 2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{24} y_{i} \equiv 1 \bmod 2$.

This is one of many different descriptions of $\Lambda_{24}$.

Density
Packing radius
$\frac{\pi^{12}}{12!} \approx 0.00193$
Kissing number 196560
Voronoi cell is a 24-polytope with 16969680 faces.

Discovered by John Leech in 1964.

## SIMPLE GROUPS

A simple group is one with no proper nontrivial normal subgroups.

Finite simple groups classified between 1950 and 1980 by hundreds of mathematicians, in thousands of pages of journal articles. Classification finished in 1980 by Griess and Aschbacher.

Any finite simple group is one of:

1. A cyclic group of prime order
2. An alternating group of degree $\geqslant 5$
3. A finite group of Lie type
4. 26 others (the 'sporadic simple groups')

Leech suspected that the automorphism group of $\Lambda_{24}$ might contain some interesting simple groups, but wasn't able to solve the problem.

Told McKay - then (1968) at work proving the existence of a sporadic group $J_{3}$ of order 50232960 predicted by Z. Janko.

Told Coxeter - who had no students capable of solving the problem.

Meanwhile, McKay told Conway, who was intrigued, and tried to interest John Thompson, who challenged him to calculate the order of the group.

Conway sets aside twelve hours every saturday afternoon and evening and six hours every wednesday evening, for as long as it takes to solve the problem.

By just after midnight on the first saturday, the problem was solved.

This group $\mathrm{Co}_{0}$ isn't simple, but it contained three new sporadic groups, $\mathrm{Co}_{1}, \mathrm{Co}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{Co}_{3}$.

| Group | Discovered | Order |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $C o_{0}$ | 1968 | 8315553613086720000 |
| $C o_{1}$ | 1968 | 4157771806543360000 |
| $C o_{2}$ | 1968 | 42305421312000 |
| $C o_{3}$ | 1968 | 495766656000 |

It also contains the oldest known sporadic groups (the Mathieu groups $M_{11}, M_{12}, M_{22}, M_{23}$ and $M_{24}$, discovered between 1861 and 1873).

| Group | Discovered | Order |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $M_{11}$ | 1861 | 7920 |
| $M_{12}$ | 1861 | 95040 |
| $M_{22}$ | 1873 | 443520 |
| $M_{23}$ | 1873 | 10200960 |
| $M_{24}$ | 1873 | 244823040 |

In addition, it contains four other previously known sporadic groups, bringing the total to twelve.

So, nearly half of the 26 sporadic simple groups are contained in the automorphism group of the Leech lattice $\wedge_{24}$.

