

Constant-Rank Codes

Maximilien Gadouleau and Zhiyuan Yan

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Lehigh University, PA 18015, USA

E-mails: {magc, yan}@lehigh.edu

Abstract—Constant-dimension codes have recently received attention due to their significance to error control in noncoherent random network coding. In this paper, we show that constant-rank codes are closely related to constant-dimension codes and we study the properties of constant-rank codes. We first introduce a relation between vectors in $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ and subspaces of $\text{GF}(q)^m$ or $\text{GF}(q)^n$, and use it to establish a relation between constant-rank codes and constant-dimension codes. We then derive bounds on the maximum cardinality of constant-rank codes with given rank weight and minimum rank distance. Finally, we investigate the asymptotic behavior of the maximal cardinality of constant-rank codes with given rank weight and minimum rank distance.

I. INTRODUCTION

While random network coding [1] has proved to be a powerful tool for disseminating information in networks, it is highly susceptible to errors. Thus, error control for random network coding is critical and has received growing attention recently. Error control schemes proposed for random network coding assume two types of transmission models: some (see, e.g., [2], [3]) depend on the underlying network topology or the particular linear network coding operations performed at various network nodes; others [4], [5] assume that the transmitter and receiver have no knowledge of such channel transfer characteristics. The contrast is similar to that between coherent and noncoherent communication systems.

Error control for noncoherent random network coding is first considered in [4]. Motivated by the property that random network coding is vector-space preserving, [4] defines an operator channel that captures the essence of the noncoherent transmission model. Hence, codes defined in finite field Grassmannians [6], referred to as constant-dimension codes, play a significant role in error control for noncoherent random network coding. In [4], a Singleton bound for constant-dimension codes and a family of codes that are nearly Singleton-bound achieving are proposed. Despite the asymptotic optimality of the Singleton bound and the codes designed in [4], the maximal cardinality of a constant-dimension code with finite dimension and minimum distance remains unknown, and it is not clear how an optimal code that achieves the maximal cardinality can be constructed. It is difficult to answer the above questions based on constant-dimension codes directly since the set of all subspaces of the ambient space lacks a natural group structure [5].

The class of nearly Singleton bound achieving constant-dimension codes in [4] are related to rank metric codes. The relevance of rank metric codes to noncoherent random network

coding is further established in [5]. In addition to network coding, rank metric codes [7]–[9] have been receiving steady attention in the literature due to their applications in storage systems [9], public-key cryptosystems [10], and space-time coding [11]. The pioneering works in [7]–[9] have established many important properties of rank metric codes. Independently in [7]–[9], a Singleton bound (up to some variations) on the minimum rank distance of codes was established, and a class of codes that achieve the bound with equality was constructed. We refer to codes that attain the Singleton bound as maximum rank distance (MRD) codes, and the class of MRD codes proposed in [8] as Gabidulin codes henceforth.

In this paper, we investigate the properties of constant-rank codes, which are the counterparts in rank metric codes of constant (Hamming) weight codes [12]. We first introduce a relation between vectors in $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ and subspaces of $\text{GF}(q)^m$ or $\text{GF}(q)^n$, and use it to establish a relation between constant-rank codes and constant-dimension codes. We also derive a lower bound on the maximum cardinality of constant-rank codes which depends on the maximum cardinality of constant-dimension codes. We then derive bounds on the maximum cardinality of constant-rank codes with given rank and minimum rank distance. Finally, we characterize the asymptotic behavior of the maximal cardinality of constant-rank codes with given rank and minimum rank distance, and compare it with asymptotic behavior of the maximal cardinality of constant-dimension codes.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II briefly reviews some important concepts in order to keep this paper self-contained. In Section III, we establish a relation between constant-dimension and constant-rank codes. In Section IV, we derive bounds on the maximum cardinality of constant-rank codes with a given minimum rank distance. Finally, Section V investigates the asymptotic behavior of the maximum cardinality of constant-rank codes.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Rank metric codes and elementary linear subspaces

Consider a vector \mathbf{x} of length n over $\text{GF}(q^m)$. The field $\text{GF}(q^m)$ may be viewed as an m -dimensional vector space over $\text{GF}(q)$. The rank weight of \mathbf{x} , denoted as $\text{rk}(\mathbf{x})$, is defined to be the *maximum* number of coordinates of \mathbf{x} that are linearly independent over $\text{GF}(q)$ [8]. For any basis B_m of $\text{GF}(q^m)$ over $\text{GF}(q)$, each coordinate of \mathbf{x} can be expanded to an m -dimensional column vector over $\text{GF}(q)$ with respect to B_m .

The rank weight of \mathbf{x} is hence the rank of the $m \times n$ matrix over $\text{GF}(q)$ obtained by expanding all the coordinates of \mathbf{x} .

For all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$, it is easily verified that $d_r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{rk}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ is a metric over $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$, referred to as the *rank metric* henceforth [8]. The *minimum rank distance* of a code C , denoted as d_r , is simply the minimum rank distance over all possible pairs of distinct codewords.

It is shown in [7]–[9] that the minimum rank distance of a block code of length n and cardinality M over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ satisfies $d_r \leq n - \log_{q^m} M + 1$. In this paper, we refer to this bound as the Singleton bound for rank metric codes and codes that attain the equality as maximum rank distance (MRD) codes. We refer to the subclass of linear MRD codes introduced independently in [7]–[9] as Gabidulin codes.

We denote the number of vectors of rank r ($0 \leq r \leq \min\{m, n\}$) in $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ as $N_r(q^m, n) = \binom{n}{r} \alpha(m, r)$ [8], where $\alpha(m, 0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$ and $\alpha(m, r) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^m - q^i)$ for $r \geq 1$. The $\binom{n}{r}$ term is often referred to as a Gaussian polynomial [13], defined as $\binom{n}{r} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha(n, r) / \alpha(r, r)$. The volume of a ball with rank radius r in $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ is denoted as $V_r(q^m, n) = \sum_{i=0}^r N_i(q^m, n)$. For all q , $1 \leq d \leq r \leq n \leq m$, the number of codewords of rank r in an $(n, n-d+1, d)$ linear MRD code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ is given by [8]

$$M_{d,r} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \binom{n}{r} \sum_{j=d}^r (-1)^{r-j} \binom{r}{j} q^{\binom{r-j}{2}} (q^{m(j-d+1)} - 1). \quad (1)$$

An *elementary linear subspace* (ELS) [14] is defined to be a linear subspace $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \text{GF}(q^m)^n$ for which there exists a basis of vectors in $\text{GF}(q)^n$. We denote the set of all ELS's of $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ with dimension v as $E_v(q^m, n)$. It can be easily shown that $|E_v(q^m, n)| = \binom{n}{v}$ for all m . An ELS has properties similar to those for a set of coordinates [14]. In particular, any vector belonging to an ELS with dimension r has rank no more than r ; conversely, any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$ with rank r belongs to a unique ELS in $E_r(q^m, n)$.

B. Constant-dimension codes

A *constant-dimension code* [4] of length n and constant-dimension r over $\text{GF}(q)$ is defined to be a nonempty subset of $E_r(q, n)$. For all $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in E_r(q, n)$, it is easily verified that

$$d_s(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}) - \dim(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}) = 2 \dim(\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V}) - 2r \quad (2)$$

is a metric over $E_r(q, n)$, referred to as the *subspace metric* henceforth [4]. The subspace distance between \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} thus satisfies $d_s(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 2\text{rk}(\mathbf{X}^T | \mathbf{Y}^T) - 2r$, where \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are generator matrices of \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} , respectively.

The *minimum subspace distance* of a constant-dimension code $\Omega \subseteq E_r(q, n)$, denoted as d_s , is the minimum subspace distance over all possible pairs of distinct subspaces. We say Ω is an (n, d_s, r) constant-dimension code over $\text{GF}(q)$ and we denote the maximum cardinality of an $(n, 2d, r)$ constant-dimension code over $\text{GF}(q)$ as $A_s(q, n, 2d, r)$. Since $A_s(q, n, 2d, r) = A_s(q, n, 2d, n-r)$ [15], only the case where $2r \leq n$ needs to be considered. Also, since $A_s(q, n, 2, r) =$

$\binom{n}{r}$ and $A_s(q, n, 2d, r) = 1$ for $d > r$, we shall assume $2 \leq d \leq r$ henceforth. Upper and lower bounds on $A_s(q, n, 2d, r)$ were derived in [4], [15], [16]. In particular, for all q , $2r \leq n$, and $2 \leq d \leq r$,

$$q^{(n-r)(r-d+1)} \leq A_s(q, n, 2d, r) \leq \frac{\alpha(n, r-d+1)}{\alpha(r, r-d+1)}. \quad (3)$$

C. Preliminary graph-theoretic results

We review some results in graph theory given in [17]. Two adjacent vertices u, v in a graph are denoted as $u \sim v$.

Definition 1: Let G and H be two graphs. A mapping f from $V(G)$ to $V(H)$ is a homomorphism if for all $u, v \in V(G)$, $u \sim v \Rightarrow f(u) \sim f(v)$.

Definition 2: Let G be a graph and ϕ a bijection from $V(G)$ to itself. ϕ is called an automorphism of G if for all $u, v \in V(G)$, $u \sim v \Leftrightarrow \phi(u) \sim \phi(v)$.

Definition 3: We say that the graph G is vertex transitive if for all $u, v \in V(G)$, there exists an automorphism ϕ of G such that $\phi(u) = v$.

An *independent set* of a graph G is a subset of $V(G)$ with no adjacent vertices. The independence number $\alpha(G)$ of G is the maximum cardinality of an independent set of G . If H is a vertex transitive graph and if there is a homomorphism from G to H , then [17]

$$\alpha(G) \geq \alpha(H) \frac{|G|}{|H|}. \quad (4)$$

III. CONSTANT-RANK AND CONSTANT-DIMENSION CODES

A. Definitions and technical results

Definition 4: A constant-rank code of length n and constant-rank r over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ is a nonempty subset of $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ such that all elements have rank weight r .

We denote a constant-rank code with length n , minimum rank distance d , and constant-rank r as an (n, d, r) constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$. We define the term $A_r(q^m, n, d, r)$ to be the maximum cardinality of an (n, d, r) constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$. If C is an (n, d, r) constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$, then the code obtained by transposing all the expansion matrices of codewords in C forms an (m, d, r) constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^n)$ with the same cardinality. Therefore $A_r(q^m, n, d, r) = A_r(q^n, m, d, r)$, and henceforth we assume $n \leq m$ without loss of generality.

We now define two families of graphs which are instrumental in our analysis of constant-rank codes.

Definition 5: The *bilinear forms graph* $R_q(m, n, d)$ has as vertices all the vectors in $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ and two vertices \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are adjacent if and only if $d_r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) < d$. The *constant-rank graph* $K_q(m, n, d, r)$ is the subgraph of $R_q(m, n, d)$ induced by the vectors in $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ with rank r .

The orders of the bilinear forms and constant-rank graphs are thus given by $|R_q(m, n, d)| = q^{mn}$ and $|K_q(m, n, d, r)| = N_r(q^m, n)$. An independent set of $R_q(m, n, d)$ corresponds to a code with minimum rank distance $\geq d$. Due to the existence of MRD codes for all parameter values, we have

$\alpha(R_q(m, n, d)) = q^{m(n-d+1)}$. Similarly, an independent set of $K_q(m, n, d, r)$ corresponds to a constant-rank code with minimum rank distance $\geq d$, and hence $\alpha(K_q(m, n, d, r)) = A_R(q^m, n, d, r)$.

Lemma 1: The bilinear forms graph $R_q(m, n, d)$ is vertex transitive for all q, m, n , and d . The constant-rank graph $K_q(m, m, d, m)$ is vertex transitive for all q, m , and d .

Proof: Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$. For all $\mathbf{x} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$, define $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}$. It is easily shown that ϕ is a graph automorphism of $R_q(m, n, d)$ satisfying $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{v}$. By Definition 3, $R_q(m, n, d)$ is hence vertex transitive.

Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^m$ have rank m , and denote their expansions with respect to a basis B_m of $\text{GF}(q^m)$ over $\text{GF}(q)$ as \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , respectively. For all $\mathbf{x} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^m$ with rank m , define $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$ such that $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{V}$, where \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} are the expansions of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} with respect to B_m , respectively. We have $\phi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{v}$, $\text{rk}(\phi(\mathbf{x})) = m$, and for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^m$, $d_r(\phi(\mathbf{x}), \phi(\mathbf{z})) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{U}^{-1}\mathbf{V}) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Z}) = d_r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$. By Definition 2, ϕ is an automorphism which takes \mathbf{u} to \mathbf{v} and hence $K_q(m, m, d, m)$ is vertex transitive. ■

It is worth noting that $K_q(m, n, d, r)$ is not vertex transitive in general.

B. Constant-dimension and constant-rank codes

In [4], constant-dimension codes were constructed from rank distance codes as follows. Let C be a code with length n over $\text{GF}(q^m)$. For any $\mathbf{c} \in C$, consider its expansion \mathbf{C} with respect to the basis B_m of $\text{GF}(q^m)$ over $\text{GF}(q)$, and construct $I(\mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{I}_m | \mathbf{C}) \in \text{GF}(q)^{m \times m+n}$. Then $I(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{I(\mathbf{C}) | \mathbf{c} \in C\}$ is a constant-dimension code in $E_m(q, m+n)$. This relation between rank codes and constant-dimension codes was also commented in graph-theoretic terms in [18].

We introduce a relation between vectors in $\text{GF}(q^m)^n$ and subspaces of $\text{GF}(q^m)^m$ or $\text{GF}(q)^n$. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$ with rank r , consider the matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^{m \times n}$ obtained by expanding all the coordinates of \mathbf{x} with respect to a basis B_m of $\text{GF}(q^m)$ over $\text{GF}(q)$. The column span of \mathbf{X} , denoted as $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x})$, is an r -dimensional subspace of $\text{GF}(q^m)^m$, which corresponds to the subspace of $\text{GF}(q^m)$ spanned by the coordinates of \mathbf{x} . The row span of \mathbf{X} , denoted as $\mathfrak{T}(\mathbf{x})$, is an r -dimensional subspace of $\text{GF}(q)^n$, which corresponds to the unique ELS $\mathcal{V} \in E_r(q^m, n)$ such that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}$.

Lemma 2: For all $\mathcal{S} \in E_r(q, m)$ and $\mathcal{T} \in E_r(q, n)$, there exists $\mathbf{x} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$ with rank r such that $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathfrak{T}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{T}$.

Proof: Consider the generator matrices $\mathbf{G} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times m}$ and $\mathbf{H} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times n}$ of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , respectively. Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{H}$ and \mathbf{x} be the vector whose expansion with respect to B_m is given by \mathbf{X} . Then $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{S}$ and $\mathfrak{T}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{T}$. ■

By Lemma 2, the functions \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{T} are surjective. They are not injective, however. For all $\mathcal{V} \in E_r(q^m, n)$, there exist exactly $\alpha(m, r)$ vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}$ with rank r [14], hence for all $\mathcal{T} \in E_r(q, n)$ there exist exactly $\alpha(m, r)$ vectors \mathbf{x} such that $\mathfrak{T}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{T}$. By transposition, it follows that there exist exactly $\alpha(n, r)$ vectors \mathbf{x} such that $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{S}$ for all $\mathcal{S} \in E_r(q, m)$.

For any $C \subseteq \text{GF}(q^m)^n$, define $\mathfrak{S}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{c}) | \mathbf{c} \in C\}$ and $\mathfrak{T}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathfrak{T}(\mathbf{c}) | \mathbf{c} \in C\}$. We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3: For all $C \subseteq \text{GF}(q^m)^n$, we have $|\mathfrak{S}(C)| \leq |C| \leq \alpha(n, r)|\mathfrak{S}(C)|$ and $|\mathfrak{T}(C)| \leq |C| \leq \alpha(m, r)|\mathfrak{T}(C)|$.

Proposition 1: For any constant-dimension code $\Gamma \subseteq E_r(q, m)$, there exists a constant-rank code C with length n and constant-rank r over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ such that $r \leq n \leq m$ and $\mathfrak{S}(C) = \Gamma$. The cardinality of C satisfies $|\Gamma| \leq |C| \leq \alpha(n, r)|\Gamma|$. On the other hand, for any constant-dimension code $\Delta \subseteq E_r(q, n)$, there exists a constant-rank code D with length n and constant-rank r over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ such that $r \leq n \leq m$ and $\mathfrak{T}(D) = \Delta$. The cardinality of D satisfies $|\Delta| \leq |D| \leq \alpha(m, r)|\Delta|$.

Proof: By Lemma 2, for any $\mathcal{U} \in \Gamma$ there exists $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{U}} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$ with rank r such that $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{U}}) = \mathcal{U}$. Therefore, the code $C = \{\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{U}} | \mathcal{U} \in \Gamma\}$ satisfies $\mathfrak{S}(C) = \Gamma$. C is a constant-rank code with length n and constant-rank r over $\text{GF}(q^m)$, and by Lemma 3, $|C|$ satisfies $|\Gamma| \leq |C| \leq \alpha(n, r)|\Gamma|$. The proof for $\Delta \subseteq E_r(q, n)$ is similar and hence omitted. ■

Proposition 1 shows that constant-dimension codes can be viewed as a special class of constant-rank codes. Although the rank metric is not directly related to the subspace metric in general, the maximal cardinalities of constant-dimension codes and constant-rank codes are related.

Proposition 2: For all q and $1 \leq r < d \leq n \leq m$,

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \geq \min\{A_S(q, n, 2(d-r), r), A_S(q, m, 2r, r)\}. \quad (5)$$

Proof: Let Γ be an optimal $(m, 2r, r)$ constant-dimension code over $\text{GF}(q)$ and Δ be an optimal $(n, 2d, r)$ constant-dimension code over $\text{GF}(q)$. Denote their cardinalities as $\mu = A_S(q, m, 2r, r)$ and $\nu = A_S(q, n, 2d, r)$ and the generator matrices of their component subspaces as $\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=0}^{\mu-1}$ and $\{\mathbf{Y}_j\}_{j=0}^{\nu-1}$, respectively. By (2), for all $0 \leq i < j \leq \nu-1$, $2\text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}_i^T | \mathbf{Y}_j^T) - 2r \geq 2d$, and hence $\text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}_i^T | \mathbf{Y}_j^T) \geq d+r$.

For all $0 \leq i \leq \mu-1$, define $\mathbf{b}_i = (\beta_{i,0}, \beta_{i,1}, \dots, \beta_{i,r-1}) \in \text{GF}(q^m)^r$ such that the expansion of $\beta_{i,l}$ with respect to a basis B_m of $\text{GF}(q^m)$ is given by the l -th row of \mathbf{X}_i . For all $0 \leq i < j \leq \nu-1$, the matrix $(\mathbf{X}_i^T | \mathbf{X}_j^T)$ has full rank by (2) and hence the elements $\{\beta_{i,0}, \dots, \beta_{i,r-1}, \beta_{j,0}, \dots, \beta_{j,r-1}\}$ are linearly independent. We thus define the basis $\gamma_{i,j} = \{\beta_{i,0}, \dots, \beta_{i,r-1}, \beta_{j,0}, \dots, \beta_{j,r-1}, \gamma_{2r}, \dots, \gamma_{m-1}\}$ of $\text{GF}(q^m)$ over $\text{GF}(q)$.

We define the code $C \subseteq \text{GF}(q^m)^n$ such that $\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{Y}_i^T$ for $0 \leq i \leq \min\{\mu, \nu\} - 1$. Expanding \mathbf{c}_i and \mathbf{c}_j with respect to the basis $\gamma_{i,j}$, we obtain $\text{rk}(\mathbf{c}_i) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}_i^T | \mathbf{0}) = r$ and $d_r(\mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{c}_j) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}_i^T | -\mathbf{Y}_j^T | \mathbf{0}) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}_i^T | \mathbf{Y}_j^T) \geq d+r$. Therefore, C is an $(n, d+r, r)$ constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ with cardinality $\min\{\mu, \nu\}$. ■

Corollary 1: For all q and m ,

$$A_R(q^m, n, 2r, r) \geq A_S(q, n, 2r, r) \quad \text{for } n \leq m \quad (6)$$

$$A_R(q^m, m, d, r) \geq A_S(q, m, 2r, r) \quad \text{for } r < d. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, a lower bound on A_S is also a lower bound on A_R for $r < d$. We may use the lower bound on A_S in (3).

IV. BOUNDS ON CONSTANT-RANK CODES

We derive bounds on the maximum cardinality of constant-rank codes. We first observe that $A_R(q^m, n, d, r)$ is a non-decreasing function of m and n , and a non-increasing function of d . We also remark that the bounds on $A_R(q^m, n, d, r)$ derived in Section III-B for $2r \leq n$ can be easily adapted for $2r > n$ by applying them to $n - r$ instead. Finally, since $A_R(q^m, n, 1, r) = N_r(q^m, n)$ and $A_R(q^m, n, d, r) = 1$ for $d > 2r$, we shall assume $2 \leq d \leq 2r$ henceforth.

By considering the Singleton bound for rank metric codes or MRD codes, we obtain a lower bound and some upper bounds on $A_R(q^m, n, d, r)$.

Proposition 3: For all q and $1 \leq r, d \leq n \leq m$,

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \geq M_{d,r} \quad \text{for } r \geq d \quad (8)$$

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \leq q^{m(n-d+1)} - \sum_{j \in J_a} A_R(q^m, n, d, j) \quad (9)$$

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \leq q^{m(n-d+1)} - \sum_{i \in I_r} M_{d,i} \quad (10)$$

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \leq q^{m(n-d+1)} - 1 \quad \text{for } r \geq d, \quad (11)$$

where $I_r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i : 0 \leq i \leq n, |i - r| \geq d\}$ and $J_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I_r \cap \{a + kd : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for $0 \leq a < d$.

Proof: The codewords of rank r in an $(n, n - d + 1, d)$ linear MRD code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ form an (n, d, r) constant-rank code. Thus, $A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \geq M_{d,r}$ for $r \geq d$.

Let C be an $(n, n - d + 1, d)$ linear MRD code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$, and denote its codewords with ranks belonging to I_r as C' . For $0 \leq j \leq n$, let C_j be optimal (n, d, j) constant-rank codes and define $C'' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{j \in J_a} C_j$. The Singleton bound on the codes $C_r \cup C'$ and $C_r \cup C''$ yields (10) and (9), respectively.

Finally, the Singleton bound on $C \cup \{0\}$, where C is an (n, d, r) ($r \geq d$) constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$, yields (11). ■

Proposition 4: For all q and $1 \leq r, d \leq n \leq m$,

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \geq N_r(q^m, n)q^{m(-d+1)} \quad (12)$$

$$A_R(q^m, m, d, m) \leq A_R(q^{m-1}, m-1, d, m-1) \cdot q^{m-1}(q^m - 1) \quad \text{for } d < m \quad (13)$$

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \leq A_R(q^m, n-1, d, r) \cdot \frac{q^n - 1}{q^{n-r} - 1} \quad \text{for } r < n. \quad (14)$$

Proof: Since $K_q(m, n, d, r)$ is a subgraph of $R_q(m, n, d)$, the inclusion map is a trivial homomorphism from $K_q(m, n, d, r)$ to $R_q(m, n, d)$. By Lemma 1, $R_q(m, n, d)$ is vertex transitive. We hence apply (4) to these graphs, which yields (12).

Let B_{m-1} and B_m be bases sets over $\text{GF}(q)$ of $\text{GF}(q^{m-1})$ and $\text{GF}(q^m)$, respectively. For all $\mathbf{x} \in \text{GF}(q^{m-1})^{m-1}$ with rank $m-1$, define $g(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^m$ such that

$$\mathbf{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{X} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{GF}(q)^{m \times m}, \quad (15)$$

where \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are the expansions of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} with respect to B_{m-1} and B_m , respectively. By (15), for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in$

$\text{GF}(q^{m-1})^{m-1}$ with rank $m-1$, we have $\text{rk}(g(\mathbf{x})) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{x}) + 1 = m$ and $\text{rk}(g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{z})) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z})$. Therefore g is a homomorphism from $K_q(m-1, m-1, d, m-1)$ to $K_q(m, m, d, m)$. Applying (4) to these graphs, and noticing that $\alpha(m, m) = q^{m-1}(q^m - 1)\alpha(m-1, m-1)$, we obtain (13).

We now prove (14). Note that any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \text{GF}(q^m)^n$ with rank r belongs to $\begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ELS's of dimension $n-1$. Indeed, such ELS's are of the form $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}) \oplus \mathcal{N}$, where $\mathcal{N} \in E_{n-r-1}(q^m, n-r)$.

Let C be an optimal (n, d, r) constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$. For all $\mathbf{c} \in C$ and all $\mathcal{V} \in E_{n-1}(q^m, n)$, we define $f(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{c}) = 1$ if $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $f(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{c}) = 0$ otherwise. For all \mathbf{c} , $\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in E_{n-1}(q^m, n)} f(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{c}) = \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$, and for all \mathcal{V} , $\sum_{\mathbf{c} \in C} f(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{c}) = |C \cap \mathcal{V}|$. Summing over all possible pairs, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in E_{n-1}(q^m, n)} \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in C} f(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{c}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in C} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in E_{n-1}(q^m, n)} f(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{c}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in C} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} A_R(q^m, n, d, r). \end{aligned}$$

Hence there exists $\mathcal{U} \in E_{n-1}(q^m, n)$ such that $|C \cap \mathcal{U}| = \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in C} f(\mathcal{U}, \mathbf{c}) \geq \frac{\begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}}{\begin{bmatrix} n \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}} A_R(q^m, n, d, r)$. The restriction of $C \cap \mathcal{U}$ to the ELS \mathcal{U} [14] is an $(n-1, d, r)$ constant-rank code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$, and hence its cardinality satisfies $\frac{q^{n-r-1}}{q^m - 1} A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \leq |C \cap \mathcal{U}| \leq A_R(q^m, n-1, d, r)$. ■

Eq. (12) is the counterpart in rank metric codes of the Bassalygo-Elias bound [19], while (14) is analogous to a well-known result by Johnson [20]. Note that (12) can be trivial for d approaching $2r$.

Proposition 5: For all q and $1 \leq r \leq n \leq m$,

$$A_R(q^m, n, r, r) = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} (q^m - 1). \quad (16)$$

Proof: First, by (8), we obtain $A_R(q^m, n, r, r) \geq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} (q^m - 1)$. Second, applying (14) successively $n-r$ times leads to $A_R(q^m, n, r, r) \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} A_R(q^m, r, r, r)$. By (11), we obtain $A_R(q^m, n, r, r) \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} (q^m - 1)$. ■

Equality in (16) is thus achieved by the codewords of rank r in an $(n, n-r+1, r)$ linear MRD code.

Proposition 6: For all q and $0 \leq r < d \leq n \leq m$,

$$A_R(q^m, n, d, r) \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

Proof: Consider a code C with minimum rank distance d and constant-rank $r < d$. If $|C| > \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} = |E_r(q^m, n)|$, then there exist two codewords in C belonging to the same ELS $\mathcal{V} \in E_r(q^m, n)$. Their distance is hence at most equal to r , which contradicts the minimum distance of C . Therefore, $|C| \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix}$. ■

Corollary 2: For all q, m , and n , $A_R(q^m, n, 2, 1) = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof: First, by Proposition 6, we obtain $A_R(q^m, n, 2, 1) \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. Second, by Corollary 1, we obtain $A_R(q^m, n, 2, 1) \geq A_S(q, n, 2, 1)$. We now prove that $A_S(q, n, 2, 1) = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. For any $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in E_1(q, n)$, $\mathcal{U} \neq \mathcal{V}$, we have $\dim(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}) = 0$ and hence $d_s(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 2$. Therefore, $E_1(q, n)$ is a constant-dimension code with minimum subspace distance 2 and $A_S(q, n, 2, 1) = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$. ■

V. ASYMPTOTIC RESULTS

In this section, we study the asymptotic behavior of $A_R(q^m, n, d_R, r)$. In order to compare it to the asymptotic behavior of $A_S(q, m, d_S, r)$, we use a set of normalized parameters different from those introduced in [4]: $\nu = \frac{n}{m}$, $\rho = \frac{r}{m}$, $\delta_R = \frac{d_R}{m}$, and $\delta_S = \frac{d_S}{2m}$. By definition, $0 \leq \rho, \delta_R \leq \nu$, and since we assume $n \leq m$, $\nu \leq 1$. We consider the asymptotic rates defined as $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left[\log_{q^{m^2}} A_R(q^m, n, d_R, r) \right]$ and $a_S(\delta_S, \rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left[\log_{q^{m^2}} A_S(q, m, d_S, r) \right]$.

Adapting the results in [5] using the parameters defined above, we obtain $a_S(\delta_S, \rho) = \min\{(1-\rho)(\rho-\delta_S), \rho(1-\rho-\delta_S)\}$ for $0 \leq \delta_S \leq \min\{\rho, 1-\rho\}$ and $a_S(\delta_S, \rho) = 0$ otherwise.

We now investigate how the $A_R(q^m, n, d, r)$ term behaves as the parameters tend to infinity. Without loss of generality, we only consider the case where $0 \leq \delta_R \leq 2\rho$, since $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) = 0$ for $\delta_R > 2\rho$.

Proposition 7: Suppose $\nu \leq 1$. For $0 \leq \delta_R \leq \rho$,

$$a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) = \rho(1 + \nu - \rho) - \delta_R. \quad (18)$$

For $\rho \leq \delta_R \leq \min\{2\rho, \nu\}$,

$$\max\{0, \rho(1 + \nu - \rho) - \delta_R\} \leq a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) \leq \rho(\nu - \delta_R). \quad (19)$$

Suppose $\nu > 1$. For $0 \leq \delta_R \leq \rho$, $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) = \rho(1 + \nu - \rho) - \nu\delta_R$. For $\rho \leq \delta_R \leq \min\{2\rho, 1\}$, $\max\{0, \rho(1 + \nu - \rho) - \nu\delta_R\} \leq a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) \leq \rho(1 - \delta_R)$.

Proof: We give the proof for $\nu \leq 1$, and the proof for $\nu > 1$ is similar and hence omitted. We first derive a lower bound on $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho)$ for all ρ . Using the combinatorial bounds in [14], (12) yields $A_R(q^m, n, d_R, r) > q^{r(m+n-r)-\sigma(q)+m(-d_R+1)}$, where $\sigma(q) < 2$ for $q \geq 2$. This asymptotically becomes $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) \geq \rho(1 + \nu - \rho) - \delta_R$ for $0 \leq \delta_R \leq \min\{2\rho, \nu\}$.

We now derive an upper bound on $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho)$. First, suppose $r \geq d_R$. Applying (14), we easily obtain $A_R(q^m, n, d_R, r) \leq \binom{n}{r} A_R(q^m, r, d_R, r)$. Combining with (11), we obtain $A_R(q^m, n, d_R, r) \leq \binom{n}{r} q^{m(r-d_R+1)} < q^{r(n-r)+\sigma(q)+m(r-d_R+1)}$. Asymptotically, this becomes $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) \leq \rho(\nu - \rho) - \delta_R + \rho$ for $\rho \geq \delta_R$. Second, suppose $r < d_R$. By the same token, we obtain $A_R(q^m, n, d_R, r) \leq \binom{n}{d_R} A_R(q^m, d_R, d_R, r) \leq q^{r(n-d_R)+\sigma(q)+m}$, and hence $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \rho) \leq \rho(\nu - \delta_R)$ for $\rho \leq \delta_R$. ■

We observe that the asymptotic behavior of the maximal cardinality of constant-dimension codes depends on whether $\rho = \frac{r}{m} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, while the asymptotic behavior of the maximal cardinality of constant-rank codes depends on whether $\nu = \frac{n}{m} \leq 1$. This is due to the different behaviors of rank metric codes of length n over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ for $m \geq n$ and $m < n$ respectively. The construction of an asymptotically optimal constant-dimension code in $E_r(q, m)$ given in [4] and reviewed in Section III-B is based on a rank metric code of length $m - r$ over $\text{GF}(q^r)$. Hence $r \geq m - r$ for the rank metric code is equivalent to $r \geq m/2$ (or $\rho \geq 1/2$) for the constant-dimension code.

By the Singleton bound on rank metric codes, the asymptotic behavior of the cardinality of an $(n, n - d_R + 1, d_R)$ linear MRD code over $\text{GF}(q^m)$ with $\nu \leq 1$ is given by $\nu - d_R$. However, by (18), $a_R(\nu, \delta_R, \nu) = \nu - d_R$ for $\nu \leq 1$ and hence the maximum cardinality of a constant-rank code with rank n is asymptotically equivalent to the cardinality of an MRD code with the same minimum rank distance. We hence conjecture that the code formed by the codewords of rank n in an $(n, n - d_R + 1, d_R)$ linear MRD code achieves the maximal cardinality asymptotically.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Ho, M. Médard, R. Koetter, D. R. Karger, M. Effros, J. Shi, and B. Leong, "A random linear network coding approach to multicast," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4413–4430, October 2006.
- [2] R. W. Yeung and N. Cai, "Network error correction, part I: Basic concepts and upper bounds," *Commun. Inform. Syst.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 19–36, 2006.
- [3] N. Cai and R. W. Yeung, "Network error correction, part II: Lower bounds," *Commun. Inform. Syst.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 37–54, 2006.
- [4] R. Koetter and F. R. Kschischang, "Coding for errors and erasures in random network coding," *submitted to IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0703061>.
- [5] D. Silva, F. R. Kschischang, and R. Koetter, "A rank-metric approach to error control in random network coding," *submitted to IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0711.0708>.
- [6] L. Chihara, "On the zeros of the Askey-Wilson polynomials with applications to coding theory," *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, vol. 8, pp. 191–207, 1987.
- [7] P. Delsarte, "Bilinear forms over a finite field, with applications to coding theory," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, vol. 25, pp. 226–241, 1978.
- [8] E. M. Gabidulin, "Theory of codes with maximum rank distance," *Problems on Information Transmission*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–12, Jan. 1985.
- [9] R. M. Roth, "Maximum-rank array codes and their application to crisscross error correction," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 328–336, March 1991.
- [10] E. M. Gabidulin, A. V. Paramonov, and O. V. Tretjakov, "Ideals over a non-commutative ring and their application in cryptology," *LNCS*, vol. 573, pp. 482–489, 1991.
- [11] P. Lusina, E. M. Gabidulin, and M. Bossert, "Maximum rank distance codes as space-time codes," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 49, pp. 2757–2760, Oct. 2003.
- [12] E. Agrell, A. Vardy, and K. Zeger, "Upper bounds for constant-weight codes," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 2373–2395, Nov. 2000.
- [13] G. E. Andrews, *The Theory of Partitions*, ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, G.-C. Rota, Ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1976, vol. 2.
- [14] M. Gadouleau and Z. Yan, "On the decoder error probability of bounded rank-distance decoders for maximum rank distance codes," *to appear in IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, available at <http://arxiv.org/pdf/cs.IT/0612051>.
- [15] S.-T. Xia and F.-W. Fu, "Johnson type bounds on constant dimension codes," *submitted to Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, Sept. 2007, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0709.1074>.
- [16] H. Wang, C. Xing, and R. Safani-Naini, "Linear authentication codes: Bounds and constructions," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 866–872, April 2003.
- [17] S. Y. El Rouayheb, C. N. Georghiades, E. Soljanin, and A. Sprintson, "Bounds on codes based on graph theory," *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. on Information Theory*, pp. 1876–1879, June 2007.
- [18] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier, *Distance-Regular Graphs*, ser. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 1989, vol. 18, no. 3.
- [19] L. A. Bassalygo, "New upper bounds for error correcting codes," *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 32–35, 1968.
- [20] S. M. Johnson, "A new upper bound for error-correcting codes," *IRE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 8, pp. 203–207, 1962.