

Let us first discuss some issues related, directly or indirectly, to error detection and correction.

Topics discussed in this section:

Types of ErrorsRedundancy Detection Versus Correction Forward Error Correction Versus RetransmissionCodingModular Arithmetic

In a single-bit error, only 1 bit in the data unit has changed.

A burst error means that 2 or more bits in the data unit have changed.

NEWTORONS

To detect or correct errors, we need to send extra (redundant) bits with data.

NETTUTIONS

In this book, we concentrate on block codes; we leave convolution codes to advanced texts.

In modulo-N arithmetic, we use only the integers in the range 0 to N −1, inclusive.

 $0 \oplus 0 = 0$

a. Two bits are the same, the result is 0.

 $0 \oplus 1 = 1$

 $1 \oplus 0 = 1$

 $1 \bigoplus 1 = 0$

b. Two bits are different, the result is 1.

c. Result of XORing two patterns

In block coding, we divide our message into blocks, each of ^k bits, called datawords. We add ^r redundant bits to each block to make the length $n = k + r$. The *resulting n-bit blocks are called codewords.*

Topics discussed in this section:

Error Detection Error Correction Hamming DistanceMinimum Hamming Distance

2^k Datawords, each of k bits

2ⁿ Codewords, each of n bits (only 2^k of them are valid)

The 4B/5B block coding discussed in Chapter ⁴ is ^a goo^d example of this type of coding. In this coding scheme, $k = 4$ and $n = 5$. As we saw, we have $2^k = 16$ datawords *and* $2^n = 32$ *codewords.* We saw that 16 out of 32 *codewords are used for message transfer and the rest are either used for other purposes or unused.*

NETTUTIONS

Let us assume that $k = 2$ and $n = 3$. Table 10.1 shows the *list of datawords and codewords. Later, we will see how to derive ^a codeword from ^a dataword.*

Assume the sender encodes the dataword ⁰¹ as ⁰¹¹ and sends it to the receiver. Consider the following cases:

1. The receiver receives 011. It is ^a valid codeword. The receiver extracts the dataword ⁰¹ from it.

- *2. The codeword is corrupted during transmission, and ¹¹¹ is received. This is not ^a valid codeword and is discarded.*
- *3. The codeword is corrupted during transmission, and ⁰⁰⁰ is received. This is ^a valid codeword. The receiver incorrectly extracts the dataword 00. Two corrupted bits have made the error undetectable.*

Table 10.1 *A code for error detection (Example 10.2)*

An error-detecting code can detect only the types of errors for which it is designed; other types of errors may remain undetected.

Let us add more redundant bits to Example 10.2 to see if the receiver can correct an error without knowing what was actually sent. We add ³ redundant bits to the 2-bit dataword to make 5-bit codewords. Table 10.2 shows the datawords and codewords. Assume the dataword is 01. The sender creates the codeword 01011. The codeword is corrupted during transmission, and ⁰¹⁰⁰¹ is received. First, the receiver finds that the received codeword is not in the table. This means an error has occurred. The receiver, assuming that there is only ¹ bit corrupted, uses the following strategy to guess the correct dataword.

1. Comparing the received codeword with the first codeword in the table (01001 versus 00000), the receiver decides that the first codeword is not the one that was sent because there are two different bits.

- *2. By the same reasoning, the original codeword cannot be the third or fourth one in the table.*
- *3. The original codeword must be the second one in the table because this is the only one that differs from the received codeword by ¹ bit. The receiver replaces ⁰¹⁰⁰¹ with ⁰¹⁰¹¹ and consults the table to find the dataword 01.*

Table 10.2 *A code for error correction (Example 10.3)*

The Hamming distance between two words is the number of differences between corresponding bits.

Let us find the Hamming distance between two pairs of words.

1. The Hamming distance d(000, 011) is ² because

000 \oplus 011 is 011 (two 1s)

2. The Hamming distance d(10101, 11110) is ³ because

10101 \oplus 11110 is 01011 (three 1s)

The minimum Hamming distance is the smallest Hamming distance betweenall possible pairs in a set of words.

Find the minimum Hamming distance of the coding scheme in Table 10.1.

SolutionWe first find all Hamming distances.

The dmin in this case is 2.

Find the minimum Hamming distance of the coding scheme in Table 10.2.

Solution

We first find all the Hamming distances.

The dmin in this case is 3.

To guarantee the detection of up to s errors in all cases, the minimumHamming distance in a block code must be dmin = s + 1.

The minimum Hamming distance for our first code scheme (Table 10.1) is 2. This code guarantees detection of only ^a single error. For example, if the third codeword (101) is sent and one error occurs, the received codeword does not match any valid codeword. If two errors occur, however, the received codeword may match ^a valid codeword and the errors are not detected.

Our second block code scheme (Table 10.2) has ^dmin ⁼ 3. This code can detect up to two errors. Again, we see that when any of the valid codewords is sent, two errors create ^a codeword which is not in the table of valid codewords. The receiver cannot be fooled.

However, some combinations of three errors change ^a valid codeword to another valid codeword. The receiver accepts the received codeword and the errors are undetected.

To guarantee correction of up to *t* **errors in all cases, the minimum Hamming distance in a block code must be dmin = 2** *t* **+ 1.**

^A code scheme has ^a Hamming distance ^dmin ⁼ 4. What is the error detection and correction capability of this scheme?

Solution

 This code guarantees the detection of up to three errors $(s = 3)$, but it can correct up to one error. In other words, if this code is used for error correction, part of its capability *is wasted. Error correction codes need to have an odd minimum distance (3, 5, 7, . . .).*

10-3 LINEAR BLOCK CODES

Almost all block codes used today belong to ^a subset called linear block codes. ^A linear block code is ^a code in which the exclusive OR (addition modulo-2) of two valid codewords creates another valid codeword.

Minimum Distance for Linear Block CodesSome Linear Block Codes*Topics discussed in this section:*

In a linear block code, the exclusive OR (XOR) of any two valid codewords creates another valid codeword.

Let us see if the two codes we defined in Table 10.1 and *Table 10.2 belong to the class of linear block codes.*

- *1. The scheme in Table 10.1 is ^a linear block code because the result of XORing any codeword with any other codeword is ^a valid codeword. For example, the XORing of the second and third codewords creates the fourth one.*
- *2. The scheme in Table 10.2 is also ^a linear block code. We can create all four codewords by XORing two other codewords.*

In our first code (Table 10.1), the numbers of 1s in the nonzero codewords are 2, 2, and 2. So the minimum Hamming distance is ^dmin ⁼ 2. In our second code (Table 10.2), the numbers of 1s in the nonzero codewords are 3, 3, and 4. So in this code we have $d_{\min} = 3$.

A simple parity-check code is a single-bit error-detecting code in which $n = k + 1$ with $d_{\min} = 2$.

Table 10.3 *Simple parity-check code C(5, 4)*

Figure 10.10 *Encoder and decoder for simple parity-check code*

Let us look at some transmission scenarios. Assume the sender sends the dataword 1011. The codeword created from this dataword is 10111, which is sent to the receiver. We examine five cases:

- *1. No error occurs; the received codeword is 10111. Thesyndrome is 0. The dataword 1011 is created.*
- *2. One single-bit error changes a1 . The received codeword is 10011. The syndrome is 1. No datawordis created.*
- *3. One single-bit error changes r0 . The received codewordis 10110. The syndrome is 1. No dataword is created.*

- *4. An error changes r0 and a second error changes a³ .The received codeword is 00110. The syndrome is 0.The dataword 0011 is created at the receiver. Note thathere the dataword is wrongly created due to thesyndrome value.*
- *5. Three bits—a3, a², and a1—are changed by errors. The received codeword is 01011. The syndrome is 1.The dataword is not created. This shows that the simpleparity check, guaranteed to detect one single error, canalso find any odd number of errors.*

A simple parity-check code can detect an odd number of errors.

NEWTORONS

a. Design of row and column parities

b. One error affects two parities

NETTUTIONS

c. Two errors affect two parities

d. Three errors affect four parities

NETTUTIONS

e. Four errors cannot be detected

Table 10.4 *Hamming code C(7, 4)*

Figure 10.12 *The structure of the encoder and decoder for a Hamming code*

Table 10.5 *Logical decision made by the correction logic analyzer*

Let us trace the path of three datawords from the sender *to the destination:*

- *1. The dataword 0100 becomes the codeword 0100011. The codeword 0100011 is received. The syndrome is000, the final dataword is 0100.*
- *2. The dataword 0111 becomes the codeword 0111001. The syndrome is 011. After flipping b2 (changing the 1to 0), the final dataword is 0111.*
- *3. The dataword 1101 becomes the codeword 1101000. The syndrome is 101. After flipping b⁰, we get 0000, the wrong dataword. This shows that our code cannotcorrect two errors.*

We need ^a dataword of at least ⁷ bits. Calculate values of ^k and ⁿ that satisfy this requirement.

Solution

 We need to make k = n − m greater than or equal to 7, or 2m − 1 − m ≥ 7.

- **1.** If we set $m = 3$, the result is $n = 23 1$ and $k = 7 3$, *or 4, which is not acceptable.*
- *2. If we set m = 4, then n = 24 − 1 = 15 and k = 15 − 4 =11, which satisfies the condition. So the code is*

Figure 10.13 *Burst error correction using Hamming code*

Cyclic codes are special linear block codes with one extra property. In ^a cyclic code, if ^a codeword is cyclically shifted (rotated), the result is another codeword.

Cyclic Redundancy Check Hardware ImplementationPolynomialsCyclic Code AnalysisAdvantages of Cyclic CodesOther Cyclic Codes*Topics discussed in this section:*

Table 10.6 *A CRC code with C(7, 4)*

Figure 10.16 *Division in the CRC decoder for two cases*

Figure 10.17 *Hardwired design of the divisor in CRC*

Figure 10.18 *Simulation of division in CRC encoder*

Figure 10.20 *General design of encoder and decoder of a CRC code*

b. Decoder

Mr.K.K.RAJKUMAR/Communication Networks/19EC501 10.64

 \mathbf{v}

a. Binary pattern and polynomial

Figure 10.22 *CRC division using polynomials*

The divisor in a cyclic code is normally called the generator polynomialor simply the generator.

a. No bit is corrupted. orb. Some bits are corrupted, but thedecoder failed to detect them.

In a cyclic code, those *e***(x) errors that are divisible by** *g***(x) are not caught.**

If the generator has more than one term and the coefficient of x0 is 1, all single errors can be caught.

*Which of the following g(x) values guarantees that a single-bit error is caught? For each case, what is the error that cannot be caught? c.1a. x + ¹ b. x***3**

Solution

- *a. No xi can be divisible by x + 1. Any single-bit error canbe caught.*
- *b. If i is equal to or greater than 3, xⁱis divisible by g(x). All single-bit errors in positions 1 to 3 are caught.c. All values of i make xi divisible by g(x). No single-biterror can be caught. This g(x) is useless.*

Find the status of the following generators related to two isolated, single-bit errors.

a. $x + 1$ *b.* x $4 + 1$ *c.x* $7 + x^6 + 1$ *d.* $x^{15} + x^{14} + 1$

Solution

- *a. This is a very poor choice for a generator. Any twoerrors next to each other cannot be detected.*
- *b. This generator cannot detect two errors that are fourpositions apart.*
- *c. This is a good choice for this purpose.*
- **Mr.K.K.RAJKUMAR/Communication Networks/19EC501 10.74***d. This polynomial cannot divide xt + 1 if t is less than 32,768. A codeword with two isolated errors up to32,768 bits apart can be detected by this generator.*

A generator that contains a factor of *x* **+ 1 can detect all odd-numbered errors.**

*Find the suitability of the following generators in relation to burst errors of different lengths.a.x*6+1 **b.** $x^{18} + x^7 + x + 1$ **c.** $x^{32} + x^{23} + x^7 + 1$

Solution

 a. This generator can detect all burst errors with a lengthless than or equal to 6 bits; 3 out of 100 burst errorswith length 7 will slip by; 16 out of 1000 burst errors oflength 8 or more will slip by.

- *b. This generator can detect all burst errors with a lengthless than or equal to 18 bits; 8 out of 1 million bursterrors with length 19 will slip by; 4 out of 1 millionburst errors of length 20 or more will slip by.*
- *c. This generator can detect all burst errors with a lengthless than or equal to 32 bits; 5 out of 10 billion bursterrors with length 33 will slip by; 3 out of 10 billionburst errors of length 34 or more will slip by.*

A good polynomial generator needs to have the following characteristics:

- **1. It should have at least two terms.**
- **2. The coefficient of the term x0 shouldbe 1.**
- **3. It should not divide** *xt* **+ 1, for** *t***between 2 and** *n* **− 1.**
- **4. It should have the factor** *x* **+ 1.**

Table 10.7 *Standard polynomials*

The last error detection method we discuss here is called the checksum. The checksum is used in the Internet by several protocols although not at the data link layer. However, we briefly discuss it here to complete our discussion on error checking

Topics discussed in this section:

Idea One's ComplementInternet Checksum

Suppose our data is ^a list of five 4-bit numbers that we want to send to ^a destination. In addition to sending these numbers, we send the sum of the numbers. For example, if the set of numbers is $(7, 11, 12, 0, 6)$, we send $(7, 11, 12, 0, 11)$ *0, 6, 36), where ³⁶ is the sum of the original numbers. The receiver adds the five numbers and compares the result with the sum. If the two are the same, the receiver assumes no error, accepts the five numbers, and discards the sum. Otherwise, there is an error somewhere and the data are not accepted.*

We can make the job of the receiver easier if we send the *negative (complement) of the sum, called the checksum.* In this case, we send $(7, 11, 12, 0, 6, -36)$. The receiver *can add all the numbers received (including the checksum). If the result is 0, it assumes no error; otherwise, there is an error.*

How can we represen^t the number ²¹ in one's complement arithmetic using only four bits?

Solution

 The number ²¹ in binary is ¹⁰¹⁰¹ (it needs five bits). We can wrap the leftmost bit and add it to the four rightmost bits. We have (0101 ⁺ 1) ⁼ ⁰¹¹⁰ or 6.

How can we represen^t the number −6 in one's complement arithmetic using only four bits?

Solution

 In one's complement arithmetic, the negative or complement of ^a number is found by inverting all bits. Positive 6 is 0110; negative 6 is 1001. If we consider only *unsigned numbers, this is 9. In other words, the complement of ⁶ is 9. Another way to find the complement of ^a number in one's complement arithmetic* is to subtract the number from 2^n-1 (16 $-$ 1 in this case).

Let us redo Exercise 10.19 using one's complement arithmetic. Figure 10.24 shows the process at the sender and at the receiver. The sender initializes the checksum to ⁰ and adds all data items and the checksum (the checksum is considered as one data item and is shown in color). The result is 36. However, ³⁶ cannot be expresse^d in ⁴ bits. The extra two bits are wrappe^d and added with the sum to create the wrapped sum value 6. In the figure, *we have shown the details in binary. The sum is then complemented, resulting in the checksum value* $9(15 - 6)$ *= 9). The sender now sends six data items to the receiver including the checksum 9.*

The receiver follows the same procedure as the sender. It adds all data items (including the checksum); the result is 45. The sum is wrappe^d and becomes 15. The wrappe^d sum is complemented and becomes 0. Since the value of the checksum is 0, this means that the data is not corrupted. The receiver drops the checksum and keeps the other data items. If the checksum is not zero, the entire packet is dropped.

Sender site:

- **1. The message is divided into 16-bit words.**
- **2. The value of the checksum word is set to 0.**
- **3. All words including the checksum areadded using one's complement addition.**
- **4. The sum is complemented and becomes thechecksum.**
- **5. The checksum is sent with the data.**

Receiver site:

- **1. The message (including checksum) isdivided into 16-bit words.**
- **2. All words are added using one'scomplement addition.**
- **3. The sum is complemented and becomes thenew checksum.**
- **4. If the value of checksum is 0, the messageis accepted; otherwise, it is rejected.**

Mr.K.K.RAJKUMAR/Communication Networks/19EC501 10.91*Let us calculate the checksum for ^a text of ⁸ characters ("Forouzan"). The text needs to be divided into 2-byte (16-bit) words. We use ASCII (see Appendix A) to change each byte to ^a 2-digit hexadecimal number. For example, ^F is represented as 0x46 and ^o is represented as 0x6F. Figure 10.25 shows how the checksum is calculated at the* sender and receiver sites. In part a of the figure, the value *of partial sum for the first column is 0x36. We keep the rightmost digit (6) and insert the leftmost digit (3) as the carry in the second column. The process is repeated for each column. Note that if there is any corruption, the checksum recalculated by the receiver is not all 0s. We leave this an exercise.*
Mr.K.K.RAJKUMAR/

Figure 10.25 *Example 10.23*

a. Checksum at the sender site

a. Checksum at the receiver site

Mr.K.K.RAJKUMAR/Communication Networks/19EC501 10.92