

Research Report

TWO-DIMENSIONAL INTERLEAVING SCHEMES WITH REPETITIONS

Mario Blaum

IBM Research Division
Almaden Research Center
650 Harry Road
San Jose, California 95120-6099

Jehoshua Bruck

California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, CA 91125

Patrick G. Farrell

Electrical Engineering Laboratories
The University, Manchester
M13 9PL, England

LIMITED DISTRIBUTION NOTICE

This report has been submitted for publication outside of IBM and will probably be copyrighted if accepted for publication. It has been issued as a Research Report for early dissemination of its contents. In view of the transfer of copyright to the outside publisher, its distribution outside of IBM prior to publication should be limited to peer communications and specific requests. After outside publication, requests should be filled only by reprints or legally obtained copies of the article (e.g., payment of royalties).



Research Division
Yorktown Heights, New York • San Jose, California • Zurich, Switzerland

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
SERIALS ACQUISITION
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106-1500

Two-Dimensional Interleaving Schemes with Repetitions

Mario Blaum

IBM Research Division

650 Harry Road

San Jose, CA 95120, USA

blaum@almaden.ibm.com

Jehoshua Bruck *

California Institute of Technology

Mail Stop 136-93

Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

bruck@paradise.caltech.edu

Patrick G. Farrell

Electrical Engineering Laboratories

The University, Manchester

M13 9PL, England

farrell@manchester.ac.uk

Abstract

We present 2-dimensional interleaving schemes, with repetition, for correcting 2-dimensional bursts (or clusters) of errors, where a cluster of errors is characterized by its area. A recent application of correction of 2-dimensional clusters appeared in the context of holographic storage. Known interleaving schemes are based on arrays of integers with the property that every connected component of area t consists of distinct integers. Namely, they are based on the use of 1-error-correcting codes. We extend this concept by allowing repetitions within the arrays, hence, providing a trade-off between the error-correcting capability of the codes and the degree of the interleaving schemes.

*Supported in part by the NSF Young Investigator Award CCR-9457811 and by the Sloan Research Fellowship.

1 Introduction

We present 2-dimensional interleaving schemes, with repetitions, for correcting 2-dimensional bursts (or clusters) of errors, where a cluster of errors is characterized by its area. Known interleaving schemes are based on arrays of integers with the property that every connected component of area t consists of distinct integers. These arrays are called t -interleaved arrays. We extend the concept of t -interleaved arrays by allowing repetitions within the arrays. Namely, a t -interleaved array with repetition r is an array of integers with the property that in every connected component of area t , every integer is repeated at most r times. Next we formally define those concepts.

Definition 1.1 We say that an element (i, j) in a 2-dimensional array is *connected* to elements $(i + 1, j)$, $(i - 1, j)$, $(i, j + 1)$ and $(i, j - 1)$, provided those elements exist.

Definition 1.2 A *path* of length n from E_0 to E_n in a 2-dimensional array is a set of $n + 1$ elements $\{E_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$ such that for every $0 \leq i < n$, element E_i is connected to element E_{i+1} .

Definition 1.3 We say that a set of t elements in a 2-dimensional array is a *cluster* of size t , if any two elements in the cluster belong in a path contained in the set.

The concept of a cluster of size t generalizes in two dimensions the concept of a burst of size t in one dimension. The same idea can be generalized to multiple dimensions (see [4]).

Example 1.1 The 1's in the array below constitute a cluster of size 7.

0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	1	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Definition 1.4 Let $t \geq 1$ and $r \geq 1$ be integers. Let $A(t, r)$ be a 2-dimensional array of integers, namely, the elements of the array are labeled by integers. We say that $A(t, r)$ is

t -interleaved with repetition r if every cluster of size t in $A(t, r)$ consists of integers that repeat at most r times. The *degree of interleaving* of the array is the number of distinct integers it contains.

Notice that, if the integers represent different codes (like in the one-dimensional case), then r -error-correcting codes distributed in a t -interleaved array with repetition r can correct any cluster of size up to t .

Example 1.2 The following is a $A(3, 1)$ interleaved array, namely, it is 3-interleaved with repetition 1. Notice that the degree of interleaving is 5:

$$A(3, 1) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 \\ \hline 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Here we need only five 1-error correcting codes to correct any cluster of size 3.

Example 1.3 The following is $A(3, 2)$, namely, it is 3-interleaved with repetition 2. Notice that the degree of interleaving is 2:

$$A(3, 2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Here we need only two 2-error correcting codes to correct any cluster of size 3.

Our goal is to construct $A(t, r)$ arrays with minimal degree. Notice that in the one-dimensional case, the minimal degree of interleaving $\lceil t/r \rceil$ corresponds linearly to the size of the burst we want to correct. This is not the case in the 2-dimensional case, as we will see in the sequel. In [4] we presented optimal degree constructions of $A(t, 1)$ arrays for arbitrary t . Here we focus on the case $r = 2$ and present lower bounds and constructions.

2 Lower Bounds

In this section we present lower bounds on the degree of interleaving of $A(t, r)$ arrays. We start by presenting the lower bound for the case $r = 2$, we then generalize it for arbitrary $r \geq 3$.

Theorem 2.1 Let $t \geq 2$. Let $A(t, 2)$ be a t -interleaved array with repetition 2. Then

1. If t is even, then the degree of interleaving of $A(t, 2)$ is at least $\frac{(t/2)(t/2+1)}{2}$.
2. If t is odd, then the degree of interleaving of $A(t, 2)$ is at least $\lceil \frac{(t+1)^2}{8} \rceil$.

Proof: The idea in the proof is to construct arrays of integers of size $\frac{(t/2)(t/2+1)}{2}$ in the case t even, and size $\lceil \frac{(t+1)^2}{4} \rceil$, in the case of t odd, and prove that if those arrays are part of $A(t, 2)$ then every integer in the array is repeated at most twice. We will prove the theorem for the case t even, the proof for the odd case follows by similar arguments.

We illustrate the idea by an example. Consider the following 2 by 3 array of labels called $B(4)$.

$$B(4) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline a & b & c \\ \hline d & e & f \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Note that that every three labels in $B(4)$ are part of a cluster of size 4. This follows from the fact that for every three labels, two are in the same row. Namely, a cluster that contains this row and the third label is of size 4. For example, let a, c and e be the three labels then the cluster that contains those labels is a, b, c and e .

In general, for arbitrary t even, consider the array $B(t)$ to be a $t/2$ by $\lceil (t+1)/2 \rceil$ array. We need to prove that every three entries in $B(t)$ are part of a cluster of size t . The idea is to construct the cluster by picking the column (of size $t/2$) in $B(t)$ that contains the middle entry (horizontally) and connecting this column to the other two entries. The size of this cluster is at most $t/2 + t/2 = t$.

For example,

$$B(6) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline a & b & c & d \\ \hline e & f & g & h \\ \hline i & j & k & l \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Let the three entries be a , f and l . We construct the cluster by taking the column b , f and j and connecting it to a and l , resulting in the cluster $\{a, b, f, j, k, l\}$ of size 6.

We proved that every three entries in $B(t)$ are part of a cluster of size t . Hence, $A(t, 2)$ must be at least as large as $B(t)$ and the degree of interleaving of $A(t, 2)$ is at least $\lceil \frac{t(t+1)}{8} \rceil$. \square

By similar techniques we can prove the following general theorem.

Theorem 2.2 Let $t \geq 2$ and $r \leq t$. Let $A(t, r)$ be a t -interleaved array with repetition r . Then the degree of interleaving of $A(t, r)$ is at least $\lceil \frac{t(t+1)}{2r^2} \rceil$.

Let us refine a little the lower bound given by Theorem 2.1 in the case $t = 6$. According to Theorem 2.1, the degree of interleaving of $A(6, 2)$ is at least 6. The next lemma shows that it is actually larger than 6.

Lemma 2.1 Let $A(6, 2)$ be a 6-interleaved array with repetition 2. Then the degree of interleaving of $A(6, 2)$ is at least 7.

Proof: According to Theorem 2.1, the degree of interleaving of $A(6, 2)$ is at least 6. Assume that it is exactly 6. Then, according to the proof of Theorem 2.1, every 3×4 rectangle and every 4×3 rectangle contain exactly 2 labels. Consider a label 0. Without loss of generality, we may assume that entry $(0,0)$ in the plane is labeled with 0. For sure there is another 0 at Lee distance at most 5 from this 0, otherwise, we would have a 3×4 or 4×3 rectangle with only one 0. Graphically, we have to fill up

\ddots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots
\dots	$(-1, -1)$	$(-1, 0)$	$(-1, 1)$	\dots
\dots	$(0, -1)$	$(0, 0)$	$(0, 1)$	\dots
\dots	$(1, -1)$	$(1, 0)$	$(1, 1)$	\dots
\ddots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots

We will consider different cases for the second 0.

- (0,1) So, we assume that the second 0 is in entry (0,1). Since every 3×4 or 4×3 rectangle contains exactly 2 0's, in particular, none of the entries (i, j) , $1 \leq i \leq 3$, $-1 \leq j \leq 2$, can have a 0 label. In particular, this is a 3×4 rectangle with no zeros, a contradiction. The cases in which the second 0 is in $(-1, 0)$, $(1, 0)$ or $(0, -1)$ are analogous, by symmetry.
- (1,1) In this case, none of the entries $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$, $-1 \leq i \leq 2$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, can have a 0 label. But this is a 4×3 rectangle containing only one 0 label, a contradiction.
- (1,2) In this case, none of the entries $(i, j) \neq (1, 2)$, $-1 \leq i \leq 2$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, can have a 0 label. But this is a 4×3 rectangle containing only one 0 label, a contradiction.
- (0,3) In this case, none of the entries $(i, j) \neq (0, 3)$, $-1 \leq i \leq 2$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, can have a 0 label. This is a 4×3 rectangle containing only one 0 label, a contradiction.
- (2,2) In this case, none of the entries $(i, j) \neq (0, 0), (-1, -1)$, $-1 \leq i \leq 2$, $-1 \leq j \leq 1$, can have a 0 label. Since this is a 4×3 rectangle, it contains exactly two 0 labels, therefore, $(-1, -1)$ is labeled as 0. But this case is symmetrical to the one in which $(1, 1)$ is labeled as 0, which we saw that it leads to a contradiction.
- (0,2) In this case, none of the entries $(i, j) \neq (0, 2), (2, 3)$, $-1 \leq i \leq 2$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, can have a 0 label. Since this is a 4×3 rectangle, it contains exactly two 0 labels, therefore, $(2, 3)$ is labeled as 0. But the case in which $(0, 2)$ and $(2, 3)$ are labeled as 0 is symmetrical to the one in which $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 2)$ are labeled as 0, which we saw that leads to a contradiction.
- (1,3) In this case, none of the entries $(i, j) \neq (1, 3)$, $-1 \leq i \leq 2$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, can have a 0 label. But this is a 4×3 rectangle containing only one 0 label, a contradiction.
- (2,3) In this case, none of the entries $(i, j) \neq (2, 3)$, $1 \leq i \leq 2$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, can have a 0 label. Consider then the entries $(i, 4)$, $0 \leq i \leq 2$. Exactly one of these 3 entries has to be labeled with 0. If it is entry $(0, 4)$, this gives a contradiction by case (1,2), if it is entry $(1, 4)$, it gives a contradiction by case (1,1), and if it is entry $(2, 4)$, it gives a contradiction by case (0,1). □

3 Constructions

In this section we present constructions of $A(2, t)$ interleaved arrays. First we describe an interleaving scheme that we call the *toroidal* interleaving scheme.

Construction 3.1 Consider a 2-dimensional array and an integer m . Label the coordinates of the array toroidally on m , i.e., the coordinates are given by (x, y) , where x and y are taken modulo m . Let b be relatively prime with m . Then, for each a modulo m , the coordinates $(i, a + ib)$ (taken modulo m) are assigned the same number a .

Example 3.1 Assume that we have a 4×6 array. Taking $m = 2$ and $b = 1$, Construction 3.1 gives the following $A(3, 2)$ interleaved array:

$$A(3, 2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Similarly, if we consider a 5×10 array for $m = 5$ and $b = 3$, we obtain the following $A(5, 2)$ interleaved array:

$$A(5, 2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

The reader can verify that the array above is 5-interleaved with repetition 2.

As we can see in Example 3.1, given an array labeled by Construction 3.1, in order to find if the array is t interleaved, it is enough to consider the $m \times m$ array obtained by the construction. The labeling of the whole array is obtained by tiling it with the $m \times m$ array.

Definition 3.1 The *Lee distance* between two elements in a torus is the length of the shortest path they belong to (for example, two adjacent elements are at Lee distance 1).

The minimum Lee distance of a set of elements is the minimum of the Lee distance between all the pairs of elements in the set.

The following lemma gives a method for finding t in Construction 3.1.

Theorem 3.1 Consider Construction 3.1 with parameters m and b . Let d be the minimum Lee distance in the $m \times m$ torus between two coordinates labeled with the same number. Then,

1. For d even, the construction provides an $A(t, 2)$ interleaved array with $t = 3d/2$.
2. For d odd, the construction provides an $A(t, 2)$ interleaved array with $t = (3d + 1)/2$.

Proof: We will prove the theorem for the case d even. The odd case is similar. Notice that it is enough to consider the minimum Lee distance between those entries labeled with 0, i.e., between the coordinates (i, ib) , $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$.

Consider any three entries in the array labeled with a 0, call them a , b , and c . Assume that a , b and c are in a cluster of size $t = 3d/2$ and reach a contradiction. By the construction, without loss of generality, the Lee distance between a and b is d . Also, the Lee distance between a and c as well as between b and c is also d . Since a , b and c are in the same cluster, it must be of size at least $d + 1$ (the path including a and b) plus $(d - 1)/2$ (the size of the connection of a and b to c). Namely the cluster is of size at least $(3d + 1)/2$ which is a contradiction. Namely, the array is a $A(t, 2)$ interleaved. \square

The following theorem from [4] describes an optimal method for constructing arrays with a given minimum Lee distance d . Those arrays are in fact $A(d, 1)$ interleaved arrays.

Theorem 3.2 Using construction 3.1 with parameters m and b provides constructions of arrays with minimum Lee distance d between equal labels. Where

1. For d an odd integer, $m = \frac{d^2+1}{2}$, and $b = d$.
2. For d an even integer, $m = \frac{d^2}{2}$, and $b = d - 1$.

Corollary 3.1 Using construction 3.1 with parameters m and b provide constructions of $A(t, 2)$ interleaved arrays. Where,

1. For $t = (3d + 1)/2$, d an odd integer, $m = \frac{d^2+1}{2}$, and $b = d$. Resulting in a degree of interleaving of $\frac{2t^2-2t+5}{9}$.
2. For $t = 3d/2$, d an even integer, $m = \frac{d^2}{2}$, and $b = d - 1$. Resulting in a degree of interleaving of $\frac{2t^2}{9}$.

Example 3.2 Consider the case $d = 4$. According to Corollary 3.1 $m = 8$ and $b = 3$. Therefore, tiling an array with the following 8×8 array gives a $A(6, 2)$ interleaved array:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	6	7	0	1	2	3	4
2	3	4	5	6	7	0	1
7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	5	6	7	0	1	2	3
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	0
6	7	0	1	2	3	4	5
3	4	5	6	7	0	1	2

For $d = 5$, according to Corollary 3.1 $m = 13$ and $b = 5$. Therefore, tiling an array with the following 13×13 array gives a $A(8, 2)$ interleaved array:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
8	9	10	11	12	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	0	1	2
11	12	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	0	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	0
9	10	11	12	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	0	1	2	3
12	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
7	8	9	10	11	12	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	0	1
10	11	12	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	0	1	2	3	4

We note that the constructions above are not optimal with respect to the degree of interleaving. In fact, we can improve the degree of interleaving obtained with construction 3.1 by using a different set of parameters. For example, we can construct $A(6, 2)$ with degree 7, compared to degree 8 above, by using $m = 7$ and $b = 2$, as follows,

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	6	0	1	2	3	4
3	4	5	6	0	1	2
1	2	3	4	5	6	0
6	0	1	2	3	4	5
4	5	6	0	1	2	3
2	3	4	5	6	0	1

Using computer search we can find optimal sets of parameters for the toroidal construction.

Next we present a general recursive construction. We will focus on the case where $t/4$ is an integer. The generalization is straightforward.

Construction 3.2 Let $t = 4k$, k an integer. Let $C_0(t)$ be the $\frac{t}{4} \times \frac{t}{4}$ array labeled by the integers $\{j : 0 \leq j \leq \frac{t^2}{16} - 1\}$, $C_1(t)$ be the $\frac{t}{4} \times \frac{t}{4}$ array labeled by the integers $\{j : \frac{t^2}{16} \leq$

$j \leq \frac{t^2}{8} - 1\}$ and $C_2(t)$ be the $\frac{t}{4} \times \frac{t}{4}$ array labeled by the integers $\{j : \frac{t^2}{8} \leq j \leq \frac{3t^2}{16} - 1\}$.

The $A(t, 2)$ interleaved array consists of the following tiling using the arrays $C_0(t)$, $C_1(t)$ and $C_2(t)$

$C_0(t)$	$C_1(t)$	$C_2(t)$
$C_2(t)$	$C_0(t)$	$C_1(t)$
$C_1(t)$	$C_2(t)$	$C_0(t)$

Example 3.3 Let $t = 4$. Then $A(4, 2)$ is obtained by tiling:

0	1	2
2	0	1
1	2	0

Let $t = 8$. Then

$$C_0(8) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$C_1(8) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 4 & 5 \\ \hline 6 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$C_2(8) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 8 & 9 \\ \hline 10 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

And $A(8, 2)$ is obtained by tiling:

0	1	4	5	8	9
2	3	6	7	10	11
8	9	0	1	4	5
10	11	2	3	6	7
4	5	8	9	0	1
6	7	10	11	2	3

Theorem 3.3 For every $t = 4k$, the arrays $A_2(t)$ in Construction 3.2 are $A(t, 2)$ interleaved.

Proof: The proof follows by observing that a cluster connecting any three elements with the same label, say 0, must go through 4 blocks (each $t/4$ by $t/4$). Hence, it is of size at least t . \square

The following table summarizes the lower bounds and upper bounds on the degree of interleaving using the different methods.

t	Lower bound	Upper bound Theorem 3.2	Upper bound Optimization	Upper bound Theorem 3.3
3	2	2	2	
4	3		3	3
5	5	5	5	
6	6	8	7	
7	8		10	
8	10	13	12(1,5)	12
9	13	18	17(1,5)	
9	13	18	16(2,3)	
10	15		19(1,7)	
11	18	25	24(1,7)	
11			22(2,3)	
12	21	32	27(1,8)	27
13	25		33(1,9)	
14	28		37(1,10)	
15	32		44(1,10)	
16	36		48(1,11)	48
17	41		57(1,13)	
17			56(4,5)	
18	45		61(1,13)	
19	50		69(1,19)	
20	55		75(1,14)	75

Table 1: Lower and upper bounds on the degree of interleaving of $A(t, 2)$.

References

- [1] K. A. S. Abdel-Ghaffar, R. J. McEliece and H. C. A. van Tilborg, *Two-Dimensional Burst Identification Codes and their Use in Burst Correction*, IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, IT-34, pp. 494-504, 1988.
- [2] C. de Almeida and R. Palazzo, *Two-Dimensional Interleaving Using the Set Partitioning Technique*, IEEE Information Theory Symposium, June 1994.
- [3] M. Blaum and J. Bruck, *Correcting of Two-Dimensional Clusters by Interleaving of Symbols*, IEEE Information Theory Symposium, June 1994.
- [4] M. Blaum and J. Bruck, *Interleaving Schemes for Multidimensional Cluster Errors*, IBM Research Report, RJ 9984, Oct. 1995.
- [5] M. Blaum and P. G. Farrell, *Array Codes for Cluster-Error Correction*, Electronic Letters, Vol. 30, No. 21, pp. 1752-3, Oct. 1994.
- [6] B. Chor, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest and J. B. Shearer, *An Application of Number Theory to the Organization of Raster-Graphics Memory*, J. of ACM, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 86-104, January 1986.
- [7] P. Delsarte, "Bilinear forms over a finite field, with applications to coding theory," J. Comb. Th. A, 25 (1978), 226-241.
- [8] F. G. Farrell, *Array Codes for Correcting Cluster-Error Patterns*, IEE Conf. on Elect. Signal Processing, York, July 1982.
- [9] E. M. Gabidulin, *Combinatorial Metrics in Coding Theory*, 2nd. Int. Symposium on Inf. Theory, Budapest, pp. 169-76, 1971.
- [10] E. M. Gabidulin, *Theory of Codes with Maximum Rank Distance*, Probl. Inform. Transm., vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 3-16, Jan.-Mar. 1985.

- [11] E. M. Gabidulin and V. V. Zanin, *Codes Correcting Array Bursts*, The Workshop on Information Protection, Proc., pp. 24-25, Moscow, 1993.
- [12] H. Imai, *Two-Dimensional Fire Codes*, IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, IT-19, pp. 796-806, 1973.

- [13] H. Imai, *A Theory of Two Dimensional Cyclic Codes*, Information and Control, Vol 34, pp. 1-21, 1977.
- [14] S. A. Lis and P. D. Henshaw, *Ultra-Dense Optical Mass Storage*, Report prepared for USAF, AFSC, AD-A232 767, 1991.
- [15] T. R. N. Rao and E. Fujiwara, *Error-Control Coding for Computer Systems*, Prentice-Hall, NJ, 1989.
- [16] R. M. Roth, *Maximum-Rank Array Codes and their Application to Crisscross Error Correction*, IEEE Trans. on Information Theory, IT-37, pp. 328-36, March 1991.