

Question 3

We are to prove that Elias Omega code is prefix-free, i.e. no Elias codeword of any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ can be a prefix of any other codeword for $m \neq n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. A prefix-free codeword implies that, for any two codewords $s1$ and $s2$ where $\text{len}(s1) < \text{len}(s2)$, $s1$ is not a prefix of $s2$.

The Elias Omega code consists of two parts, the length encoding (coloured blue) and the integer encoding (coloured red):

$$\text{E.g. Elias}(123) = 0000101111011$$

To encode an integer into Elias Omega code, we first generate the binary representation of the integer (the red part). This component always starts with a 1-bit. Then we encode the length of the binary representation after a decrement by 1 and flip the first bit, then the length of that after decrementing by 1 and flip the first bit, all the way until we reach an encoding of length 1. All length components always start with a 0-bit.

Suppose Elias Omega code is not prefix-free, there exists two Elias Omega codewords for integers n ($s1$) and m ($s2$), in which $s1$ is the prefix of $s2$, therefore $\text{len}(s1) \leq \text{len}(s2)$, and $n < m$.

$$s1 = b_1b_2b_3 \dots b_jb_{j+1}b_{j+2} \dots b_{j+x} = d_n n_2$$

$$\text{and } s2 = b'_1b'_2b'_3 \dots b'_kb'_{k+1}b'_{k+2} \dots b'_{k+y} = d_m m_2$$

It is impossible for Elias Omega codes of the same length to be identical, since the binary representation component is unique for all numbers. Therefore in the case where $\text{len}(s1) = \text{len}(s2)$ and $n < m$, Elias Omega codes are prefix-free by contradiction.

In the scenario where $\text{len}(s1) < \text{len}(s2)$, this implies that $\text{len}(n_2) < \text{len}(m_2)$, and $\text{len}(d_m) \leq \text{len}(d_n)$. A total of 4 cases will arise:

$$1. \text{len}(d_n) = \text{len}(d_m)$$

Since $\text{len}(n_2) < \text{len}(m_2)$, $(b_1b_2b_3 \dots b_j) \neq (b'_1b'_2b'_3 \dots b'_k)$, $s1$ is not a prefix of $s2$.

$$2. \text{len}(d_n) + \text{len}(n_2) = \text{len}(d_m)$$

This indicates that $s1$ is equal to the length encoding of m_2 , which is impossible. This is due to the fact that the binary representation component n_2 can't be present in the length component of m_2 because it would have its MSB flipped to a 0 to encode the length. Therefore $s1$ is not a prefix of $s2$.

$$3. \text{len}(d_n) + \text{len}(n_2) < \text{len}(d_m)$$

This is similar to case 2 where we will encounter the binary representation component n_2 which is present in the length component of m_2 . This is impossible because it would have its MSB flipped to a 0 to encode the length. Therefore $s1$ is not a prefix of $s2$.

$$4. \text{len}(d_n) + \text{len}(n_2) > \text{len}(d_m)$$

This is the mirror of cases 2 and 3 where we encounter the 1-bit in the binary representation component m_2 which is present in the length component of n_2 . This is impossible because it would have its MSB flipped to a 0 to encode the length. Therefore $s1$ is not a prefix of $s2$.

In all 5 cases, we have proved that Elias Omega code is prefix-free by contradiction.