



Why

1

Definition

Let X be a set and let A be a finite set. We denote the set of all finite sequences (strings) in A by $\mathcal{S}(A)$. We read $\mathcal{S}(A)$ aloud as “the strings in A .”

A *code* for X in A is a function from X to $\mathcal{S}(A)$. In this context, we refer to the finite set A as an *alphabet*. The *length* of an object (w.r.t to a code $c : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(A)$) is the length of the sequence $c(x)$. We call a code *nonsingular* if it is injective.

Examples

Extensions

We can extend a code $c : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(A)$ to a code for $\mathcal{S}(X)$ in a natural way. The *extension* of c is the function $C : \mathcal{S}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(A)$ defined, for $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathcal{S}(X)$, by

$$\mathcal{S}(\xi) = (c(\xi_1), \dots, c(\xi_n)).$$

We call an code *uniquely decodable* if its extension is injective. In other words, given the code $C(\xi)$ for a sequence $\xi \in \mathcal{S}(X)$, we can recover ξ .

¹Future editions will include.

Prefix-free codes

A code $C : X \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is *prefix-free* if, for all $x \in X$, $C(x)$ is not a prefix² of $C(x')$ for all $x' \neq x \in X$. Prefix-free codes are nice because they are uniquely decodable. The converse, is not true.

Proposition 1. *There exists a set X , alphabet A , and not prefix-free code $C : X \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that C is uniquely decodable.*

Proof. Try $X = \{A, B\}$, $D = \{0, 1\}$ and $C(A) = (0)$, $C(B) = 01$. Proof by induction on the length of the sequence, base case length 1 and length 2 sequences.³ \square

Example...

²To be defined.

³Future editions will expand on this account.

