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#### Abstract

We give an explicit decoding scheme for the permutation arrays under Hamming distance metric, where the encoding is constructed via a distance-preserving mapping from ternary vectors to permutations (3-DPM).


## 1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the set of permutations from $\{1,2, \cdots, n\}$, denoted as $S_{n}$. We study the decoding issue with respect to an encoding scheme $C:\{0,1,2\}^{n} \rightarrow S_{n}$, i.e., given a corrupted permutation $\pi \in S_{n}$ that is close to a codeword $C(x) \in S_{n}$ we want to recover $x \in\{0,1,2\}^{n}$. We use the Hamming distance metric to measure the distance for ternary vectors and permutations. That is, for any $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ and $y=\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right) \in\{0,1,2\}^{n}$, the distance between $x$ and $y$ is defined as $d_{H}(x, y)=\left|\left\{i: x_{i} \neq y_{i}\right\}\right|$, which is the number of positions they differ. Similarly, for $\pi$ and $\tau \in S_{n}, d_{H}(\pi, \tau)=\left|\left\{i: \pi_{i} \neq \tau_{i}\right\}\right|$. An $(n, d)$ permutation array (PA) is a subset of $S_{n}$ with the property that the distance between any two permutations in the array is at least $d$. PAs have been studied for some time, see e.g. [1] for a list of early references. Vinck [8, 7] proposed permutation arrays as an error correcting code over power-line communications, where each symbol $i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$ is associated with a frequency $f_{i}$ and a message is encoded as a permutation. Most of the previous works have been on finding mappings from binary vectors to permutations that preserve the minimum distance of the binary vectors. A typical approach starts by encoding a message with a binary code, which is then mapped to a permutation and transmitted. From a correctly received permutation, one can find the corresponding binary vector, with which one can recover the message. But, there is little discussion on correcting errors directly from the permutations when the error is not erasure. It was not clear how to efficiently recover the message, when the received permutation was not a codeword. Using $l_{\infty}$-norm to measure the distance between permutations, Lin et al. [5, 3] proposed the first efficient encoding and decoding scheme for permutation arrays. In this paper, we investigate the same problem but with the Hamming distance metric, which is widely used in coding theory and related areas[2]. Meanwhile, Lin et al. [6] gave a simple distance-preserving

[^0]mapping from ternary vectors into permutations. Based on their construction from $\{0,1,2\}^{n}$ to $S_{n}$ for $n \geq 16$, we develop an efficient decoding scheme for permutation arrays. For the rest of the paper, we review the encoding algorithms in section 2 and show our main result, the decoding algorithm, in Section 3.

## 2 Construction of 3-DPM

For completeness, we include the construction of ternary distance preserving mapping (3-DPM)[5]. First of all, we show the algorithm for input length $8 m$ for any integer $m \geq 2$. We call the algorithm $A_{8 m}$. Then $A_{8 m}$ can be extended to all input of length at least 16. The approach gives a framework for designing general $q$-DPM. For convenience, we use the notation $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1,2, \ldots, n\}$ and $[i, j]$ for the set $\{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}$, where $i$ and $j$ are integers and $i<j$.

## $2.1 \quad 3$-DPM of length $8 m$ for $m \geq 2$

The 3-DPM of length $8 m\left(A_{8 m}\right)$ is shown in Figure 1. Algorithm $A_{8 m}$ consists of two passes: PASS 1 and PASS 2. The encoding scheme for $n=16$ is illustrated in Figure 2, which is similar to the sorting network[4]. Each vertical line segment connects two horizontal lines and the value of the variable next to it determines to swap the values on the horizontal lines or not. During PASS 1 , if the variable associated with a vertical line segment has value 1 , then the values of the two corresponding horizontal lines are swapped. For PASS 2, the values will be swapped when the associated variable has value 2 . We summarize the transitions of PASS 1 and 2 in Table 1 and 2 . Table 2 is very similar to Table 1 if we replace 1 by 2 . Note that addition and substraction are operated in $Z_{8 m}=[8 m]$, that is, if $a, b \in Z_{8 m}$ then the output of $a+b$ is $(a+b \bmod 8 m)$ if $(a+b$ $\bmod 8 m) \neq 0 ; 8 m$ otherwise.

Table 1: Possible values of $\pi_{j}^{1}$ after PASS 1 for $k \in\{0,1, \ldots, 4 m-1\}$.

|  | $x_{2 k+1}$ | $x_{2 k+2}$ | $x_{2 k+3}$ | $\pi_{2 k+2}^{1}$ | $\pi_{2 k+3}^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | - | - | $2 k+2$ | $2 k+3$ |
| 2 | - | - | 1 | $2 k+2$ | $2 k+4$ |
| 3 | - | 1 | - | $2 k+3$ | $2 k+2$ |
| 4 | - | 1 | 1 | $2 k+4$ | $2 k+2$ |
| 5 | 1 | - | - | $2 k+1$ | $2 k+3$ |
| 6 | 1 | - | 1 | $2 k+1$ | $2 k+4$ |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | - | $2 k+3$ | $2 k+1$ |
| 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $2 k+4$ | $2 k+1$ |

### 2.2 3-DPM for input length $\geq 16$

Algorithm $A_{8 m}$ has a nice property as shown in lemma 1 and can be extended to handle input length greater than or equal to 16 . As in the previous subsection, let $\pi=A_{8 m}(x)$ and $\pi^{1}$ be the intermediate result after PASS 1. The 3-DPM algorithm $A_{8 m+k}$ is shown in Figure 3.

## Algorithm $A_{8 m}$ :

Input: $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{8 m}\right) \in Z_{3}^{8 m}$
Output: $\left(\pi_{1}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m}\right) \in S_{8 m}$

PASS 1 :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\pi_{1}^{1}, \pi_{2}^{1}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m}^{1}\right) \leftarrow(1,2, \ldots, 8 m) \\
& \text { for } i=0 \text { to } 4 m-1 \text { do; } \\
& \quad \text { if } x_{2 i+1}=1 \text { then swap }\left(\pi_{2 i+1}^{1}, \pi_{2 i+2}^{1}\right) \\
& \text { for } i=0 \text { to } 4 m-1 \text { do; } \\
& \quad \text { if } x_{2 i+2}=1 \text { then swap }\left(\pi_{2 i+2}^{1}, \pi_{2 i+3}^{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

PASS 2 :

```
\(\left(\pi_{1}, \pi_{2}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m}\right) \leftarrow\left(\pi_{1}^{1}, \pi_{2}^{1}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m}^{1}\right) ;\)
for \(i=0\) to \(m-1\) do;
    if \(x_{8 i+1}=2\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 i+1}, \pi_{8 i+5}\right)\);
    if \(x_{8 i+2}=2\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 i+2}, \pi_{8 i+6}\right)\);
    if \(x_{8 i+3}=2\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 i+3}, \pi_{8 i+7}\right)\);
    if \(x_{8 i+4}=2\) then \(\operatorname{swap}\left(\pi_{8 i+4}, \pi_{8 i+8}\right)\);
for \(i=0\) to \(m-1\) do;
    if \(x_{8 i+5}=2\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 i+5}, \pi_{8 i+9}\right)\);
    if \(x_{8 i+6}=2\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 i+6}, \pi_{8 i+10}\right)\);
    if \(x_{8 i+7}=2\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 i+7}, \pi_{8 i+11}\right)\);
    if \(x_{8 i+8}=2\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 i+8}, \pi_{8 i+12}\right)\);
```

Output $\left(\pi_{1}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m}\right)$.
Figure 1: 3-DPM Algorithm $A_{8 m}$

Table 2: Possible values of $\pi_{j}$ after PASS 2 for $k \in\{0,1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and $i \in\{1,2,3,4\}$.

|  | $x_{8 k+i}$ | $x_{8 k+4+i}$ | $x_{8 k+8+i}$ | $\pi_{8 k+4+i}$ | $\pi_{8 k+8+i}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | - | - | - | $\pi_{8 k+4+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+8+i}^{1}$ |
| 2 | - | - | 2 | $\pi_{8 k+4+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+12+i}^{1}$ |
| 3 | - | 2 | - | $\pi_{8 k+8+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+4+i}^{1}$ |
| 4 | - | 2 | 2 | $\pi_{8 k+12+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+4+i}^{1}$ |
| 5 | 2 | - | - | $\pi_{8 k+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+8+i}^{1}$ |
| 6 | 2 | - | 2 | $\pi_{8 k+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+12+i}^{1}$ |
| 7 | 2 | 2 | - | $\pi_{8 k+8+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+i}^{1}$ |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | $\pi_{8 k+12+i}^{1}$ | $\pi_{8 k+i}^{1}$ |

## $\overbrace{\text { PASS } 1} \overbrace{\text { PASS } 2} \overbrace{\text { PASS 2: 2nd loop }}$



Figure 2: Encoding with sorting network for $n=16$. Initially, line $i$ has value $i$. After PASS 1, line $i$ has value $\pi_{i}^{1}$. Each vertical line segment has an associated variable to its left, which decides to swap the values of two horizontal lines connecting to it or not.

```
Algorithm \(A_{8 m+k} \quad(8 m \geq 16,1 \leq k \leq 7):\)
Input: \(\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{8 m+k}\right) \in Z_{3}^{8 m+k}\)
Output: \(\left(\pi_{1}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m+k}\right) \in S_{8 m+k}\)
\(\left(\pi_{1}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m}\right) \leftarrow A_{8 m}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{8 m}\right)\);
\(\left(\pi_{8 m+1}, \ldots, \pi_{8 m+k}\right) \leftarrow(8 m+1, \ldots, 8 m+k) ;\)
for \(i=1\) to \(k\) do;
    if \(x_{8 m+i}=1\) then swap \(\left(\pi_{8 m+i}, \pi_{\pi^{-1}(i-3)}\right)\);
    if \(x_{8 m+i}=2\) then \(\operatorname{swap}\left(\pi_{8 m+i}, \pi_{i}\right)\);
```

Figure 3: 3-DPM Algorithm $A_{8 m+k}$ for $k \in\{1, \ldots, 7\}$

Lemma 1. [6] For any $i \in\{1,2, \cdots, 8 m\}, \pi_{i} \neq i-3$.
Theorem 1. [6] $A_{8 m+k}: Z_{3}^{8 m+k} \rightarrow S_{8 m+k}$ is a $\mathbf{3 - D P M}$ for all $m \geq 2$ and $k \in\{1, \cdots, 7\}$.
Corollary 1. [6] There exists an explicit construction of 3-DPM from $Z_{3}^{n}$ to $S_{n}$ for any $n \geq 16$.
Note that the above construction can be applied to the case when $q \geq 3$. However, for different $q$, we need a different version of lemma 1 in order to obtain an explicit construction of $q$-DPM.

## 3 Decoding Permutation Arrays with 3-DPM

As shown in [1], we can use 3-DPM to construct permutation arrays with Hamming distance. In this section we show the corresponding decoding algorithm.

Suppose $C$ is an $(n, d)$ ternary code, which can correct up to $e$ errors. Let $n=8 m+k, m \geq 2$ and $0 \leq k \leq 7$. By Theorem 1 and $m \geq 2$, we have a distance-preserving mapping $A_{8 m+k}: Z_{3}^{n} \rightarrow S_{n}$. It is easy to see that $A_{8 m+k}(C)$ is a permutation array of length $n$ with minimum distance $d$. Let $P$ be $A_{8 m+k}(C)$ and so $|P|=\left|A_{8 m+k}(C)\right|=|C|$.

We show the encoding/decoding scheme in Figure 4. For the encoding issue, if $C$ has an efficient encoding algorithm $E: \mathrm{Msg} \rightarrow Z_{3}^{n}$, where Msg is an arbitrary message space with size equal to $|C|$. Let $E_{P}=A_{8 m+k} \circ E$, then $E_{P}:$ Msg $\rightarrow S_{n}$ is an efficient encoding algorithm for $P$ because $E$ and $A_{8 m+k}$ are both efficient.


Figure 4: Encoding and decoding with permutation arrays and 3-DPM
Now consider the decoding issue. If $C$ has an efficient decoding algorithm $D: Z_{3}^{n} \rightarrow C$ to correct up to $e$ errors, i.e., for any codeword $x \in C$, and a corrupted codeword $y \in Z_{3}^{n}$ with $d_{H}(x, y) \leq e$,
then $D(y)=x$. Let $\pi=A_{8 m+k}(x) \in P$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ be a corrupted permutation satisfying $d_{H}\left(\pi, \pi^{\prime}\right)=d$. Without decoding $\pi^{\prime}$ to $\pi$ directly, we design an algorithm $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$ which computes the inversion of $A_{8 m+k}$. If we can bound $d_{H}\left(A_{8 m+k}^{-1}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right), x\right)$ by $d_{H}\left(\pi, \pi^{\prime}\right)$, then we can decode $P$ by combining $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$ and $D$.

To understand the decoding algorithm, let us explain the idea first. Note that $A_{8 m+k}$ is based on $A_{8 m}$ and then handle the last $k$ positions. We consider the inversion of $A_{8 m}$ first. The idea is based on the proof of lemma $1[6]$, which shows for any $i, \pi_{i} \neq i-3$ by checking the path of symbol $i-3$ and deriving a contradiction on the value of $x_{i-4}$. In general if $\pi_{i}=t$, we can determine the transition path of symbol $t$ and the values of four positions of $x$. For example, given $\pi_{5}=12$, the path of symbol 12 can be determined as in the figure below, where symbol 12 goes to position 13 in PASS 1 and goes to position 9 and then 5 in PASS 2. Furthermore, we can determine that $x_{11} \neq 1$, $x_{12}=1, x_{5}=2$ and $x_{9}=2$ by Tables 3 and 4 , where each $\pi_{i}$ can have up to 15 legitimate values.


Figure 5: The unique path of symbol 12, given $\pi_{5}=12$.
Tables 3 and 4 show each possible value of $\pi_{i}$. For example, suppose $\pi_{i}=i+7,(i \bmod$ $8) \in\{5,6,7,8\}$ and $i$ is odd( e.g. the case $\pi_{5}=12$ ). In the gray area of Table 4 , it implies that $\pi_{i}=\pi_{i+8}^{1}, \pi_{i+8}^{1}=i+7$ and gives the values of four positions of $x$, i.e., $x_{i}=2, x_{i+4}=2, x_{i+6} \neq 1$ and $x_{i+7}=1$. One can verify each entry in both tables by checking algorithm $A_{8 m}$. Note that some entries are not applicable(n.a.), since $A_{8 m}$ avoids some values for certain positions in a permutation.

Checking each position of $\pi$, we can determine all the values of $x_{i}$ 's and compute the inversion of $A_{8 m}$. Now consider $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$. If $\pi_{i}=t$ where $i \in\{8 m+1, \ldots, 8 m+k\}$, then we set $x_{i}=0$ if $\pi_{i}=i, x_{i}=1$ if $\pi_{i}=i-3$, and $x_{i}=2$ otherwise. If $\pi_{i}=t$ with $i \in\{1, \ldots, 8 m\}$ and $t \in\{8 m+1, \ldots, 8 m+k\}$, it implies $\pi_{i}$ must have been swapped with $\pi_{t}=t$ in the final stage of algorithm $A_{8 m+k}$. Thus we can just swap the value of $\pi_{i}$ and $\pi_{t}$ first and then determine $x$ by the above approach. We give the algorithm $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$ as follows.

Table 3: Path Table of $\pi_{i}, i=8 k+8+j, j \in\{1,2,3,4\}$

| $i=8 k+8+j, j \in\{1,2,3,4\}, i \in[n], k \in\left\{0, \ldots,\left\lfloor\frac{n}{8}\right\rfloor-1\right\}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $i$ is odd |  | $i$ is even |  |
|  | $\pi_{i}$ |  | $\pi_{i}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \pi_{i-8}^{1} \\ x_{i-8}=2, \\ x_{i-4}=2 \end{gathered}$ | $i-10$ | $x_{i-10}=1, x_{i-9}=1$ | $i-9$ | $x_{i-9}=1, x_{i-8} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-9$ | $x_{i-10} \neq 1, x_{i-9}=1$ | $i-8$ | $x_{i-9} \neq 1, x_{i-8} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-8$ | $x_{i-9} \neq 1, x_{i-8} \neq 1$ | $i-7$ (n.a) |  |
|  | $i-7$ | $x_{i-9} \neq 1, x_{i-8}=1$ | $i-6$ (n.a.) |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \pi_{i-4}^{1} \\ x_{i-8} \neq 2 \\ x_{i-4}=2 \end{gathered}$ | $i-6$ | $x_{i-6}=1, x_{i-5}=1$ | $i-5$ | $x_{i-5}=1, x_{i-4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-5$ | $x_{i-6} \neq 1, x_{i-5}=1$ | $i-4$ | $x_{i-5} \neq 1, x_{i-4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-4$ | $x_{i-5} \neq 1, x_{i-4} \neq 1$ | $i-3$ (n.a.) |  |
|  | $i-3$ (n.a.) |  | $i-2$ (n.a.) |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pi_{i}^{1} \\ & x_{i-4} \neq 2 \\ & x_{i} \neq 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $i-2$ | $x_{i-2}=1, x_{i-1}=1$ | $i-1$ | $x_{i-1}=1, x_{i} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-1$ | $x_{i-2} \neq 1, x_{i-1}=1$ | $\imath$ | $x_{i-1} \neq 1, x_{i} \neq 1$ |
|  | 2 | $x_{i-1} \neq 1, x_{i} \neq 1$ | $i+1$ | $x_{i}=1, x_{i+1} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+1$ | $x_{i-1} \neq 1, x_{i}=1$ | $i+2$ | $x_{i}=1, x_{i+1}=1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pi_{i+4}^{1} \\ & x_{i-4} \neq 2 \\ & x_{i}=2 \end{aligned}$ | $i+2$ | $x_{i+2}=1, x_{i+3}=1$ | $i+3$ | $x_{i+3}=1, x_{i+4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+3$ | $x_{i+2} \neq 1, x_{i+3}=1$ | $i+4$ | $x_{i+3} \neq 1, x_{i+4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+4$ | $x_{i+3} \neq 1, x_{i+4} \neq 1$ | $i+5$ | $x_{i+4}=1, x_{i+5} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+5$ | $x_{i+3} \neq 1, x_{i+4}=1$ | $i+6$ | $x_{i+4}=1, x_{i+5}=1$ |

Table 4: Path Table of $\pi_{i}, i=8 k+4+j, j \in\{1,2,3,4\}$

| $i=8 k+4+j, j \in\{1,2,3,4\}, i \in[n], k \in\left\{0, \ldots,\left\lfloor\frac{n}{8}\right\rfloor-1\right\}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $i$ is odd |  | $i$ is even |  |
|  | $\pi_{i}$ |  | $\pi_{i}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pi_{i-4}^{1} \\ & x_{i} \neq 2, \\ & x_{i-4}=2 \end{aligned}$ | $i-6$ | $x_{i-6}=1, x_{i-5}=1$ | $i-5$ | $x_{i-5}=1, x_{i-4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-5$ | $x_{i-6} \neq 1, x_{i-5}=1$ | $i-4$ | $x_{i-5} \neq 1, x_{i-4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-4$ | $x_{i-5} \neq 1, x_{i-4} \neq 1$ | $i-3$ (n.a.) |  |
|  | $i-3$ (n.a.) |  | $i-2$ (n.a.) |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \pi_{i}^{1} \\ x_{i} \neq 2, \\ x_{i-4} \neq 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $i-2$ | $x_{i-2}=1, x_{i-1}=1$ | $i-1$ | $x_{i-1}=1, x_{i} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i-1$ | $x_{i-2} \neq 1, x_{i-1}=1$ | $i$ | $x_{i-1} \neq 1, x_{i} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i$ | $x_{i-1} \neq 1, x_{i} \neq 1$ | $i+1$ | $x_{i}=1, x_{i+1} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+1$ | $x_{i-1} \neq 1, x_{i}=1$ | $i+2$ | $x_{i}=1, x_{i+1}=1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \pi_{i+4}^{1} \\ & x_{i}=2, \\ & x_{i+4} \neq 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $i+2$ | $x_{i+2}=1, x_{i+3}=1$ | $i+3$ | $x_{i+3}=1, x_{i+4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+3$ | $x_{i+2} \neq 1, x_{i+3}=1$ | $i+4$ | $x_{i+3} \neq 1, x_{i+4} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+4$ | $x_{i+3} \neq 1, x_{i+4} \neq 1$ | $i+5$ | $x_{i+4}=1, x_{i+5} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+5$ | $x_{i+3} \neq 1, x_{i+4}=1$ | $i+6$ | $x_{i+4}=1, x_{i+5}=1$ |
| $\pi_{i+8}^{1}$ | $i+6$ | $x_{i+6}=1, x_{i+7}=1$ | $i+7$ | $x_{i+7}=1, x_{i+8} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+7$ | $x_{i+6} \neq 1, x_{i+7}=1$ | $i+8$ | $x_{i+7} \neq 1, x_{i+8} \neq 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & x_{i}=2, \\ & x_{i+4}=2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $i+8$ | $x_{i+7} \neq 1, x_{i+8} \neq 1$ | $i+9$ | $x_{i+8}=1, x_{i+9} \neq 1$ |
|  | $i+9$ | $x_{i+7} \neq 1, x_{i+8}=1$ | $i+10$ | $x_{i+8}=1, x_{i+9}=1$ |

Algorithm $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}(8 m \geq 16, k \in[0,7]):$
(1) For all $i$ in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$, check whether $\pi_{8 m+i}$ is $8 m+i$ or $i-3$ or others, then assign the corresponding value 0,1 , or 2 , to $x_{8 m+i}$ respectively.
(2) For all $i$ in $\{1, \ldots, 8 m\}$, if $\pi_{i}$ is larger than $8 m$, then swap $\left(\pi_{i}, \pi_{\pi_{i}}\right)$.
(3) For each $\pi_{i}, i \in\{1, \ldots, 8 m\}$, let $B_{i}$ be an empty bucket for $x_{i}$. By the value of $i$ and $\pi_{i}$, find the corresponding entries in Table 3 or Table 4. If it is not in the tables or not applicable(n.a), then do nothing. Else determine the values of four positions of $x$, from which obtain $x_{i}=b$ by checking the tables, put $b$ to $B_{i}$ if $b \in\{1,2\}$. If $b \notin\{1,2\}$, then put 0 to $B_{i}$.
(4) Determine $x_{i}$ by a weighted majority vote. In each bucket, ' 0 ' has weight 0.5 ; ' 1 ' and ' 2 ' each has weight 1 . For each $i$ in $\{1, \ldots, 8 m\}$, check $B_{i}$, assign $x_{i}$ to be the value $b \in\{0,1,2\}$ with the largest weight. If tie, choose the larger value.

First we use $\pi_{8 m+i}$ to decide $x_{8 m+i}$ for all $i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$. One can verify that if $\pi_{8 m+k}$ is not corrupted then $x_{8 m+k}$ is correct. Next for $i \in\{1, \ldots, 8 m\}$, if $\pi_{i}>8 m$, it implies $A_{8 m+k}$ swaps $\pi_{i}$ and $\pi_{\pi_{i}}$, and then we should swap them. Third, bucket $B_{i}$ is used to collect the votes (information) of $x_{i}$. For each $\pi_{i}=t$, one can determine the values of $x$ in four positions by checking Table 3 and Table 4. If $x_{i}=b \in\{1,2\}$ then put $b$ to $B_{i}$; if $x_{i} \notin\{1,2\}$ then put ' 0 ' to $B_{i}$. For example, if $\pi_{5}=12$, then it will put ' 2 ' to $B_{5}$ and $B_{9}$, put ' 1 ' to $B_{12}$ and put ' 0 ' to $B_{11}$. Finally for each bucket $B_{i}$, make a weighted majority vote to determine the value of $x_{i}$. Because if it gives $x_{i} \neq 1$ (or 2 ) then we put 0 to the bucket but the vote 0 does not guarantee $x_{i}$ is 0 , thus we give 0 half weight in the weighted majority vote. If tie, choose the larger value. Note that Step (3) also indicates that Algorithm $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$ can handle erasure error.

Each $\pi_{i}^{\prime}$ contributes information in at most 4 positions of $x$. For each $x_{i}$, four positions of $\pi^{\prime}$ contribute correct information of $x_{i}$, if $\pi^{\prime}$ is not corrupted, since each $x_{i}$ is used to decide whether to swap two positions or not in PASS 1, likewise in PASS 2. Thus it reveals some information about $x_{i}$ by checking the path of those four symbols.

The inverse algorithm $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$ works well if $\pi$ is not corrupted. Let us consider the corrupted $\pi^{\prime}$. By Tables 3 and 4, each error will give wrong information in at most 4 positions of $x$, and also lose correct information in at most 4 positions of $x$. It immediately gives a rough bound $d_{H}\left(A_{8 m+k}^{-1}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right), x\right) \leq 8 \cdot d_{H}\left(\pi, \pi^{\prime}\right)$. Here we give a better bound by analyzing it more carefully. Let $\pi=A_{8 m+k}(x)$ be the correct codeword of $x$, and $\pi^{\prime}$ a corrupted permutation.
Claim 1. $d_{H}\left(A_{8 m+k}^{-1}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right), x\right) \leq 4 \cdot d_{H}\left(\pi, \pi^{\prime}\right)+k$
Proof. Let $x^{\prime}=A_{8 m+k}^{-1}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)$. First note $\left|B_{i}\right|=4$ for all $i \in\{1, \ldots, 8 m\}$ if $\pi^{\prime}$ is not corrupted by Table 3 and Table 4. Furthermore, it is easy to verify $B_{i}=\{2,2,0,0\}$ if $x_{i}=2, B_{i}=\{1,1,0,0\}$ if $x_{i}=1$ and $B_{i}=\{0,0,0,0\}$ if $x_{i}=0$. Observe that adding any extra vote to $B_{i}$ or taking any vote from $B_{i}$ would not change the result of the weighted majority vote. It implies that once the result of the weighted majority vote is wrong, then it must have at least two wrong votes from two corrupted $\pi_{i}^{\prime \prime}$ s. Each $\pi_{i}^{\prime}$ votes in at most four buckets and it causes at most eight changes on the
buckets, since a wrong vote can have two effects, i.e., removing a vote from one bucket and adding an extra vote to another.

Now we estimate the total effects of the corrupted positions. Let $d_{H}\left(\pi_{[1,8 m]}, \pi_{[1,8 m]}^{\prime}\right)=d_{1}$, $d_{H}\left(\pi_{[8 m+1,8 m+k]}, \pi_{[8 m+1,8 m+k]}^{\prime}\right)=d_{2}$, and $d=d_{1}+d_{2}$. It's clear $d_{H}\left(x_{[8 m+1,8 m+k]}, x_{[8 m+1,8 m+k]}^{\prime}\right) \leq d_{2}$ because $\pi_{i}=\pi_{i}^{\prime}$ implies $x_{i}=x_{i}^{\prime}$ for $i \in[8 m+1,8 m+k]$. For each $\pi_{i} \neq \pi_{i}^{\prime}$ with $i \in[8 m]$, by the above observation, it causes at most $8 / 2=4$ wrong decisions on average in the weighted majority vote. For each $i \in[8 m]$ with $\pi_{i}=\pi_{i}^{\prime}$, if $\pi_{i}^{\prime}>8 m$, even $\pi_{i}^{\prime}$ is not corrupted, the corresponding $\pi_{\pi_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ could be corrupted already. Each corrupted $\pi_{\pi_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ adds wrong information to at most 8 buckets. But there are at most $d_{2}$ such $\pi_{\pi_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. Thus $d_{H}\left(x_{[1,8 m]}, x_{[1,8 m]}^{\prime}\right) \leq 4 *\left(d_{1}+d_{2}\right)=4 d$. Finally, we have $d_{H}\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)=d_{H}\left(x_{[1,8 m]}, x_{[1,8 m]}^{\prime}\right)+d_{H}\left(x_{[8 m+1,8 m+k]}, x_{[8 m+1,8 m+k]}^{\prime}\right) \leq 4 d+k \leq 4 \cdot d_{H}\left(\pi, \pi^{\prime}\right)+k$.

Let us return to the decoding issue. Let $D_{P}=D \circ A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$ and $d \leq e / 4-2$ be the number of errors in $\pi^{\prime}$. By Claim 1, $d_{H}\left(x, x^{\prime}\right) \leq 4 d+k \leq 4(e / 4-2)+7 \leq e$. Thus $D_{P}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)=D\left(A_{8 m+k}^{-1}\left(\pi^{\prime}\right)\right)=$ $D\left(x^{\prime}\right)=x$ by the definition of $D$. We conclude that the decoding algorithm is efficient because $D$ and $A_{8 m+k}^{-1}$ are both efficient and can correct up to $e / 4-2$ errors. The above proves the following theorem.

Theorem 2. For all $n \geq 16$ and $d \leq n$, suppose $C$ is an $(n, d)$ ternary code and $P$ is an $(n, d)$ permutation array generated by $A_{8 m+k}$. If $C$ has an efficient encoding/decoding algorithm pair, then there is an efficient encoding/decoding algorithm pair for P. Furthermore, if the decoding algorithm of $C$ can correct up to e errors, then the decoding algorithm of $P$ can decode correctly when the corrupted codeword $\pi^{\prime}$ satisfies $d_{H}\left(\pi, \pi^{\prime}\right) \leq e / 4-2$, for some codeword $\pi \in P$.

Note that the decoding scheme will also work when the received corrupted codeword $y \in$ $\{1,2, \cdots, n\}^{n}$ is not a permutation but satisfies $d_{H}(\pi, y) \leq e / 4-2$, for some codeword $\pi \in P$.

In most cases, we take $n$ as a multiple of 8 and then the decoding algorithm $D_{P}$ guarantees to correct up to $e / 4$ errors. In particular, the decoding algorithm can decode almost correctly when the error does not exceed $e / 4$ too much. This leads us to conjecture that the bound $e / 4$ may not be tight.
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