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Abstract—Real-valued lattices and complex-valued lattices are mutually convertible, thus we can take advantages of algebraic integers to defined good lattice quantizers in the real-valued domain. In this paper, we adopt complex integers to define generalized checkerboard lattices, especially $\mathcal{E}_m$ and $\mathcal{E}_m^*$ defined by Eisenstein integers. Using $\mathcal{E}_m^*$, we report the best lattice quantizers in dimensions 14, 18, 20, and 22. Their product lattices with integers $\mathbb{Z}$ also yield better quantizers in dimensions 15, 19, 21, and 23. The Conway-Sloane type fast decoding algorithms for $\mathcal{E}_m$ and $\mathcal{E}_m^*$ are given.
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I. INTRODUCTION

T HE theory of lattices has been used to achieved remarkable breakthroughs in a wide range of fields, ranging from coding theory [1]–[3] to cryptography [4]–[6]. Most of the applications require the construction of good lattices in terms of sphere-packing or quantization. For a long time sphere-packing has attracted the attention of Mathematicians, and many low-dimensional dense lattices have been found [7], whose optimality has been proved in dimensions 3, 8, and 24 [8]–[10].

While a good lattice should feature a small packing density in (lattice) sphere packing, in quantization we need its normalized second moment (NSM) to be as small as possible. Optimal lattices for quantization are however less developed. In dimensions $13 \leq n \leq 15$ and $17 \leq n \leq 23$, the best quantizers have long been $D_n^*$ and $A_n^*$, which are above Zador’s upper bound [11]. Recently Agrell and Allen [12] have proposed optimal product lattices and improved lattice quantizers in dimensions 13 to 15, 17 to 23, and 25 to 48, which are the first reported lattices with normalized second moments below the Zador upper bound. Nevertheless, [12][Thm. 7] has shown that these product lattices are not even locally optimal.

Good lattices can be built from an algebraic approach [7] or a random-search approach [13]. As nature favors symmetry, most good lattices for quantization have exhibited a high degree of symmetry. On way to construct algebraic lattices is by using high order rings of number fields and canonical embedding to obtain real-valued lattices. Another possible way is to defined complex-valued lattices from rings of imaginary quadratic fields, and map them to real-valued versions. By introducing complex Constructions A and B to lift linear codes to lattices, Conway and Sloane [7] (Chap. 7) have shown that many optimal low-dimensional lattices can be produced. Algebraic lattices often enjoy faster decoding algorithms. E.g., complex lattices defined by Gaussian integers and Eisenstein integers have been used to construct lattice reduction algorithms which are about 50% faster than their counterparts [14], [15].

This paper aims to further investigate complex-valued lattices for quantization, with the hope of reaching smaller NSM and faster decoding algorithms. The contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We design low-dimensional complex-valued lattices, referred to as generalized checkerboard lattices. Their lattice bases are lower-triangular and sparse, which cost little storage. Their corresponding real-valued lattices fill the knowledge gap of small-dimensional optimal lattices for quantization. The $\mathcal{E}_m^*$ lattices based on Eisenstein integers exhibit the smallest NSM in dimensions 14, 18, 20, and 22, which are 0.06852, 0.06866, 0.06853, and 0.06851, respectively. These lattices can also be extended to product lattices to achieve the best quantizers in dimensions 15, 19, 21, and 23.

- We present the Conway-Sloane type fast decoding algorithms for the proposed generalized checkerboard lattices. The Conway-Sloane type decoding refers to the decoding principle of using coset decomposition, in which decoding over each coset is fast and simple. By counting the complexity of the algorithm by the number of visited lattice vectors, the worst-case complexity of the proposed algorithms in $\mathcal{E}_m$ and $\mathcal{E}_m^*$ are 4 and 16 visited nodes, respectively. Thus fast quantization algorithms over the generalized checkerboard lattices have been enabled.

Notation: Matrices and column vectors are denoted by uppercase and lowercase boldface letters. The sets of all rationals, integers, real and complex numbers are denoted by $\mathbb{Q}$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$, respectively. $\oplus$, $\otimes$ and $\circlearrowright$ denote the direct sum, the Kronecker tensor product and the Cartesian product, respectively. $\sum(\cdot)$ represents the summation of all the components in a vector.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Real-valued Lattices

Definition 1 (Real lattice). An $n$-dimensional lattice $\Lambda$ is a discrete additive subgroup of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq n$. Based on $n$ linearly independent vectors $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\Lambda$ can be written as

$$\Lambda = \{z_1b_1 + z_2b_2 + \cdots + z_nb_n, z_1, \ldots, z_n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \quad (1)$$
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The matrix \( B = [b_1, \ldots, b_n] \) is referred to as a generator matrix (lattice basis) of \( \Lambda \).

The nearest neighbor quantizer \( Q_{\Lambda}(\cdot) \) is defined as
\[
Q_{\Lambda}(x) = \arg\min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|x - \lambda\|.
\]
(2)
The quantizer is based on a decoding algorithm which solves the closest vector problem (CVP) \([16]\) of lattices.

The fundamental Voronoi region \( V_{\Lambda} \) of a lattice \( \Lambda \) is the set of points which are quantized to the zero vector:
\[
V_{\Lambda} = \{ x : Q_{\Lambda}(x) = 0 \}.
\]
(3)
The normalized second moment (NSM) of a lattice \( \Lambda \) is defined by
\[
G_n(\Lambda) = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\Lambda)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \int_{x \in V_{\Lambda}} \|x\|^2 dx
\]
(4)
where \( \text{Vol}(\Lambda) = \det(B^T B)^{1/2} \) is referred to as the volume of a lattice.

**B. Complex-valued Lattices**

**Definition 2** (Quadratic field). A quadratic field is an algebraic number field \( \mathbb{K} \) of degree \( |\mathbb{K} : \mathbb{Q}| = 2 \) over \( \mathbb{Q} \). With \( d > 0 \) and being a square free integer, we say \( \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-d}) \) is an imaginary quadratic field.

**Definition 3** (Complex integers). The set of algebraic integers in \( \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-d}) \) forms a ring of integers denoted as \( \mathbb{Z}[\xi] \).

By setting \( d = 1 \), we obtain the set of Gaussian integers \( \mathbb{Z}[i] \), \( i \neq \sqrt{-1} \). By setting \( d = 3 \), we obtain the set of Eisenstein integers \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), \( \omega = \frac{1 + \sqrt{-3}}{2} \) (\( \omega \) is set as the sixth root of unity for convenience, rather than the third root of unity).

**Definition 4** (Complex lattice [14]). A complex lattice is a discrete \( \mathbb{Z}[\xi] \)-submodule of \( \mathbb{C}^{m'} \) that has a basis, \( m' \geq m \). Let \( b_1, \ldots, b_m \) be \( m \) linearly independent vectors in \( \mathbb{C}^{m'} \), a complex \( \mathbb{Z}[\xi] \) lattice \( \Lambda \) can be written as
\[
\bar{\Lambda} = \{ \bar{\varepsilon}_1 b_1 + \bar{\varepsilon}_2 b_2 + \cdots + \bar{\varepsilon}_m b_m : \bar{\varepsilon}_1, \ldots, \bar{\varepsilon}_m \in \mathbb{Z}[\xi] \}
\]
(5)
The matrix \( B = [b_1, \ldots, b_m] \) is referred to as a generator matrix of \( \Lambda \).

\( \bar{\Lambda} \) has an equivalent \( 2m \)-dimensional real-valued lattice \( \bar{\Lambda}^\mathbb{R} \) whose real-valued generator matrix is
\[
B_{\bar{\Lambda}} = \begin{bmatrix} \Re (B) & -\Im (B) \\ \Im (B) & \Re (B) \end{bmatrix} \left( \Phi_{\mathbb{Z}[\xi]} \otimes I_n \right),
\]
(6)
where \( \Phi_{\mathbb{Z}[\xi]} \) denotes the real-valued generator of \( \mathbb{Z}[\xi] \), and
\[
\Phi_{\mathbb{Z}[i]} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},
\]
(7)
\[
\Phi_{\mathbb{Z}[\omega]} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1/2 \\ 0 & \sqrt{3}/2 \end{bmatrix}
\]
(8)
The volume and the NSM of \( \bar{\Lambda} \) can both be defined by \( \bar{\Lambda}^\mathbb{R} \):
\[
\text{Vol}(\bar{\Lambda}) \triangleq \text{Vol}(\bar{\Lambda}^\mathbb{R}) = | \det(B^T B) | \left( \Phi_{\mathbb{Z}[\xi]} \right)^m,
\]
(9)
\[
G_m(\bar{\Lambda}) \triangleq G_{2m}(\bar{\Lambda}^\mathbb{R}).
\]
(10)

**III. COMPLEX LATTICES OVER EISENSTEIN INTEGERS: CONSTRUCTION AND DECODING**

**A. Construction of \( \mathcal{E}_m \) and \( \mathcal{E}_m^\perp \)**

**Definition 5**. Let \( \omega \) be a complex unit of \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \). The \( \mathcal{E}_m \) lattice is a \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \)-sublattice of \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega]^m \) defined as
\[
\mathcal{E}_m = \{ (\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_m) \in \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m : \bar{x}_1 + \cdots + \bar{x}_m \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \}.
\]
(11)

For this definition, the complex generator of \( \mathcal{E}_m \) in one dimension is simply \( 1 + \omega \). In dimensions larger than two, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 6**. If \( \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m \in \mathcal{E}_m \) are \( m \) linearly independent vectors satisfying
1) \( \sum(\beta_1) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega], \ldots, \sum(\beta_m) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \),
2) \( |\det([\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m])|^2 = 3 \),
then \( \{ \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m \} \) is a lattice basis of \( \mathcal{E}_m \).

**Proof**: Condition 1 guarantees that \( \{ \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m \} \) forms either a full lattice or a sublattice of \( \mathcal{E}_m \). Since \( \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m \) consists of
\[
\{ (\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_m) \in \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m : \bar{x}_1 + \cdots + \bar{x}_m \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \} \\
\cup \{ (\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_m) \in \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m : \bar{x}_1 + \cdots + \bar{x}_m \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + 1 \}
\cup \{ (\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_m) \in \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m : \bar{x}_1 + \cdots + \bar{x}_m \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + \omega \},
\]
the lattice \( \mathcal{E}_m \) has a nesting ratio of 3 over \( \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m \). Thus the condition of \( |\det([\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m])|^2 = 3 \) justifies that \( \{ \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m \} \) cannot be a sublattice of \( \mathcal{E}_m \).

We instantiate one lattice basis of \( \mathcal{E}_m \) as
\[
\bar{B}_{\mathcal{E}_m} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{m-1} & 0_{1 \times (m-1)} \omega x_{(m-1)} \\ \omega & 1 + \omega \end{bmatrix} \triangleq [\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \ldots, \bar{b}_m],
\]
(12)
where \( I_{m-1}, 0_{1 \times (m-1)}, 1_{1 \times (m-1)} \) denote an identity matrix, a column vector of zeros, and a row vector of ones. The subscripts indicate their dimensions.

Since \( \sum_{k=1}^m \bar{b}_k = 0 \), \( \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \ldots, \bar{b}_m \) are also linear independent, they can construct a lattice.

**Definition 7**. Let \( m \geq 2 \). The \( \mathcal{E}^+_m \) lattice is
\[
\mathcal{E}^+_m = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]d/2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\omega]b_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\omega]b_m,
\]
(13)
where \( d = \sum_{k=1}^m b_k = [1, 1, \ldots, m\omega + 1]^T \).

As such, the lattice basis of \( \mathcal{E}^+_m \) can be written as
\[
\bar{B}_{\mathcal{E}^+_m} = [d/2, \bar{b}_2, \ldots, \bar{b}_m].
\]
(14)
For instance, the generator matrix of \( \mathcal{E}^+_4 \) is represented by
\[
B_{\mathcal{E}^+_4} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1/2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 4(\omega + 1)/2 & \omega & \omega & 1 + \omega \end{bmatrix}.
\]
(15)

**Theorem 8**. The \( \mathcal{E}^+_m \) lattice is equivalent to the union of \( \mathcal{E}_m \) cosets:
\[
\mathcal{E}^+_m = \mathcal{E}_m \cup (\mathcal{E}_m + \frac{d}{2}) \cup (\mathcal{E}_m + \omega \frac{d}{2}) \cup (\mathcal{E}_m + \omega^* \frac{d}{2}).
\]
(16)
By substituting Eq. (19) into (13), the theorem is proved.

We have

\[ \mathcal{E}_m = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]b_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \times b_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\omega]b_m = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]d \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\omega]b_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Z}[\omega]b_m. \]  

(17)

By using the decomposition of \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) w.r.t. \( 2\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), i.e.,

\[ \mathbb{Z}[\omega] = 2\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \cup (2\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + 1) \cup (2\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + \omega) \cup (2\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + \omega^*), \]

we have

\[ \mathbb{Z}[\omega]d/2 = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]d \cup (\mathbb{Z}[\omega]d + d/2) \cup \cdots \cup (\mathbb{Z}[\omega]d + \omega^*d/2), \]

(18)

By substituting Eq. (19) into (13), the theorem is proved.

\[ \text{Remark 9. The } \mathcal{E}_m^+ \text{ lattice is new, but } \mathcal{E}_m \text{ can be related to existing lattices. Recall that two lattices are said to be equivalent if we can obtain one of them from the other by rotation, reflection, a change of scale, and a unimodular multiplication to the lattice basis. Then } \mathcal{E}_m^+ \text{ is equivalent to the following lattices:} \]

\[ \{(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m : x_1 + \cdots + x_m \in (1 + \omega)\omega^k\mathbb{Z}[\omega], \}

\[ k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, 5. \]

(20)

They share the same nesting ratio of 3 over \( \mathbb{Z}[\xi]^m \).

**Proposition 10.** \( E_6^+ \) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{E}_3 \).

\[ \text{Proof: With reference to } [17], \text{ the complex lattice bases of } E_6^+ \text{ can be written as} \]

\[ \mathcal{B}_{E_6^+} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \]

(21)

This lattice is generated by setting the sum of coordinates as \( (1 + \omega)\omega^k\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \). Based on Eq. (20) the proposition is proved.

\[ \text{Remark 11. } \mathcal{E}_m \text{ can also be interpreted as the complex Construction A [17][Page 197] over ternary even-parity codes, but not over binary even-parity codes. By using Eisenstein integers and a complex number } 1 + \omega, \text{ for binary even-parity codes the lattice generator matrix can be written as} \]

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{m-1} & 0_{1 \times (m-1)} & 1 + \omega \\ 0_{1 \times (m-1)} & \mathbf{I}_{m-1} \end{bmatrix}. \]

(22)

As the summation of the first \( m - 1 \) vectors are not in \( (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), decoding of such lattices can only be performed using the cosets of \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega]^m \) with respect to the even-parity codewords.

B. Decoding of \( \mathcal{E}_m \) and \( \mathcal{E}_m^+ \)

Recall that CVP is, with a complex-valued query point \( \bar{y} \), to find the closet lattice vector of it. In this section, by taking advantages of the internal structure of coset decomposition, fast decoding algorithms for \( \mathcal{E}_m \) and \( \mathcal{E}_m^+ \) are presented. We call them Conway-Sloane type [18] algorithms.

1) Decoding of \( \mathcal{E}_m \): In dimension \( m = 1 \), the decoding problem is equivalent to finding the nearest neighbor with respect to \( (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \). The 2-dimensional real-valued generator matrix of \( (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) has the form

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \frac{3}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \]

Then we employ two CVPs over a square lattice \( \Lambda' \) and its coset \( \Lambda' + [\frac{3}{\sqrt{3}}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}]^T \), where the real-valued basis of \( \Lambda' \) is

\[ \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \]

In dimensions \( m \geq 2 \), the closest vector to \( \bar{y} \) can only arise in 4 possible scenarios, consisting of “no flip”, “one close flip”, “one far flip”, and “two close flips”. As shown in Fig. 1.

“Case 1” is when all coordinates of \( y \) are within the Voronoi cell of \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), and the summation of \( Q_{2\mathbb{Z}[\omega]}(y_j) \) belongs to \( (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \). If “Case 1” is not met, we have to flip one/two of the \( Q_{2\mathbb{Z}[\omega]}(y_j) \) to obtain the desired result. “Case 2” is when we flip the \( Q_{2\mathbb{Z}[\omega]}(y_j) \) which is the closest to its neighboring lattice point. “Case 3” is when we are not going to flip a \( Q_{2\mathbb{Z}[\omega]}(y_j) \) with respect to a refined subset, and “Case 4” is when we have to flip two \( Q_{2\mathbb{Z}[\omega]}(y_j) \) which are the closest ones to the Voronoi region boarders.

The details are explained as follows. Firstly, we quantize each component of \( y \) into \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), obtaining

\[ \bar{x}_1 = Q_{2\mathbb{Z}[\omega]}(\bar{y}). \]

(23)

Recall that \( \mathcal{E}_m \) is a sublattice of \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega]^m \) satisfying \( \bar{x}_1 + \cdots + \bar{x}_m \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \). Then if \( \text{sum}(\bar{x}_1) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), we output \( \bar{x}_1 \) as the closest vector and the algorithm terminates. This corresponds to Case 1 in Fig. 1.

Secondly, if \( \text{sum}(\bar{x}_1) \notin (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), we find the second closest vector to \( \bar{y} \) in \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega]^m \). Define

\[ \bar{r} \triangleq \bar{y} - \bar{x}_1. \]

(24)

For each component \( \bar{r}_k \) of \( \bar{r} \) it has a close component among the 6 Voronoi relevant vectors

\[ S = \{1, \omega, \omega^3, \omega^4, \omega^5\}, \]

(25)

referred to as \( \omega^{\ell(k)} \). We define the incremental distance function \( \text{dist}(\cdot) \) as

\[ \text{dist}(\bar{r}_k) = |\omega^{\ell(k)} - \bar{r}_k| - |\bar{r}_k|^2. \]

(26)

The vector in \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega]^m \) with the smallest incremental distance is the second closest vector to \( \bar{y} \). Let \( r_1 \) be the component with the smallest incremental distance, then the second estimate is given by

\[ \bar{x}_2 = \bar{x}_1 + (0, \ldots, \omega^{\ell(l)}, \ldots, 0). \]

(27)

If \( \text{sum}(\bar{x}_2) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), we output \( \bar{x}_2 \) as the closest vector and the algorithm terminates. This corresponds to Case 2 in Fig. 1.

Lastly, if Case 2 has failed, it implies that the flip in

\[ \mathcal{S}_1 = \{1, \omega^2, \omega^4\}, \]

(28)
or

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \{\omega, \omega^3, \omega^5\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

cannot meet the requirement of \(\text{sum}(\cdot) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega]\). Then the closest vector to \(\tilde{y}\) must be coming from either a far flip or two close flips of \(x_1\). Without lost of generality, assume that the close flip in Case 2 happens in \(S_1\). By saying a far flip, it means that we search for the smallest incremental distance over \(S_2\); and by saying two close flips, we search for the two smallest incremental distances over \(S_1\). The two scenarios correspond to Cases 3 and 4 in Fig. 1. The candidate which is closer to \(\tilde{y}\) among Cases 3 and 4 is denoted as \(x_3\). The algorithm output \(x_3\) and terminates.

Hereby we explain why \(\text{sum}(x_3) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega]\), such that Cases 3 and 4 must succeed. Notice that \(1 + \omega^2 = 3\), and

$$\mathbb{Z}[\omega] = (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \cup \{(1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + 1\} \cup \{(1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + \omega\}. \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

If Cases 1 and 2 fail, which means \(\text{sum}(x_1) \notin (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega]\) and \(\text{sum}(x_1) \notin (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + 1\), or \(\text{sum}(x_1) \notin (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega]\) and \(\text{sum}(x_1) \notin (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + \omega\), then based on Eq. (30) we have

$$\text{sum}(x_1) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + \omega, \text{ or } \text{sum}(x_1) \in (1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega] + 1. \hspace{1cm} (31)$$

Thus Cases 3 and 4 are simply searching for the closest \(\mathbb{Z}[\omega]\) vector to \(\tilde{y}\) based on the constraint in Eq. (31).

2) Decoding of \(\mathcal{E}_m^+\). The CVP algorithm for \(\mathcal{E}_m^+\) consists of the CVP algorithm for each of the \(\mathcal{E}_m\) cosets. For instance, to decode (16), we calculate

$$\tilde{x}_1 = Q_{\mathcal{E}_m}(\tilde{y}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

$$\tilde{x}_2 = Q_{\mathcal{E}_m}(\tilde{y} - \tilde{d}) + \tilde{d},$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

$$\tilde{x}_3 = Q_{\mathcal{E}_m}(\tilde{y} - \omega\tilde{d}) + \omega\tilde{d},$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

$$\tilde{x}_4 = Q_{\mathcal{E}_m}(\tilde{y} - \omega^2\tilde{d}) + \omega^2\tilde{d}. \hspace{1cm} (35)$$

The final estimate is the closest one to \(\tilde{y}\):

$$\hat{x} = \arg \min_{\tilde{x}_k, k=1,2,3,4} ||\tilde{x}_k - \tilde{y}||. \hspace{1cm} (36)$$

C. Decoding complexity

We count the complexity of the algorithm by the number of visited lattice vectors. The worst-case complexity of the proposed algorithms in \(\mathcal{E}_m\) and \(\mathcal{E}_m^+\) are 4 and 16 visited nodes, respectively.

It is noteworthy that Conway and Sloane [17] have presented a decoding algorithm for \(E_n^0\), which also works for \(\mathcal{E}_m\). But the decoding complexity costs \(3^{m-1}\) visited nodes. Specifically, the method is to factorize \(\mathcal{E}_m\) as the union of \((1 + \omega)\mathbb{Z}[\omega]^m\). Thus its number of cosets grows exponentially with \(m\).

IV. Extensions

A. Other complex lattices

In the case of Eisenstein integers, we can similarly defined

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,1+\omega} = \mathcal{E}_m \cup (\mathcal{E}_m + \frac{\vec{d}}{1 + \omega}) \cup (\mathcal{E}_m + \omega \frac{\vec{d}}{1 + \omega}), \hspace{1cm} (37)$$

which employs Eq. (30) to factorize \(\mathbb{Z}[\omega]\).

The generalized checkerboard lattices can also be defined by using Gaussian integers \(\mathbb{Z}[i]\):

$$\mathcal{G}_m = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathbb{Z}[i]^m : x_1 + \cdots + x_m \in (1 + i)\mathbb{Z}[i]\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)

$$\mathcal{G}_m^+ = \mathcal{G}_m \cup (\mathcal{G}_m + \frac{\vec{p}}{2}) \cup (\mathcal{G}_m + \frac{\vec{p}}{2}) \cup (\mathcal{G}_m + (1 + i)\frac{\vec{p}}{2}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (39)

$$\mathcal{G}_{m,1+i}^+ = \mathcal{G}_m \cup (\mathcal{G}_m + \frac{\vec{p}}{1+i}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (40)

where \(\vec{p} = [1,1,\ldots,mi+1]^\top\). For completeness, we also present the Conway-Sloane type CVP algorithms for \(\mathcal{G}_m\) in Appendix A. The CVP algorithms of \(\mathcal{G}_m^+\) and \(\mathcal{G}_{m,1+i}^+\) are straightforward.

These extensions cannot discover better lattices, but they can re-produce some optimal lattices in small dimensions.

**Proposition 12.** \(D_4\) is equivalent to \(G_2\), \(E_8\) is equivalent to \(G_{4,1+\omega}^+\).

**Proof:** By using complex Construction A [7][Chap. 7], the equivalence between \(D_4\) and \(G_2\) is straightforward. Regarding \(E_8\), its complex lattice basis can be written as [19]:

$$\mathcal{B}_{E_8} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 + i & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 + i & 2i & -2 & 0 \\ 1 + i & 0 & 2i & 2 + 2i \end{bmatrix}. \hspace{1cm} (41)$$
Then we have \( 2B_{g_{m,1+i}} U = B_{E_{m}} \), in which
\[
B_{g_{m,1+i}} = \begin{bmatrix}
1/(1+i) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1/(1+i) & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1/(1+i) & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
(1+4i)/(1+i) & i & i & 1+i
\end{bmatrix}
\]
(42)
\[
\hat{U} = \begin{bmatrix}
i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & i & -1 & 0 \\
-2i & 1 & 1+i & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]
(43)

Since \( \hat{U} \) is unimodular, the proposition is proved.

The proposed \( \mathcal{E}_m, \mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{E}_{n,1+i}, \mathcal{G}_m, \mathcal{G}_{m,1+i} \) and \( \mathcal{G}^+_m, \mathcal{G}^+_n, \mathcal{G}^+_{m,1+i} \) are collectively referred to as generalized checkerboard lattices, because the design principle is similar to those of the checkerboard lattices \( D_n \) and \( D_n^+ \). The sum of a vector in \( D_n \) equals to an even number, while the sum of a vector in \( \mathcal{E}_m \) or \( \mathcal{G}_m \) belongs to an ideal of the ring of imaginary quadratic fields. \( D_n^+ \) is defined by the cosets of \( D_n \), while \( \mathcal{E}_m^+, \mathcal{E}_{n,1+i}^+, \mathcal{G}_m^+ \) and \( \mathcal{G}_{m,1+i}^+ \) are also defined from cosets.

### B. Odd dimensional real-valued lattices

Good complex lattices of dimension \( m \) is equivalent to good lattices of real-valued dimension \( 2m \). For odd dimensions, we can leverage Agrell and Allen’s recent result [12] to construct good lattices from generalized checkerboard lattices.

**Theorem 13** ([12], Cor. 5). For given lattices \( \Lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \) and \( \Lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \), with the optimal choice of \( a \), the product lattice \( \Lambda_{opt} = \Lambda_1 \otimes a \Lambda_2 \) has NSM
\[
G_{n_1+n_2}(\Lambda_{opt}) = G_{n_1}(\Lambda_1)^{n_1/n_1+n_2} G_{n_2}(\Lambda_2)^{n_2/n_1+n_2}.
\]

### V. NSM PERFORMANCE

Deriving the NSM exactly is complicated as it requires a complete description of the Voronoi regions of the generalized checkerboard lattices. Fortunately, based on the proposed fast CVP algorithms, we can use Monte Carlo integration method in [17] to compute the NSM with high accuracy.

Fig. 2 compares the NSM perform of the generalized checkerboard lattices with existing results. Benchmarks include the conjectured lower bound from Conway and Sloane [20], Zador’s upper bound [21], root lattices \( D_n^*, A_n^*, D_n^* \), and the known best lattices (empirically) \( D_4, D_8^+, K_{12}, \Lambda_{16} \), and \( \Lambda_{24} \). Before the recently introduced product lattices in [12], the best known lattices in dimensions \( 13 \leq n \leq 15 \), \( 17 \leq n \leq 23 \) have been lattices \( D_n^* \) and \( A_n^* \) [11], whose NSMs are much larger than Zador’s upper bound.

- In Fig. 2-(a), it shows that \( G_{n}^+(\mathcal{E}_{7}^+) = 0.06952 \), \( G_{7}^+(\mathcal{E}_{7}^+) = 0.06866 \), \( G_{7}^+(\mathcal{E}_{7}^+) = 0.06853 \), and \( G_{7}^+(\mathcal{E}_{7}^+) = 0.06851 \), which achieve the smallest reported NSMs so far. Lattices \( \mathcal{E}_{m,1+i}^+ \) perform better than \( \mathcal{E}_m^+ \) in dimensions \( n \leq 6 \) (\( m \leq 12 \)), where the NSM of \( \mathcal{E}_{6,1+i}^+ \) is extremely close to that of the Coxeter-Todd \( K_{12} \). We use the \( D_n^* \) lattice to reflect what real-valued checkerboard lattices variant can achieve, which are worse than \( \mathcal{E}_m \) and \( \mathcal{E}_{m,1+i} \) in dimensions larger than 12.

### VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have designed generalized checkerboard lattices \( \mathcal{E}_m \) and \( \mathcal{E}_{m,1+i} \) lattices, which not only enjoy fast decoding performance, but exhibit small NSMs in dimensions 14 to 15, 18 to 23. The future work may aim at developing higher dimensional complex lattices for quantization.

![Fig. 2: The NSM performance of the generalized checkerboard lattices.](image-url)
TABLE I: The best known lattice quantizers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real-valued dimension ( n )</th>
<th>Best previously reported ( \Lambda )</th>
<th>NSM</th>
<th>Lattice</th>
<th>( \bar{E}_n )</th>
<th>Lower [20]</th>
<th>Upper [21]</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Better than reported ( \bar{E}_n )</th>
<th>Upper [21]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08333(\overline{3})</td>
<td>( \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>( 0.08333\overline{3} )</td>
<td>0.50000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.080187537</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_1 )</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.080187(\overline{5})</td>
<td>( \bar{A}_2 )</td>
<td>( 0.080187537 )</td>
<td>0.159154943</td>
<td>0.080187537</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_1 \otimes \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07543280</td>
<td>( \bar{A}_3 )</td>
<td>( 0.077874895 )</td>
<td>0.115802581</td>
<td>0.08122715</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>( \bar{G}_2 \otimes \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.076032(\overline{3})</td>
<td>( \bar{D}_4 )</td>
<td>( 0.070680780 )</td>
<td>0.099735570</td>
<td>0.07603235</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>( \bar{G}_2 \otimes \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.075625443</td>
<td>( \bar{D}_5 )</td>
<td>( 0.07456327 )</td>
<td>0.091319469</td>
<td>0.07794301</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_3 \otimes \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.074243697</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_6^2 )</td>
<td>( 0.073474906 )</td>
<td>0.086084334</td>
<td>0.07434</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_3 \otimes \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0731(\overline{1})64903</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_7 )</td>
<td>( 0.072483503 )</td>
<td>0.082478806</td>
<td>0.07548</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>( \bar{G}_2 \otimes \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.071682(\overline{9})099</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_8 )</td>
<td>( 0.071636064 )</td>
<td>0.079824101</td>
<td>0.071682909</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>( \bar{E}_4 \otimes \bar{Z} )</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each component \( \bar{r}_k \) of \( \bar{r} \) it has a close component among the 4 Voronoi relevant vectors

\[
\mathcal{S} = \{i, i^2, i^3, i^4\},
\]

referred to as \( i^{(k)} \). In a nutshell, this is finding the component in \( \bar{x}_1 \) whose real or imaginary part is has the smallest distance to the border of the Voronoi region. The incremental distance function for each coordinate of \( \bar{r} \) is

\[
dist(\bar{r}_k) = |i^{(k)} - \bar{r}_k|^2 - |\bar{r}_k|^2. \tag{47}
\]

Let \( \bar{x}_1 \) be the component with the smallest incremental distance, then the second estimate is given by

\[
\bar{x}_2 = \bar{x}_1 + (0, \ldots, i^{(l)}, \ldots, 0). \tag{48}
\]

Since \( \sum(\bar{x}_1) \notin (1 + i)\mathbb{Z}[i] \), after flipping a component in \( \bar{x}_1 \) we must have \( \sum(\bar{x}_2) \in (1 + i)\mathbb{Z}[i] \). Thus we output \( \bar{x}_2 \) as the closest vector and the algorithm terminates. This corresponds to Case 2 in Fig. 3. The worst-case complexity of this algorithm is \( 2 \) visited nodes.
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