Average Redundancy of Variable-Length Balancing Schemes à la Knuth
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Abstract—We study and propose schemes that map messages onto constant-weight codewords using variable-length prefixes. We provide polynomial-time computable formulas that estimate the average number of redundant bits incurred by our schemes. In addition to the exact formulas, we also perform an asymptotic analysis and demonstrate that our scheme uses \( \frac{1}{2} \log n + O(1) \) redundant bits to encode messages into length-\( n \) words with weight \((n/2) + q\) for constant \( q \).

I. INTRODUCTION

The imbalance of a binary word \( x \) refers to the difference between the number of ones and the number of zeros in \( x \). A word of even length is balanced if its imbalance is exactly zero and a code is balanced if all its codewords are balanced. Due to their applications in various recording systems, balanced codes have been extensively studied (see \( [1] \) for a survey). In recent years, interest in balanced codes has rekindled because of the emergence of DNA macromolecules as a next-generation data storage medium with its unprecedented density, durability and replication efficiency \( [2] \). Specifically, a DNA string comprises four bases or letters: A, T, C, and G, and a string is GC-rich (or GC-poor) if a high (or low) proportion of the bases corresponds to either G or C. Since GC-rich or GC-poor DNA strings are prone to both synthesis and sequencing errors \( [4], [5] \), we aim to reduce the difference between the number of G and C and the number of A and T on every DNA codeword. This requirement turns out to be equivalent to reducing the imbalance of a related binary word (see for example \( [5] \), \( [6] \)).

In his seminal paper \( [7] \), Knuth proposed a simple and elegant linear-time algorithm that transforms an arbitrary binary length-\( n \) message into a balanced length-\( n \) codeword. To allow the receiver to recover the message, a \( [\log_2 n] \)-bit prefix must be transmitted and hence, Knuth’s method incurs a redundancy of \( [\log_2 n] \) bits. This differs from the minimum required by a multiplicative factor of two (see \( [3] \)). Later, Alon et al. \( [8] \) demonstrated that, under certain assumptions of the encoding scheme, \( \log_2 n \) redundant bits are necessary (see discussion in Section \( [11] \) for more details). Hence, it appears unlikely that we can improve Knuth’s balancing technique if we insist on transmitting prefixes of a fixed length.

Therefore, in \( [9], [10] \), Immink and Weber proposed balancing schemes that transmit variable-length prefixes and studied the average redundancy of their proposals. Specifically, in \( [9] \), Weber and Immink provided two variable-length balancing schemes whose average redundancy are asymptotically equal to \( \log_2 n \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + 0.936 \), respectively. Later in \( [10] \), Immink and Weber proposed another variable-length balancing scheme which we study closely in this paper. In \( [10] \), Immink and Weber provided closed formulas for the average redundancy of their scheme and computed these values for \( n \leq 8192 \). While numerically the redundancy values are close to the optimal value given in \( [3] \), a tight asymptotic analysis was not provided. In this work, we make modifications to the scheme in \( [10] \) and demonstrate that the average redundancy is at most \( \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + 0.526 \) asymptotically.

Even though the average redundancy of our scheme differs from the optimal \( [5] \) by an additive constant of approximately 0.2, our scheme and its accompanying analysis can be easily extended to the case where the imbalance is fixed to some positive constant. Formally, for an even integer \( n \) and some fixed integer \( q \), we say that a length-\( n \) word is \( q \)-balanced if its imbalance is exactly \( q \), that is, its weight is exactly \((n/2) + q\). A code is \( q \)-balanced if all words are \( q \)-balanced. Since all words in an \( q \)-balanced have the same weight, such codes are also known as constant-weight codes and are used in a variety of communication and data storage scenarios. Recent applications involve data storage in crossbar resistive memory arrays \( [11], [12] \) and live DNA \( [13] \) (see also \( [14] \) for a survey).

While there is extensive research on constructing constant-weight codes with distance properties, simple efficient encoding methods are less well-known. In fact, this problem was posed by MacWilliams and Sloane as Research Problem 17.3 \( [15] \). To the best of our knowledge, there are three encoding approaches: the enumerative method of Schalkwijk \( [16] \), the geometric approach of Tian et al. \( [17] \), and the Knuth-like method of Skachek and Immink \( [19] \). For the case where \( q \) is constant, the first two methods encode in quadratic time \( O(n^2) \), while the third method runs in linear time. However, the third method incurs \( \log_2 n \) redundant bits and this is the regime that we study in this work. Specifically, when \( q \) is a positive constant, we show that there is a linear-time variable-length \( q \)-balancing scheme that incurs average redundancy of at most \( \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + 2.526 \) redundant bits.

In summary, our contributions are two-fold. First, we adapt the variable-length balancing schemes in \( [10] \) to map messages into \( q \)-balanced words for a fixed \( q \geq 0 \). Second, and more crucially, we provide a detailed analysis of the average redundancy of our variable-length \( q \)-balancing schemes. To this end, we borrow tools from lattice-path combinatorics and provide closed formulas for the upper bounds on the average redundancy of both Schemes A and B (described in Sections \( [11] \) and \( [1] \)). Unfortunately, as with \( [10] \), we are unable to complete the asymptotic analysis for Scheme A. Hence, we introduce Scheme B which uses slightly more redundant bits, and show that Scheme B incurs average redundancy of at most \( \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + 2.526 \) redundant bits asymptotically when \( q > 0 \). Interestingly, for the case \( q = 0 \), the average redundancy of Scheme B can be reduced to \( \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + 0.526 \) and this is better than the schemes given in \( [9] \).

In the next section, we formally define a variable-length \( q \)-balancing scheme and state our results.

\(^{1}\)For ease of exposition in later sections, we use the term imbalance to refer to the (signed) difference, instead of absolute difference. In other words, a positive imbalance indicates that there are more ones than zeroes.
II. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, we fix $n$ to be an even integer and let $[n]$ denote the set $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots , n\}$. For a binary word $x = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $j \in [n]$, we let $x[j]$ and $x_{[j]}$ denote its length-$j$ prefix and length-$j$ suffix, respectively. In other words, $x[j] = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_j$ and $x_{[j]} = x_{n-j+1} x_{n-j+2} \ldots x_n$. Also, for two binary words $x$ and $y$, we use $xy$ to denote their concatenation and $x^a$ to denote the concatenation of $a$ copies of $x$. Finally, we use $\mathbb{X}$ to denote the complement of $x$.

Now, since $n$ is even, we set $n = 2m$ and fix a non-negative integer $q \leq m = n/2$. Recall that a length-$n$ word $x$ is $q$-balanced if its weight is exactly $m + q = n/2 + q$. In other words, the imbalance of $x$ is exactly $2q$. The collection of all $q$-balanced words of length $n$ is denoted by $\mathbb{B}(n, q)$. If $q = 0$, then we simply write $\mathbb{B}(n, q)$ as $\mathbb{B}(n)$ and refer to these words as balanced words.

Here, our goal is to efficiently map arbitrary binary messages into codewords in collection $\mathbb{B}(n, q)$, while incurring as few redundant bits as possible. Formally, we have the following.

**Definition 1.** An $(n, k, \rho; q)$-variable-length balancing scheme is a pair of encoding and decoding maps $(E, F)$ such that:

(i) $E$ is an injective encoding map from $\{0, 1\}^k \to \mathbb{B}(n, q) \times \{0, 1\}^*$. In other words, $E(x) = (c, p)$ with $c \in \mathbb{B}(n, q)$ and $p \in \{0, 1\}^*$, and we refer to $p$ as the prefix. Here, $\{0, 1\}^*$ denotes the set of all finite-length binary words.

(ii) $D$ is a decoding map from $\text{Im}(E)$ to $\{0, 1\}^k$ such that $D \circ E(x) = x$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^k$.

Here, $\rho$ denotes the average redundancy and it is given by

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{x \in \{0, 1\}^k} (|E(x)| - k). \quad (1)$$

Clearly, the cardinality of $\mathbb{B}(n, q)$ is given by $(n/2 + q)!((n/2)!)^{-1}$, where the latter asymptotic estimate follows from Stirling’s approximation (see for example, [19, Theorem 4.6]). Therefore, the redundancy of $\mathbb{B}(n, q)$, and thus, the minimum redundancy, is given by

$$n - \log_2 \left( \frac{n}{n/2 + q} \right) \quad (2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \pi + O \left( \frac{1}{n} \right)$$

$$\sim \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + \Delta, \text{ where } \Delta \approx 0.326 \ldots . \quad (3)$$

Here, we assume that $q$ is constant and asymptotics are taken with respect to $n$. That is, $f(n) \sim g(n)$ means that $\lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/g(n) = 1$.

As mentioned earlier, when $q = 0$, we have the celebrated Knuth’s balancing technique [7]. A crucial ingredient to this technique is the following simple flipping operation. For any word $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $j \in [n]$, we define $\text{Flip}(x, j)$ to be the binary word obtained by flipping the first $j$ bits of $x$. That is, $\text{Flip}(x, j) = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_{j-1} x_{j+1} \ldots x_n$. Then Knuth’s technique simply searches for an index $j$ such that $\text{Flip}(x, j)$ belongs to $\mathbb{B}(n, q)$. Formally, we say that $j$ is a $q$-balancing index for $x$ if $\text{Flip}(x, j)$ belongs to $\mathbb{B}(n, q)$ and we use $T(x, q)$ to denote the set of all $q$-balancing indices of $x$. In other words, $T(x, q) = \{ j \in [n] : \text{Flip}(x, j) \in \mathbb{B}(n, q) \}$. Knuth’s key observation is that $T(x, 0)$ is always nonempty, or equivalently, a 0-balancing index always exist [7]!

Let $\text{Flip}(x, \tau) = c$. In order for the receiver to recover the message $x$, the sender needs to transmit both $c$ and some representation of $\tau$. As the set of all possible balancing indices has size $n$, we require a $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$-bit prefix $p$ to represent the index $\tau$. Hence, Knuth’s balancing technique results in an $(n, n, 0; 0)$-variable-length balancing scheme with $\rho = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$. Note that this is in fact a fixed-length scheme because the prefix $p$ is always of length $\rho$. However, $\rho$ is twice the optimal quantity given in [5]. One way to reduce this redundancy is to use a different and possibly smaller set of possible balancing words. Unfortunately, Alon et al. demonstrated that the size of any balancing set must be at least $n$, and so $\log_2 n$ redundant bits are necessary. So, in [9, 10], Immink and Weber turn their attention to variable-length balancing schemes. We summarize their results here.

**Theorem 1** ([9, 10]). Let $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. There exists explicit $(n, n, \rho; 0)$-variable-length balancing schemes with average redundancy $\rho_i$ as follows:

$$\rho_1 \sim \log_2 n , \quad (4)$$

$$\rho_2 \sim \frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + 0.916 \ldots , \quad (5)$$

$$\rho_3 \sim \frac{1}{2^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} \gamma(i, n) \log i , \quad (6)$$

where

$$\gamma(i, n) = \frac{2^n}{i} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{i} \cos \frac{\pi j}{i+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \cos \frac{\pi j}{i} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} \cos \frac{\pi j}{i-1} \right) . \quad (7)$$

We refer to these schemes as Schemes 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

When $q > 0$, the set of $q$-balancing indices may be empty. That is, there exist binary words $x$ with $T(x, q) = \emptyset$ and we refer to such words as bad words. Hence, a different encoding rule must be applied to these bad words, and simple linear-time methods were proposed and studied by Skachek and Immink [13]. While their $q$-balancing schemes are in fact variable-length schemes, Skachek and Immink did not provide an analysis of the average redundancy of their schemes and instead argued that $\log_2 n + O(1)$ redundant bits are sufficient in the worst case (when $q$ is constant).

Our Contributions.

(I) In this paper, we amalgamate the variable-length scheme in [10] with the $q$-balancing schemes in [18] to obtain new variable-length $q$-balancing schemes. We formally describe Schemes A and B in Sections III and V, respectively.

(II) Crucially, our objective is to provide a sharp analysis of the average redundancy of our $q$-balancing schemes. In Section III, we outline our analysis strategy. Section IV then provides the connection with lattice path combinatorics, a detailed proof that the fraction of bad words is negligible, and finally, a closed expression [10] for an upper bound on the average redundancy.

(III) Unfortunately, we were unable to give an asymptotic estimate for [10]. Hence, we make a small modification to obtain Scheme B and demonstrate Theorem 2. In Table I, we compare the average redundancy of Scheme B with those in prior work when $q = 0$.

---

*It can be shown that there is a balancing index $\tau$ in the interval $0 \leq \tau \leq n-1$.

*For purposes of brevity, we omit the closed formulas for Schemes 1 and 2.
Proof. If \( w^t(x') \leq n/2 - q \), then appending 0s does not alter the weight. So, \( x^02^q \) has weight at most \( n/2 - q \) and thus, the latter word is Type-1-good by Lemma 3. Otherwise, \( w^t(x') \geq n/2 - q + 1 \) and \( x^t1^2q \) has weight at least \( n/2 + q + 1 \). Again, Lemma 3 implies that the latter is a Type-1-good word. □

With this lemma, we are ready to define our first variable-length q-balancing scheme. Henceforth in this paper, for expository purposes, we drop the ceiling and floor functions, and assume that all logarithmic functions return integer values.

**Scheme A:** An \((n, n, p_A; q)\)-balancing scheme

**Input:** \( x \in \{0, 1\}^n \)

**Output:** \( c \in B(n, q), p \in \{0, 1\}^* \)

(I) Determine if \( x \) is Type-i-good or Type-i-bad.
- If \( x \) is Type-i-good, set \( \hat{x} = x \).
- If \( x \) is Type-0-good, set \( \hat{x} = \overline{x} \).
- If \( x \) is Type-1-bad, set \( \hat{x} = x^{[n-2q][2q]} \).
- If \( x \) is Type-0-bad, set \( \hat{x} = \overline{x}^{[n-2q][2q]} \).

By Lemmas 3 and 4, we have that \( T(\hat{x}, q) \neq \emptyset \).

(II) Determine the q-balanced word \( c \).
- \( \tau \leftarrow \min T(\hat{x}, q) \)
- \( c \leftarrow \text{Flip}(x, j) \)

(III) Determine the prefix \( p \).
- Compute \( \Gamma_q(c) \) using (17) (see Section IV-B).
- \( z \leftarrow \text{length-}r\text{-binary representation of the index of } \tau \text{ in } \Gamma_q(c) \).
- If \( x \) is Type-i-good, set \( p \leftarrow 0iz \).
- If \( x \) is Type-i-bad, we set \( p \leftarrow 1izx[2q] \).

**A. Instructive Example**

Fix \( n = 8, q = 2 \), and hence, our target weight is six. We consider the message \( x = 11100000 \). For Step (I), using Lemma 8 we determine that \( x \) is Type-0-good and set \( \hat{x} = 00011111 \).

In Step (II), we find that \( \tau = 1 \) and set \( c = 10011111 \).

In Step (III), we find the prefix \( p \). Since \( R(c) = (0, 1, 0, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4) \), it follow from (15) that \( \Gamma_q(c) = \{0, 1, 3, 6, 7, 8\} \). Since the size of \( \Gamma_q(c) \) is six, three bits suffice to represent all balancing indices and the representation of \( \tau \) is 001. Thus, we set \( p = 00011 \).

We summarize this example and include encodings of other messages in Figure IV.

**B. Average Redundancy Analysis**

We now analyze the average redundancy of Scheme A. To this end, consider a message \( x \) and let \( z(x) \) and \( p(x) \) be the resulting index representation and prefix, respectively. Observe from Scheme A, when the word \( x \) is good, the prefix \( p(x) \) has length \( 2 + |z(x)| \). On the other hand, when the word \( x \) is bad, the prefix \( p(x) \) has length \( 2 + |z(x)| + 2q \leq 2 + 2q + \log_2 n \).

Therefore, if we denote the number of bad words in \( \{0, 1\}^n \) by \( D(n, q) \), we have that

\[
\rho_A \leq 2 + \frac{1}{2n} \left( \sum \text{x is good} |z(x)| \right) + \frac{D(n, q)}{2n} (2q + \log_2 n). \tag{9}
\]

Hence, in the next section, we use lattice path combinatorics to analyse both \( D(n, q) \) and \( \sum \text{x is good} |z(x)| \). For the former quantity, we have the following proposition whose proof is deferred to Section IV-A.
Proposition 5. For fixed $q$, we have $D(n, q) = o(2^n)$.

Therefore, it remains to study the latter quantity and we derive a closed formula in Section IV-B. Then, together with Proposition 5, we have the following estimate for the average redundancy of Scheme A.

Theorem 6. Scheme A is an $(n, n, \rho_A; q)$ variable-length balancing scheme where

$$\rho_A \lesssim \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} i \gamma_q(i, n) \log_2 i,$$

and $\gamma_q(i, n)$ is computed using Theorem 7.

Hence, the average redundancy $\rho_A$ can be computed in polynomial time. However, an asymptotically tight analysis of the expressions in (10), (11) and (12) remains elusive. So, in Section IV, we make a simple modification to Scheme A and show that the resulting scheme has average redundancy at most $\frac{1}{2} \log_2 n + O(1)$.

IV. ANALYSIS USING LATTICE PATH COMBINATORICS

In this section, we complete the analysis of $\rho_A$. Results in this section are based on a classic combinatorial problem – lattice paths enumeration. We remark that Immink and Weber applied similar methods for their analysis of variable-length 0-balancing schemes [9], [10]. Here, we not only extend the analysis to the case where $q > 0$, but also used lattice path combinatorics to enumerate bad words.

Definition 3. A path in the integer lattice plane $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is simple if it starts from a lattice point and consists of horizontal $\rightarrow$ and vertical $\uparrow$ unit steps in the positive direction.

Since the 1850s, lattice paths have been extensively studied and we refer the reader to Krattenthaler [20] for a comprehensive survey of the history, applications and related results. In this paper, we are interested in counting the following quantities. Suppose that $a$, $b$, $c$, $d$, $s$, and $t$ are integers with the following properties: $a \leq b \leq d$, $a + s \leq b \leq a + t$, and $c + s \leq d \leq c + t$. We then let $L((a, b) \to (c, d))$ denote the number of simple paths from $(a, b)$ to $(c, d)$, while $L((a, b) \to (c, d); s, t)$ denotes the number of all simple paths from $(a, b)$ to $(c, d)$ that stay below the line $Y = X + t$ and above the line $Y = X + s$. We have the following enumeration results.

Theorem 7 (20). Set $\Delta_x = c - a$ and $\Delta_y = d - b$.

$$L((a, b) \to (c, d)) = \binom{\Delta_x + \Delta_y}{\Delta_x}.$$  

Suppose further that $\Delta_h = t - s + 2$.

$$L((a, b) \to (c, d); s, t) = 4^{\frac{(\Delta_h - 1)/2}{\Delta_h}} \binom{\Delta_x + \Delta_y}{\Delta_x} \times \sin \frac{\pi k(a - b + t + 1)}{\Delta_h} \sin \frac{\pi k(c - d + t + 1)}{\Delta_h}.$$  

Suppose that $t = \infty$ and $s = 0$. That is, we count all paths above $Y = X$. So, $a \leq b$ and $c \leq d$.

$$L((a, b) \to (c, d); 0, \infty) = \binom{\Delta_x + \Delta_y}{\Delta_x} \binom{\Delta_x + \Delta_y}{\Delta_x} - \binom{\Delta_x + \Delta_y}{\Delta_x} \cdot \frac{d - a + 1}{\Delta_x}.$$  

Next, we describe a transformation $\Pi$ that maps binary words $\{0, 1\}^n$ of certain weight to length-$n$ simple paths between certain lattice points in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Specifically, for any binary word $x = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_n$, we define a simple path $\Pi(x)$ where

- $\Pi(x)$ starts from $(0, wt(x) - m)$ (recall that $n = 2m$);
- When $x_i = 0$, we move a vertical unit $\uparrow$;
- When $x_i = 1$, we move a horizontal unit $\rightarrow$.

In Figure [1], we provide some examples of the transformation $\Pi$. The following lemma summarizes certain properties of $\Pi$.

Lemma 8.

(i) Fix $q$ and recall that $\mathcal{B}(n, q)$ is the set of words with weight $m + q$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all simple paths from $(0, q)$ to $(m + q, m)$. Then $\Pi$ is a bijection from $\mathcal{B}(n, q)$ to $\mathcal{P}$.

(ii) Let $x = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_n$. Suppose that the lattice points on $\Pi(x)$ are $(X_0, Y_0), (X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$. Then for $j \in [n]$, the imbalance of $\text{Flip}(x, j)$ is given by $2(Y_j - X_j)$.

Proof. (i) This is straightforward from the definition of $\Pi$.

(ii) We prove by induction. When $j = 0$, the imbalance of $x$ is $2wt(x) - n = 2wt(x) - m = 2(Y_0 - X_0)$.

Next, we assume that the imbalance of $\text{Flip}(x, j - 1)$ is given by $2(Y_{j - 1} - X_{j - 1})$. If $x_j = 0$, then $Y_j$ increases by one and the imbalance of $\text{Flip}(x, j)$ increases by two. Similarly, if $x_j = 1$, then $X_j$ increases by one and the imbalance of $\text{Flip}(x, j)$ decreases by two. In both cases, imbalance of $\text{Flip}(x, j - 1)$ is given by $2(Y_{j - 1} - X_{j - 1})$ and the proof is complete.

A. Enumeration of Bad Words

First, we apply Lemma 8 to characterize good and bad words.

Lemma 9. Fix $q > 0$ and consider the lines $Y = X + q$ and $Y = X - q$. Let $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and consider the path $\Pi(x)$.

(i) $x$ is bad if and only if $\Pi(x)$ is strictly between $Y = X + q$ and $Y = X - q$.

(ii) $x$ is Type-1-good if and only if $\Pi(x)$ touches the line $Y = X + q$.

(iii) $x$ is Type-0-good if and only if $\Pi(x)$ does not touch the line $Y = X + q$, but touches the line $Y = X - q$.

Therefore, the number of bad words is immediate from Lemma 9(i) and Theorem 7.

Proposition 10. We have that

$$D(n, q) = \sum_{y=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \binom{\pi k}{2q} \sin \frac{\pi k(q - y)}{2q} \sin \frac{\pi k(q + y)}{2q}.$$  

Proof. Let $x$ be a word with weight $m + y$. Then by Lemma 8 we have that $\Pi(x)$ starts from $(0, y)$ and ends at $(m + y, m)$. Then it is straightforward to check that when $y \geq q$, the path $\Pi(x)$ touches the line $Y = X + q$. Similarly, when $y \leq q$, the path $\Pi(x)$ necessarily touches the line $Y = X - q$. Therefore, whenever $y \leq q$ or $y \geq q$, $x$ is necessarily Type-1-good. This also proves Lemma 3.

Hence, we consider the case where $1 - q \leq y \leq q - 1$. Then the bad words with weight $m + y$ correspond to the paths that start from $(0, y)$ and end at $(m + y, m)$ and lie strictly between $Y = X + q$ and $Y = X - q$. Then (12) states that this number is given by $\sum_{y=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} \binom{\pi k}{2q} \sin \frac{\pi k(q - y)}{2q} \sin \frac{\pi k(q + y)}{2q}$. Summing over all valid values of $y$ recovers the proposition.
Next, we estimate asymptotically the number of bad words. Note that each summand is at most \( \frac{2}{\pi q} (2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2q})^n \). Now, since 0 < \( k < q \), we have that 0 < \( \frac{2k}{pk} < \pi/2 \). Then the monotone decreasing property of the cosine in this region shows that each summand is at most \( \frac{4(2k)^2}{q} \) summands, we have \( D(n, q) \leq \frac{4(2k)^2}{q} (2 \cos \frac{\pi}{2q})^n = o(2^n) \). This completes the proof of Proposition 4.

**B. Average Redundancy of Good Words**

In this section, we provide a closed formula for the quantity \( \sum_{x} I(x) \) defined in \( \Phi \). Immink and Weber first investigated this quantity in their proposed variable-length balancing scheme \( \Phi \). In their paper, instead of studying the set of balancing indices associated with a message \( x \), they investigated the set of 0-balancing indices that can be received with a codeword \( c \). Formally, for \( c \in B(n, q) \), we consider the following set:

\[
 \Gamma_x(c) = \{ j \in [n] : \text{Flip}(x, j) = c, \quad \tau(x, j) = j \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \{0, 1\}^n \} .
\]

Here, \( \tau(x) \) is defined to be min \( T(x, q) \). It turns out that given \( c \in B(n, q) \), we can determine \( \Gamma_x(c) \) efficiently. Specifically, when \( q = 0 \), Immink and Weber provided a simple characterization of \( \Gamma_x(c) \) using the notion of running sum.

**Definition 4.** Let \( x = x_1x_2 \ldots x_n \in \{0, 1\}^n \). The running sum of \( x \), denoted by \( R(x) \), is a length-(\( n+1 \)) integer-valued vector indexed by \( [n] \) defined by

\[
 R(x)_i = \begin{cases} 
 0, & \text{if } i = 0, \\
 R(x)_{i-1} + (-1)^{x_i+1}, & \text{if } i > 0.
\end{cases}
\]

The following proposition generalizes a result in \( \Phi \) for the case where \( q \geq 0 \).

**Proposition 11.** Let \( c \in B(n, q) \). Then

\[
 \Gamma_x(c) = \{ i \in [n] : R(c)_i \neq R(c)_j \ for \ all \ j < i \} .
\]  

**Proof.** Let \( c = c_1c_2 \ldots c_n \). Then \( \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_k = m + q \).

Now, let \( x = \text{Flip}(c, i) \) and suppose that \( i \notin \Gamma_x(c) \). This means that there is an index \( j < i \) where \( \text{Flip}(x, j) \in B(n, q) \).

Since \( \text{Flip}(x, j) = c_1 \ldots c_j c_{j+1} \ldots c_k \cdot 0_1 \ldots c_n \), we have that \( \sum_{k=1}^{j} c_k + (i-j) - 2 \sum_{k=j+1}^{i} c_k = m + q \). Hence,

\[
 2 \sum_{k=j+1}^{i} c_k - (i-j) = \sum_{k=j+1}^{i} (2c_k - 1) = \sum_{k=j+1}^{i} (-1)^{c_k+1} = 0 ,
\]

which is equivalent to \( R(c)_i = R(c)_j \).

Next, for \( 1 \leq i \leq n+1 \), we consider the following subset of words in \( B(n, q) \):

\[
 \mathcal{E}_q(i, n) = \{ c \in B(n, q) : |\Gamma_x(c)| = i \} \quad \text{(16)}
\]

and determine its size \( \gamma_q(i, n) \triangleq |\mathcal{E}_q(i, n)| .

To characterize the words in \( \mathcal{E}_q(i, n) \) as lattice paths, we introduce the notion of width.

**Definition 5.** Consider a lattice path \( \pi \). Suppose that \( t_{min} \) and \( s_{max} \) are the smallest and largest integers such that \( \pi \) lies in between \( Y = X + t_{min} \) and \( Y = X + s_{max} \). Then the width of \( \pi \) is defined to be \( t_{min} - s_{max} \).

**Lemma 12.** Fix \( q \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq n+1 \). Then \( x \in \mathcal{E}_q(i, n) \) if and only if the path \( \Pi(x) \) has width exactly \( i-1 \).

Hence, determining \( \gamma_q(i, n) \) is equivalent to enumerating lattice paths with a certain width. Therefore, using principles of inclusion and exclusion with Theorem 7, we have the following result.

**Theorem 13.** We have that

\[
 \gamma_q(i, n) = \sum_{t=0}^{i-1} \left( G(i-1, t) - G(i-2, t) - G(i-2, t-1) + G(i-3, t-1) \right) , \quad \text{(17)}
\]

where \( G(i, t) \) is given by the expression

\[
 G(i, t) = \frac{2^{n+2} (t+i+1)/2}{i+2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \cos^k \frac{\pi k}{i+2} \sin \frac{\pi k(t+1)}{i+2} \sin \frac{\pi k(t+1-2q)}{i+2} . \quad \text{(18)}
\]

**Proof.** Let \( c \in \mathcal{E}_q(i, n) \). Then using the transformation \( \Pi \), we have that \( \Pi(c) \) is a simple path from \( (0, q) \) to \( (m+q, m) \). Then Lemma 12 states that the path \( \Pi(c) \) has width exactly \( i-1 \). In other words, if we set \( t = t_{min} \) as in Definition 5, then \( s_{max} = t - (i-1) \).

Hence, for this fixed value of \( t \), we are interested in the number of paths that touch both \( Y = X + t \) and \( Y = X + t - (i-1) \).

Now, applying Theorem 7 with (13), we observe that \( G(i-1, t) = L \left( (0, 0) \rightarrow (m+q, m); t - (i-1), t \right) \) counts all paths that are between \( Y = X + t \) and \( Y = X + t - (i-1) \). Next, we apply the principle of inclusion and exclusion. Specifically, we exclude the paths between \( Y = X + t \) and \( Y = X + t - (i-2) \), between \( Y = X + (t-1) \) and \( Y = X + t - (i-1) \), and include the paths between \( Y = X + (t-2) \) and \( Y = X + t - (i-2) \).

These quantities are given by \( G(i-2, t) \), \( G(i-2, t-1) \) and \( G(i-3, t-1) \), respectively.

Summing over all possible values of \( t \), we obtain (17).}

Note that when \( q = 0 \), we recover (7). Inserting the expression of \( \gamma_q(i, n) \) into (10), we obtain a closed formula for an upper bound of \( \rho_A \). As (18) appears unamenable to asymptotic analysis, we introduce our second variable-length balancing scheme.
V. SECOND VARIABLE-LENGTH q-BALANCING SCHEME

In this section, we define Scheme B and analyze its average redundancy with methods similar to previous sections. We then complete the asymptotic analysis and prove Theorem 2. As mentioned earlier, Scheme B is similar to Scheme A and the main difference is that we consider a message of length \( n = 1 \).

Hence, we first encode into codeword \( c' \) with weight \( m + q - 1 \) or \( m + q \). Then, we append one extra redundant bit so that the resulting codeword \( c \) has length \( n \) and weight \( n/2 + q \). In other words, \( c \in \mathcal{B}(n, q) \). Surprisingly, this modification simplifies the analysis of average redundancy and allows us to prove that the average redundancy of Scheme B is within an additive constant of 0.2 from the optimal value in (3) when \( q = 0 \).

As before, for a word \( x \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1} \), we define the set of indices \( T_B(x, q) \) and use it to classify \( x \) as good or bad.

**Definition 6.** Let \( x \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1} \). Then we set

\[
T_B(x, q) \triangleq \{ j \in [n-1] : \text{wt}(\text{Flip}(x, j)) \in \{m + q - 1, m + q - 1\} \}.
\]

Then \( x \) is bad if \( T_B(x, q) = T_B(x, q) = \emptyset \). Otherwise, \( x \) is Type-1-good if \( T_B(x, q) \neq \emptyset \); and \( x \) is Type-0-good if \( T_B(x, q) = \emptyset \) and \( T_B(x, q) \neq \emptyset \).

Using similar methods, we obtain the analogue of Lemma 4.

**Lemma 14.** Suppose that \( x \) is bad. If \( x' = x^{[n-
-2q-3]} \), then either \( x'(0)^{2q-2} \) or \( x'(1)^{2q-2} \) is Type-1-good. We say that \( x \) is Type-i-bad if \( x'(i)^{2q-2} \) is Type-1-good.

We now formally describe Scheme B.

**Scheme B:** An \((n, n-1, \rho_B; q)\)-balancing scheme

**Input:** \( x \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1} \)

**Output:** \( c' \in \mathcal{B}(n, q), p \in \{0, 1\}^* \)

(I) Determine if \( x \) is Type-i-good or Type-i-bad.

- If \( x \) is Type-i-good, set \( \bar{x} = x \).
- If \( x \) is Type-i-bad, set \( \bar{x} = x^{[n-2q-3]}1^{2q-2} \).
- If \( x \) is Type-0-bad, set \( \bar{x} = x^{[n-2q-3]}(0)^{2q-2} \).

Hence, we have that \( T_B(\bar{x}, q) \neq \emptyset \).

(II) Determine the q-balanced word \( c' \).

- \( \tau \leftarrow \min T_B(\bar{x}, q) \)
- \( c \leftarrow \text{Flip}(\bar{x}, j) \)
- If \( \text{wt}(c) = m + q - 1 \), we append 1 to \( c \) to obtain \( c' \).
- If \( \text{wt}(c) = m + q \), we append 0 to \( c \) to obtain \( c' \).

(III) Determine the prefix \( p \).

- Compute \( \Gamma_q(c) \) using Proposition 11.
- \( z \leftarrow \text{length-}r \text{ binary representation of the index of } \tau \text{ in } \Gamma_q(c) \). Here, \( r = \log |\Gamma_q(c)| \).
- If \( x \) is Type-i-good, we set \( p \leftarrow 0iz \).
- If \( x \) is Type-i-bad, we set \( p \leftarrow 1izx^{[2q-2]} \).

As before, to estimate the average redundancy \( \rho_B \), we determine the number of bad words and the average redundancy of good words. Specifically, let \( x \) be a message and set \( z(x) \) and \( p(x) \) to be the resulting index representation and prefix, respectively. If we denote the number of bad words in \( \{0, 1\}^{n-1} \) by \( D_B(n-1, q) \), we have that

\[
\rho_B \leq 3 + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left( \sum_{x \text{ is good}} |z(x)| \right) \frac{D_B(n-1, q)}{2^{n-2} + \log_2 n} (2q - 2 + \log_2 n). \tag{20}
\]

To determine \( D_B(n-1, q) \), we use the following characterization.

**Lemma 15.** Fix \( q > 0 \) and let \( x \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1} \). Then \( x \) is bad if and only if \( \Pi(x) \) is strictly between \( Y = X + q - 1 \) and \( Y = X - q + 1 \).

Then we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 16.** For fixed \( q \), \( 2D_B(n-1, q) \leq D(n, q) \leq o(2^n) \).

**Proof.** Let \( x \) be a bad word of length \( n-1 \). Then \( \Pi(x) \) is a lattice path bounded strictly between \( Y = X + q - 1 \) and \( Y = X - q + 1 \). Now, append either 0 or 1 to \( x \) to obtain \( x' \). Clearly, \( \Pi(x') \) is now bounded strictly between \( Y = X + q \) and \( Y = X - q \) and so, \( x' \) is bad. Hence, \( 2D_B(n-1, q) \leq D(n, q) \) as desired.

Next, we estimate \( \sum_{x \text{ is good}} |z(x)| \). To do so, we set \( \tau_q(x) \triangleq \min T_B(x, q) \) and

\[
\Gamma_q(c) \triangleq \{ j \in [n-1] : \text{Flip}(x, j) = c, \tau_q(x) = j \text{ for } x \in \{0, 1\}^{n-1} \}.
\]

As before, we characterize a \( \Gamma_q(c) \) using its running sum.

**Proposition 17.** Suppose that \( \text{wt}(c) \in \{m + q - 1, m + q\} \).

\[
\Gamma_q(c) = \begin{cases} 
\{ i \in [n-1] : R(c)_i \geq 0, R(c)_i \neq R(c)_j, j < i \}, & \text{if \( \text{wt}(c) = n/2 + q - 1 \)}, \\
\{ i \in [n-1] : R(c)_i \leq 0, R(c)_i \neq R(c)_j, j < i \}, & \text{if \( \text{wt}(c) = n/2 + q \}).
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** We consider the case where \( \text{wt}(c) = m + q - 1 \). The proof for \( \text{wt}(c) = m + q \) is similar. Proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 11 we have that \( i \notin \Gamma_q(c) \) if there exists \( j < i \) such that \( R(c)_i = R(c)_j \).

Next, we claim that if \( R(c)_i < 0 \), then \( i \notin \Gamma_q(c) \). Now, let \( x = \text{Flip}(c, i) \). Since \( R(c)_i < 0 \), we have that \( c_i = 0 \) and so, \( x_i = 1 \). Then \( \text{Flip}(x, i-1) \) has weight \( n+q \) and so, the balancing index for \( x \) is at most \( i-1 \). Therefore, \( i \notin \Gamma_q(c) \).

As before, for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), we consider the following set of \( n \cdot (n-1) \) words:

\[
E_q(i, n-1) = \{ \text{wt}(c) \in \{m + q - 1, m + q\} : |\Gamma_q(c)| = i \} \tag{21}
\]

determine its size \( \gamma_q(i, n-1) \triangleq |E_q(i, n-1)| \).

**Lemma 18.** Fix \( q \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). Then \( x \in E_q(i, n-1) \) if and only if

(i) the path \( \Pi(x) \) starts from \( (0, q) \) and is above and touching \( Y = X + q - i \) or,

(ii) the path \( \Pi(x) \) starts from \( (0, q) \) and is below and touching \( Y = X + q + i - 1 \).

Then using principles of inclusion and exclusion with Theorem 7 we have a surprisingly clean expression for \( \gamma_q(i, n-1) \).

**Theorem 19.** Fix \( q > 0 \). Then

\[
\gamma_q(i, n-1) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{2i-2q}{n} \binom{n}{m+i-q} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq 2q - 1, \\
\frac{2i+2q}{n} \binom{n}{m+i-q} - \frac{2i-2q}{n} \binom{n}{m+i-q} & \text{if } 2q \leq i \leq m - q, \\
\frac{2i+2q}{n} \binom{n}{m+i-q} & \text{if } m - q + 1 \leq i \leq m + q.
\end{cases}
\]

When \( q = 0 \), we have

\[
\gamma_q(i, n-1) = \frac{4i}{n} \binom{n}{m+i}.
\]
Proof. Let \( c \in \mathcal{E}_q(i, n - 1) \). First, suppose that \( c \) has weight \( m + q - 1 \). Then Lemma \([18]\) states that \( \Pi(c) \) is above and touching the line \( Y = X + q - i \). The number of such paths is the same as the number of simple paths that start from \((0, i - 1)\), end at \((m+q, m-q+i-1)\) and are below and touching the line \( Y = X \).

Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem \([28]\), we apply the principle of inclusion and exclusion with (22), and compute the number of such paths to be \( \left( \binom{2m-i}{m-q} - \binom{2m-i}{m+i-q} \right) \). Since we require both \((0, i - 1)\) and \((m+q, m-q+i-1)\) to be above the line \( Y = X \), we have that \( \max(1, 2q) \leq i \leq m + q \).

Now, when \( c \) has weight \( m + q - 1 \), Lemma \([18]\) states that \( \Pi(c) \) is below and touching the line \( Y = X + q + i - 1 \) above the line \( Y = X \). We present the main result of this section.

Theorem 20 (\([19]\) Theorem 4.91). Let \( F(x) \) be a polynomially bounded function, that is, \( F(x) = O(x^d) \) for some integer \( d > 0 \). Then \( m \)

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{m} F(k) \left( \frac{2m}{k} \right) \sim \int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/m} F(x) dx.
\]

We present the main result of this section.

Theorem 21. Fix \( q \). Then

\[
\frac{1}{2n-1} \sum_{x \text{ is good}} |z(x)| \lesssim \frac{1}{2} \log n + \beta,
\]

where \( \beta = \frac{2-\ln 4 - \gamma}{\ln 4} - \frac{1}{2} \approx 0.474 \ldots \) and \( \gamma \) is the Euler-Mascheroni constant.

Proof. Let \( Z_1 \) the first summand of (22) and estimate this quantity. First, we set \( k = i - q \) on the right-hand side and extend the range of \( k \) to obtain

\[
Z_1 \leq \frac{1}{2m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \frac{2k(k+q) \log(k+q)}{2m} \left( \frac{2m}{m+k} \right).
\]

Next, we have Stirling’s estimate of the central binomial \([19]\):

\[
\frac{2m}{2m} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi m}}.
\]

Then setting \( F(x) = (x+q)^2 \log(x+q) \) in Theorem 20 we have that

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{m} (k+q)^2 \log(k+2+q) \left( \frac{2m}{m+k} \right)
\]

\[
\sim \int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/m} (x+q)^4 \log(x+q) dx.
\]

We do a change in variable and set \( z = x/\sqrt{m} \) to obtain the expression

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{m} e^{-z^2} \left( \sqrt{\frac{mz+q}{2}} \log(\frac{mz+q}{q}) \right) \sim \int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} z^2 \log z dz + \frac{n^{m/2} \log n}{2} \int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} z^2 dz.
\]

Similarly, for the second summand in (22), we obtain the exact same expression.

Now, we have

\[
\int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} z^2 \log z dz = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} (1-2\ln 4 - \gamma)}{4 \ln 4}
\]

and

\[
\int_{x=0}^{\infty} e^{-z^2} z^2 dz = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}.
\]

So, combining everything, we have that the right-hand side of (24) tends to

\[
\frac{1}{2} \log m + \frac{2-\ln 4 - \gamma}{\ln 4}
\]

\[
\approx \frac{1}{2} \log n + \frac{2-\ln 4 - \gamma}{\ln 4} - \frac{1}{2} \approx \frac{1}{2} \log n - 0.474 \ldots,
\]

as required.

Together with (20), we obtain the desired upper bound for \( \rho_B \) and obtain Theorem 2. Moreover, when \( q = 0 \), we have that all words are good. In this case, we need not prepend \( z \) with the two bits and thus, the average redundancy is simply given by \( 1 - \beta \approx 0.526 \).

References


