

Implementation of Run-Length Encoding In Examination For Lossless Data Compression

Thirunavukkarasu E ^[1], Karuppusami G ^[2], Ezhilarasu P ^[3]

Professor and Head ^[1]

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Jairupaa College of Engineering, Tiruppur

Dean – Research and Innovations ^[2]

Department of Mechanical Engineering
Sri Eshwar College of Engineering, Coimbatore

Associate Professor ^[3]

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
Hindusthan College of Engineering and Technology, Coimbatore
Tamil Nadu - India

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we discuss Run-length encoding data compression technique. Three type of input taken. First, more than two input characters with frequent run-length considered. Then, two input character with almost equal frequency of occurrence are considered. Finally two input character with one character having less frequency of occurrences and another one with more frequencies of occurrences are considered. Its compression ratio, space savings, and average bits also calculated. Comparison between each condition performed.

Keywords:- Run-length, Compression, Encoding, Decoding.

I. INTRODUCTION

Data compression defined as the reorganization of data in such a way that, the volume of the resultant data (compressed data) is less than that of the volume of the source data (uncompressed data). The decompression technique applied to get back the uncompressed source data. After decompression if some data destroyed because of compression and decompression, then the compression called as lossy compression. If none of the data destroyed and available in its original uncompressed form, then the compression called as lossless compression. The Run-length encoding comes under lossless compression. Time complexity and space complexity are the two important complexities in data compression.

Because of data suppression, only little amount of time needed for data transfer between source system and target system. For instance, if the original size of the source data is 4GB and the transfer rate is 512 kbps. The time need for the transfer obtained by the given equation 1.

Time needed for transfer of data = Input data / transfer rate

(1)

(1 MB = 1024 KB and 1 KB = 8

kb)

Input data = 4 GB

= 4 * 1024 * 1024

* 8

= 4 * 1024 * 1024

* 8 kb

Transfer rate = 512 kbps

So time taken for transfer of data = (4 * 1024 * 1024 * 8) / 512

= 4 * 2 * 1024 * 8

= 65536 seconds

If the given data compressed into 2.5GB, then the time taken for transfer will be 40960 seconds.

If the destination allowed amount of storage is 2TB, then the target machine can store the following number of files by using the equation 2.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | 9727K0206 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | F | P |
| 7. | 9727K0207 | P | P | P | P | F | P | P | P | P |
| 8. | 9727K0208 | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 9. | 9727K0209 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 10. | 9727K0210 | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 11. | 9727K0211 | P | P | F | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 12. | 9727K0212 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 13. | 9727K0213 | F | P | P | P | P | F | P | F | P |
| 14. | 9727K0214 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 15. | 9727K0215 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 16. | 9727K0216 | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 17. | 9727K0217 | P | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 18. | 9727K0218 | P | P | P | F | P | P | P | P | P |
| 19. | 9727K0219 | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 20. | 9727K0220 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 21. | 9727K0221 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 22. | 9727K0222 | P | P | P | P | F | P | P | P | P |
| 23. | 9727K0223 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 24. | 9727K0224 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 25. | 9727K0225 | F | P | P | P | P | F | P | P | P |
| 26. | 9727K0226 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 27. | 9727K0227 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 28. | 9727K0228 | P | P | P | P | P | F | P | P | P |
| 29. | 9727K0229 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 30. | 9727K0230 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 31. | 9727K0231 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 32. | 9727K0232 | P | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 33. | 9727K0233 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 34. | 9727K0234 | F | P | P | P | F | P | P | P | P |
| 35. | 9727K0235 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 36. | 9727K0236 | P | P | P | P | F | P | P | P | P |
| 37. | 9727K0237 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 38. | 9727K0238 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 39. | 9727K0239 | F | P | P | P | P | F | P | P | P |
| 40. | 9727K0240 | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 41. | 9727K0241 | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 42. | 9727K0242 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 43. | 9727K0243 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 44. | 9727K0244 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 45. | 9727K0245 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 46. | 9727K0246 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 47. | 9727K0247 | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | P |
| 48. | 9727K0248 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | F |
| 49. | 9727K0249 | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |
| 50. | 9727K0250 | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |

Table . 1. Consolidated results for nine subjects with six theory and three lab.

For the input :
 eeeeeeeeeeeezzzhhhhhhhhhhhhhiiiiiiiiiiiii

= 2.24 bits per character

Compression ratio = 400/112
 = 50:14
 =3.57:1
 Space savings =1-(112/400)
 = 1-(7/25)
 = 1-0.28
 = 0.72
 = 72%
 Average bits = 112/50
 = 2.24 bits per character

For the input :
 uuuuuuummmmmmmaaaaadddddeeeeeeeeeeeeeevviii
 iiiii

Compression ratio = 400/120
 = 50:15
 =3.66:1
 Space savings =1-(120/400)
 = 1-(15/50)
 = 1-0.3
 = 0.7
 = 70%
 Average bits = 120/50
 = 2.4 bits per character

For the input
 :ppppppppaaaaaaaalllllllllaaaaaaaaannnnnniiiiii

Compression ratio = 400/112
 = 50:14
 =3.57:1
 Space savings =1-(112/400)
 = 1-(7/25)
 = 1-0.28
 = 0.72
 = 72%
 Average bits = 112/50

The Consolidated Compression ratio, Space savings and Average bits for nine subjects are as shown in the table 2.

| S.No | Subject | Compression Ratio | Space savings | Average bits |
|------|---------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1 | Theory1 | 2.173913 | 54% | 3.68 |
| 2 | Theory2 | 3.333333 | 70% | 2.4 |
| 3 | Theory3 | 3.846154 | 74% | 2.08 |
| 4 | Theory4 | 3.333333 | 70% | 2.4 |
| 5 | Theory5 | 2.777778 | 64% | 2.88 |
| 6 | Theory6 | 2.941176 | 66% | 2.72 |
| 7 | Lab1 | 3.846154 | 74% | 2.08 |
| 8 | Lab2 | 3.846154 | 74% | 2.08 |
| 9 | Lab3 | 3.846154 | 74% | 2.08 |

Table . 2. Consolidated Compression ratio, Space savings and Average bits for nine subjects with six theory and three lab.

V. CONCLUSION

The obtained results depicts that the Run-Length encoding gives better compression ratio, space savings, and average bits for the input with the long Run-Length. The Run-Length Encoding gives better compression ratio, space savings, and average bits as compared with the uncompressed data.

REFERENCE

- [1] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Run-length_encoding
- [2] Khalid Sayood, “Introduction to Data Compression”, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, Burlington, United States of America, 2nd edition, 600 pages, 2000.
- [3] Mark Nelson and Jean-loup Gailly , “The Data Compression Book”, M&T Books, New York, United States of America, 2nd edition, 541 pages, 1995.
- [4] David Salomon, “Data Compression: The Complete Reference”, Springer, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, United States of America, Germany, 2nd edition, 823 pages, 2000.
- [5] David Salomon and Giovanni Motta, “Handbook of Data Compression”, Springer London, 2000.
- [6] J.A. Storer, “Data Compression”, Computer Science Press, Rockville, MD ,1988.

- [7] E. Belloch, "Introduction to Data Compression", Computer Science Department, Carnegie Mellon University, 2002.
- [8] Lynch, J. Thomas, "Data Compression: Techniques and Applications", Lifetime Learning Publications, Belmont, CA, 1985
- [9] Rafael C. Gonzalez, Richard E. Woods, Digital Image Processing, Pearson Education, 2002
- [10] S. W. Golomb, "Run-Length Encodings," IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. IT-12, no. 3, pp. 399–401, July 1966.