Abstract. Coding Theory naturally lies at the intersection of a large number of disciplines in pure and applied mathematics. A multitude of methods and means has been designed to construct, analyze, and decode the resulting codes for communication. This has suggested to bring together researchers in a variety of disciplines within Mathematics, Computer Science, and Electrical Engineering, in order to cross-fertilize generation of new ideas and force global advancement of the field. Areas to be covered are Network Coding, Subspace Designs, General Algebraic Coding Theory, Distributed Storage and Private Information Retrieval (PIR), as well as Code-Based Cryptography.


Introduction by the Organizers

Coding theory has developed for a long time since its introduction in the late 1940’s as a tool for the realization of Shannon’s fundamental limits of communication on unreliable channels. Its rich inter-dependency with other areas of mathematics such as algebra, combinatorics, and probability theory, and its applications to a number of areas such as cryptography, electrical engineering, and theoretical computer science have brought forward coding theory as a highly important area of applicable discrete mathematics. As a matter of fact, most papers submitted to arXiv under the area of math.IT belong to coding theory, and math.IT is one of the most active mathematical areas in entire arXiv, as the reader may wish to verify on http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/math.

The above organizers proposed an Oberwolfach workshop on coding theory for this reason, and it was clear at the outset that it would bring together leading
researchers in several key areas of mathematical coding theory. In addition to the many mathematicians, there were a number of computer scientists and electrical engineers present. Participants came from many countries and the group included both senior and junior researchers. This workshop was preceded by several events in Dagstuhl (Seminar 11452 in November 2011, Seminar 13351 in August 2013, and Seminar 16101 in March 2016), in particularly the latter of which the prominent role of coding theory for contemporary challenges (Big Data) was emphasized and proven. The organizers of the present workshop are positive that this workshop, along with its predecessors, helps to increase the interaction between mathematicians and researchers in applied areas of communications technology.

In the following paragraphs we briefly sketch the areas of research covered, together with their relationships.

(1) **Network Coding.** Network coding theory is concerned with the encoding and transmission of information in the situation where there may be many information sources and possibly many receivers in a communication network. This is a comparably fresh area of coding theory and was established around 1999. The technical kernel of this topic is still sufficiently close to the channel coding problem posed by Shannon in 1948, and differs from it in that a network takes the role of the traditional single-link communication.

As this specific area of coding theory is comparably new, numerous classically educated coding theorists have not yet been intensively exposed to it. Thus, we included leading researchers in the workshop, in the hope that they attract others to the field.

(2) **Subspace Designs.** In various areas of combinatorics, a \(q\)-analog of a structure or statement is a generalization involving a new parameter \(q\) that returns the original entity or expression in the limit as \(q \to 1\) (where this limit is often misleading, as the generalized entity may only be defined for discrete values of \(q\)).

Subspace designs form the \(q\)-analogs of designs in the sense of traditional design theory. Here, such a \(q\)-analog of a \(t\)-design is a selection of \(k\)-subspaces of \(\mathbb{F}_q^n\) such that each \(t\)-subspace is contained in the same number \(\lambda\) of subspaces in the collection. A number of recent papers have successfully approached the construction question by adopting the so-called Kramer-Mesner method which prescribes a group of automorphisms in order to reduce the complexity of the search tree that contains subspace designs with reasonable parameters.

The theory of subspace designs has received full attention only recently. It is however of utter importance, because \(q\)-analogs of designs are sources of (optimal) subspace codes, that play a prominent role in the above-discussed field of random network coding. We therefore included leading researchers into the workshop, hoping for mutual inspiration between coding theory and this challenging field in combinatorial theory.
(3) **Algebraic Coding Theory.** Algebraic coding theory primarily investigates codes obtained from algebraic constructions. Important examples of this area of coding theory are codes from algebraic geometry, and also codes over rings, as they were more intensively studied since the nineties of the previous century. This discipline is almost as old as coding theory itself, and has attracted many of the brightest minds in the field.

Methods from many distinct mathematical sciences, but also of computer science and electrical engineering are very important in this area. There are emerging relationships between this area and Gröbner bases, graphs, and $q$-analogs of designs, to mention only a few, and our plan was to bring together top experts in these fields to facilitate an exchange of ideas pertaining to this and other interesting questions between the fields.

(4) **Distributed Storage and Private Information Retrieval.** A key task of any data storage system is to protect large volumes of stored data in the case of server failure, subject to severe constraints in terms of physical storage space, energy consumption, bandwidth, and security.

Private Information Retrieval (PIR) protocols make it possible for users to retrieve data items from a (distributed) database without disclosing information about the identity of the data items retrieved.

Distributed Storage and Private Information Retrieval challenge both coding theory and cryptography, while they seek to solve the most prominent problems of current and future communication scenarios. This area in contemporary coding theory has been introduced rather recently, and hence, many traditional methods from coding theory have not yet been adapted in full extent to it. It is subject to further modelling and faces a good number of unsolved or even yet unposed problems. We invited leading researchers to the workshop, hoping to further inspire this challenging field in mathematical coding theory.

(5) **Code-Based Cryptography.** Traditional public-key cryptography is in practice implemented by the RSA encryption scheme or with a Diffie-Hellman key exchange where one uses the group law of an elliptic curve over a finite field. In 1994 Peter Shor demonstrated that the underlying mathematical problems, namely the factorization of integers and the discrete logarithm problem over an elliptic curve are both polynomial time problems if one has a powerful quantum computer available.

As quantum computers have had real progress in recent years it became paramount to come up with public-key cryptographic schemes that resist attacks by quantum computers. As a matter of fact the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) made a call for the development of a standard. For above reasons there is an active research going on in so-called post-quantum cryptography.

Among the promising candidates in post-quantum cryptography are the systems based on coding theory. The idea goes back to a 1978 paper of
Robert McEliece where the subject was introduced, and has opened the nowadays well-established field of code-based cryptography.

It was the firm believe of the organizers that in a workshop on coding theory some time should naturally be devoted to presentations and discussions on how coding theory can contribute to the area of post-quantum cryptography.

The Oberwolfach workshop 1912, that took place from March 17 till March 23, 2019, was well attended and attracted 57 researchers (20 female) from all scholarly disciplines relevant to contemporary coding theory. The researchers came from 17 countries (Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Ireland, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, USA), and the program provided 29 talks and presentations that were requested to be highly accessible in light of the presence of a good number of early career researchers.

Acknowledgement: The MFO and the workshop organizers would like to thank the National Science Foundation for supporting the participation of junior researchers in the workshop by the grant DMS-1641185, “US Junior Oberwolfach Fellows”. Moreover, the MFO and the workshop organizers would like to thank the Simons Foundation for supporting Christine A. Kelley, Felice Manganiello and Heide Gluesing-Luerssen in the “Simons Visiting Professors” program at the MFO.
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Guessing Random Additive Noise Decoding (GRAND)

Muriel Médard
(joint work with Ken R. Duffy)

We revisit the classical coding theorem of Shannon by considering an alternate means of performing maximum a posteriori decoding, which, under the usual assumption of a uniformly distributed input codebook, is maximum likelihood (ML). Our approach considers a model where a channel output, say $Y^n$, of $n$ symbols, is created by the addition, over some finite field, of a codeword $C^n$ of $n$ symbols and a noise $N^n$. The Shannon coding theorem for, say, binary symbols, says that the maximum rate, that we denote $R$, is $1 - H$, where $H$ is the Shannon entropy rate of $N$, and the rate $R$ is such that the cardinality of the set of codewords (the codebook) is $2^{nR}$. The complexity of performing ML decoding by examining all possible $2^{nR}$ codewords is prohibitive, leading to the search for readily decodable codes, and motivating much of the work in coding theory.

Assume now that we instead guess the noise, $N^n$, from most likely to least likely, and that we query whether $Y^n - N^n$ is a member of the codebook, i.e. whether $Y^n - N^n$ is a valid codeword. Such an investigation would also lead to a ML decoding. By using recent results on large deviations by Christiansen and Duffy, which use results from Massey, Arikan and others on moments of guesswork (the number of guesses until the correct query occurs), we can re-establish the coding theorem, along with error exponents and success exponents, which are quite new. We show that this seemingly naïve approach leads to low complexity decoding and, surprisingly, to a complexity that decreases as $R$, the code rate, increases. We also show that we can readily account for non-memoryless noise distributions, such as Markov models of noise yield. We show preliminary results that indicate that the best usual decoding approaches for certain common codes can be outperformed by orders of magnitude by using GRAND.

Network Coding with flags

Gabriele Nebe
(joint work with Dirk Liebhold, Angeles Vazques-Castro)

In Random Linear Network Coding the nodes in the network forward random linear combinations of the input vectors. So the information travelling through the network is the subspace generated by all the input vectors. Networks like the internet keep track of the package sequence number. Network Coding with Flags allows the nodes to compute linear combinations only with vectors having a smaller sequence number. So the information that is preserved by the network is a nested sequence of subspaces, a so called flag.
The set of all flags in $K^n$ forms a simplicial complex, where the maximal simplices are the fine flags $\{0\} < V_1 < \ldots < V_n = K^n$ with $\dim(V_i) = i$. This simplicial complex is well known in mathematics as the spherical building of $\text{GL}_n(K)$. The type of a flag

$$W_* : \{0\} < W_1 < \ldots < W_\ell < K^n$$

is the set $\text{type}(W_*) := \{\dim(W_i) | 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ of dimensions of the spaces in the flag. It parametrises the orbits of $\text{GL}_n(K)$ on the set of all flags in $K^n$. Subspace codes can be recovered by taking $\ell = 1$. Together with Angeles Vazquez-Castro (Barcelona) and my PhD student Dirk Liebhold we developed a theory how to use flags for network coding [1].

In analogy with constant dimension codes we look at codes as subsets of the set of flags of a given type. The distance to measure transmission errors is the generalization of the Grassmann distance

$$d(W_*, W'_*) = \sum_{i=1}^\ell d_G(W_i, W'_i),$$

where $d_G(W, W') = \frac{1}{2}(\dim(W + W') - \dim(W \cap W'))$. This distance is $\text{GL}_n(K)$-invariant. The orbit of flags of a given type decomposes further into cells, according to the pivot positions of the subspaces. Each cell is a regular orbit of the unipotent radical $U$ of a parabolic subgroup of $\text{GL}_n(K)$. The $\text{GL}_n(K)$-invariant distance hence can be seen as a distance function on $U$. In the subspace case ($\ell = 1$) the group $U$ is abelian, more precisely isomorphic to a full matrix space, turning the cells into affine metric spaces and allowing for linear rank metric codes in $U$. This fails to be true in the general case. For example if $n = r(\ell + 1)$ and $\dim(W_i) = ri$, then the largest cell is a regular orbit for the group

$$U = \{u_A := \begin{pmatrix} I & A_{11} & A_{12} & \cdots & A_{1\ell} \\ 0 & I & A_{22} & \cdots & A_{2\ell} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & I & A_{\ell\ell} \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & I \end{pmatrix} | A_{ij} \in K^{r \times r}, 1 \leq i \leq j \leq \ell \}.$$

The distance of $u_A$ and the unit element $u_0$ is

$$d(u_A, u_0) = \sum_{i=1}^\ell r_i,$$

where $r_i = \text{rk} \begin{pmatrix} A_{1,i} & \cdots & A_{1\ell} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ A_{i,i} & \cdots & A_{i\ell} \end{pmatrix}$.

In general $d(u_A, u_B) = d(u_A u_B^{-1}, u_0) \neq d(u_{A^{-1}B}, u_0)$. The paper [1] describes good flag codes, e.g. the checkerboard codes consisting of fine flags in $K^n$ for $n = 2^t+1$, which are $n-1$-dimensional linear codes with minimum distance $2^t$. Other interesting examples for flag codes as well as encoding and decoding algorithms are given in Dirk Liebhold’s thesis [2].
Subspace codes consisting of \(k\)-spaces pairwise intersecting in at least \((k-2)\)-spaces

Leo Storme

(joint work with Daniele Bartoli, Jozefien D’haeseleer, Ago-Erik Riet, Peter Vandendriessche)

Consider a vector space \(V\) and a set of \(k\)-spaces \(C = \{\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n\}\). If these \(k\)-spaces pairwise intersect in \((k-t)\)-spaces, then \(C\) is called a \((k, k-t)\)-SCID (set of Subspaces with Constant Intersection Dimension). When we identify the elements of \(C\) with codewords, this gives us in fact an equidistant subspace code.

The classical example of a \((k, k-t)\)-SCID is a \((k-t)\)-sunflower. This is a set of \(k\)-spaces which pairwise intersect in the same \((k-t)\)-space.

An important theorem on \((k, k-t)\)-SCID states that every \((k, k-t)\)-SCID \(C\) of size

\[|C| > \left(\frac{q^k - q^{k-t}}{q - 1}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{q^k - q^{k-t}}{q - 1}\right) + 1\]

is equal to a \((k-t)\)-sunflower.

The general belief is that this lower bound is too large. Most likely, for general \(q, k, t\), smaller \((k, k-t)\)-SCID are already equal to \((k-t)\)-sunflowers. There is first of all a complete classification of \((k, k-1)\)-SCID.

A \((k, k-1)\)-SCID is either:
- a \((k-1)\)-sunflower,
- a set of \(k\)-spaces contained in a \((k+1)\)-space.

In recent research, improvements to this sunflower bound have been found for \((k, k-2)\)-SCID.

There is the important result of Beutelspacher, Eisfeld and Müller [1] which states that every \((3, 1)\)-SCID \(S\), with \(|S| \geq 3(q^2 + q + 1)\), is contained in
- a hyperbolic quadric in \(V(6, q)\),
- a dual partial 2-spread of \(V(5, q)\),
- a 1-sunflower.

The following examples are classical examples of \((k, k-2)\)-SCID.
- \((k-2)\)-sunflower: \(k\)-spaces through given \((k-2)\)-space.
- Dual of a set of 2-spaces in \(V(k+2, q)\), pairwise intersecting in the zero vector, is a set of \(k\)-spaces in \(V(k+2, q)\), pairwise intersecting in a \((k-2)\)-space.
\[ \text{(Size at most } q^k + q^{k-2} + \cdots + q^2 + 1, \text{ when } k \text{ even, and size at most } q^k + q^{k-2} + \cdots + q, \text{ when } k \text{ odd)} \]

- **star**: set of \( k \)-spaces intersecting a given other \( k \)-space \( \Omega \) in distinct \((k-1)\)-spaces.

\[ \text{(Size at most } q^{k-1} + q^{k-2} + \cdots + q + 1) \]

To characterize the largest \((k,k-2)\)-SCID, the concept of a configuration was used. Consider a \((k,k-2)\)-SCID \( S \). A **configuration** is a set of three codewords \( A, B, C \) of \( S \), such that \( A \cap B \cap C \) is a \((k-4)\)-space \( \pi_{ABC} \).

This then led to the following characterization results.

The three largest \((k,k-2)\)-SCID, \( k \geq 4 \), are either:

- a \((k-2)\)-sunflower,
- the dual of a set of \( 2 \)-spaces in \( V(k+2,q) \), pairwise intersecting in the zero vector,
- a star.

As a corollary, the following sharp sunflower bound was proven.

Let \( S \) be a \((k,k-2)\)-SCID, with \( k \geq 4 \).

If

- \( |S| > q^k + q^{k-2} + \cdots + q^2 + 1 \), for \( k \) even,
- \( |S| > q^k + q^{k-2} + \cdots + q \), for \( k \) odd,

then \( S \) is a \((k-2)\)-sunflower.

The arguments which were used to prove the preceding characterization results on the largest \((k,k-2)\)-SCID, made us believe that also the largest sets of \( k \)-spaces, pairwise intersecting in at least \((k-2)\)-spaces could be classified.

There was already the major classification result of \( 3 \)-spaces pairwise intersecting in at least a \( 1 \)-space, by M. De Boeck [2], which states that in \( V(n,q) \), \( n \geq 7 \), maximal sets of \( 3 \)-spaces pairwise intersecting in at least a \( 1 \)-space, are one of 11 types, and also the Erdös-Ko-Rado results by Frankl and Wilson [3]:

Let \( S \) be a set of \( k \)-spaces in \( V(n,q) \), pairwise intersecting in at least a \( (k-2) \)-space.

(i) If \( n \geq 2k \), then \( |S| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-k+2}{2} \right\rfloor \). Equality holds if and only if \( S \) is the set of all the \( k \)-spaces, containing a fixed \((k-2)\)-space of \( V(n,q) \), or \( n = 2k \) and \( S \) is the set of all the \( k \)-spaces in a fixed \((k+2)\)-space.

(ii) If \( k+2 \leq n \leq 2k-1 \), then \( |S| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{k+2}{k} \right\rfloor \). Equality holds if and only if \( S \) is the set of all the \( k \)-spaces in a fixed \((k+2)\)-space.

By using ideas involving again the notion of configuration, large sets of \( k \)-spaces pairwise intersecting in at least \((k-2)\)-spaces were investigated, under the condition that no non-zero vector lies in all the \( k \)-spaces. This led to upper bounds on the sizes of such sets of \( k \)-spaces pairwise intersecting in at least \((k-2)\)-spaces.
As a consequence, we know that larger examples of such sets of $k$-spaces are cone examples: they have a vertex $\Omega$ of a certain dimension $k - k' > 0$, and these examples are then described by this vertex $\Omega$ and a base example $\mathcal{S}$ which is a set of $k'$-spaces pairwise intersecting in at least $(k' - 2)$-spaces.
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Channel Resolvability Codes for Secrecy and Stealth

GERHARD KRAMER

(joint work with Rana Ali Amjad)

Resolvability refers to generating random strings of symbols whose (joint) probability distribution is “close” to a product distribution. The problem of resolvability coding is to determine the smallest number of bits needed to generate such strings. Channel resolvability adds a channel after the encoder (the bits-to-string mapping) and considers the distribution of the channel output strings. Channel resolvability plays an important role for secrecy and stealth communication, e.g., for the wiretap channel.

A basic paper on the topic is by Wyner (1975) who developed information theory for a problem with two output strings. Wyner measured “closeness” by using a normalized informational divergence. Han-Verdú (1993) refined the theory by using variational distance, and generalized the theory to channels with memory. We describe a coding scheme for channel resolvability on binary-input channels that can approach the information-theoretic limits. The scheme uses a sparse linear code as an inner code, and any code with large minimum distance as an outer code. We show that the inner code generator matrix sparsity can be on the order of $n \log n$ for a code with blocklength $n$. This matches the encoding complexity of other existing schemes such as polar codes. One question posed is whether one can design “optimal” resolvability codes with less complexity, especially linear complexity.
Combinatorial Aspects of Rank Metric Codes

Eimear Byrne

(joint work with Alessandro Neri, Alberto Ravagnani, John Sheekey)

Rank metric codes were first introduced to the coding theory community by Del-
sarte [7] in the framework of association schemes. He also gave a construction of a
class of extremal rank metric codes, called maximum rank distance, or MRD code,
which by definition meet the rank metric Singleton bound. They were later studied
times, they have seen a formidable resurgence of interest, due to their connec-
tions to subspace codes, network coding and as possible candidates for code-based
cryptosystems and signature schemes.

Rank metric codes may be vector spaces in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, or may be linear spaces of
matrices. We discuss three different aspects of rank metric codes and in doing so
highlight some fundamental difference between the theories of these two classes.

**Definition 1.** Let $m \geq n$. An $\mathbb{F}_q$-[n × m, k, d] matrix code $C$ is a $k$-dimensional
$\mathbb{F}_q$-subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n \times m}$ of minimum rank distance

$$d = \text{rk}(C) := \min\{\text{rk}(X) : 0 \neq X \in C\}.$$  

It is called MRD if $k = m(n - d + 1)$. An $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-[n, k, d] vector rank metric code is
a $k$-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ of minimum rank distance

$$d = \text{rk}(C) := \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(c_1, c_2, ..., c_n) : 0 \neq c \in C\}.$$  

It is called MRD if $k = n - d + 1$.

MRD codes exist for all choices of $q, n, d$ in the form of Delsarte-Gabidulin
codes, or the larger family of twisted Gabidulin codes. Any $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-[n, k] code in
$\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ can be realised as an $\mathbb{F}_q$-[n × m, km] matrix code in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n \times m}$ by expanding each
coefficient with respect to a basis $\Gamma$ of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$.

In the case of Hamming metric codes, the support of a word is its set of non-zero
coordinates. In the case of rank metric codes, the support of $X \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ is the
column-space of $X$. If $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ its support is the column space of $\Gamma(x)$ for some
basis $\Gamma$ of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$.

**Density of MRD Codes.** It can be shown by an application of the Schwartz-
Zippel Lemma [12], combined with a criterion of Gabidulin [8], that the vector
linear MRD rank metric codes are dense in the family of all vector linear rank
metric codes of the same dimension. Explicitly, if $F(q)$ denotes the family of all $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-[n, k] vector rank metric codes and $G(q)$ denotes the family of all $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-[n, k, n − k + 1] vector rank metric codes then $\lim_{q \to \infty} \frac{G(q)}{F(q)} = 1$. However, as the
following theorem shows, the matrix MRD codes are not dense in the family of
all matrix codes of the same dimension. This result is achieved in [5] by counting
techniques, using the notion of a partition balanced family. Several other density
problems can be solved using these methods. A different approach (see [1]) yields
the same conclusion.
Theorem 2 ([5]). Let $F(q) := \{ C \in F_q^{n \times m} : \dim(C) = k \}$ and $G(q) := \{ C \in F(q) : C$ is not MRD$\}$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $q_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\forall$ prime powers $q \geq q_\varepsilon$, 
\[
\frac{|G(q)|}{|F(q)|} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.
\]
In particular, $\lim_{q \to \infty} \frac{|G(q)|}{|F(q)|} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, provided the limit exists.

Similar results hold for these families parametrized by $m$, that is as $m \to \infty$, the vector rank metric codes are dense, while the matrix MRD codes are not.

**Codes and Subspace Designs.** The notion of a subspace design, or a design over $F_q$, has been known since the 1970s, with the first non-trivial construction given by Thomas [13]. A $t$-$(n,r,\lambda)$ subspace design is a collection $B$ of $r$-dimensional subspaces of $F_q^n$ with the property that every $t$-dimensional subspace of $F_q^n$ is contained in the same number of elements of $B$. While it is known that $t$-subspace designs exist for infinitely many parameter sets [9], relatively few infinite families are known. There is a single known sporadic example of a realizable parameter set of $q$-Steiner system, which has $\lambda = 1$. These are $2$-$(13,3,1)$ subspace designs over $F_2$, found by employing the Kramer-Mesner algorithm. A major open problem concerns the existence of a $q$-analogue of the Fano plane, which would have parameters $2$-$$(7,3,1)$.

A new approach to the problem is to use coding theory. The celebrated Assmus-Mattson theorem [2], which is an application of the MacWilliams Duality Theorem, identifies criteria under which the Hamming supports of the words of a fixed weight in a linear code form the blocks of a classical $t$-$(n,r,\lambda)$ design, which is a collection of $r$-subsets of $[n]$, such that every $t$-subset of $[n]$ is contained in $\lambda$ blocks. We give a rank-metric analogue of this theorem, giving a connection between subspace designs and rank-metric codes.

Theorem 3 ([6]). Let $C$ be an $F_q^n$-$[n,k,d]$ rank metric code. Let $1 \leq t < d$ be an integer. Suppose that $C^\perp$ has at most $d-t$ ranks in $\{1,...,n-t\}$. Let $d^\perp$ be the minimum distance of $C^\perp$. Then

1. the $d$-dimensional supports of $C$ form the blocks of a $t$-design over $F_q$,
2. the $d^\perp$-dimensional supports of $C^\perp$ form the blocks of a $t$-design over $F_q$.

We remark that while a version of the theorem exists for matrix codes, it is not true to say that for any $d$-dimensional support $U$ of an element of a matrix code $C$ that the number $|\{X \in C : \sigma(X) = U\}|$ is an invariant of $d$.

**Tensor Representation of Codes.** The role of matrices in classical coding theory is fundamental. Efficient encoding and decoding procedures rely on the concepts of generator and parity check matrices. Several properties of a code are characterised by such matrices, including duality, equivalence and its minimum distance. These matrices also yield connections to equivalent objects in finite geometry, and hence many optimal codes have been constructed from sets of points in projective space.
We present rank-metric codes in the framework of 3-tensors. More precisely, we define the generator tensor and parity check tensor of an $F_q$-linear space of matrices and describe the properties of such codes in relation to these objects.

An important and well-studied parameter of a tensor is given by its tensor rank. This aspect of bilinear maps is central to algebraic complexity theory [3]. In terms of rank metric codes, this is a significant parameter. E.g., the storage overhead and the number of symbol operations required by a tensor encoder is a function of the tensor rank. Moreover, the computational/storage costs are lower than those associated with a generator matrix, especially for the matrix rank metric codes.

Let $N_q(k,d) := \min\{N : \exists \text{ an } F_q[N,k,d] \text{ code}\}$. It is well known [3] that any $F_q[n \times m, k, d]$ code has tensor rank at least $N_q(k,d)$. We say the code is tensor rank optimal if its tensor rank meets this lower bound.

**Theorem 4** ([4]). Let $R, k, d$ satisfy $R = N_q(k,d)$. Let $C$ be an $F_q[R,k,d]$ code. Let $V \in F_q^{n \times R}$ and $W \in F_q^{m \times R}$ have full rank. The code \{\(V \text{diag} (c) W^T : c \in C\}\} is an $F_q[n \times m, k, d]$ rank metric code of tensor rank $R$ in the following cases.

1. $R \leq n$, $V$ has rank $n$, and $W$ generates an $[R,m]$ MDS code.
2. $R \leq m$, $W$ has rank $m$, and $V$ generates an $[R,n]$ MDS code.
3. $R \leq n + m - d$, $V$ and $W$ both generate MDS codes.
4. $n = k$, $m = d$, $V$ is the parity-check matrix of an (extended) GRS code, $W$ is the generator matrix of an (extended) GRS code, and $C$ is an (extended) GRS code.

We introduce a new invariant, the list of generalized tensor ranks of an $F_q[n \times m, k, d]$ rank metric code and use these to obtain a refinement of the tensor rank bound proved by Kruskal [10]. We show that generalized rank weights can be used to distinguish inequivalent MRD codes.
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A Factor-Graph Approach to Quantum Information Processing

PASCAL O. VONTOBEL
(joint work with July X. Li)

Graphical notations like factor graphs [1, 2, 3] have proven to be very useful toward expressing relationships between (random) variables and toward formulating low-complexity algorithms for either exactly or approximately computing quantities of interest. For example, decoding algorithms for low-density parity-check codes, which have recently been selected for the new 5G telecommunications standard, are conveniently expressed in terms of factor graphs.

In this presentation, we have reviewed our factor-graph-based approach to quantum information processing [4, 5]. In particular, we have focused on quantum stabilizer codes (see, e.g., [6]) and discussed a new, factor-graph-transform-based approach to relate various graphical representations of such codes [7, 8]. Our approach allows us not only to express spatial correlations of encoded qubits (as is usually done) but also to conveniently express temporal correlations. Overall, this gives us a means to describe and characterize correlations of encoded qubits in space and time.
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A linear code \( C \) is called a \( G \)-code (or a group code) if \( C \) is a right ideal in the group algebra \( KG = \{ a = \sum_{g \in G} a_g g \mid a_g \in G \} \) where \( G \) is a finite group and \( K \) a finite field. Here the vector space \( KG \) with basis \( \{ g \in G \} \) serves as the ambient space with the weight function \( \text{wt}(a) = |\{ g \in G \mid a_g \neq 0 \}| \) and the non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) which is defined by \( \langle g, h \rangle = \delta_{g,h} \) for \( g, h \in G \).

Note that \( KG \) carries a \( K \)-algebra structure via the multiplication in \( G \). More precisely, if \( a = \sum_{g \in G} a_g g \) and \( b = \sum_{g \in G} b_g g \) are given, then
\[
ab = \sum_{g \in G} (\sum_{h \in G} a_h b_{h^{-1}g}) g.
\]

In this sense cyclic codes are group codes for a cyclic group \( G \). Reed Muller codes over prime fields \( \mathbb{F}_p \) are group codes for an elementary abelian \( p \)-group \( G \) \([2], [5]\), and there are many other remarkable optimal codes which have been detected as group codes \([8], [6], [4], [11]\).

We would like to mention here that choosing right ideals as group codes is just done by convention. Everything what we are going to prove holds equally true for group codes which are left ideals.

**Theorem.** \([3]\) Let \( C \) be a linear code over \( K \) of length \( n \) and let \( G \) be a finite group of order \( n \). Then \( C \) is a right ideal in \( KG \) if and only if \( G \) is isomorphic to a transitive subgroup of the permutation automorphism group of \( C \).

**Definition.** A right ideal \( I \) in a finite dimensional \( K \)-algebra \( A \) (denoted by \( I \leq A \)) is called **checkable** if there exists an element \( v \in A \) such that
\[
I = \{ a \mid a \in A, va = 0 \} = \text{Ann}_r(v) = \text{Ann}_r(Av).
\]

Note that checkable left ideals are defined analogously via the left annihilator of a principal right ideal.

**Examples.**

a) Let \( e = e^2 \) be an idempotent in \( A \). Then the ideal \( eA \) is checkable. This can be seen as follows. Obviously, \( eA \leq \text{Ann}_r(A(1 - e)) \). Since any \( 0 \neq (1 - e)b \in (1 - e)A \) is not in \( \text{Ann}_r(A(1 - e)) \) we have \( eA = \text{Ann}_r(A(1 - e)) \).

b) If \( A \) is a semisimple algebra, then all right and left ideals are generated by idempotents. Thus all right and left ideals are checkable.

c) All cyclic codes are checkable, since the check equation is given by the check polynomial.

d) LCD group codes \( C \) (that is, codes for which \( C \cap C^\perp = \{0\} \)) are checkable since
\( C = eKG \) with a self-adjoint idempotent \( e \) [7].

**Examples.** a) The binary extended \([24, 12, 8]\) Golay code is a checkable group code in \( \mathbb{F}_2S_4 \) [4] and \( \mathbb{F}_2D_{24} \) [11], where \( S_4 \) is the symmetric group on 4 letters and \( D_{24} \) is a dihedral group of order 24.

b) In [10] the authors point out that in numerous cases the parameters of checkable group codes for an abelian group \( G \) are as good as the best known linear codes mentioned in [9]. Even more, there is a checkable \([36, 28, 6]\) group code in \( \mathbb{F}_5(C_6 \times C_6) \) and a checkable \([72, 62, 6]\) group code in \( \mathbb{F}_5(C_6 \times C_{12}) \). In both cases the minimum distance is improved by 1 from an earlier lower bound in [9].

As mentioned in the introduction the group algebra \( KG \) carries a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \). Thus, for any group code \( C \leq KG \) the orthogonal space \( C^\perp \leq KG \) is well defined and also a group code in \( KG \).

**Theorem.** For any right ideal \( C \leq KG \) the following are equivalent.

a) \( C \) is checkable.

b) \( C^\perp \) is a principal right ideal.

As a main result we have the following Theorem. Note that a proof of the equivalence of b) and c) is already contained in [12].

**Theorem.** If char \( K = p \), then the following are equivalent.

a) \( KG \) is code-checkable.

b) Every right ideal in \( KG \) is principal.

c) \( G \) is \( p \)-nilpotent with cyclic Sylow \( p \)-subgroup.

d) Every right ideal in the principal \( p \)-block \( B_0(G) \leq KG \) is principal.

In the literature there are many papers which prove that particular classes of linear codes are asymptotically good. Already 1966 Assmus, Mattson and Turyn asked the question whether the class of cyclic codes is asymptotically good. The answer is still open. Thus we may ask the more general question

**Problem.** Is the class of group codes asymptotically good?

So far it has been answered only in characteristic 2.

**Theorem.** [1] For any finite field of characteristic 2 the class of checkable group codes is asymptotically good.

Using the methods of Bazzi and Mitter we are close to a proof that the above Theorem also holds true if char\(K = p \) with \( p \equiv 3 \) mod 4.
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Constructions of optimal locally recoverable codes via Dickson polynomials

SIHEM MESNAGER

(joint work with Jian Liu, Deng Tang)

Locally recoverable codes (LRC codes) have recently been a very attractive subject in the research on coding theory due to their theoretical appeal and applications in large-scale distributed storage systems, where a single storage node erasure is considered as a frequent error-event.

An LRC code is said to have locality $r$ if the value at any codeword coordinate can be recovered by accessing at most $r$ other coordinates. We refer to such a code as an $(n, k, r)$ LRC code over finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$, if the code is of length $n$, which has $q^k$ codewords and locality $r$. For an LRC code with locality $r$, if a symbol is lost due to a node failure, its value can be recovered by accessing the value of at most $r$ other symbols.

Problems of constructing LRC codes and bounding their parameters have been the subject of a considerable number of publications. Research on bounds for LRC codes was initiated in [3] which showed that the minimal distance $d(C)$ of an $(n, k, r)$ LRC code is bounded as follows: $d(C) \leq n - k - \lceil k/r \rceil + 2$. LRC codes achieving this bound with equality are called optimal LRC codes. Taking into account the size of the code alphabet, another upper bound on the minimum distance of $(n, k, r)$ LRC codes was established by Cadambe and Mazumdar [1].
An ingenious idea in designing optimal LRC codes is due to Tamo and Barg [7]. By generalizing the Reed-Solomon codes, Tamo and Barg [7] constructed a family of optimal \((n,k,r)\) LRC codes over a finite field of size that slightly exceeds the code length \(n\). Their method can provide optimal LRC codes for a lot of feasible triplet of parameters \((n,k,r)\). These optimal LRC codes are obtained from specially constructed polynomials over finite fields, called \(r\)-good polynomials that is to say, an \(r\)-good polynomial yields an optimal \((n,k,r)\) LRC code with \(n\) divisible by \(r + 1\). However, there are only a few known constructions of \(r\)-good polynomials. In their very remarkable paper [7], Tamo and Barg have provided three families of good polynomials. In 2018, Liu, Mesnager and Chen [5] have presented two general methods of designing \(r\)-good polynomials by using function composition, which lead to three new constructions of \(r\)-good polynomials. Very recently, Micheli [6] has provided a Galois theoretical framework which allows to produce \(r\)-good polynomials and showed that the construction of \(r\)-good polynomials can be reduced to a Galois theoretical problem over global function fields. The objective of this talk is to explore more polynomials which could be good candidates for being \(r\)-good polynomials. More specifically, we exploit Dickson polynomials to provide more families of \(r\)-good polynomials leading to the constructions of optimal LRC codes.

1. Background and notation

Let \(p\) be a prime and \(q = p^s\) be an \(s\)-th power of \(p\) with \(s\) a positive integer. We denote by \(\mathbb{F}_q\) the finite field with \(q\) elements and by \(\mathbb{F}_q^*\) the cyclic group \(\mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}\).

Dickson polynomials (see e.g. [4]) introduced by Dickson in 1897 form an important class of polynomials. They have been extensively investigated in recent years under different contexts. For \(b \in \mathbb{F}_q^*\) and integer \(m \geq 1\), let

\[
D_{m,b}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{mp}{m-j} \rfloor} \frac{m}{m-j} \binom{m-j}{j} (-b)^j x^{m-2j}
\]

denote the Dickson polynomial (of the first kind) of degree \(m\) over \(\mathbb{F}_q\).

A polynomial \(F\) over \(\mathbb{F}_{p^e}\) is said to be an \(r\)-good polynomial if

1. the degree of \(F\) is \(r + 1\),
2. there exist pairwise disjoint subsets \(\{A_1, \ldots, A_l\}\) of \(\mathbb{F}_{p^e}\) with cardinality \(|A_i| = r + 1\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, l, l \geq 1\), such that the restriction of \(F\) to each subset \(A_i\) is constant.

2. Constructions of \(r\)-good polynomials via Dickson polynomials

For \(q\) odd, let \(b \in \mathbb{F}_q^*\) and integer \(m \geq 1\). If \(m|(q-1)\), then the Dickson polynomial \(D_{m,b}(x)\) is an \((m-1)\)-good polynomial. Suppose \(b \in \xi^l U_m\) for some \(l \in S = \{0,1,\ldots,(q-1)/m-1\}\), where \(\xi\) is a primitive element of \(\mathbb{F}_q\), \(\xi U_m\) is the multiplicative coset of \(U_m = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q \mid x^m = 1\}\). Then, the only pairwise disjoint subsets of \(\mathbb{F}_q\) with cardinality \(m\) such that \(D_{m,b}\) is constant on each subset
include
\[ D_i = \{ u + b \cdot u^{-1} \mid u \in \xi^i U_m \} , \] for \( i \in I \subseteq S \), where
\[ I = \begin{cases} 
0, 1, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} - 1, l + 1, l + 2, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} + \frac{q-1}{2m} - 1, & \text{if } l \text{ is even, } \frac{q-1}{2m} \text{ is even,} \\
0, 1, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} - 1, l + 1, l + 2, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} + \frac{q-1}{2m} - \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } l \text{ is even, } \frac{q-1}{2m} \text{ is odd,} \\
0, 1, \ldots, \frac{l}{2}, l + 1, l + 2, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} + \frac{q-1}{2m} - \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } l \text{ is odd, } \frac{q-1}{2m} \text{ is even,} \\
0, 1, \ldots, \frac{l}{2}, l + 1, l + 2, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} + \frac{q-1}{2m} - 1, & \text{if } l \text{ is odd, } \frac{q-1}{m} \text{ is odd.} 
\end{cases} \]

For \( q \) odd, let \( b \in \mathbb{F}_q^* \) and integer \( m \geq 3 \) satisfying \( m|q-1 \). Suppose \( b \in \xi^l U_m \) for some \( l \in \{0, 1, \ldots, (q-1)/m-1\} \), where \( \xi \) is a primitive element of \( \mathbb{F}_q \). Then, one can deduce that the Dickson polynomial \( D_{m,b}(x) \) is constant on exactly \( l_{D_{m,b}} \) pairwise disjoint subsets with cardinality \( m \), where
\[ l_{D_{m,b}} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{q-1}{2m} - 1, & \text{if } l \text{ is even, } \frac{q-1}{m} \text{ is even,} \\
\frac{q-1-m}{2m}, & \text{if } l \text{ is even, } \frac{q-1}{m} \text{ is odd,} \\
\frac{q-1}{2m}, & \text{if } l \text{ is odd, } \frac{q-1}{m} \text{ is even,} \\
\frac{q-1-m}{2m}, & \text{if } l \text{ is odd, } \frac{q-1}{m} \text{ is odd.} 
\end{cases} \]

For \( q \) even, let \( b \in \mathbb{F}_q^* \) and integer \( m \geq 3 \) satisfying \( m|q-1 \). Then, the Dickson polynomial \( D_{m,b}(x) \) is an \((m-1)\)-good polynomial. Suppose \( b \in \xi^l U_m \) for some \( l \in S = \{0, 1, \ldots, (q-1)/m-1\} \), where \( \xi \) is a primitive element of \( \mathbb{F}_q \). \( \xi^l U_m \) is the multiplicative coset of \( U_m = \{ x \in \mathbb{F}_q \mid x^m = 1 \} \). Then, the only pairwise disjoint subsets of \( \mathbb{F}_q \) with cardinality \( m \) such that \( D_{m,b} \) is constant on each subset include
\[ D_i = \{ u + b \cdot u^{-1} \mid u \in \xi^i U_m \} , \] for \( i \in I \subseteq S \), where
\[ I = \begin{cases} 
0, 1, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} - 1, l + 1, l + 2, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} + \frac{q-1}{2m} - \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } l \text{ is even,} \\
0, 1, \ldots, \frac{l-1}{2}, l + 1, l + 2, \ldots, \frac{l}{2} + \frac{q-1}{2m} - 1, & \text{if } l \text{ is odd.} 
\end{cases} \]

For \( q \) even, let \( b \in \mathbb{F}_q^* \) and integer \( m \geq 3 \) satisfying \( m|q-1 \). Then, one can show that the Dickson polynomial \( D_{m,b}(x) \) is constant on exactly
\[ l_{D_{m,b}} = \frac{q-1-m}{2m} \] pairwise disjoint subsets with cardinality \( m \).

3. Concluding remarks

In this talk we have showed that the well-known Dickson polynomials are good candidates to be \( r \)-good polynomials. We have also explored new methods on constructing \( r \)-good polynomials via combining Dickson polynomials with linear functions. We found that there exist a large number of such \( r \)-good polynomials besides the known ones.
Acknowledgement. We would like to thank Gaojun Luo for the discussion on $r$-good polynomials via Dickson polynomials in Hangzhou, China.
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Thermal-Management Coding for High-Performance Interconnects

Tuvi Etzion

High temperatures have dramatic negative effects on interconnects performance. We introduce new efficient coding schemes that directly control the peak temperature of a bus by effectively cooling its hottest wires. This is achieved by avoiding state transitions on the hottest wires for as long as necessary until their temperature drops off. At the same time, we reduce the average power consumption by ensuring that the total number of state transitions on all the wires is bounded. Furthermore we are able to correct a number of errors that might occur during the transmission of the information. All these goals are achieved by using some redundancy, we use $n > k$ wires to encode a given $k$-bit bus. We provide optimal solutions and full analysis in each case.

Applications of nonbinary convolutional codes

Ángela Barbero and Øyvind Ytrehus

Binary convolutional codes were initially attractive for practical applications due to their simple decoding algorithms. Recent years have seen a renewed interest in convolutional codes, this time with a focus on bounds and constructions on nonbinary codes. These codes have better distance properties than their binary counterparts, but are less useful on communication channels that produce errors, since e.g. Viterbi decoding becomes prohibitively complex for all but the simplest codes. However, maximum likelihood decoding is feasible for erasure channels. This makes the codes interesting for several practical modern applications:
Promising applications and research areas

(1) Codes for delay sensitive erasure channels, e.g. transport protocols in the Internet. See Section 1.
(2) Codes for distributed storage. See Section 2.
(3) Codes for distributed computation. See Section 3.
(4) The above examples inherently assume an underlying symbol erasure channel. For channels that introduce errors, sequential decoding was a much used decoding algorithm before the invention of Viterbi decoding. A sequential decoder is less sensitive to the size of the convolutional code’s state space than a Viterbi decoder is. Actually, the column distance profile is more important. How do nonbinary codes perform with sequential decoders on a channel which makes errors?
(5) Alternatively, on channels with errors, error detection can be achieved quicker in some cases using convolutional codes as opposed to block codes. The idea was patented by Jim Massey in 1967 [1], using binary convolutional codes. Nonbinary codes will offer more rapid detection, since they have a better column distance profile than binary codes. Roughly speaking, a convolutional code possesses an optimum column profile iff the distance between distinct codewords grows as fast as possible (see e.g. [2]), thus allowing a rapid reconstruction of lost information packets.

Potential applications

(1) Block codes have been proposed for Private Information Retrieval (PIR). Is there a way to utilize the sliding window properties of convolutional codes for PIR?
(2) Block codes have been used with success for efficient compressed sensing. What about convolutional codes?
(3) Recently, there have been block subspace codes, or codes designed to have good rank metric properties. What can be achieved in terms of convolutional codes for good rank metric properties?

Potential but less promising (?) applications

(1) Convolutional McEliece asymmetric cryptographic schemes: This sounds like a natural idea. However, proposed schemes are either broken or not explained in sufficient detail.

1. Codes for Internet transport

Sequences of IP packets sent over the Internet are traditionally made robust by using TCP’s ARQ strategies. For delay sensitive applications, the inherent delay cost of this approach is unacceptable. Hence coded transmission, in particular employing convolutional codes with an optimum column distance profile, offers better delay properties [2].
2. Codes for Distributed storage

In order to protect stored files in distributed storage media against hardware failures, the storage system must offer a reliable scheme for reconstruction of lost content. Early systems used file replication to provide reliability. File replication essentially amounts to storing with a repetition code; for this reason, the use of more advanced codes have become more common, allowing a drastic reduction in the storage requirements compared with file replication for comparable robustness performance. Although Reed-Solomon codes offer optimum code rate, Dimakis et al. [3] showed that there is a tradeoff between code rate and reconstruction complexity.

In most cases that have been studied, block codes have been used, with the immediate consequence that files must be static, or encoded in blocks of short length, sacrificing code rate. We show that using convolutional codes instead, files may be extended (as e.g. in blockchain applications), or edited by changing local parts, or inserting or deleting file parts. Direct access to individual records is facilitated by using systematic codes (convolutional or block). If a file is read continuously from start to end, the coding problem is similar to a streaming application. On the other hand, with direct access, locally repairable codes become an advantage. Martinez-Peas and Napp [4] describe locally repairable convolutional codes in a rank distance perspective. In contrast, we describe the storage of files using codes from [2], that may be stored directly but possibly augmented by extra parity checks in order to improve storage reliability and also to facilitate block reconstruction in case of hardware failures.

It follows by definition that a rate \((n - 1)/n\) MDP convolutional in which every parity check extends over more than one \(n\)-symbol block cannot be locally repairable within one block. Lowering the rate to \((n - 1)/(n + 1)\) by adding an extra parity symbol (corresponding to a zero-memory parity check!) per block will obviously also make the code 1-erasure-1-block locally repairable. This offers the added possibility of improving the distance properties by optimizing the selection of the other parity checks.

3. Codes for Distributed computation

Distributed computation of certain common operations, often related to linear algebra, can be described in a way similar to distributed storage. Computation in some nodes (stragglers) may take longer to complete than anticipated, thus delaying the result of the entire operation. In the coded approach, the stragglers are considered erasures, and the computational problem is formulated with redundancy in such a way that the missing straggler results can be recreated based on the rest. Convolutional codes for this problem were considered in [5].
Matrix Codes and Rook Theory

ALBERTO RAVAGNANI

(joint work with Heide Gluesing-Luerssen)

1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Rank-metric codes are linear spaces of matrices over a finite field endowed with the rank distance. They were first studied by Delsarte for combinatorial interest via association schemes [1]. Special classes of rank-metric codes were independently discovered by Gabidulin [2] and Roth [6]. In 2008, Silva, Kschischang and Kötter [7] proposed rank-metric codes as a solution to the problem of error amplification in adversarial networks. Since then, matrix codes have been the subject of intense mathematical research, and have been studied in connection with several topics in algebra and combinatorics.

In this abstract, we survey some results from a joint work [4] with H. Gluesing-Luerssen, that was presented at the Oberwolfach Workshop on Contemporary Coding Theory (ID 1912). The focus of the abstract is on the connection between rank-metric codes and the theory of rook placements.

We start by defining rank-metric codes. In the sequel, we let $q$ be a prime power and $F_q$ the finite field with $q$ elements. We also work with integers $m \geq n > 0$.

**Definition 1.** A (matrix rank-metric) code is an $F_q$-linear subspace $C \leq F_q^{n \times m}$. Its dual is $C^\perp = \{ Y \in F_q^{m \times n} \mid \langle X, Y \rangle = 0 \forall X \in C \}$, where $\langle X, Y \rangle = \text{Tr}(XY^T)$ is the trace-product of $X$ and $Y$. Note that $C^\perp$ is also a code, whose dimension is $mn - \text{dim}(C)$. We let $W_i(C)$ denote the number of rank $i$ matrices in a code $C$.

The starting point of our discussion is an elegant theorem by Delsarte [1] that relates the rank distribution of a code $C \leq F_q^{n \times m}$ to the rank distribution of its dual code $C^\perp$. This can be interpreted as the rank-metric analogue of the celerated MacWilliams identities for codes with the Hamming metric.
Theorem 2. Let \( C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) be a code and let \( 0 \leq j \leq n \) be an integer. We have
\[
W_j(C^\perp) = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{i=0}^{n} W_i(C) \sum_{s=0}^{n} (-1)^{j-s} q^{ms+\binom{j-s}{2}} \left[ \begin{array}{c} n-i \\ s \end{array} \right]_q \left[ \begin{array}{c} n-s \\ j-s \end{array} \right]_q.
\]

Partitioning the elements of \( \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) according to their rank is not the only way of classifying matrices. Every partition \( P \) of \( \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) yields a notion of \( P \)-enumerator of a code \( C \) as follows.

Definition 3. Let \( P = (P_i)_{i \in I} \) be a partition of \( \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \). The \( P \)-enumerator of a code \( C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) is \( (P(C, i) \mid i \in I) \), where \( P(C, i) \) denotes the cardinality of \( C \cap P_i \).

In [4], we address the problem of constructing partition pairs \( (P, Q) \) on \( \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) with the following property: For every code \( C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \), the \( P \)-enumerator of \( C \) and the \( Q \)-enumerator of \( C^\perp \) determine each other via an invertible transformation. This problem is an instance of a more general and well-studied question in the context of additive codes in finite abelian groups.

2. The Pivot and Reverse-Pivot Partition

We partition the elements of \( \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) according to the pivot indices in their reduced row-echelon form (RREF). This defines a partition on \( \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \), denoted by \( P^{\text{piv}} \), which we call the pivot partition. We denote by \( \text{piv}(X) \) the list of pivots of a matrix \( X \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \).

Example 4. The matrix
\[
X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\]
over \( \mathbb{F}_3 \) has \( \text{piv}(X) = (1, 3) \).

Similarly, \( P^{\text{rpiv}} \) partitions the elements of \( \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) according to the pivot indices in their reduced row-echelon form computed from the right. We call it the reverse-pivot partition. The reverse list of pivots of \( X \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m} \) is denoted by \( \text{rpiv}(X) \). More precisely, we have \( \text{rpiv}(X) = (m + 1 - j_r, \ldots, m + 1 - j_1) \) if \( \text{piv}(XS) = (j_1, \ldots, j_r) \), where
\[
S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{GL}_m(\mathbb{F}_q).
\]

For example, the matrix \( X \) in Example 4 has \( \text{rpiv}(X) = (2, 3) \). In the sequel, we let \( \Pi = \{ (j_1, \ldots, j_r) \mid 1 \leq r \leq n, 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_r \leq m \} \cup \{ () \} \) denote the set of admissible pivot lists, where \( () \) is the empty list.

3. MacWilliams-Type Identities

In [4], we show that the pair of partitions \( (P^{\text{piv}}, P^{\text{rpiv}}) \) satisfies the property stated right after Definition 3 on page 25. We also compute the coefficients of the corresponding linear transformation in terms of the rank distribution of matrices supported on certain Ferrers diagrams. The latter are defined as follows.
Definition 5. Let $x, y > 0$ be positive integers. An $x \times y$ Ferrers diagram is a subset $F \subseteq \{1, \ldots, x\} \times \{1, \ldots, y\}$ such that $(i, j) \in F$ implies $(i', j') \in F$ whenever $1 \leq i' \leq i$ and $j \leq j' \leq y$. Given an integer $r$ and an $x \times y$ Ferrers diagram $F$, we denote by $P_r(F; q)$ the number of rank $r$ matrices $M \in \mathbb{F}_q^{x \times y}$ that are supported on $F$ (i.e., with $M_{ij} = 0$ whenever $(i, j) \notin F$).

A Ferrers diagram $F$ can be visualized as an array of top and right-aligned dots. We write $F = [c_1, \ldots, c_y]$ if $c_1, \ldots, c_y$ are the lengths of the columns of $F$. For instance, the Ferrers diagram $F = [1, 1, 3, 4]$ is depicted in Fig. 1. We establish

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{ferrers diagrams.png}
\caption{The Ferrers diagram $F = [1, 1, 3, 4]$.}
\end{figure}

a MacWilliams-type identity relating the pivot enumerator of a code $C$ to the reverse-pivot enumerator of $C^\perp$. The coefficients of the identity are expressed in terms of the rank distribution associated with Ferrers diagrams.

Theorem 6 (Gluesing-Luerssen, R.). Let $C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times m}$ be a code and $\lambda, \mu \in \Pi$. Let

$$\sigma = \tilde{\mu}, \quad \lambda \cap \sigma = (\lambda_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\alpha_x}), \quad \tilde{\sigma} \setminus \lambda = (\tilde{\sigma}_{\beta_1}, \ldots, \tilde{\sigma}_{\beta_y}).$$

For $j \in [y]$ set $z_j = |\{i \in [x] \mid \lambda_{\alpha_i} < \tilde{\sigma}_{\beta_j}\}|$, and let $F$ be the $x \times y$ Ferrers diagram $F = [z_1, \ldots, z_y]$. We have

$$P^{\text{piv}}(C^\perp, \mu) = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} \sum_{t=0}^m (-1)^{\lambda \cap \sigma} q^{nt + \binom{|\lambda \cap \sigma|}{2} - t} \sum_{r=0}^{\lambda \cap \sigma} \! \! \! P_r(F; q) \left[ \frac{\lambda \cap \sigma - r}{t} \right]_q P^{\text{piv}}(C, \lambda).$$

The quantity $P_r(F; q)$ is well-studied in the context of rook theory. In [5], Haglund establishes an interesting connection between $P_r(F; q)$ and the $q$-rook polynomial $R_r(F; q) \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$ for an arbitrary Ferrers board $F$. The latter has been introduced by Garsia and Remmel. We refer the reader to [3] for the definitions.

Theorem 7 (Haglund). For any Ferrers diagram $F$ and any $r \geq 0$ we have $P_r(F; q) = (q - 1)^r q^{|F| - r} R_r(F; q)_{q^{-1}}$ in the ring $\mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$.

In [4], we give a closed formula for $P_r(F; q)$, for any Ferrers diagram $F$, any $r$, and any $q$. Using Haglund theorem, we obtain as a simple corollary an explicit expression for the $q$-rook polynomials associated with an arbitrary Ferrers diagram.

Theorem 8 (Gluesing-Luerssen, R.). For any $x \times y$ Ferrers diagram $F = [c_1, \ldots, c_y]$ and all $1 \leq r \leq \min\{x, y\}$ we have

$$P_r(F; q) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq y} q^{r - \sum_{j=1}^r i_j} \prod_{j=1}^r (q^{c_{i_j} - j + 1} - 1).$$
In particular, we have

\[(1 - q)^r \cdot R_r(F; q) = q^{\sum_{j=1}^{y} c_j - ry} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq y} \prod_{j=1}^{r} \left( q^{i_j + j - c_{i_j} - 1} - q^{i_j} \right). \]
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**General Strong Polarization**

**Madhu Sudan**

(joint work with J. Blasiok, V. Guruswami, P. Nakkiran, A. Rudra)

The classical theorem of Shannon [8] asserts that the capacity of the binary symmetric channel with parameter $p$ is $(1 - h(p))$ where $h(p)$ is the binary entropy function. More elaborately it says that if we choose any $\epsilon > 0$, then for sufficiently large $n$, there are codes of block length $n$, rate at least $1 - h(p) - \epsilon$ that can correct random bit flip errors with high probability, where each bit is flipped independently with probability $p$. Forney [7]'s technique of concatenated codes (from 1966) shows how to do this with polynomial time algorithms, where the algorithms run in time polynomial in $n$ for every fixed $\epsilon > 0$. However the dependence on $\epsilon$ remained exponentially high.

Arikan [1]'s introduction of Polar codes in 2008 suggested a possibility that we may have finally found a technique to reduce the dependence to be polynomial in epsilon. Five years later in 2013, Guruswami and Xia [5], and independently Hassani, Alishahi and Urbanke [6] finally confirmed this possibility thus resolving a major open question in the Shannon theory.

In our work we give clean modular explanations of the main theorem above, which also yields generalizations to a broader class of codes, and broader class of channels (including channels with some memory) and yield exponentially low probability of decoding failure (of the form $\exp(-n^{\Omega(1)})$). Based on [2, 3, 4].
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Algebraic codes are good

Patrick Solé

We survey the algebraic structure [3], and asymptotic performance of the self-dual and LCD classes of quasi-cyclic [1], quasi-twisted [2], and dihedral codes over finite fields and finite rings. Of special interest is the case of low index: double circulant codes and four circulant codes [4]. We show that additive cyclic codes are good [5], and give an alternative proof that dihedral codes are good [1].
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Majority logic decoding and subspace designs

Alfred Wassermann

In [6], a simple decoding method based on majority decision for linear codes is presented. Its attraction lies in the easy realization in hardware and it requires that the dual code has to contain the blocks of a $t$-design, $t \geq 2$, as codewords.

Ever since then, people studied the linear codes generated by the blocks of $t$-designs. In order to get a good code it is desirable that the rank of the block-point incidence matrix of the design is small over some finite field. The famous Hamada conjecture states that geometric designs, which consist of the set of all $k$-flats in $\text{PG}(v,q)$ or $\text{AG}(v,q)$, minimize the $p$-rank for a prime power $q = p^s$.

Here, a few simple observations on the codes from subspace designs – also known as $q$-analogs of designs – are reported. These codes have the same length and majority logic decoding capability as the codes from geometric designs, but their decoding complexity is improved.

Rudolph [6] suggested to use the rows of a $b \times v$ block-point incidence matrix $N_D$ of a $2-(v,k,\lambda)$ design $D$ as parity check equations for a linear code $C_D$ over $\mathbb{F}_p$.

In [6, 4] it is shown that with one-step majority logic decoding the number of errors which can be decoded is equal to $\lfloor (r + \lambda - 1)/2\lambda \rfloor$, with $r$ being the repetition number of the design.

1. Geometric designs and their codes

Let $q$ be a prime power $p^m$ and $V$ be a vector space of finite dimension $v$ over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. For $0 \leq k \leq v$, we denote by $\binom{V}{k}_q = \{U \subseteq V \mid \dim U = k\}$ the set of $k$-dimensional subspaces of $V$. The cardinality of $\binom{V}{k}_q$ can be expressed by the Gaussian coefficients $\# \binom{V}{k}_q = \binom{v}{k}_q = \binom{v-1}{k-1}\cdots\binom{v-k+1}{1}\frac{(q^k-1)(q^k-2)\cdots(q-1)}{(q^k-1)(q^k-2)\cdots(q-1)}$.

Taking $P = \binom{V}{1}_q$ as set of points and $B = \binom{V}{k}_q$ as set of blocks, then it is well known [1, 1§2] that $G = (P,B)$ is a $2-(\binom{v}{1}_q,\binom{k}{1}_q,\binom{v-2}{k-2}_q)$ design. $G$ is called geometric or classical design. We note that $r = \binom{v-1}{k-1}_q$ and $b = \binom{k}{1}_q$. The $p$-rank for a geometric design $G$ has been determined by Hamada [3]. The code $C_G$ is called Projective Geometry code (PG code), see e.g. [5].

2. Subspace designs

Subspace designs – also called $q$-analogs of designs – were introduced independently by Ray-Chaudhuri, Cameron, Delsarte in the early 1970s.

Let $q$ be a prime power $p^m$ and $V$ be a vector space of finite dimension $v$ over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. For integers $0 \leq t \leq k \leq v$ and $\lambda$ a non-negative integer, a pair $D = (V,B)$, where $B$ is a collection of $k$-dimensional subspaces (blocks) of $V$, is called a $t-(v,k,\lambda)_q$ subspace design on $V$ if each $t$-dimensional subspace of $V$ is contained in exactly $\lambda$ blocks.
A $t-(v, k, \lambda)_q$ design $\mathcal{D}$ consists of $b = \lambda \binom{v}{t}_q / \binom{k}{t}_q$ blocks and every 1-dimensional subspace appears in $r = \lambda \binom{v-1}{t-1}_q / \binom{k-1}{t-1}_q$ blocks of $\mathcal{D}$. Moreover, every $2-(v, k, \lambda)_q$ subspace design is also a $2-(\binom{v}{1}_q, \binom{k}{1}_q, \lambda)$ combinatorial design.

As subspace design, the set of blocks of a geometric design with the above parameters is the trivial $t-(v, k, \lambda)_q$ subspace design for all $0 \leq t \leq k$.

### 3. Majority logic decoding with subspace designs

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a $t-(v, k, \lambda)_q$ subspace design. Then, $\mathcal{D}$ can be regarded as combinatorial $2-(\binom{v}{1}_q, \binom{k}{1}_q, \lambda_2)$ design. The rows of its block-point incidence matrix $N_{\mathcal{D}}$ are a subset of the rows of the incidence matrix $N_{\mathcal{G}}$ of the $2-(\binom{v}{1}_q, \binom{k}{1}_q, \binom{v-2}{k-2}_q)$ geometric design $\mathcal{G}$. Since if rows are removed from a matrix, its rank can only get smaller or stay constant, it is a simple observation that $\text{rank}_{p} N_{\mathcal{D}} \leq \text{rank}_{p} N_{\mathcal{G}}$. Therefore, codes from subspace designs are either the same codes as those from the corresponding geometric designs or contain these codes.

The number of errors $\ell$ which can be corrected by one-step majority logic decoding is $\ell = \lfloor \frac{r + \lambda - 1}{2\lambda} \rfloor$. Thus, $\ell$ can be bounded by

$$\lfloor \frac{q^{v-1} - 1}{q^{k-1} - 1} - 1 \rfloor / 2 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor \frac{q^{v-1} - 1}{q^{k-1} - 1} - 1 \rfloor / 2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda},$$

i.e. the choice of $\lambda$ is irrelevant for the error-correction capability of the code.

The advantage of taking a subspace design with small $\lambda$ over the trivial design is the reduced complexity of the decoder. For every position of a received word, the decoder runs through those $r$ blocks of the design which contain the corresponding point. Therefore, subspace designs with small values of $\lambda$ are preferable and the trivial subspace design is the worst choice since it attains the maximal value of $\lambda$.

The same can be concluded for the affine designs from subspace designs.

The above considerations lead to the

**Generalized Hamada conjecture:** A $t-(v, k, \lambda)_q$ subspace design $\mathcal{D}$, regarded as combinatorial design, has parameters $2-(\binom{v}{1}_q, \binom{k}{1}_q, \lambda)$. The $p$-rank of $\mathcal{D}$ is minimal among all combinatorial designs with the same parameters.
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A novel decoding scheme for hard and soft decision decoding of cyclic codes is described based on [1] and [2]. Proper cyclic shifts and componentwise counting of components of these shifts are exploited. In the hard decision case the decoding performs better than the binary Johnson radius and, in addition, gives reliability information which can be the basis for various variants of decoding algorithms. Further, soft decision information from the detection can be exploited in the decoding. Since the novel decoding algorithm performs better in case of low rate codes, the Plotkin construction is used to construct and decode codes with higher rate. This construction combines two codes and it is proved that a 3 dB better channel can be obtained for decoding the second code.

**BCH Codes.** Let $\alpha$ be a primitive element of the field $\mathbb{F}_q$ with $q = 2^m$ and let $n = q - 1$. A BCH($n, k, d$) code uses the cyclotomic cosets $K_i = \{i \cdot 2^j, j = 0, 1, \ldots, m - 1\}$ which are the conjugate roots in order to create polynomials with roots from the base field $\mathbb{F}_2$. For any $K_i$ we can create a monomial

$$m_i(x) = \prod_{j \in K_i} (x - \alpha^{-j}).$$

The generator polynomial of a BCH code of length $n$ is the product of a set of different monomials $m_i(x)$. For the generator polynomial $g(x) = \prod m_i(x)$ the dimension is $k = n - \deg g(x)$. The designed minimum distance is $d$ if $g(x)$ has $d - 1$ consecutive roots.

**Error Models.** In the binary case we transmit $n$ code bits $c_i$ over a binary symmetric channel (BSC). A symbol is corrupted by an error $\varepsilon_i$ and the symbol $r_i = c_i + \varepsilon_i$ is received. Thus, if $\tau$ errors in the $n$ transmitted symbols at the positions $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_\tau$ have occurred, we denote this error-polynomial by

$$\varepsilon(x) = x^{e_1} + x^{e_2} + \ldots + x^{e_\tau}.$$ 

For the AWGN channel we use BPSK modulation with $c_i = 0 \leftrightarrow x_i = 1$ and $c_i = 1 \leftrightarrow x_i = -1$. We receive $y_i = x_i + n_i$ were $n_i \in \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is the Gaussian noise.

**Basic Idea.** Assume we have a dual codeword of weight $d^\perp$ such that $b(x) = x^{b_1} + x^{b_2} + \ldots + x^{b_{d^\perp}}$ with $b_1 = 0$. Since the code is cyclic this is possible. Let the polynomial $w(x)$ be the multiplication of the dual codeword $b(x)$ with the received polynomial $r(x)$. This polynomial $w(x)$ is identical to the multiplication of $b(x)$ with the error $\varepsilon(x)$. Since by definition of the dual code we have $c(x)b(x) = 0 \mod (x^n - 1)$ and therefore,

$$w(x) = r(x)b(x) = (c(x) + \varepsilon(x))b(x) = c(x)b(x) + \varepsilon(x)b(x) = \varepsilon(x)b(x) \mod (x^n - 1).$$
We can interpret $w(x)$ as cyclic shifts of the error $\varepsilon(x)$ and add these shifts (coefficients are added in $\mathbb{F}_2$) as follows

$$w(x) = x^{b_1} \varepsilon(x) + \ldots + x^{b_d} \varepsilon(x) \mod (x^n - 1)$$

$$= x^{e_1} + x^{e_2} + \ldots + x^{e_r} +$$

$$x^{e_1+b_2} + x^{e_2+b_2} + \ldots + x^{e_r+b_2} +$$

$$\vdots$$

$$x^{e_1+b_{d-1}} + x^{e_2+b_{d-1}} + \ldots + x^{e_r+b_{d-1}},$$

where the exponents $e_i + b_j$ are calculated mod $n$. Note that $w(x) \in \mathcal{C}^\perp$ and therefore, $d^\perp \leq \text{wt } w(x) \leq \min\{\tau d^\perp, n\}$ for all $\varepsilon(x) \notin \mathcal{C}$. In fact, any non-zero coefficient of $w(x)$ is an error or a shifted error. If an even number of the shifts of $\varepsilon(x)$ will have a 1 at position $j$ then $w_j = 0$. We can shift the non-zero coefficients of $w(x)$ (which are shifted errors) back to their original position by cyclically shifting the polynomial $w(x)$ by the values $b_j \in \{-b_2, -b_3, \ldots, -b_{d^\perp}\}$ and thus, have $d^\perp$ polynomials $x^{b_j}w(x) \mod (x^n - 1)$. Since shifting does not change the weight, every 1 of $w(x)$ is in one of the $d^\perp$ shifts at an original error position. In other words, in the set of all $d^\perp$ shifts we have at least $\text{wt } w(x)$ errors at their original position. That we have at least $\text{wt } w(x)$ errors at their original position is due to the fact that a shifted error (which stays non-zero in $w$) can be possibly also at another error position in some shift. In each shift of $w(x)$ we have in average at least $\text{wt } w(x)/d^\perp$ errors at the original position of the $\tau$ errors while the remaining $\text{wt } w(x) - \text{wt } w(x)/d^\perp$ positions are at the $n - \tau$ non-error positions. The summation of the $d^\perp$ shifts of $w(x)$ calculates the frequency of occurrence of ones at the $n$ code positions

$$\Phi = \sum_{j \in \text{sup } b(x)} (x^{-j} w(x)) \mod (x^n - 1),$$

where the summation of the coefficients is done as integer addition. Clearly the value $\Phi_j$ is the number of ones at position $j$ in the $d^\perp$ shifts of $w(x)$. The largest values correspond to errors and can be iteratively corrected.

**Example.** We use the BCH(63, 24, 15) to illustrate several aspects. Note that this code is the best code known with this parameters. The table shows the expected $E[]$ and the simulated $AV[]$ values of $\Phi$ depending on the number of errors $\tau$ and $e$ denotes error and $c$ non-error positions and $E[\omega]$ is the expected weight of $w(x)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\tau$</th>
<th>$E[\omega]$</th>
<th>$E[\Phi_e(\tau)]$</th>
<th>$AV[\Phi_e(\tau)]$</th>
<th>$E[\Phi_c(\tau)]$</th>
<th>$AV[\Phi_c(\tau)]$</th>
<th>$E[\Phi_{\max}]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>181.5</td>
<td>192.2</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>196.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>160.3</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>120.1</td>
<td>188.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>146.9</td>
<td>169.5</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>125.7</td>
<td>181.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>162.3</td>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>175.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>135.6</td>
<td>141.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the numbers in the table one should expect that decoding above half the minimum distance is possible. Indeed, the decoding of the BCH(63, 24, 15)
performs as a decoder which can correct 9 errors which is 2 more than half the minimum distance. Bit flipping decoding of this code can be found in [5].

**Plotkin Construction.** The construction [3] combines two codes to construct a code of doubled length. Given \( C^{(1)}(n, k_1, d_1) \) and \( C^{(2)}(n, k_2, d_2) \) both \( \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n \) then

\[
C(2n, k_1 + k_2, \min\{2d_1, d_2\}) = \{ c = (c^{(1)} \mid c^{(2)}) ,\ c^{(i)} \in C^{(i)} \}.
\]

The length \( 2n \) and the dimension \( k_1 + k_2 \) are obvious. For the minimum distance we describe a possible decoder for \( C \). After the BSC we receive \( r = c + e = (c^{(1)} + e^{(1)} \mid c^{(1)} + c^{(2)} + e^{(2)}) \).

The first step is the addition of the right and the left half which gives \( c^{(1)} + e^{(1)} + c^{(2)} + e^{(2)} = c^{(2)} + e^{(1)} + e^{(2)} \). Since \( \text{wt}(e) \geq \text{wt}(e^{(1)} + e^{(2)}) \) the \( c^{(2)} \) will be correctly decoded if \( \tau = \text{wt}(e) \leq \frac{d^{(2)} - 1}{2} \).

The second step assumes that \( c^{(2)} \) is correct and adds \( c^{(2)} \) to the right half which is \( c^{(1)} + e^{(2)} \). In addition we have the left half \( c^{(1)} + e^{(1)} \). Assume \( d^{(1)} - 1 \) errors in both halves. These can be distributed only such that either \( c^{(1)} + e^{(1)} \) or \( c^{(1)} + e^{(2)} \) contains \( \leq \frac{d^{(1)} - 1}{2} \) errors. Decoding both and choosing the smaller error weight corrects, thus, the minimum distance is \( 2d_1 \).

Define \( x^{(1)} \odot x^{(2)} = (x_0^{(1)} x_0^{(2)}, x_1^{(1)} x_1^{(2)}, \ldots, x_{n-1}^{(1)} x_{n-1}^{(2)}) \), where \( x_i = (-1)^{c_i} \), then

\[
\{ c = (c^{(1)} \mid c^{(1)} + c^{(2)}) \} \iff \{ x = (x^{(1)} \mid x^{(1)} \odot x^{(2)}) \}.
\]

For BPSK over AWGN channel we receive \( y = x + n = (y^{(1)} \mid y^{(2)}) = (x^{(1)} + n^{(1)} \mid x^{(1)} \odot x^{(2)} + n^{(2)}) \). The addition of the left and right half is here \( \hat{y}^{(2)} = y^{(1)} \odot y^{(2)} \) or \( \hat{y}_i^{(2)} = \text{sign}(y_i^{(1)} y_i^{(2)}) \min\{|y_i^{(1)}|, |y_i^{(2)}|\} \). Soft decoding of \( \hat{y}^{(2)} \) gives \( x^{(2)} \) and we assume it is correct. Then we have \( x^{(1)} + n^{(1)} \) and \( x^{(1)} + n^{(2)} \) both \( \in \mathcal{N}(1, \sigma^2) \) or \( \in \mathcal{N}(-1, \sigma^2) \). The addition of these gives \( \in \mathcal{N}(\pm 2, 2\sigma^2) \). The amplitude has factor 2 and thus the signal power has factor 4, however the noise power (variance) is only doubled. Hence, factor 2 gain \( \rightarrow 3 \) dB. The combination \( y^{(1)} + x^{(2)} \odot y^{(2)} \) dates back to 1995 and can be found in step 2b on page 376 in [4]. Then it was derived in [6] in 2002 and called equivalent channel. Finally, in [7] it was shown that with this combination channel capacity is achievable.
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Symbol Erasures in Random Network Coding

Anna-Lena Horlemann-Trautmann

(joint work with Heide Gluesing-Luerssen)

Network coding in general, and random (or non-coherent) network coding in particular, has received much attention during the last 20 years. In random network coding we want to communicate information over a network to several receivers. To increase the information throughput we allow the inner nodes of the network to create random linear combinations of the incoming information and forward this linear combination along the outgoing edges. In the classical setup, as used in [1], the edges of a network are $q$-ary symmetric channels, i.e., during transmission symbols from $\mathbb{F}_q$ may change into other symbols of $\mathbb{F}_q$. In this talk however, we focus on networks whose edges are erasure channels, i.e., symbols are either unchanged or erased during transmission. A symbol erasure will be denoted by “?”.

This scenario has been studied significantly less than the classical setup, but some work exists. For instance, in [2] the authors define hybrid codes to correct both symbol erasures and classical errors.

Subspace codes, first introduced in [1], are a widely used class of codes well suited for error correction in random network coding. They are defined as sets of subspaces of some given vector space of dimension $n$ over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ with a specified subspace distance, or equivalently, with a prescribed maximal pairwise intersection dimension. One of the most studied families of subspace codes are spread codes (or simply spreads). It is well known that these codes exist whenever $k|n$. We will use the following construction of (Desarguesian) spread codes: Let $P \in \text{GL}_k(q)$ be the companion matrix of a monic irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ of degree $k$. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $n = mk$. Then

$$C = \{ \text{rowspace}(0_{k \times k} | \ldots | 0_{k \times k} | I_k | B_{i+1} | \ldots | B_m) \mid i = 1, \ldots, m, B_i \in \mathbb{F}_q[P] \}$$

is a spread code in $\mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$.

In this work we investigate the performance of spread codes over an erasure-only network channel. More precisely, we compare the symbol erasure correction capability and the probability of decoding success of spread codes in two different network channel models: the row erasure channel (REC), which is modeled as

$$R = AU + E1_n$$

and the column erasure channel (CEC), modeled as

$$R = AU + 1_k E$$
where $U \in \mathbb{F}_{q}^{k \times n}$ is a basis matrix of the codeword, $R \in \mathbb{F}_{q}^{k \times n}$ is the received word, $A \in \mathbb{F}_{q}^{k \times k}$ represents the linear transformations of the inner nodes, and $E \in \{0,?\}^{k \times n}$ is the symbol erasure matrix. In the first case, $E$ is multiplied by the all-one matrix on the right, which makes an erasure spread over the whole row, in the latter, $E$ is multiplied by the all-one matrix on the left, which makes an erasure spread over the whole column.

For simplicity we assume that all symbol erasures occur independently and with the same erasure probability $p$.

When using a spread code $C \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{q}(k,n)$ over these two channels, we get the following results:

- In both, the REC or the CEC, the code $C$ can correct any erasure pattern $E \in \{0,?\}^{k \times n}$ with at most $k-1$ nonzero entries. On the other hand, there exist erasure patterns in $\{0,?\}^{k \times n}$ with $k$ nonzero entries that cannot be corrected. Thus, the symbol erasure correction capability in the classical sense is $k-1$ for both channels.
- On the REC there are $$r(n,k) := 2^{kn} - (2^{n} - 1)^{k}$$ symbol erasure patterns $E \in \{0,?\}^{k \times n}$ that can be corrected by $C$.
- Using $C$ over the REC, the probability of decoding success is $$P_{\text{row}} := 1 - (1 - (1 - p)^{n})^{k}.$$ 
- Over the CEC the number of correctable erasure patterns depends on the codeword. Overall, the code $C$ can correct on average (at least) $$e_{\text{avg}} := \frac{N^{m}}{q^{n} - 1} \left( q^{n} - \left[ \frac{(q^{k} - 1)(N - 1)}{N} + 1 \right]^{m} \right)$$ symbol erasure patterns.
- By averaging over all possible codewords in $C$, the probability of decoding success over the CEC is $$P_{\text{avg}} := \frac{1}{q^{n} - 1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{\ell+1}(q^{k} - 1)^{\ell+1} P_{\ell}$$ $$= \frac{\pi_{0}^{m}}{q^{n} - 1} \left[ q^{n} - \left( \frac{(q^{k} - 1)\pi_{1}}{\pi_{0}} + 1 \right)^{m} \right],$$

where $$\pi_{0} := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \pi^{j} (1 - p)^{k(k-j)},$$ $$\pi_{1} := \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{j} \pi^{j} (1 - p)^{k(k-j)} = \pi_{0} - (1 - p)^{k^{2}}.$$ 

To compare the two probabilities of decoding success we show that the one for the CEC grows much faster than the one for the REC.
• For sufficiently large \( m = n/k \),
\[
\frac{P_{\text{row}}(n,k)}{P_{\text{avg}}(n,k)} \leq k(1-p)^{k-k^2} \left( \frac{(1-p)^k}{\pi_0} \right)^{m-1}.
\]

As a consequence, for any fixed \( k \) we have \( \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{P_{\text{row}}(n,k)}{P_{\text{avg}}(n,k)} = 0 \).

Furthermore, we compare the previous results to the erasure correction capability of hybrid codes, as defined in [2], in the CEC. These hybrid codes are defined as compositions of subspace codes with Reed-Solomon codes. Since hybrid codes have different information rate than spread codes for the same \( k \) and \( n \), we need to compare the erasure correction capability for codes of approximately the same rate, but different values for \( k \) and \( n \). The results depend on the parameters: for (very) small values of \( m = n/k \) spread codes have a higher probability of decoding success, whereas for growing \( m \) hybrid codes perform better. However, spread codes have the advantage that they can be defined over any underlying field, whereas for hybrid codes we need field sizes in the range of \( n \). Moreover, decoding can be done more efficiently for spread codes than for hybrid codes. Therefore, depending on the application, any of the two codes can be advantageous.

Remark: The results presented in this report and in the corresponding presentation have been published in [3]. In there, the channel models, the erasure correction capabilities of spread and hybrid codes, as well as the corresponding decoding algorithms are described in more detail. Furthermore, the performance of spread and hybrid codes in a column erasure channel, where also deletions (i.e., row erasures) might occur, is analyzed.
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QQR Codes, Points on Hyperelliptic Curves, and Goppa’s Conjecture

NIGEL BOSTON
(joint work with Jing Hao)

This extended abstract concerns a fundamental question in coding theory. We are interested in linear codes over the field \( F \) of size 2. These are linear subspaces \( C \) of \( F^n \). There are 3 important numbers associated to \( C \), namely \( n \), the dimension of \( C \) usually denoted \( k \), and its minimum distance \( d \), which is the smallest number of coordinates in which two unequal elements of \( C \) differ. Good codes have many well-spaced codewords, and so have both rate \( R := k/n \) and relative minimum distance \( \delta := d/n \) large.
If we plot points \((R, \delta)\) obtained for all linear codes over \(F\), then most of them are clustered near the origin and Manin formalized this by proving that there is a curve \(R = \alpha_2(\delta)\) below which the points are dense and above which there are only isolated points. It is therefore of fundamental importance to identify the function \(\alpha_2\) and Goppa conjectured that \(\alpha_2(\delta) = 1 - H_2(\delta)\), where \(H_2(\delta)\) is the binary entropy function, \(-\delta \log_2(\delta) - (1 - \delta) \log_2(1 - \delta)\).

Quasi-quadratic residue codes are a family of codes that, as we shall see, put Goppa’s conjecture to the test. There is one (called QQR\((p)\)) for each odd prime \(p\) and the weight (number of nonzero coordinates) of each codeword \(c_S\) equals to the number of points on a related hyperelliptic curve, \(X_S : y^2 = \prod_{a \in S} (x - a)\), defined over \(F_p\). Here \(S\) runs through all \(2^p\) subsets of \(F_p\). This allows for both the injection of ideas from arithmetic statistics into coding theory and the application of coding theory to study the distribution of the number of points as the curve varies.

We focused on \(p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\), when QQR\((p)\) is self-dual and has \(n = 2p, k = p\). If there are \(a_i\) codewords of weight \(i\), then \(\sum a_i x^i y^{n-i}\) is called the weight enumerator \(A\) of the code. We made some preliminary study of this for QQR\((p)\) and observed (and then proved using the theory of shadows and studying automorphisms of the code) that \(A\) is always divisible by \((x^2 + y^2)^{d-1}\). In conjunction with Gleason’s theorem restricting the form of \(A\) for self-dual codes, this allowed us to compute \(A\) for \(p\) up to 67.

Moreover, we observed and proved a similar result for quadratic residue codes QR\((p)\), namely that their weight enumerators are divisible by \((x + y)^d\). This was then used to discover and correct errors in online tables of weight enumerators of QR codes. We also answered a question of Joyner (in the negative) as to whether the weight enumerators of QQR codes necessarily satisfy Duursma’s Riemann Hypothesis.

Next, we used Sidel’nikov’s result on the cumulative distribution function of a code to establish that the weight distribution of QQR codes is asymptotically normal as \(p\) goes to infinity. This then establishes that, after being symmetrized, the point distribution of the hyperelliptic curves \(X_S\) converges to the normal distribution as \(p\) goes to infinity, a variant of an unpublished result of Larsen, which was established by very different means.

Finally, back to Goppa’s conjecture, where the connection with hyperelliptic curves tells us, as observed by Joyner, that if for infinitely many primes \(p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}\), \(|X_S(F_p)| < 1.779944271p\) for all \(S \subseteq F_p\), then Goppa’s conjecture is false. Letting \(M(p) := \max_S |X_S(F_p)|/p\), by exploiting Hasse-Weil and a study of extremal curves, we computed that for all odd primes \(p \leq 61\) except for \(p = 41\), \(M(p)\) is actually less than this critical value. This gives weak evidence that this approach could lead to a failure of Goppa’s conjecture. It was noted that there are curves \(X_S\) with 73 points for \(p = 41\) and that there exist large \(p\) with \(M(p)\) as close to 2 as we like by using curves of the form \(y^2 = x^d - 1\) for specially chosen \(d, p\).
(Scattered) Linear Sets are to Rank-Metric Codes as Arcs are to Hamming-Metric Codes

JOHN SHEEKEY
(joint work with Geertrui Van de Voorde)

In this talk we review the classical correspondence between linear codes in the Hamming metric and sets of points in a projective space, and outline the analogous correspondence for codes in the rank metric.

A linear \([n, k]\) code \(C\) over a field \(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}\) can be represented by a generator matrix \(G \in M_{k \times n}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})\); the code is then given by \(C = \{xG : x \in (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^k\}\). The Hamming weight of a vector \(v\) is defined as \(\text{wt}_H(v) = \#\{i : v_i \neq 0\}\), while the rank weight is defined as \(\text{wt}_R(v) := \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)\).

If \(A\) denotes the set of columns of \(G\), then it is well known that the Hamming weight of a codeword \(xG \in C\) is given by
\[
\text{wt}_H(xG) = n - |x^\perp \cap A|,
\]
where \(x^\perp := \{y : (\alpha x) \cdot y = 0 \, \forall \, \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}\}\), and \(|x^\perp \cap A|\) counts multiplicities. Thus questions regarding the Hamming weight distribution of a code can be translated into questions regarding intersection properties of the set \(A\) with hyperplanes of \((\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^k\). The code \(C\) is MDS if and only if no \(k\) of the elements of \(A\) lie on a common hyperplane; this is precisely the same condition that the set of projective points in \(\text{PG}(k-1, q^m)\) defined by \(A\) form an arc.

Let us define \(L\) as the \(\mathbb{F}_q\)-span of the columns of \(G\); \(L\) is then an \(\mathbb{F}_q\)-subspace of \((\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^k\). Then it is straightforward to show that that
\[
\text{wt}_R(xG) = n - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(x^\perp \cap L).
\]
Thus questions regarding the rank weight distribution of a code can be translated into questions regarding intersection properties of the \(\mathbb{F}_q\)-subspace \(L\) with the \(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}\)-subspaces \(x^\perp\). Such questions have been studied in finite geometry, where the set of points in \(\text{PG}(k-1, q^m)\) defined by \(L\) is referred to as a linear set. This correspondence was first noted for the case \(k = 2\) in [4], and further extended in [5].

**Theorem** ([5]). Let \(C\) and \(C'\) be two \(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}\)-linear codes endowed with the rank metric with generator matrices \(G, G'\) respectively, and let \(L\) and \(L'\) be the \(\mathbb{F}_q\)-span of the columns of \(G\) and \(G'\) respectively.

1. The code \(C\) is MRD if and only if the linear set defined by \(L\) is scattered with respect to hyperplanes in \(\text{PG}(k-1, q^m)\).
2. The codes \(C\) and \(C'\) are equivalent as rank metric codes if and only if \(L\) and \(L'\) are equivalent under the action of \(\Gamma L(k, q^m)\) on \((\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^k\).

Linear sets have been studied for a variety of reasons; for example blocking sets and two-weight codes. See [2], [3] for background. The above correspondence theorem allows us to translate results from finite geometry into results on rank...
metric codes, and vice versa. As an example, the following is a corollary of a result in [1]:

If \( C \) is a two-dimensional \( \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \)-linear rank-metric code in \((\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^m\) with second largest weight \( m - e \), then \( e \) divides \( m \) and all weights in \( C \) are divisible by \( e \). Furthermore, the matrix code in \( M_m(\mathbb{F}_q) \) obtained from \( C \) is equivalent to a code in \( M_{m/e}(\mathbb{F}_{q^e}) \).

There remain many interesting open problems in both rank metric codes and linear sets. This talk is intended to highlight the link between these two areas which proceeded independently for nearly 20 years, and to suggest that researchers in either topic may find useful techniques and interesting open problems in the other.
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**Searching for \((q\text{-Analogs of) Steiner Triple Systems}\)**

**PATRIC R. J. ÖSTERGÅRD**

Combinatorial designs are well-studied regular discrete structures. An example of a design is the Fano plane, which can be presented as a set system:

\[
\{\{0, 1, 2\}, \{0, 3, 4\}, \{0, 5, 6\}, \{1, 3, 5\}, \{1, 4, 6\}, \{2, 3, 6\}, \{2, 4, 5\}\}.
\]

The Fano plane has the property that every 2-subset of the set \( \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\} \) is contained in exactly one of the sets of the set system. The Fano plane is then a 2-(7, 3, 1) design, when we denote by \( t-(v, k, \lambda) \) a multisets of \( k \)-subsets (called blocks) of a \( v \)-set (of points) such that each \( t \)-subset of the \( v \)-set occurs in exactly \( \lambda \) blocks. As we are interested in structural properties of designs, the underlying set of elements is typically irrelevant; we say that two \( t \)-designs are isomorphic if there is a bijection between the underlying sets that maps one \( t \)-design onto the other. For more information about combinatorial designs in general and various specific types of designs in particular, see [4].

A central problem in design theory is that of determining existence of \( t \)-designs with given parameters. If the existence problem can be solved in the positive for some set of parameters, one may proceed and attack the classification problem, which asks for a complete set of representatives from the isomorphism classes. This work has a mathematical as well as a computational flavor [5].

In the framework of vector spaces, one may define analogs of \( t-(v, k, \lambda) \) designs. Let \( \mathbb{F}_q^v \) be the \( v \)-dimensional vector space over the finite field \( \mathbb{F}_q \). A \( q \)-analog of
a $t$-$(v,k,\lambda)$ design is a set $S$ of $k$-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$, such that each $t$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ is contained in exactly $\lambda$ elements of $S$. Whereas the existence problem for 2-$(v,3,1)$ designs—called Steiner triple systems—has been solved, the only known nontrivial existence result for $q$-analogs of Steiner triple systems is that $q$-analogs of 2-$(13, 3, 1)$ designs exist [1].

One big challenge in the study of $q$-analogs of designs is that the size of the objects is very large already for the smallest admissible parameters. For example, it is a rather straightforward task to manually find and show uniqueness of designs with the parameters of the Fano plane, but so far neither analytical nor computational methods have succeeded in finding a $q$-analog of the Fano plane or proving that it does not exist. We have seen that the 2-$(7, 3, 1)$ Fano plane has only 7 blocks, but a $q$-analog of the Fano plane would consist of as many as 381 3-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^7$ for $q = 2$.

Due to a scarcity of results for $q$-analogs of Steiner triple systems, the role of bringing known results and concepts from classical designs to the $q$-analog setting is emphasized. A few such examples will be considered here.

A parallel class of a $t$-$(v,k,\lambda)$ design is a set of blocks that partition the set of points. A partition of the blocks of a design into parallel classes is called a resolution and the design is said to be resolvable. A resolvable 2-$(v,3,1)$ design is called a Kirkman triple system. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a Kirkman triple system with $v$ points is that $v \equiv 3 \pmod{6}$.

The smallest open case for classifying Kirkman triple systems is $v = 21$. The author and Janne Kokkala have made progress, still unpublished, on the classification of such designs. For example, the case where the designs contain a Fano plane has already been settled.

What would a $q$-analog of a quadrilateral be? Note that the blocks of the presented quadrilateral intersect each of the sets $\{0, 5\}$, $\{1, 4\}$, and $\{2, 3\}$ in exactly one point and those three pairs of points are precisely the pairs that do not occur in any of the blocks. A $(v, g, k, \lambda)$ group divisible design (GDD) is a collection of $k$-subsets (blocks) of a $v$-set of points and a partition of the points into $g$-sets (groups), such that each 2-subset of the $v$-set is contained in either $\lambda$ blocks or a group but not both. Hence a quadrilateral is a $(6, 2, 3, 1)$ GDD.

In [3], $q$-analogs of GDDs are studied. A $q$-analog of a $(v, g, k, \lambda)$ GDD is a collection of $k$-dimensional subspaces (blocks) of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ and a vector space partition into $g$-dimensional subspaces (groups), such that each 2-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^v$ is contained in either $\lambda$ blocks or a group but not both.

As a matter of fact, in this setting there is no $q$-analog of a quadrilateral [3, Lemma 5]. This raises a question about what other substructures could play important roles in the study of $q$-analogs of Steiner triple systems.

Kirkman triple systems could also be studied in the $q$-analog setting. Then there has to be a partition of the blocks into sets of blocks that form vector space partitions. Considering such structures at this very moment may sound pointless
as already the case of Steiner triple systems is wide open. However, it should be noted that the stronger conditions may be advantageous as they, for example, narrow down and speed up computer searches. The smallest nontrivial case is $v = 9$; in [2] structures “close to” $q$-analogs of Steiner triple systems with these parameters were found so these may indeed exist (even as Kirkman triple systems).

Finally, by [3] it is possible that there is a $q$-analog of a $(9, 3, 3, 3, 1)$ GDD. The existence of such a structure would imply the existence of a $q$-analog of a Steiner triple system with $v = 9$, since the groups can be taken as additional blocks when we have $g = k$. As the groups form a vector space partition (the $q$-analog of a parallel class), such a system would correspond to a $q$-analog of a Steiner triple system with (at least) one parallel class.
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Service rates of codes

EMINA SOLJANIN

Coding has traditionally been used in transmission and storage of data to provide reliability in a more efficient way than simple replication. The traditional performance indicators of codes are the minimum distance and the code rate. More recently, special codes have been developed that also provide efficient maintenance of storage under node failures. In addition to the traditional metrics, the properties of codes that matter in such scenarios are the code locality and availability. Emerging applications, such as distributed learning and fog computing, are adding yet another use for coding. In these applications, the goal is to maximize the number of users that can be simultaneously served by the system. One such service is simultaneous download of different jointly coded data blocks by many users competing for the system’s resources. Here, coding affects the rates at which users can be served. Most of the work on data access has been concerned with the download latency (see e.g., [1] and references therein). It has recently been recognized, that another important metric that measures the availability of the stored data is the service rate [2, 3, 4, 5]. Maximizing service rate (or the throughput) of a distributed system helps support a large number of simultaneous system users. This talk introduced the notion of the service rate region of codes and presented some examples where this region is known.
Figure 1. (left) Replicated, coded, and hybrid systems with $n = 4$ nodes storing $k = 2$ files. (right) Service capacity regions of the three systems when the service capacity of each node is $\mu = 1$. The regions have the same areas. Coding can handle the skews in request arrival rates $\lambda_a$ and $\lambda_b$ for the two stored objects.

Mathematically, we formulate this problem as follows: There are $k$ files to be stored (redundantly) across $n$ servers. We assume that $n \geq k$ and that files are mathematically elements of some finite field. Each server can store a linear combination of files. We further assume wlog that the time to download a file from server $\ell$ is exponential with rate $\mu_\ell$, $1 \leq \ell \leq n$, and that requests to download file $i$ arrive at rate $\lambda_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. A set of stored symbols that can be used to compute a given file (symbol) is referred to as a recovery set for that file. We denote by $R_{i,1}, \ldots, R_{i,t_i}$ the $t_i$ disjoint recovery sets of file $i$, and by $\lambda_{i,j}$ the portion of requests for file $i$ that are assigned to the recovery group $R_{i,j}$, $j = 1, \ldots, t_i$. Then the achievable service rate region of such a system is the set of vectors $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k)$ for which there exist $\lambda_{i,j}$ satisfying the following constraints:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} \lambda_{i,j} = \lambda_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq t_i} \lambda_{i,j} \leq \mu_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq n.$$  

The first set of constraints ensures that the demands for all files are served, and the second set ensures that no node is sent requests in excess of its service rate.

Interestingly, the best schemes (those that maximize the achievable service rate region) often combine replication and coding. To see that, we consider an example shown in Fig. 1, which also illustrates an application. The system consists of 2 cameras monitoring two intersecting streets. One of the cameras acquires content $a$ concerning the traffic on one of the streets, and the other content $b$ concerning the other street. Suppose we can store files $a$ and $b$ redundantly on 4 nodes. Fig. 1 (left) shows 3 redundant storage examples: replication, coding, and combined replication and coding. Given that each node can serve $\mu = 1$ requests per second, we want
to maximize $\lambda_a$ and $\lambda_b$, the rate of requests for $a$ and $b$ that can be supported. File $a$ can be downloaded from the node storing $a$, or from two nodes that store combinations of $a$ and $b$. Fig. 1 (right) shows that coded systems can handle skews in content popularity better than replicated systems. Combined replication and coding can better support asymmetries in demands. This capability is important if the interests in traffic $a$ vs. traffic $b$ change e.g., depending on the time of the day, and if they are high then they are seldom equally likely. Regarding the reliability under node failures, we observe that the coded system preserves data if any two nodes fail, the replication system preserves data if at most one of $a$ nodes and at most one of $b$ nodes fail, and the hybrid system preserves data if any two nodes fail unless both $b$ and $a + b$ nodes fail.
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\section*{Making McEliece and Regev meet

GILLES ZÉMOR

\textbf{The McEliece paradigm.} For decades, devising a code-based public-key cryptosystem was based on the McEliece paradigm, spelt out in the seminal 1978 paper [1]. The idea is to choose a linear code $C$ that comes with an efficient decoding algorithm, and to publish a random generator matrix $G$. The trapdoor encryption primitive is defined as

$$M = \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$$

$$m \mapsto mG + e$$

where $e$ is a random vector of predetermined small weight $t$ (we speak of an encryption primitive because semantic security needs to be added to it to obtain a genuine cryptosystem). The public matrix $G$ should “look like” the generator matrix of a random code and it is expected that an attacker who wishes to access $m$ can do no better than tackle the generic problem of decoding a random linear code. The legitimate receiver has access to the hidden decoding algorithm and can therefore decrypt efficiently. The original McEliece cryptosystem chooses the code $C$ to be a random binary Goppa code. This has proved to be quite successful,
but relies upon the assumption that it is not feasible to recover a Goppa code’s hidden structure from a random generator matrix. In practice, this is indeed the case, but we do not have a formal assurance that recovering the hidden structure reduces to solving a well-identified problem that fits nicely in present-day complexity theory. This has for long left the McEliece cryptosystem under the suspicion that a method for breaking it exists and is waiting to be discovered.

Many alternatives to the use of Goppa codes have been proposed over the years, and many of them have been broken. The modern variant, MDPC-McEliece [2] is interesting in that it replaces Goppa codes with codes with a very weak structure, making it credible that no efficient recovery algorithm exists that exposes the hidden properties. A Moderate Density Parity Check (MDPC) code is defined by a parity-check matrix whose rows all have weight \( w \). It comes with a natural decoding algorithm, the bit-flipping algorithm, which consists in deciding, in parallel for every bit position \( i \), to flip its value whenever doing so decreases the syndrome weight: the process is iterated several times. The number \( t \) of correctable errors by bit-flipping is approximately \( n/w \). The time-complexity of decoding a random linear code from \( t \) errors by Information Set decoding techniques (essentially the best we know) is approximately \( 2^t \), and the time-complexity of recovering the hidden words of weight \( w \) is, by similar techniques also of the order \( 2^w \). By choosing \( w \approx \sqrt{n} \) one maximises the difficulty of breaking the scheme by known methods, making it of the order \( 2^{\sqrt{n}} \).

**The Alekhnovich paradigm.** At the turn of the century, Alekhnovich [3] came up with a radically new way of devising a public-key cryptosystem based on coding theory, by departing from the McEliece approach. Instead of devising a somewhat practical scheme and then doing one’s best to evaluate its security, Alekhnovich devised a scheme specifically so that it came with a proof that breaking it implies the existence of an algorithm that decodes random linear codes. This came at the cost of making the scheme totally impractical, but subsequent variants made the idea more and more efficient and the point we are making in this talk is that these more efficient variants come to closely resemble MDPC-McEliece. In fact, we can propose a variation that can be seen either as a slightly modified MDPC-McEliece scheme, or a slightly modified Alekhnovich-Regev type scheme. This variation has arguably the best of both worlds in that it is only slightly less efficient than MDPC-McEliece, but breaking it provably reduces to the difficulty of decoding random linear codes.

One of Alekhnovich’s core ideas, itself inspired by Ajtai’s work on lattices, is to introduce the following decision problem \( D \).

- **Input:** A uniform binary random matrix \( H \), together with a binary vector \( y \) of length \( n \) such that:
  1. \( y \) is either chosen randomly uniformly,
  2. or \( y \) is of the form \( sH + \varepsilon \) where \( s \) is uniform random and where \( \varepsilon \) is a random vector whose weight is some parameter \( t \). In other words \( y \) is at distance \( t \) from a random vector in the code generated by the rows of \( H \).
• **Problem:** Decide whether we are in case (1) or (2).

It turns out that any algorithm that solves problem $D$ with a probability of success significantly better than pure guessing can be transformed into an algorithm that decodes random linear codes $[4, 6]$ from random errors of weight $t$. So if we assume that decoding random linear codes is difficult, it must hold that there is no efficient algorithm that solves problem $D$ better than pure guessing.

The “Regev” version of Alekhnovich’s cryptosystem is as follows $[5, 7]$. The message space is $\{0, 1\}$ (one bit).

- **Public key:** $H, y = sH + \varepsilon$.
- **Secret key:** $s$.
- **Encryption:** $C(m) = (He^T, z = m + \langle e, y \rangle)$.
- **Decryption:** $z + sHe^T = m + \langle e, \varepsilon \rangle$.

Both vectors $e$ and $\varepsilon$ are chosen randomly of weight $t < \sqrt{n}$. Decryption works because the probability that $\langle e, \varepsilon \rangle \neq 0$ is small. There is a non-zero probability however, that decryption may fail.

Once problem $D$ has been introduced, the security reduction is very simple. If there is an attack against the cryptosystem, it must work just as well when the vector $y$ is chosen at random uniformly in the whole space, otherwise we would have a distinguishing algorithm that solves problem $D$. But then, for the same reason, the attack should continue to work just as well when the small-weight vector $e$ is replaced by a random vector chosen uniformly in the whole space. But after both those transformations, the ciphertext is simply random noise, so nothing can decipher it. Therefore, either it is possible to solve efficiently problem $D$ and hence decode random linear codes, or the cryptosystem is unbreakable.

Consider now the following “vector” version of the above cryptosystem.

- **Public key:** $H, Y = SH + E$. $S$ and $E$ are matrices, and every row of $E$ is chosen to be of weight $t$. In other words the couple $(s, \varepsilon)$ of the original cryptosystem is replaced by several independent copies of it. Let $C$ be the code whose parity-check matrix is $\left[\frac{Y}{S}\right]$. Let $G$ be a generator matrix for the code $C$.
- **Secret key:** $E$.
- **Encryption:** $m \mapsto C(m) = mG + e$. The vector $e$ is random of weight $t$ as before. The plaintext $m$ is a vector of length $\ell$, the number of rows of the matrix $G$.
- **Decryption:** compute $EC(m)^T = Ee^T$. This is the syndrome of $e$ for the (secret) matrix $E$. We may use bit-flip (MDPC) decoding to recover $e$ from $E$.

Note that when $H = 0$ we are back to the original MDPC-McEliece encryption primitive. Adding the random matrix $H$ to the MDPC-McEliece scheme enables us to obtain therefore an Alekhnovich-Regev-type scheme, which has the added value of having a security proof which reduces security to the problem of decoding random linear codes. The McEliece and Alekhnovich paradigms have come together!
These ideas have undergone further developments that appear in the BIKE suite [8].
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**On the lengths of divisible codes**

MICHAEL KIERMAIER

(joint work with Thomas Honold, Sascha Kurz, Alfred Wassermann)

1. Divisible Codes

Divisible codes have been introduced by Ward in 1981 [6]. An $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear code is called $\Delta$-divisible if all its weights are divisible by $\Delta$. The main case of interest is that $\Delta$ is a power of the characteristic of the base field. In this talk, we consider the case $\Delta = q^r$ with $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Divisible codes are interesting for several reasons. Many good codes are divisible. There are connections to self-dual and self-orthogonal codes as well as Griesmer-optimal codes. In this talk, we concentrate on applications in finite geometry and the theory of subspace codes.

Ward’s “divisible code bound” [7] gives an upper bound on the dimension of a divisible code, depending on an upper and lower bound on the weights. We follow kind of an orthogonal approach and investigate the lengths of divisible codes, independently of the dimension. As divisible codes can always be extended by all-zero positions, it is natural to look at the effective length, which is the number of coordinates which are not all-zero.

For that purpose, we define the numbers $s_q(r, i) = q^i \cdot \frac{2^{r-i+1}-1}{q-1}$, which have the property $q^i \mid s_q(r, i)$, but $q^{i+1} \nmid s_q(r, i)$. This allows us to create kind of a positional system upon the sequence of base numbers $S_q(r) = (s_q(r, 0), s_q(r, 1), \ldots, s_q(r, r))$. Each integer $n$ has a unique $S_q(r)$-adic expansion $n = a_0s_q(r, 0) + a_1s_q(r, 1) + \ldots +$
Let \( S \) be a partial spread of size \( r \) where \( 0 \leq r \leq q - 1 \) and \( \sigma \) denotes the cross-sum of the elements of \( S \). Now we can state the following characterization of the effective lengths of \( q \)-divisible codes:

**Theorem 1** ([4, Th. 1]). Let \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( r \in \mathbb{N}_0 \). Then the following are equivalent:

(i) There exists a \( q^r \)-divisible \( \mathbb{F}_q \)-linear code of effective length \( n \).

(ii) The leading coefficient of the \( S_q(r) \)-adic expansion of \( n \) is non-negative.

As a byproduct of the proof, we get the following bound on the maximum weight of a divisible code.

**Theorem 2** ([4, Th. 2]). Let \( C \) be a \( q^r \)-divisible code of effective length \( n \). Then the maximum weight of \( C \) is at most \( \sigma q^r \), where \( \sigma \) denotes the cross-sum of the \( S_q(r) \)-adic expansion of \( n \).

## 2. Partial spreads

Let \( V \) be a \( \mathbb{F}_q \)-vector space of finite dimension \( v \). A set \( S \) of \( (k - 1) \)-flats in PG\((V)\) is called a partial spread if the elements of \( S \) have pairwise trivial intersection. Equivalently, each point of PG\((V)\) is covered by at most one element in \( S \). The points not covered by any element of \( S \) are called holes. An important research question asks for the maximum possible size \( A_q(v, k) \) of a partial spread.

In the case \( v \mid k \), it is possible to cover all the points of PG\((V)\) by a spread \( S \), showing that \( A_q(v, k) = \frac{q^v - 1}{q - 1} \). Otherwise, write \( v = tk + r \) with \( r \in \{0, \ldots, k - 1\} \) and assume \( t \geq 2 \). In 1975, Beutelspacher gave a construction showing that 

\[
A_q(v, k) \geq \frac{q^v - q^{k+r}}{q^{k-1}} + 1.
\]

Furthermore, he proved that the construction is optimal for \( r = 1 \) [1]. Recently, a considerable progress has been made by Năstase and Sis- sokho, showing that Beutelspacher’s construction is optimal whenever \( k > \frac{q^r - 1}{q - 1} \) [5, Th. 1].

We demonstrate how this result follows as a corollary from Theorem 1, see also [4, Cor. 2]. The crucial observation is that the set \( P \) of holes of a partial \((k - 1)\)-spread \( S \) describes a \( q^{k-1} \)-divisible code of effective length \( \#P \). Assume that \( S \) is a partial \((k - 1)\)-spread of size \( \frac{q^v - q^{k+r}}{q^{k-1}} + 2 \). Then 

\[
\#P = \frac{q^{k+r} - 1}{q - 1} - 2 \cdot \frac{q^{k-1}}{q - 1}.
\]

The \((k - 1)\)-adic expansion of that number is 

\[
\#P = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i s_q(k - 1, i) \quad \text{with} \quad a_0 = a_1 = \ldots = a_{k-2} = q - 1 \quad \text{and leading coefficient} \quad a_{k-1} = q \cdot (\frac{q^{k-1}}{q - 1} - k + 1) - 1.
\]

By Theorem 1, \( a_{k-1} \geq 0 \) or equivalently, \( k \leq \frac{q^r - 1}{q - 1} \).

## 3. Projective divisible codes

A linear code \( C \) is called projective if in a (and then in any) generator matrix of \( C \), any two columns of \( C \) are linearly independent and there are no zero columns.\(^1\) The effective length of a projective code is always agrees with its length.

In the above setting of a set of holes of a partial spread, we know more than what was actually used. In fact, the set of holes \( P \) of a partial \((k - 1)\)-spread \( S \)

\(^1\)The latter condition is only necessary for linear codes of length 1.
describes a projective $q^{k-1}$-divisible linear code. The following example shows that this additional restriction may further improve upper bounds on $A_q(v,k)$. Consider a partial 3-spread $S$ in $\text{PG}(\mathbb{F}_2^{11})$. Its set of holes is of size $2047 - 15\#S$. Application of Theorem 1 shows that there exists no binary 8-divisible code of effective length $2047 - 136 \cdot 15 = 7$, but there exists one of effective length $2047 - 135 \cdot 15 = 22$. Therefore, we get the upper bound $A_2(11,4) \leq 135$. However, there is no projective binary 8-divisible code of length $2047 - 133 \cdot 15 = 52$ (see Theorem 3 below), improving the upper bound by 3 to 132. The determination of the exact value of $A_2(11,4)$ remains an open problem. So far, the best known construction is the one by Beutelspacher, and the best known upper bound is the one we just derived, so there remains the gap $129 \leq A_2(11,4) \leq 132$.

Motivated by the above example, we study the lengths of projective divisible codes. The question appears to be much harder. No direct characterization as in Theorem 1 is known. There are open cases already for 16-divisible binary, 9-divisible ternary and 5-divisible $\mathbb{F}_5$-linear codes. On the positive side, the lengths of projective even, doubly-even and triply-even binary linear codes are known:

\textbf{Theorem 3.} (a) The lengths of projective 2-divisible (even) binary codes are $3, 4, 5, 6, \ldots$

(b) The lengths of projective 4-divisible (doubly even) binary codes are $7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, \ldots$

(c) The lengths of projective 8-divisible (triply even) binary codes are $15, 16, 30, 31, 32, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 60, 61, 62, 63, \ldots$

Theorem 3 has been shown in [2, Th. 13], with the exception of the hardest single case of projective 8-divisible codes of length 59, whose non-existence has been established only recently in [3].

4. THE JOHNSON BOUND FOR SUBSPACE CODES

Many of the classical coding bounds have been adapted to subspace codes. However, practically everything is covered by the “Johnson type bound II” in [8]. Similar to partial spreads (which are a special case of subspaces codes), subspace codes can be connected to certain divisible codes. Combined with Theorem 1, this yields an improvement of the Johnson bound, see [4, Th. 5].

5. OPEN PROBLEMS

We conclude with a list of open problems and ideas for future research.

- Theorem 1 only covers $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear $\Delta$-divisible codes with $\Delta = q^r$, $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The more general case that $\Delta$ is only a power of the characteristic of $\mathbb{F}_q$ remains open.
- Extend Theorem 3 to more cases, like 16-divisible binary, 9-divisible ternary or 5-divisible $\mathbb{F}_5$-linear codes.
• Investigate the lengths of divisible codes with restrictions on the minimum weight, on the dimension and/or on the point multiplicity.
• Classify divisible codes of parameters which are in some sense extremal.
• Investigate indecomposable divisible codes.
• Investigate the $q$-analog setting of divisible rank metric codes.
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Algebraic Quantum Coding Theory

MARKUS GRASSL

We presented a short introduction to the basic concepts of quantum error-correcting codes, linking quantum mechanics and algebraic coding theory.

Quantum error-correcting codes (QECC) are subspaces of a complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ which are protected against certain types of “quantum errors” (decoherence). In many cases, the ambient space $\mathcal{H}$ is a tensor product of finite-dimensional spaces $\mathbb{C}^q$, i.e., $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^q \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathbb{C}^q = (\mathbb{C}^q)^{\otimes n}$. A quantum code $C$ of dimension $K = q^k$ and minimum distance $d$ is denoted by $C = [n, k, d]_q$. Similar to the classical case, the distance $d$ describes how many “local” errors can be corrected.

While there is a general theory of quantum error-correcting codes [4], one faces the problem to give an efficient description of the subspace $C$ in the ambient space $\mathbb{C}^{q^n}$, whose dimension grows exponentially in $n$. The main solution to this problem is given by so-called stabilizer codes [1, 2, 3].

This allows to construct QECC based on classical linear codes of length $n$ over the fields $\mathbb{F}_q$ and $\mathbb{F}_{q^2}$ which are self-orthogonal with respect to the Euclidian or Hermitian inner product, respectively. The standard metric is the Hamming metric. The properties of the resulting QECC can be derived from the properties of the related codes over finite fields, exploiting methods from algebraic coding theory. Furthermore, quantum mechanics allows to extract information about the error via measurements. The result of the measurement can be interpreted as the
error syndrome of the classical code, allowing to essentially use classical decoding algorithms.
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Invariants of rank-metric codes and q-polymatroids

Elisa Gorla
(joint work with Relinde Jurrius, Hiram López Valdez, Alberto Ravagnani)

Let $q$ be a prime power and let $\mathbb{F}_q$ denote the finite field with $q$ elements. Let $m, n$ be positive integers and denote by $\text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ the $\mathbb{F}_q$-vector space of matrices of size $n \times m$ with entries in $\mathbb{F}_q$. Up to a transposition, we assume without loss of generality that $n \leq m$. For a vector subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$, we denote by $V^\perp$ the dual of $V$ with respect to the usual scalar product.

**Definition 1.** The function

$$d : \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q) \times \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q) \longrightarrow \mathbb{N} \quad (A, B) \mapsto \text{rk}(A - B)$$

is a **distance** on $\text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. The rank is the corresponding **weight function**. A **rank-metric code** is a vector subspace $C \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. The minimum distance of a rank-metric code $C \neq 0$ is the integer

$$d_{\text{min}}(C) = \min\{\text{rk}(M) \mid M \in C, \ M \neq 0\}.$$

Two rank-metric codes $C, D \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ are **equivalent** if there is an $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear isometry $\varphi : \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q) \to \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $\varphi(C) = D$.

For brevity, in this extended abstract no proofs are given and references are kept to a minimum. We refer the interested reader to [1] for a comprehensive mathematical introduction to rank-metric codes and a list of references and to [2] for the proofs of the results presented in this note.

We recall the Singleton Bound for rank-metric codes:

$$\dim(C) \leq m(n - d_{\text{min}}(C) + 1).$$

Codes that meet the bound are called **Maximum Rank Distance** (MRD).
The weight distribution and the higher weights are invariants of a rank-metric code, which depend on the weights of the elements of the code and on the dimensions of subspaces satisfying certain rank conditions. They are connected to the decoding properties of the code. The maximum rank of a code $C$ is

$$\max \{ \text{rk}(M) \mid M \in C \}. \tag{76x666}$$

It is well known that every rank-metric code satisfies the Anticode Bound:

$$\dim(C) \leq m \cdot \max \{ \text{rk}(C) \}. \tag{76x683}$$

Codes that meet the bound are called **optimal antcodes**.

**Definition 2.** The **generalized weights** of $C$ are

$$d_i(C) = \frac{1}{m} \min \{ \dim(A) \mid A \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q) \text{ optimal anticode, } \dim(C \cap A) \geq i \}, \tag{76x714}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, \dim(C)$.

It is easy to prove that $d_1(C) = d_{\min}(C)$.

**Definition 3.** A **$q$-polymatroid** is a pair $P = (\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho)$ where $\rho$ is a function from the set of all subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $U, V \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$:

1. (P1) $0 \leq \rho(V) \leq \dim(V)$,
2. (P2) if $U \subseteq V$, then $\rho(U) \leq \rho(V)$,
3. (P3) $\rho(U + V) + \rho(U \cap V) \leq \rho(U) + \rho(V)$.

A **$q$-matroid** is a $q$-polymatroid $(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho)$ such that $\rho$ is integer-valued.

Definition 3 is a direct $q$-analogue of the definition of an ordinary polymatroid, with the extra property that $\rho(V) \leq \dim(V)$ for all $V \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. It is essentially equivalent to the definition of $(q, m)$-polymatroid given by Shiromoto in [4].

**Examples 4.** • The simplest example of $q$-(poly)matroid is $(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \dim(\cdot))$, where $\dim(\cdot)$ denotes the function that associates to a vector space its dimension.

• Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. The pair $(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \psi_U)$ with $\psi_U(V) = \dim(V \cap U)$ is not a $q$-(poly)matroid, since $\psi_U$ does not satisfy property (P3).

• Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$. The pair $(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho_U)$ with $\rho_U(V) = \dim(U) - \dim(U \cap V^\perp)$ is a $q$-(poly)matroid.

One has the following natural notion of equivalence for $q$-polymatroids.

**Definition 5.** Two $q$-polymatroids $(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho_1)$ and $(\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho_2)$ are **equivalent** if there exists an $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear isomorphism $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_q^n \to \mathbb{F}_q^n$ such that $\rho_1(V) = \rho_2(\varphi(V))$ for all $V \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

One can associate $q$-polymatroids to rank-metric codes as follows.

**Definition 6.** Given $C \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ a rank-metric code, we define the $q$-polymatroid $P(C) = (\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho_C)$, where

$$\rho_C(V) = \frac{1}{m}(\dim(C) - \dim(C(V^\perp))) \in \mathbb{Q}. \tag{76x749}$$
For \( n < m \), we associate to \( C \) the \( q \)-polymatroid \( P(C) \).
For \( n = m \), we associate to \( C \) the \( q \)-polymatroids \( P(C) \) and \( P(C^T) \).

Here \( C^T \) denotes the transposed of the code \( C \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \), namely
\[
C^T = \{ M^T \mid M \in C \} \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{F}_q).
\]
It is easy to show that equivalent rank-metric codes produce equivalent \( q \)-polymatroids. A possible exception is the case \( m = n \), where if \( C \) and \( D \) are equivalent rank-metric codes, then either \( P(C) \) is equivalent to \( P(D) \) and \( P(C^T) \) is equivalent to \( P(D^T) \), or \( P(C) \) is equivalent to \( P(D^T) \) and \( P(C^T) \) is equivalent to \( P(D) \).

**Example 7** (\( q \)-polymatroids of MRD codes). Let \( C \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) be a rank-
metric code with minimum distance \( d_{\text{min}}(C) = d \). Then \( C \) is MRD if and only if \( P(C) = (\mathbb{F}_q^{n}, \rho_C) \) where
\[
\rho_C(V) = \begin{cases} 
n - d + 1 & \text{if } \dim(V) > n - d + 1, \\
\dim(V) & \text{if } \dim(V) \leq n - d + 1.
\end{cases}
\]

Notice that MRD codes of the same dimension have the same associated \( q \)-polymatroid, but they are not necessarily equivalent, see [2, Example 5.8].

**Example 8** (\( q \)-polymatroids of optimal anticodes). Let \( C \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) be a rank-
metric code with \( r = \max \text{rk}(C) \). Let
\[
\rho(V) = \dim(V + \langle e_1, \ldots, e_{n-r} \rangle) - (n - r),
\]
where \( e_i \) denotes the \( i \)-th vector of the standard basis of \( \mathbb{F}_q^n \). Then \( C \) is an optimal anticode if and only if either \( P(C) \) is equivalent to \( (\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho) \), or \( m = n \) and \( P(C^T) \) is equivalent to \( (\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho) \).

Notice that the \( q \)-polymatroids of Examples 7 and 8 are \( q \)-matroids. Vector rank-
metric codes are another example of rank-metric codes whose associated \( q \)-polymatroids are \( q \)-matroids, see [3]. There are however examples of rank-metric codes, whose associated \( q \)-polymatroid is not a \( q \)-matroid, see [2, Example 5.10].

The interest in associating \( q \)-polymatroids to rank-metric codes comes from the fact that several invariants of rank-metric codes can be computed from the associated \( q \)-polymatroids. E.g., it is easy to show that the dimension and minimum distance of a rank-metric code can be computed from the associated \( q \)-polymatroid(s). Moreover, in [4] Shiromoto shows that same result holds for the weight distribution. In [2], we prove the same result for the generalized weights.

**Theorem 9.** Let \( C \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q) \) be a rank-
metric code, \( 1 \leq i \leq \dim(C) \). Let
\[
d_i(P(C)) = n - \max \left\{ \dim(V) \mid V \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho_C(V) \leq \frac{\dim(C) - i}{m} \right\}.
\]
If \( n < m \), then \( d_i(C) = d_i(P(C)) \).
If \( n = m \), then \( d_i(C) = \min\{ d_i(P(C)), \; d_i(P(C^T)) \} \).

Finally, there is a natural notion of dual \( q \)-polymatroid.
Definition 10. Let $P = (\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho)$ be a $q$-polymatroid. For $V \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ define
\[ \rho^*(V) = \dim(V) - \rho(\mathbb{F}_q^n) + \rho(V^\perp). \]
The $q$-polymatroid $P^* = (\mathbb{F}_q^n, \rho^*)$ is the dual of $P$.

Using standard arguments, one can show that $P^*$ is a $q$-polymatroid, that the duals of equivalent $q$-polymatroids are equivalent, and that $P^{**} = P$. Moreover, duality for $q$-polymatroids is compatible with duality for rank-metric codes.

Theorem 11. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ be a rank-metric code. Then $P(\mathcal{C})^* = P(\mathcal{C}^\perp)$.
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Sub-packetization of Minimum Storage Regenerating Codes:
A lower bound and a work-around
Venkatesan Guruswami

Modern cloud storage systems need to store vast amounts of data in a fault tolerant manner, while also preserving data reliability and accessibility in the wake of frequent server failures. Traditional MDS (Maximum Distance Separable) codes provide the optimal trade-off between redundancy and number of worst-case erasures tolerated. However, the applicability of the MDS codes in modern storage systems also depends on their ability to efficiently reconstruct parts of a codeword from the rest of the codeword.

Minimum storage regenerating (MSR) codes are a special sub-class of MDS codes that provide mechanisms for exact regeneration of a single code-block by downloading the minimum amount of information from the remaining code-blocks. As a result, MSR codes are attractive for use in distributed storage systems to ensure node repairs with optimal repair-bandwidth. However, all known constructions of MSR codes require large sub-packetization levels (which is a measure of the granularity to which a single vector codeword symbol needs to be divided into for efficient repair). This restricts the applicability of MSR codes in practice.

In this talk, we presented a near-optimal lower bound that exponentially large sub-packetization is inherent for MSR codes. This lower bound is from [1]. As a way to circumvent this lower bound, we also propose a natural relaxation of MSR codes that allows one to circumvent this lower bound, and present a general approach to construct MDS codes that significantly reduces the required sub-packetization level by incurring slightly higher repair-bandwidth as compared to MSR codes [3].
Let us state the above results a bit more formally. An \((n,k,\ell)\)-vector MDS code \(C\) over the field \(\mathbb{F}\) is a subspace (over \(\mathbb{F}\)) of dimension \(k\ell\) of \((\mathbb{F}^\ell)^n\). Its codewords can be viewed as \(c = (c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n)\) where each \(c_i\) is a vector of length \(\ell\) over \(\mathbb{F}\). The MDS property implies that any codeword \(c \in C\) can be uniquely recovered from the components \(c_i, i \in T\), for any subset \(T\) of \(k\) indices. This gives the optimal resilience from worst-case symbol erasures for the given storage overhead of \(r := n - k\) redundant/check symbols. In the context of their use in distributed storage, we are interested in bandwidth-efficient repair of an arbitrary symbol \(c_f\) (for an index \(f\) corresponding to a failed node) by downloading the minimal possible information about \(c_i, i \neq f\). A simple argument shows that this minimal amount equals \(\ell/r\). An MSR code is one that allows for the repair of any failed symbol by downloading exactly \(\ell/r\) symbols about every other codeword symbol. Formally, for every \(f \in [n]\), there are \(\mathbb{F}\)-linear repair functions \(R_f^i : \mathbb{F}^\ell \to \mathbb{F}^{\ell/r}\), \(i \neq f\), such that \(c_f\) can be recovered as an \(\mathbb{F}\)-linear combination of all the symbols \(R_f^i(c_i), i \neq f\). (Here we restrict attention to linear repair schemes.) The quantity \(\ell\) is referred to as the sub-packetization of the MSR code.

A long line of work has led to some beautiful constructions of MSR codes, for example in [7, 4]. However, these incur very large sub-packetization of \(\ell \approx r^{n/r}\), which is exponential in \(n\) for small values of the redundancy \(r\) (which is of most interest in storage applications). There were partial results showing this is inherent: a lower bound of \(\ell \gtrsim \exp(\sqrt{k/r})\) was shown in [2], and an exponential bound of \(\ell \gtrsim r^{k/r}\) was shown in [5] for the special case when the repair functions are projections (i.e., they just return some components of the codeword symbol).

Our main result in [1] that we discussed in the talk is an almost optimal lower bound on sub-packetization of MSR codes. The proof is short and elegant, based on tracking the dimension of the space of some maps that fix a collection of subspaces associated with the MSR code, and was presented in almost full detail in the talk.

**Theorem 1.** Suppose an \((n,k,\ell)\)-vector MDS code with redundancy \(r = n - k\) is MSR. Then its sub-packetization \(\ell\) must satisfy \(\ell \geq e^{(k-1)/(4r)}\).

Given the necessity of large sub-packetization for MSR codes, the talk turned to the notion of \(\epsilon\)-MSR codes put forth in [3]. An \(\epsilon\)-MSR code relaxes the requirement of optimal repair bandwidth, and allows the download of up to \((1 + \epsilon)\ell/r\) symbols from each of the helper nodes \(i \neq f\) when recovering the symbol \(c_f\). In other words, the repair functions \(R_i^f\) have range \(\mathbb{F}^{(1+\epsilon)\ell/r}\). If \(\epsilon\) is small, this is only a small factor more compared to the optimal \(\ell/r\) bound. Yet, the following theorem from [3] shows that this small elbow room in the repair bandwidth can lead to huge savings in the sub-packetization, by a doubly exponential amount in fact!

**Theorem 2.** There is an explicit construction of an \((n,k,\ell)\)-vector MDS code that is \(\epsilon\)-MSR over a field \(\mathbb{F}\) of size \(O(nr)\) and has sub-packetization \(\ell \leq O(r^{O(r/\epsilon)} \log n)\).
The talk discussed the high level strategy for constructing the above codes, which is via a combination of a short MSR code of length $m$ and large sub-packetization (say $r^m$, as in the construction of [6]) with a long linear code of large relative distance (of about $1 - \epsilon$) over an alphabet of size $q \leq m$.
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The covering radius conjecture for Reed-Muller codes

KAI-UWE SCHMIDT

The Hamming distance of two Boolean functions $f, g : \mathbb{F}_2^n \to \mathbb{F}_2$ is

$$d(f, g) = \#\{y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n : f(y) \neq g(y)\}.$$ 

Put

$$\rho_n = \max_{f} \min_{g} d(f, g),$$

where the maximum is over all functions $f$ from $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ to $\mathbb{F}_2$ and the minimum is over all $2^{n+1}$ affine functions $g$ from $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ to $\mathbb{F}_2$. Then $\rho_n$ equals the covering radius of the $[2^n, n+1]$ Reed-Muller code, whose determination is one of the oldest and most difficult open problems in coding theory [7]. The determination of $\rho_n$ also answers the question of how well Boolean functions can be approximated by linear functions, which is of significance in cryptography. One can also interpret $\rho_n$ in terms of the Fourier coefficients of Boolean functions. It is convenient to define

$$\mu_n = 2^{n/2} - \rho_n/2^{n/2-1}.$$ 

An averaging argument shows that $\mu_n \geq 1$ and a simple recursive construction shows that $\mu_{n+2} \leq \mu_n$. The fact that $\mu_2 = 1$ implies that $\mu_n = 1$ for all even $n$; the functions attaining the minimum are known as bent functions and these have been studied extensively for more than forty years [5].

We are interested in the case that $n$ is odd. Since $\mu_1 = \sqrt{2}$, we have $1 \leq \mu_n \leq \sqrt{2}$. It is known that equality holds in the upper bound for each $n \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. It
was suggested in [2] that $\mu_n = \sqrt{2}$ for all odd $n$, which was disproved by Patterson and Wiedemann [4], by showing that

$$\mu_n \leq \sqrt{729/512} = 1.19 \ldots$$

for each $n \geq 15$.

More recently it was shown by Kavut and Yücel [3] that

$$\mu_n \leq \sqrt{49/32} = 1.23 \ldots$$

for each $n \geq 9$.

Patterson and Wiedemann [4] also conjectured that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mu_n = 1.$$

However no improvement of (1) for large $n$ has been found since this conjecture has been posed in 1983. In [6], I have proved that this conjecture is true and during the talk I explain the ideas behind the proof. The key idea is a semiprobabilistic construction; it mimics the well known partial spread construction for bent functions [1] and is further coupled with some randomness. This allows one to prove that there is a function from $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ to $\mathbb{F}_2$ for odd $n$ that looks asymptotically like a bent function.
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**Identifying rank-metric codes using Galois group action**

**Alessandro Neri**

(joint work with Sven Puchinger, Anna-Lena Horlemann-Trautmann)

Rank-metric codes have recently become a topic of high interest due to their many applications. They were introduced independently by Delsarte [1], Gabidulin [2] and Roth [7], but only in the last decade they attracted many researchers from different areas of mathematics, computer science and engineering. The framework is explained as follows. One considers a prime power $q = p^r$, a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ and an extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ of degree $m$. On the set $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, the $q$-rank of a vector $v$ is defined as $\text{rk}_q(v) := \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(v_1, \ldots, v_n)_{\mathbb{F}_q}$. The $q$-rank induces the rank distance on
the space $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}^n$: the rank distance of two vectors is equal to the $q$-rank of their difference. In this setting, an $[n,k]_q$ rank-metric code $C$ is a $k$-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}$-subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}$ endowed with the rank distance. The minimum distance $d$ of $C$ is the minimum $q$-rank of a non-zero vector in $C$. The parameters $k,n$ and $d$ are related by a simple and effective relation, namely the Singleton-like bound, which states that $d \leq n - k + 1$. Codes that meet this bound with equality are called maximum rank distance codes, or MRD codes in short.

The first construction of MRD codes was given by Delsarte, Gabidulin and Roth and is described as follows. Let $1 \leq k \leq n$ be integers, and $\theta$ be a generator of $G := \text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}/\mathbb{F}_q)$. Consider the $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-subspace $G_{k,\theta} := (\text{id}, \theta, \ldots, \theta^{k-1})\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ of the group algebra $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[G]$, and choose a vector $g \in \mathbb{F}_{q^n}$ such that $\text{rk}_q(g) = n$. The $[n,k]_{q^m}$ code $G_{k,\theta}(g) := \{ (f(g_1), \ldots, f(g_n)) \mid f \in G_{k,\theta} \}$ is called $\theta$-Gabidulin code.

It was proved in [1] that this construction always provides MRD codes.

Very recently, it was shown in [5] that, for a sufficiently large extension field degree $m$ there are plenty of MRD codes that are not $\theta$-Gabidulin codes. Motivated by this result, it has been a research problem of high interest to construct new families of MRD codes. The most prominent new one was given by Sheekey in [9]. However, when looking for new constructions of rank-metric codes, it is important to check if the new codes are really new, or are equivalent to any of the already known codes.

Given some integers $0 < s_1 < \ldots < s_r < m$ and two equivalent $[n,k]_{q^m}$ rank-metric codes $C$ and $C'$, it is easy to check that also the codes $C + \theta^{s_1}(C) + \ldots + \theta^{s_r}(C)$ and $C' + \theta^{s_1}(C') + \ldots + \theta^{s_r}(C')$ are equivalent, where the addition is the vector space sum. Motivated by this simple observation, we introduce the following setting and definitions. Let $P_{q^m}(n)$ denote the set of all $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$-subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_{q^n}^n$. For any automorphism $\theta \in \text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}/\mathbb{F}_q)$ and integer $0 \leq i \leq n$, we consider the map

$$S^\theta_i : P_{q^m}(n) \rightarrow P_{q^m}(n)$$

$$C \mapsto \sum_{j=0}^i \theta^j(C)$$

and the integers

$$s_i^\theta(C) := \dim(S^\theta_i(C)) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_i^\theta(C) := s_{i+1}^\theta(C) - s_i^\theta(C).$$

With this notation, $s_i^\theta(C)$ is called the $i$-th $\theta$-dimension of $C$, and $\Delta_i^\theta(C)$ the $i$-th $\theta$-increment of $C$. These sequences of integers are invariants of rank-metric codes under code equivalence, and provide an easy checkable criterion to determine inequivalence of codes. In addition, these sequences and the maps $S^\theta_i$ have some interesting properties. For a given $[n,k]_{q^m}$ rank-metric code $C$, we have

$$k = s_0^\theta(C) \leq \ldots \leq s_{n-k}^\theta(C) \leq n, \quad k \geq \Delta_0^\theta(C) \geq \ldots \geq \Delta_{n-k}^\theta(C) = 0.$$

These very simple sequences not only provide a tool for checking code inequivalence, but they also have some important applications. Indeed, they yield an elementary way to prove the following result, which is an improvement of a result in [8] for some sets of parameters. In the next theorem, $\phi(m)$ denotes the Euler’s totient function, while $\Phi(a,b) = |\{1 \leq s \leq b \mid \gcd(s,a) = 1\}|$. 

Theorem 1. Let $k, n, m$ be positive integers with $2 \leq k \leq n - 2$, and let $N_q(k, m, n)$ be the number of inequivalent Gabidulin codes of dimension $k$ in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$.

(a) If $m = n$ then

$$N_q(k, m, m) = \frac{\phi(m)}{2}.$$ 

(b) If $m > n$, then

$$\frac{\Phi(m, n)}{2m[\mathbb{F}_q : \mathbb{F}_p]} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \frac{q^{m-i+1} - 1}{q^i - 1} \leq N_q(k, m, n) \leq \frac{\phi(m)}{2} \prod_{i=2}^{n} \frac{q^{m-i+1} - 1}{q^i - 1}.$$ 

The second application concerns a characterization result for the special family of Gabidulin codes.

Theorem 2 (Characterization of $\theta$-Gabidulin codes). Let $C$ be an $[n, k]_{q^m}$ rank-metric code with minimum distance $d > 1$ and let $\theta$ be a generator of $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}/\mathbb{F}_q)$. The following are equivalent:

1. $C$ is a $\theta$-Gabidulin code.
2. $C$ is MRD and $s_1^\theta(C) = k + 1$ ([3]).
3. $(s_i^\theta(C))_i = (k, k + 1, \ldots, n)$.
4. $(\Delta_i^\theta(C))_i = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)$.
5. $C = \text{rowsp}(I_k \mid X)$, where:
   (a) $\text{rk}(\theta(X) - X) = 1$,
   (b) the $q$-rank of the first row of $\theta(X) - X$ is $n - k$,
   (c) the $q$-rank of the first column of $\theta(X) - X$ is $k$ ([4]).

The investigation on the $\theta$-dimensions and $\theta$-increments is ongoing. They have nice properties and they seem to represent a natural invariant that needs to be studied, which provides new characterization results. Moreover, using this tool, one can prove results such as [8] in an elementary way. It is still an open problem to understand whether they can characterize other families of MRD codes, or they can even provide new constructions of codes.
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Constructing asynchronous batch codes using hypergraphs

VITALY SKACHEK

(joint work with Ago-Erik Riet and Eldho K. Thomas)

Batch codes were first proposed in [3] as means for balancing load in distributed storage systems. They are also of potential use in private information retrieval (PIR). Batch codes can be viewed as a special case of so-called PIR codes [2]. Both batch and PIR codes were extensively studied in the last years. For a survey of the known results on these two families of codes, the reader can refer to [6].

Definition. [7] An \((n,k,t)\) batch code \(C\) over a finite alphabet \(\Sigma\) is defined by an encoding mapping \(C: \Sigma^k \to \Sigma^n\), and a decoding mapping \(D: \Sigma^n \times [k]^t \to \Sigma^t\), such that

1. For any \(x \in \Sigma^k\) and \(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_t \in [k]\),
   \[D(y = C(x), i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_t) = (x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_t}).\]

2. The symbols in the query \((x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \ldots, x_{i_t})\) can be reconstructed from \(t\) respective pairwise disjoint recovery sets of symbols of \(y\) (the symbol \(x_{i_\ell}\) is reconstructed from the \(\ell\)-th recovery set for each \(\ell, 1 \leq \ell \leq t\)).

Let \(\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q\) be a finite field with \(q\) elements, where \(q\) is a prime power, and \(C\) be a linear \([n,k]\) code over \(\mathbb{F}\). Denote the redundancy by \(\rho = n - k\). For a linear batch code, the encoding of \(C\) is given as a multiplication by a \(k \times n\) generator matrix \(G\) over \(\mathbb{F}\) of an information vector \(x \in \mathbb{F}^k\),

\[y = x \cdot G; \quad y \in \mathbb{F}^n.\]

A linear batch code with the parameters \(n, k\) and \(t\) over \(\mathbb{F}_q\), where \(t\) is a number of queried symbols, is denoted as an \([n,k,t]_q\)-batch code.

In this work, we present a new variant of batch codes termed “asynchronous batch codes”, which are designed for parallel recovery of information symbols from the coded database, where different requests take different service time (i.e. the requests are served in an asynchronous manner).

Definition. An asynchronous \([n,k,t]_q\)-batch code \(C\) is an \([n,k,t]_q\)-batch code with the additional property that for any legal query \((x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_2}, \ldots, x_{\ell_t})\), for all \(\ell_i \in [k]\), it is always possible to replace \(x_{\ell_i}\) by some \(x_{\ell_{\ell+1}}, \ell_{t+1} \in [k]\), such that \(x_{\ell_{t+1}}\) is retrieved from the servers not used for retrieval of \(x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_2}, \ldots, x_{\ell_{t-1}}, x_{\ell_{t+1}}, \ldots, x_{\ell_t}\), without reading more than one symbol from each server.

It turns out that the graph-based batch codes studied in [4] are asynchronous. By building on the ideas in [4], we show that hypergraphs of Berge girth at least four yield graph-based asynchronous batch codes. We prove the hypergraph-theoretic proposition that the maximum number of hyperedges in a hypergraph of a fixed Berge girth equals the quantity in a certain generalization of the hypergraph-theoretic (6,3)-problem. We then apply the constructions and bounds in [1] to obtain batch code constructions and bounds on the optimal redundancy of the graph-based asynchronous batch codes.

We show that the optimal redundancy $\rho(k)$ of graph-based asynchronous batch codes with the query size $t = 3$ is $2\sqrt{k}$. Moreover, for a general fixed value of $t \geq 4$, $\rho(k) = O\left(k^{1/(2-\epsilon)}\right)$ for any small $\epsilon > 0$. For a general value of $t \geq 4$, $\lim_{k \to \infty} \rho(k)/\sqrt{k} = \infty$.

This talk is based on a work [5], where the settings and proofs are presented in more detail.

**REFERENCES**


**Bounding the number of affine roots**

**Olav Geil**

In this survey we consider the problem of bounding the number of affine roots of multivariate polynomials including briefly mentioning applications in communication theory and function field theory. For univariate polynomials it is well-known that a polynomial of degree $s$ can have at most $s$ roots over any given field, even when counted with multiplicity. This is in contrast to multivariate polynomials which often have infinitely many roots. However, under certain natural restrictions the number is finite and estimating it becomes of interest.

The simplest case to consider is that of counting roots over some finite Cartesian product point set $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_m$, $S_i \subseteq F$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Here, $F$ can be any field,
one particular case of interest being when $S_i = F = F_q$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, where the latter notation means the finite field with $q$ elements. The natural extension of the previous mentioned result to the case of multivariate polynomials then is that a polynomial with leading monomial $X_1^{i_1} \cdots X_m^{i_m}$, $i_j < s_j = \#S_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$, can have at most

$$s_1 \cdots s_m - \prod_{j=1}^{m} (s_j - i_j)$$

affine roots. This result holds for arbitrary monomial ordering.

**Example:** Consider the polynomial $F(X,Y) = X^2Y + Y^2 + 2$ over $F_5$. To give an upper bound on the number of affine roots over $F_5$ we consider two different monomial orderings. Namely, as indicated in Figure 1, one for which $\text{lm}(F) = X^2Y$ and another for which $\text{lm}(F) = Y^2$. From the first choice we see that there can at most be 13 roots. The second choice, however, reveals that actually there cannot be more than 10 roots.
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Figure 1. Two choices: $\text{lm}(F) = X^2Y$ or $\text{lm}(F) = Y^2$. Number of roots at most $\min\{13, 10\} = 10$

The powerful – yet not very well-known – result (1) has as an easy corollary the famous Schwartz-Zippel bound which states that a polynomial in $m$ variables and of total degree $s < q$ has at least $(q - s)q^{m - 1}$ non-roots over $F_q$.

Considering common roots of more polynomials one may without loss of generality assume that the leading monomials are pairwise different. Plugging these monomials into a figure like Figure 1 one obtains in a very natural way a generalization of (1) by counting again the monomials not marked with $\ast$.

So far we did not treat roots with multiplicity. For multivariate polynomials there are many different ways of defining the concept typically using Hasse derivatives. The classical definition used in papers like [2, 8] is sometimes called the standard multiplicity. It is possible to formulate a generalization of (1) to estimate the number of roots with at least some prescribed multiplicity for a range of different types of multiplicity [6], but for the standard multiplicity one obtains better information from Dvir et al.‘s generalization of the Schwartz-Zippel bound [2].
Employing the lemmas in [2] one further obtains a method to obtain refined information from the leading monomial with respect to a lexicographic ordering.

**Example:** In this example we estimate the maximal number of roots of multiplicity at least 3 over $\mathbb{F}_5$ when given information on the leading monomial with respect to a lexicographic ordering, see Figure 2. The results are derived by employing the lemmas in [2]. Observe that the figure is not symmetric.
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In the following we return to not considering multiplicity. The theorem behind (1) is the result below which can be found in many textbooks on commutative algebra, e.g. [1].

**Theorem:**
Consider an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{F}[X_1, \ldots, X_m]$. For any monomial ordering the set of monomials that are not leading monomial of any polynomial in $I$ constitutes a basis for $\mathbb{F}[X_1, \ldots, X_m]/I$ as a vector space over $\mathbb{F}$.

From this one obtains an upper bound on the number of roots of any zero-dimensional ideal. This result is known as the footprint bound [5, 9]. Actually, when restricting to the case of perfect fields (e.g. finite fields) and assuming that $I$ contains a univariate square-free polynomial in each variable one obtains a way to establish the actual number of roots by employing Buchberger's algorithm. This for instance can be used at a theoretical level to determine the second highest number of roots that a polynomial of total degree $s$ can have over a finite field. See [4, 12].

Another application is to consider rather than Cartesian product point sets – as we did at the beginning of the survey – instead points on curves over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Employing results by Miura [10] and Pellikaan [11] we are able to reproduce the Goppa bound on one-point algebraic geometric codes and to often improve upon
it. Furthermore, we can show [7] that the number of rational places of a function field over \( \mathbb{F}_q \) having \( \Lambda = \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\} \) as a Weierstrass semigroup can at most be

\[
\#(\Lambda \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} (qw_i + \Lambda)) + 1.
\]

There are many other applications besides the ones we listed above. This for instance includes estimating the information leakage and recovery numbers in secret sharing and the ability to correct phase-shift errors and qudit-flip errors when using quantum codes from the CSS construction [3].
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