## CS250/EE387-LECTURE 18-RS codes as





It hums out that communication is EXPENSIVE (and is a bottleneck in distributed storage systems) so this is a win.

。 » }

 $C_1, C_7, C_{n-1} \Rightarrow C_i!$ 

Ci

LESS

COMMUNICATION!

What 's the model here?

LOCALITY seems useful. But are LCCs the right bol for the job?

ANSWER: No+ really.

(a) The night model is ERASURES, not ERRORS.

(b) 98% of the time , only ONE server is down.

\* Based on a study of the Facebook Warehouse cluster.

Means

Instead what do we want?

(1) Best trade-off between RATE and DISTANCE possible - a ka an MDS cude. • We want to handle as many fuilures as possible in the worst case. Recall this

 (2) Every symbol can be obtained from not-too-many other symbols. n-k+1=d
 When there is only 1 failure, we'd like to repair it with minimal communication.

2 RS CODES are BAD IDEA for DISTRIBUTED STORAGE.

(1) MDS Code

(2) Every symbol can be obtained by not-too many other symbols X

(2) duesn't hold:

· Suppose f G ff { [x], deg(f) < k.

• I NEED be evaluation pts  $f(\alpha_{k}), ..., f(\alpha_{k})$  to say ANYTHING at all about  $f(\alpha_{k+1})$ 

ey, suppose f(X) is a quadrahic and goes through these 2 points: what is  $f(\alpha_s)$ ? CUULD BE ANYTHING.

 $d_1 \quad d_2 \quad d_3$ 



So that's really wasteful.

So can we find some other code satisfying (1) and (2)?

NO ! Actually that argument works for any MDS code, not just RS codes. So:

IF (1) MDS code then (2) Every symbol can be obtained by not-too-many other symbols X

Two WAYS around this: WAY 1: Give up on MDS. This is really interesting and the buzzword WAY 2: Rephrase (2) is "Locally Recoverable Code." We won't talk about it.

— We will talk about this.

We will instead shoot for:

(1) MDS code (2) Every symbol can be obtained by not-too-many BITS from other symbols.

In pictures the model is this:



Such a code is called a REGENERATING CODE. There's tons of super cool work on these that I won't talk about. But for today ...

"THM." Reed-Solomon Codes ARE good regenerating codes.

(3) RS CODES are a GREAT IDEA for distributed storage!

For simplicity let's focus on k = n/2, n = q,  $q = a^{t}$ . So a rodeword of  $RS_{q}(F_{q}, q, \frac{q}{2})$  looks like:

f(o) f(-r) f(-r) for a primitive elt  $\gamma$ .

Say f(0) fuils. Works with any node, but for concreteness say it's f(0).

CLAIM (which we will show)

It is possible to download ONE BIT from  $f(\gamma^i)$  for i=1, ..., q-1, and recover f(0).

Notice this is q-1 BITS total, while the naive scheme would download  $k = \sqrt[4]{2}$  whole symbols, each are lq(q) bits — so that's  $\frac{g lg(g)}{2}$ .

So the CLAIM is BETTER than the naive scheme!

CLAIM (which we will not show)

This is ophimal \*

\* Gralinear scheme, Gran MDS code.

To prove two first CLALM, we will noted the following adgetor. Bets:  
FACT: 
$$F_{at}$$
 is a vector space over  $F_{a}$ .  
So we can think of  $\alpha \in F_{at}$  as a vector  $\vec{a} \in F_{a}^{\pm}$  if we want.  
(of course, this is for two additive structure only).  
FACT. Let  $P(X) = X + X^2 + X^4 + \dots + X^{a^{t-1}}$ . Then  
(u)  $P: F_{at} \rightarrow F_{a}$  is  $F_{a}$ -linear.  
(u)  $P(x) = P(g \cdot X)$  for some  $g \in F_{a}$ .  
(c) "Morselly" we should think of  $P(\alpha \cdot \beta)$  as  $\langle \vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \rangle$  for  $\vec{\alpha}, \vec{\beta} \in F_{a}^{\pm}$ .  
(P(X) is usually called the "field trace".  
"pt" of the form  $P(x_{1}) = P(x_{1}) = P(x_{1})$ , recall  $(\alpha + p)^{2} = \alpha^{2} + p^{2}$  in  $F_{a}$ .  
To see  $P(x_{1}) \in F_{a}$ , notice  $P(x_{1}^{2} = P(x_{1})$ , which is only true for 0 and 1.

Now that we have thuse fact, we can prove the CLAIM. Recall 
$$q=5^{\ddagger}$$
.  
By RS duality, RS  $_{1}(F_{1}, q, \frac{\pi}{2})^{\perp} = RS_{1}(F_{1}, q, \frac{\pi}{2})$   
So for all  $f, g \in F_{2}[X]$  u/ degree  $< k = \sqrt{2}$ ,  
 $O = \sum f(\alpha) \cdot g(\alpha)$   
 $\alpha \in F_{1}$ .  
 $f(o) g(o) = \sum f(\alpha) \cdot g(\alpha)$   
 $\alpha \in F_{2} \setminus 1^{\circ}$ .  
For any  $g \in F_{2}^{\circ}$ , lat  $g_{3}(X) = \frac{P(q, X)}{X} = -q + X + X^{3} + X^{7} + \dots + X^{3^{1}-1}$ .  
Then  $cleg(q_{3}) = \partial^{1-1} - 1 = \frac{q}{2} - 1 = k - 1$ .  
So we may plug in  $q_{3}$  for  $g$  above:  
 $\forall f \in F_{q}[X]$  st.  $da_{3}(f) < \sqrt{2}$  :  
 $f(o) g_{3}(0) = \sum_{\alpha \in F_{1} \setminus 1^{\circ}} f(\alpha) \cdot g(\alpha)$   
 $p(f(0) \cdot g) = P(\sum_{\alpha \in F_{1} \setminus 1^{\circ}} f(\alpha) \cdot \frac{P(y\alpha)}{\alpha})$  Def of  $q_{3}$ .  
 $P(f(0) \cdot g) = P(f(\alpha) \cdot \frac{P(y\alpha)}{\alpha})$  Tate P( $i$  on but sites  
 $P(f(0) \cdot g) = \sum P(f(\alpha) \cdot \frac{P(y\alpha)}{\alpha})$  P( $i$  is  $F_{2}$ -invert  
 $< i \overline{n}, \overline{g} > = \sum_{\alpha \in F_{1} \setminus 0} P(g(\alpha) < \frac{P(\alpha)}{\alpha})$  P( $i > 2, \overline{p}$ , moolly  
 $\langle i \overline{n}, \overline{g} \rangle = \sum_{\alpha \in F_{1} \setminus 0} P(g(\alpha) < \frac{P(\alpha)}{\alpha})$  P( $g(\alpha) \in F_{2}$ , so its just a cales

So for all 
$$\tilde{g} \in F_{2}^{-6}$$
, we have  
 $\langle f(\tilde{\omega}), \tilde{g} \rangle = \underset{\alpha \in F_{1} \setminus 0}{\sum} P(ga) \langle f(\tilde{\omega}), \tilde{d}^{\dagger} \rangle$   
Recall the goal is to find f(0). So the algorithm is:  
ALG. (Assuming f(0) has field).  
 $\cdot$  The nocle holding  $f(d)$  returns  $b_{\alpha} = \langle f(\tilde{\omega}), (\tilde{d}^{-1}) \rangle \in F_{2}$   
 $\cdot$  We compute  $\langle \tilde{e}_{i}, f(\tilde{o}) \rangle = \underset{\alpha \in F_{1} \setminus 0}{\sum} P(g_{i} \cdot \alpha) \cdot b_{\alpha} \in F_{2}$  for all  $i$ , where  
 $p_{i} \in F_{2} t \text{ s.t. } p_{i}^{-1} = \tilde{e}_{i} \in F_{2}^{-1}$ 

That's it ? This feels a bit magical, but achually it generalizes to some other parameter regimes and also turns out to be optimal?

See [Guruswami, W. 16], [Dau, Milenkovic 17], [Temo-Ye-Berg 17] for more.

#### The point:

- For distributed storage, a different notion of locality is appropriate.
   This is good news since even though RS codes are NOT good LCCs, they ARE good regenerating codes!
- · Also, this is kind of a neet fact about polynomial interpolation.

#### 4) COURSE RECAP.

Next week I will be traveling and Marco Mondelli will be guest lecturing. So this is it from me!

#### WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

fundamental trade-offs between RATE and DISTANCE
 The "correct" trade-off for binary codes is still open, but over large alphabets

it is attained by ...

- REED-SOLOMON CODES and "LOW-DEGREE POLYS DON'T • OMG the BEST code! HAVE TOO MANY ROUTS."
  - · How to decode RS codes, and how to use this to get efficiently decodable binary codes. · Reed-Muller, BCH, concatenation, of my.
- · Brief detour into RANDOM ERRORS and we can get the same trade-offs with LIST-DECUDING !

· Capacity = 1 - H(p) either way?

• We can do list - Lecoding (also list - recovery) EFFICIENTLY of the GURUSWAMI - SUDAN Agonithm! And we can modify this to achieve capacity by FOLDING.

· STEP 1: INTERPOLATE. STEP 2: ROOT-FIND. JEP 3: PROFIT.

We talked about RM codes and locality! • Plus, local-list-cleccoliny, and just now regenerality codes!

Along the way, APPLICATIONS! · Crypto, Compressed Sensing, Group testing, Heavy Hitters, Learning theory, Storage, (communication, QR codes, that puzzles,...)

### THE MORAL(S) of the STORY :

(1) Low-degree polynomials don't have too many roots. and this fact is unreasonably useful!

(2) Error correcting codes show up all over the place. maybe even in your own research?

# QUESTION TO PONDER

What can emor correcting codes do for you?