Improved Schemes for Asymptotically Optimal Repair of MDS Codes

Ameera Chowdhury
University of California San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093
ameerah@alumni.caltech.edu

Alexander Vardy
University of California San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093
avardy@ucsd.edu

arXiv:1710.01867v3 [cs.IT] 5 Apr 2021

March 8, 2024

Abstract

We consider (n,k,l) MDS codes of length n, dimension k, and subpacketization l over a finite field F. A codeword of such a code consists of n column-vectors of length l over F, with the property that any k of them suffice to recover the entire codeword. Each of these n vectors may be stored on a separate node in a network. If one of the n nodes fails, we can recover its content by downloading symbols from the surviving nodes, and the total number of symbols downloaded in the worst case is called the *repair bandwidth* of the code. By the cut-set bound, the repair bandwidth of an (n,k,l) MDS code is at least $l(n-1)/(n-k)$. There are several constructions of MDS codes whose repair bandwidth meets or asymptotically meets the cut-set bound. For example, Ye and Barg constructed (n,k,r^n) Reed–Solomon codes that asymptotically meet the cut-set bound, where $r = n-k$. Ye and Barg also constructed optimal-bandwidth and optimal-update (n,k,r^n) MDS codes. Wang, Tamo, and Bruck constructed optimal-bandwidth $(n,k,r^{n/(r+1)})$ MDS codes, and these codes have the smallest known subpacketization for optimal-bandwidth MDS codes.

A key idea in all these constructions is to represent certain integers in base r. We show how this technique can be refined to improve the subpacketization of the two MDS code constructions by Ye and Barg, while achieving asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. Specifically, when $r = s^m$ for an integer s, we obtain an (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) Reed–Solomon code and an optimal-update (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) MDS code, both having asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. Thus for $r = 2^m$, for example, we achieve the subpacketization of 2^{m+n-1} rather than 2^{mn} in the original constructions by Ye and Barg. When r is not an integral power, we can still obtain (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) Reed–Solomon codes and optimal-update (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) MDS codes by choosing positive integers s and m such that $s^m \leqslant r$. In this case, however, the resulting codes have bandwidth that is near-optimal rather than asymptotically optimal. We also present an extension of this idea to reduce the subpacketization of the Wang–Tamo–Bruck construction while achieving a repair-by-transfer scheme with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. For example, for $r = 2^m$ we achieve the subpacketization of $2^{k/r+m-1}$, which significantly improves upon the subpacketization of $2^{mn/(r+1)}$ in the Wang–Tamo–Bruck construction. Based on the foregoing examples, we believe our approach may be generally useful in reducing the subpacketization of MDS code constructions that utilize r-ary expansion.

*The research of Ameera Chowdhury and Alexander Vardy was supported by the United States National Science Foundation under Grants CCF-1405119 and CCF-1719139. This work was presented in part at the Allerton Conference on Communications, Control and Computing, October 2017, and at the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, June 2018.

1. Introduction

MDS codes are desirable for distributed storage applications because of their optimal storage versus reliability tradeoff. Codewords of an (n,k,l) MDS code of length n, dimension k, and subpacketization l over a finite field F consist of n column vectors of length l over F, with the property that any k of the n vectors suffice to recover the entire codeword. Each of these n vectors may be stored on a separate node in a network. If one of the n nodes fails, a replacement node is set up to recover the content stored at the failed node by downloading information from the remaining functional nodes. The *(exact) repair bandwidth* is the total number of symbols downloaded in the worst case when repairing a failed node exactly. By the cut-set bound of [1], an (n,k,l) MDS code has repair bandwidth at least

$$\left(\frac{n-1}{n-k}\right) l. \tag{1}$$

Many (n,k,l) MDS codes with repair bandwidth meeting or asymptotically meeting (1) have been constructed; for an excellent survey, see [2] and the references therein. For example, Ye and Barg [3] constructed (n,k,r^n) Reed–Solomon codes that asymptotically meet the cut-set bound (1), where $r = n-k$ is the number of parities. Ye and Barg have also constructed in [4] optimal-bandwidth and optimal-update (n,k,r^n) MDS codes. Here, *optimal-bandwidth* means meeting the bound (1), whereas *optimal-update* will be defined precisely in Section 4. Wang, Tamo, and Bruck [5] constructed optimal-bandwidth $\left(n,k,r^{n/(r+1)}\right)$ MDS codes; these codes have the smallest known subpacketization for optimal bandwidth MDS codes.

Optimal-bandwidth (n,k,l) MDS codes necessarily have a high level of subpacketization. For example, a result of [6] shows that the subpacketization l of an optimal-bandwidth (n,k,l) MDS code must satisfy

$$l \geqslant \exp\left(\frac{k-1}{4r}\right). \tag{2}$$

The high-rate optimal-bandwidth codes referenced in [2] typically require an even larger subpacketization. The bound (2) is a recent improvement on a result of [7] that showed optimal-bandwidth (n,k,l) MDS codes must have subpacketization at least $l \approx \exp(\sqrt{k/r})$. For various reasons, which we do not discuss here, it is often desirable to design repair schemes that achieve low repair bandwidth without requiring a very high subpacketization. Consequently this paper, like [2,8–12], explores a tradeoff between the subpacketization l and the repair bandwidth of MDS codes.

Code Construction	**Repair Bandwidth**	**Subpacketization**	Meets Cut-Set Bound (1)?
(n,k) RS code our construction	$< \frac{(n-1+3r)l}{r}$ for $r = s^m$	$l = s^{m+n-1}$	Asymptotically meets (1) for $r = s^m$
(n,k) RS code [3]	$< \frac{(n+1)l}{r}$	$l = r^n$	Asymptotically meets (1)

Table 1: Tradeoff between repair bandwidth and subpacketization for Reed–Solomon code constructions in [3] and in Section 3 (Theorem 6) of this paper. There are no requirements on the field size for either of the constructions.

A key idea in many (n,k,l) MDS code constructions [2–5,12,13] is to expand integers in base r. In this paper, we demonstrate how this technique can be refined to improve the subpacketization of the two (n,k,l) MDS code constructions by Ye and Barg [3,4]. Specifically, in the case where the number of parities r is an integral power, that is $r = s^m$, we construct an (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) Reed–Solomon code and an optimal-update (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) MDS code, both having an asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. For example for $r = 2^m$, we achieve the subpacketization of 2^{m+n-1}, which improves upon the subpacketization of 2^{mn} in the constructions of Ye and Barg. Table 1 compares our Reed–Solomon code construction with that of Ye and Barg [3].

Code Construction	**Repair Bandwidth**	**Subpacketization**	Optimal Update with Diagonal Encoding Matrices
(n,k,l) MDS code our construction	$< \frac{\left(n-1+2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1}(s^v-1)\right)l}{r}$ for $r=s^m$ asymptotically meets (1)	$l = s^{m+n-1}$	Yes
(n,k,l) MDS code [4]	$\frac{(n-1)l}{r}$, meets (1)	$l = r^n$	Yes

Table 2: Tradeoff between repair bandwidth and subpacketization for optimal-update (n,k,l) MDS code constructions in [4] and in Section 4 (Construction 1 and Theorem 9) of this paper. Both constructions require $|F| \geqslant rn$.

Theorem 6 in Section 3 gives a precise statement of our main result for Reed–Solomon codes. Table 2 compares our optimal-update MDS code construction with that of Ye and Barg [4]. Construction 1 and Theorem 9 in Section 4 give a precise statement of our main result for optimal-update MDS codes.

When r is not an integral power, we can still obtain (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) Reed–Solomon codes and optimal-update (n,k,s^{m+n-1}) MDS codes by choosing positive integers s and m such that $s^m \leqslant r$. In this case, however, the resulting codes have bandwidth that is near-optimal rather than asymptotically optimal.

We also present another refinement of the r-ary expansion technique that leads to (n,k,l) MDS codes with repair-by-transfer schemes that have asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. In a *repair-by-transfer scheme*, exact repair of a failed node involves downloading from the surviving nodes only certain subsets of their symbols rather than linear combinations thereof. Thus the contacted nodes have to perform minimal computations, which makes repair-by-transfer schemes an attractive variant of linear repair schemes.

Specifically, when r is an integral power, we significantly reduce the subpacketization of the Wang–Tamo–Bruck construction [5] while achieving a repair-by-transfer scheme that has asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. For example for $r = 2^m$, we achieve the subpacketization of $2^{k/r+m-1}$, which improves upon the subpacketization of $2^{mn/(r+1)}$ in the Wang–Tamo–Bruck construction [5]. In general, when $r = s^m$ for an integer $s \geqslant 2$, our codes have subpacketization $l = s^{k/r+m-1} = rs^{k/r-1}$. Specifically, we construct an $(n,k,s^{k/r+m-1})$ MDS code which has a repair-by-transfer scheme with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. Construction 2 and Theorem 15 in Section 6 give a precise statement of our main result for repair-by-transfer schemes.

Table 3 compares our code construction with other state-of-the-art (n,k,l) MDS codes. Rawat, Tamo, Guruswami, and Efremenko recently proposed a code construction in [2, Theorem III.1] which utilizes a design parameter τ to obtain a family of MDS codes with small subpacketization and near-optimal bandwidth. When $r = s^m$ is an integral power, setting $\tau = \lceil \frac{n}{mr} \rceil$ in [2, Theorem III.1] yields an (n,k,l) MDS code with asymptotically optimal bandwidth that performs as well as the codes we construct in Section 6. We point out that our construction is contemporaneous with and very different from the construction in [2, TheoremIII.1].

Having demonstrated how to improve the subpacketization of three very different (n,k,l) MDS code constructions, we hope that our approach may be broadly useful in reducing the subpacketization of MDS codes. The general idea is simple: when $r = s^m$ is an integral power, one can improve the subpacketization of MDS code constructions that utilize r-ary expansion by instead expanding integers in the smaller base s. The results presented in this paper show how to tailor this general idea to specific (n,k,l) MDS code constructions.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We begin in Section 2 with some background and context for the repair of Reed–Solomon codes. Section 2.2 briefly discusses the Guruswami–Wootters [14] characterization of linear exact repair schemes for MDS codes, upon which our construction as well as the constructions in [3, 14, 15, 17–21] are based. Section 3 presents our main result for Reed–Solomon codes (Theorem 6). Section 4 presents Construction 1 and Theorem 9, which constitute our main results for optimal-update MDS

Code Construction	Subpacketization	Repair Bandwidth	Field Size	Repair by transfer?
Ye–Barg [4]	$l = r^{\lceil \frac{n}{r} \rceil}$	$\frac{(n-1)l}{r}$, meets (1)	$< r \lceil \frac{n}{r} \rceil$ fully explicit	Yes
Wang-Tamo-Bruck [5]	$l = r^{n/(r+1)}$	$\frac{(n-1)l}{r}$, meets (1)	$< \binom{n-1}{r} rl$ not fully explicit	No
this paper	$l = s^{(k/r)+m-1}$ for $r = s^m$	$< \left(1 + \frac{2^{\sum_{v=1}^{m-1}(r-s^v)}}{n-1}\right) \frac{(n-1)l}{r}$ Asymptotically meets (1)	$< \binom{n-1}{r} rl$ not fully explicit	Yes
Rawat *et al.* [2] (special case)	$l = r^{\lceil \frac{n}{Cr} \rceil}$ for $C \geqslant 1$	$< \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lceil \frac{n}{Cr} \rceil}\right) \frac{(n-1)l}{r}$ Asymptotically meets (1)	$\geqslant (n+1)^{(r-1)l+1}$, fully explicit $< O(n^r rl)$, not fully explicit	Yes

Table 3: Comparisons of repair bandwidth, subpacketization, field size, and existence of repair-by-transfer schemes for the code proposed in Section 6 (Construction 2 and Theorem 15) and other state-of-the-art (n,k,l) MDS codes.

codes. Section 5 adapts the Wang–Tamo–Bruck framework [5] for use in constructing (n,k,l) MDS codes that have repair-by-transfer schemes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. Section 6 presents our main results (Construction 2 and Theorem 15) on repair-by-transfer schemes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth.

2. Repairing Reed–Solomon Codes

In this section, we first provide some background and context for the repair of Reed–Solomon codes. Subsequently, we discuss the Guruswami–Wootters [14] characterization of linear exact repair schemes for MDS codes, upon which our result as well as the results of [3,14,15,17–21] are based.

2.1. General overview

In the conventional solution to the exact repair problem using Reed–Solomon (RS) codes, we split the file into k blocks. Each of the k blocks is represented by some element of a finite field E and then viewed as the coefficient of a polynomial. In this way, the file is identified with a polynomial f over E of degree $\leqslant k-1$. We then distribute the file over n nodes by choosing n distinct evaluation points $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in E$ and storing $f(\alpha_i)$ at node i. To recover a failed node, we can download information from any k remaining nodes because any k evaluations $f(\alpha_i)$ of a degree $k-1$ polynomial exactly determine the polynomial and hence the contents of the failed node. One can show that, in the conventional solution, downloading information from k remaining nodes is not only sufficient for repairing one node, but also necessary. Therefore, at first glance, RS codes seem ill-suited for the exact repair problem because recovering the contents of a single failed node requires downloading k symbols of E or, equivalently, the whole file. Thus, despite the ubiquity of RS codes in storage

systems, until the recent work of Guruswami and Wootters [14], these codes were regarded as poorly suited for distributed storage applications since they were thought to have a very high repair bandwidth.

To mitigate this issue, we can apply the *regenerating codes* framework [1,22] in which a replacement node may download only *part* of the contents of a surviving node rather than being forced to download the whole node. This is accomplished by viewing E as a vector space over one of its subfields F, and allowing each surviving node to return one or more symbols in F. Crucially, each node may return fewer than $\log_{|F|} |E|$ symbols of F when queried, and our goal is to download as few such subsymbols as possible. The (exact) *repair bandwidth* of the code over F is the total number of subsymbols downloaded in the worst case. We assume that each node returns an F-linear function of its contents so that we have a *linear repair scheme*.

Since Reed–Solomon codes are MDS, the cut-set bound (1) and the lower bound (2) from [7] apply. Recently, Tamo, Ye, and Barg [15,16] improved (2) for RS codes, and showed that any RS code meeting the cut-set bound has a subpacketization l that satisfies

$$l \geqslant \exp\Big(\big(1+o(1)\big)k\log k\Big). \tag{3}$$

They also explicitly constructed in [15,16] Reed–Solomon codes meeting the cut-set bound whose subpacketization is given by

$$l = \exp\Big(\big(1+o(1)\big)n\log n\Big).$$

We note that the lower bound on the subpacketization in (3) does not apply to RS codes whose repair bandwidth meets the cut-set bound only *asymptotically* as $n \to \infty$. For example, Ye and Barg [3] have previously constructed such RS codes (whose repair bandwidth asymptotically meets the cut-set bound) with subpacketization $l = r^n$. If r is fixed, while $n \to \infty$, then r^n could be significantly lower than (3).

When the subpacketization l is small, we cannot hope to meet the cut-set bound. In particular, Guruswami and Wootters [14] established a lower bound on the repair bandwidth of (n,k,l) MDS codes with linear repair schemes. Subsequently, Dau and Milenkovic [20] refined and improved this bound in some cases. As a result, it is now known that an (n,k,l) MDS code with a linear repair scheme must have bandwidth at least:

$$(n-1)\log_{|F|}\left(\frac{(n-1)|E|}{(r-1)(|E|-1)+(n-1)}\right). \tag{4}$$

Moreover, full-length RS codes meeting (4) were explicitly constructed in [14] and [20]. Necessarily, these codes have small subpacketization l; the optimal-bandwidth RS code in [14] has subpacketization $l = \log_{n/r}(n)$, for example. In Table 4, we summarize the tradeoffs between subpacketization and repair bandwidth for explicit RS code constructions. Further work on repairing RS codes can be found in [17–19,21,23].

2.2. Linear repair schemes for Reed–Solomon codes

In a Reed–Solomon code, a codeword is a sequence of function values of a polynomial of degree less than k. Given a finite field E, let $E[x]$ denote the ring of polynomials over E.

Definition 1. *A generalized Reed–Solomon code, denoted* $\mathrm{GRS}(n,k,A,v)$*, of dimension* k *over the finite field* E *using* n *evaluation points* $A = \{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n\} \subset E$ *is the set of vectors*

$$\Big\{(v_1 f(\alpha_1),\ldots,v_n f(\alpha_n)) : f \in E[x], \deg(f) < k\Big\} \subseteq E^n,$$

where $v = (v_1,\ldots,v_n)$ *are some nonzero coefficients in* E*. When* $v = (1,\ldots,1)$*, the corresponding generalized Reed–Solomon code* $\mathrm{GRS}(n,k,A,\mathbf{1}) = \mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ *is called a Reed–Solomon code.*

Code Construction	**Repair Bandwidth**	**Subpacketization**	Meets Cut-Set Bound (1)?
(n,k) RS code [14]	$n-1$	$l = \log_{n/r} n$	No, but meets (4)
(n,k) RS code [20]	$(n-1)l(1-\log_n r)$	$\log_q n$	No, but meets (4)
(n,k) RS code this paper	$< \frac{(n-1+3r)l}{r}$ for $r = s^m$	$l = s^{m+n-1}$	Asymptotically meets (1) for $r = s^m$
(n,k) RS code [3]	$< \frac{(n+1)l}{r}$	$l = r^n$	Asymptotically meets (1)
(n,k) RS code [15]	$\frac{(n-1)l}{r}$	$l \approx n^n$	Yes, meets (1)

Table 4: Tradeoff between repair bandwidth and subpacketization for Reed–Solomon codes. There are no requirements on the size of the finite field for any of the constructions.

By [24, Theorem 4 in Chapter 10], we have that $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)^\perp$, the dual of a Reed-Solomon code $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$, is a generalized Reed-Solomon code $\mathrm{GRS}(n,n-k,A,v)$, where

$$v_i = \prod_{j \neq i} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)^{-1} \qquad \text{for } i = 1,2,\ldots,n \tag{5}$$

We now formalize the definition of a linear repair scheme for the Reed-Solomon code $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ discussed above. Recall that each node α returns an F-linear function of its contents $f(\alpha)$ where F is a subfield of E. One example of an F-linear function from E to F is the *field trace* $\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}$.

Definition 2. *Let $E = \mathrm{GF}(q^l)$ be an extension of degree l of the field $F = \mathrm{GF}(q)$. The field trace $\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}\colon E \to F$ is defined to be*

$$\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(\beta) = \beta + \beta^q + \beta^{q^2} + \cdots + \beta^{q^{l-1}}.$$

Conversely, one can show that the F-linear functions from E to F are precisely the *trace functionals* $L_\gamma : E \to F$ given by $L_\gamma(\beta) = \mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(\gamma\beta)$ for some $\gamma \in E$.

In a linear repair scheme, a node that stores $f(\alpha)$ therefore returns elements of F of the form $L_\gamma(f(\alpha))$. The field elements $\gamma \in E$ used by each node thus describe a linear repair scheme for $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$. The following definition of a linear exact repair scheme is from Guruswami and Wootters [14].

Definition 3. *A linear exact repair scheme for $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ over a subfield $F \subseteq E$ consists of*

- *For each $\alpha_i \in A$ and for each $\alpha_j \in A \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$, a set of queries $Q_j(i) \subseteq E$.*
- *For each $\alpha_i \in A$, a linear reconstruction algorithm that computes*

$$f(\alpha_i) = \sum_{h=1}^{l} \lambda_h \mu_h \tag{6}$$

for some coefficients $\lambda_h \in F$ and a basis $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_l$ for E over F, where the coefficients λ_h are F-linear combinations of the responses to the queries, namely:

$$\bigcup_{j \in [n]\setminus\{i\}} \Big\{ L_\gamma\big(f(\alpha_j)\big) : \gamma \in Q_j(i) \Big\}. \tag{7}$$

The repair bandwidth b of the linear exact repair scheme is the total number of symbols in F downloaded to recover a failed node in the worst case, which can be expressed as:

$$b = \max_{i\in[n]} \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} \big|Q_j(i)\big|. \tag{8}$$

Recall that $l = \log_{|F|}|E|$ is the dimension of E as a vector space over F. Guruswami and Wootters [14] show that specifying a linear repair scheme for $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ over F is equivalent to finding, for each α_i in A, a set of l polynomials $\mathbb{P}_i \subset E[x]$ of degree less than $n-k$ such that $\{p(\alpha_i) : p \in \mathbb{P}_i\}$ is a basis for E over F (whereas $\{p(\alpha_j) : p \in \mathbb{P}_i\}$ for all $j \neq i$ spans a low-dimensional subspace over F). Specifically, the following theorem is due to Guruswami and Wootters [14].

Theorem 1. *Let $F \subseteq E$ be a subfield such that the degree of E over F is l and let $A \subset E$ be any set of evaluation points. The following are equivalent.*

1. *There is a linear repair scheme for $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ over F with bandwidth b.*
2. *For each $\alpha_i \in A$, there is a set $\mathbb{P}_i \subset E[x]$ of l polynomials of degree less than $n-k$ such that*

$$\dim_F\Big(\{p(\alpha_i) : p \in \mathbb{P}_i\}\Big) = l \tag{9}$$

and the sets $\{p(\alpha_j) : p \in \mathbb{P}_i\}$ for $j \neq i$ satisfy

$$b \geqslant \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} \dim_F\Big(\{p(\alpha_j) : p \in \mathbb{P}_i\}\Big). \tag{10}$$

The RS code constructed in Section 3, as well as the RS codes constructed in [3, 14, 15, 17–21], rely on the fact that the second statement in Theorem 1 implies the first, so we sketch the proof.

Suppose that the codeword symbol $f(\alpha_i)$ in a codeword $(f(\alpha_1),\ldots,f(\alpha_n)) \in \mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ is erased.

Lemma 2. *For a basis $\{\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_l\}$ for E over F, the value of $f(\alpha_i)$ can be uniquely recovered from the values*

$$\{\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(\zeta_h f(\alpha_i))\}_{h=1}^{l}.$$

Proof. If $\{\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_l\}$ is the dual (trace-orthogonal) basis of the basis $\{\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_l\}$, then

$$f(\alpha_i) = \sum_{h=1}^{l} \mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(\zeta_h f(\alpha_i))\mu_h. \quad \square \tag{11}$$

Suppose we have l codewords $\{c_h^\perp = (c_{h,1}^\perp,\ldots,c_{h,n}^\perp)\}_{h=1}^{l}$ in $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)^\perp$ such that $\{c_{1,i}^\perp,\ldots,c_{l,i}^\perp\}$ is a basis for E over F. By Lemma 2, to find the value of $f(\alpha_i)$, it suffices to find the values of $\{\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(c_{h,i}^\perp f(\alpha_i))\}_{h=1}^{l}$.

Lemma 3. *From $\{\{\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(c_{h,j}^\perp f(\alpha_j))\}_{h=1}^{l}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}$, we can recover the values of $\{\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(c_{h,i}^\perp f(\alpha_i))\}_{h=1}^{l}$.*

Proof. By duality and because $\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}$ is F-linear, we have for all $h \in [l]$ that

$$\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(c_{h,i}^\perp f(\alpha_i)) = -\sum_{j\neq i} \mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(c_{h,j}^\perp f(\alpha_j)). \quad \square$$

Similarly, Lemma 4 holds because $\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}$ is F-linear.

Lemma 4. *Define $Q_j(i)$ to be a maximum linearly independent subset of the set $\{c^\perp_{h,j}\}_{h=1}^l$. We can find the values of*

$$\{\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(c^\perp_{h,j} f(\alpha_j))\}_{h=1}^l$$

for $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ from the values of

$$\{\mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(\gamma f(\alpha_j)) : \gamma \in Q_j(i)\} = \{L_\gamma(f(\alpha_j)) : \gamma \in Q_j(i)\}.$$

Now we show how to specify a linear exact repair scheme for $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ over F as in Definition 3.

Lemma 5. *A set of l codewords $\{c^\perp_h = (c^\perp_{h,1}, \ldots, c^\perp_{h,n})\}_{h=1}^l$ in $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)^\perp$ such that $\{c^\perp_{1,i}, \ldots, c^\perp_{l,i}\}$ is a basis for E over F suffices to specify a linear exact repair scheme for $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ over F as in Definition 3.*

Proof. Setting $\lambda_h = \mathrm{tr}_{E/F}(c^\perp_{h,i} f(\alpha_i))$ and letting $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_l$ be a dual basis for the basis $\{c^\perp_{1,i}, \ldots, c^\perp_{l,i}\}$, we have that (6) holds by (11). Moreover, defining $Q_j(i)$ as in Lemma 4, we see that the coefficients λ_h are F-linear combinations of the queries in (7) by Lemma 3 and Lemma 4. □

Since $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)^\perp = \mathrm{GRS}(n, n-k, A, \nu)$, where ν is given by (5), we see that the hypothesis of Lemma 5 is equivalent to (9) and that the right hand sides of (8) and (10) are equal. Hence, the second statement of Theorem 1 implies the first.

3. Reed–Solomon Repair Schemes with Improved Subpacketization

Recall that Ye and Barg [3] explicitly constructed (n,k,r^n) RS codes whose bandwidth asymptotically meets the cut-set bound. In this section, we generalize this construction and improve the subpacketization at the expense of an asymptotically negligible increase in repair bandwidth. Table 1 compares our Reed–Solomon code construction with that of Ye and Barg [3]. If $r = 2^m$, for example, we achieve the subpacketization of 2^{m+n-1}, which improves upon the subpacketization of 2^{mn} in the constructions by Ye and Barg. Theorem 6 gives a precise statement of our main result for RS codes.

Theorem 6. *Let n and k be arbitrary fixed integers, and suppose that $n-k = s^m$ where $s \geqslant 2$ and $m \geqslant 1$. Let F be a finite field and let $h(x)$ be a degree l irreducible polynomial over F where $l = s^{m+n-1}$. Let β be a root of $h(x)$ and set the symbol field $E = F(\beta)$ to be the field generated by β over F. Choose the set of evaluation points to be $A = \{\beta^{s^0}, \beta^{s^1}, \ldots, \beta^{s^{n-1}}\}$. The exact repair bandwidth of the code $\mathrm{RS}(n,k,A)$ over F is at most*

$$\left(\frac{n-1+3s^{m-1}+2s^{m-2}+\cdots+2s-(m-4)}{n-k}\right) l, \tag{12}$$

and hence asymptotically meets (1) for fixed $n-k$ as $n \to \infty$.

Note that the construction in Theorem 6 generalizes the Ye–Barg construction in [3] because setting $s = r$ and $m = 1$ in Theorem 6 yields their result. However, in general when $r = s^m$ for $m \geqslant 2$, instead of expanding integers in base r as Ye and Barg [3] do, we will expand integers in base s.

When r is not an integral power, we can still use the ideas in the proof of Theorem 6. For example, we can choose any positive integers s and m such that $s^m \leqslant r$. The statement and proof of Theorem 6 still hold if we replace by s^m every occurrence of $n-k$. For fixed r, as $n \to \infty$, the ratio between the repair bandwidth of the resulting RS codes and (1) would be r/s^m. It is always possible to choose $s^m \leqslant r$ so that r/s^m is at most 2. We summarize this result in the following corollary.




Figure 1: The s-ary expansions of a, zs^t, and $u = a + zs^t$ in Claim 2 when $m = 3$ and $t = i - 4$. Observe that $a \in S_i$ because $a_{i+2} = a_{i+1} = a_i = 0$ and $u \in S_{i,t}$ because $u_{i+2} = u_{i+1} = 0$, $u_i = 1$, and $u_{i-1} = 0$.

Corollary 7. *Let n and k be arbitrary fixed integers and suppose that $n - k \geqslant s^m$ where $s \geqslant 2$ and $m \geqslant 1$. The exact repair bandwidth over F of the code $\mathrm{RS}(n, k, A)$ constructed in Theorem 6 is at most*

$$\left(\frac{n - 1 + 3s^{m-1} + 2s^{m-2} + \cdots + 2s - (m-4)}{s^m} \right) l. \tag{13}$$

For fixed $n - k$, as $n \to \infty$, the ratio between (13) *and* (1) *would be $(n-k)/s^m$, which is at most* 2.

In this section, we prove Theorem 8, a version of Theorem 6 with a slightly weaker bound on the repair bandwidth. More involved counting and case analysis, which we defer to Appendix A, yields the repair bandwidth bound (12) in Theorem 6. We use the notation $[x, y] = \{x, x+1, \ldots, y\}$ for integers $x < y$.

Theorem 8. *The exact repair bandwidth over F of the code $\mathrm{RS}(n, k, A)$ constructed in Theorem 6 is at most*

$$\left(\frac{n - 1 + 2(m-1)s^m - 2m + 6}{n - k} \right) l, \tag{14}$$

and hence asymptotically meets (1) *for fixed $n - k$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof of Theorem 8. By Theorem 1, it suffices to find, for each $i \in [0, n-1]$, a set of l polynomials $\{f_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{l}$ satisfying $\deg(f_{i,j}) < n - k$ so that $f_{i,1}(\beta^{s^i}), \ldots, f_{i,l}(\beta^{s^i})$ form a basis for E over F and so that

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leqslant t \leqslant n-1 \\ t \neq i}} \dim_F \left(\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^{l} \right) \tag{15}$$

is bounded above by (14). Recall that $l = s^{m+n-1}$ by assumption. Given $a \in [0, l-1]$, we can write its s-ary expansion as $(a_{m+n-2}, \ldots, a_0)$; that is

$$a = \sum_{j=0}^{m+n-2} a_j s^j,$$

where $a_j \in [0, s-1]$ for $j \in [0, m+n-2]$. Define the set S_i for $i \in [0, n-1]$ by

$$S_i = \{a \in [0, l-1] : a_i = \cdots = a_{i+m-1} = 0\},$$

and define the set of l polynomials

$$\{f_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{l} = \{\beta^a x^z : a \in S_i, z \in [0, n-k-1]\}.$$

Notice that, for each i, we have indeed defined $l = s^{m+n-1}$ polynomials because $|S_i| = s^{n-1}$ and because there are $n - k = s^m$ choices for z.




Figure 2: The s-ary expansions of a, zs^t, and $u = a + zs^t$ in Claim 3 when $m = 3$ and $t = i + 3$. Note that $a \in S_i$ as $a_{i+2} = a_{i+1} = a_i = 0$ and $u \in S'_{i,t}$ as $u_{n+2} = 1$, $u_{n+1} = \cdots = u_{i+6} = u_{i+2} = u_{i+1} = u_i = 0$.

Claim 1. *For $i \in [0, n-1]$, the set $\{f_{i,1}(\beta^{s^i}), \ldots, f_{i,l}(\beta^{s^i})\}$ is a basis for E over F.*

Proof. Since $n - k = s^m$ and $z \in [0, n-k-1]$, we can write the s-ary expansion of z as

$$z = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} z_j s^j,$$

where $z_j \in [0, s-1]$ for $j \in [0, m-1]$. Consequently,

$$\beta^a (\beta^{s^i})^z = \beta^a (\beta^{s^i})^{\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} z_j s^j} = \beta^{a + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} z_j s^{i+j}}.$$

By considering s-ary expansions, we see that as a ranges over S_i and z_j ranges over $[0, s-1]$ for $j \in [0, m-1]$, the sum $a + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} z_j s^{i+j}$ ranges over $[0, l-1]$. We thus have

$$\{f_{i,1}(\beta^{s^i}), \ldots, f_{i,l}(\beta^{s^i})\} = \{1, \beta, \ldots, \beta^{l-1}\}.$$

The latter set is clearly a basis for E over F. □

Our remaining task is to show that (15) is bounded from above by (14). To this end, we now establish upper bounds on $\dim_F(\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^l)$ in two cases according to whether $t \leqslant i - m$ or $t \geqslant i + m$. The case where $t \in [i - (m-1), i + (m-1)]$ is dealt with separately.

Claim 2. *If $i - t \geqslant m$, then*

$$\dim_F \left(\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^l \right) \leqslant \frac{l}{n-k} + \frac{l}{s^{i-t}}.$$

Proof. Define the set

$$S_{i,t} = \{u \in [0, l-1] : u_{i+m-1} = \cdots = u_{i+1} = 0, u_i = 1, u_{i-1} = \cdots = u_{t+m} = 0\}. \tag{16}$$

Referring to Figure 1, we claim that if $i - t \geqslant m$, then

$$\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^l = \{\beta^{a+zs^t} : a \in S_i, z \in [0, n-k-1]\} \subseteq \{\beta^u : u \in S_i \cup S_{i,t}\}.$$

By considering the s-ary expansions of a and zs^t, we see that if $u = a + zs^t \notin S_i$, then the addition must have generated a carry from coordinate $t + m - 1$ to coordinate i, which motivates (16). Claim 2 follows because

$$|S_i| = \frac{l}{n-k} \quad \text{and} \quad |S_{i,t}| = \frac{l}{s^{i-t}}. \quad \square$$

Claim 3. *If $t - i \geqslant m$, then*

$$\dim_F \left(\{ f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t}) \}_{j=1}^{l} \right) \leqslant \frac{l}{n-k} + \frac{l}{s^{m+n-t-1}}.$$

Proof. Define the set

$$S'_{i,t} = \{ u \in [0, s^{m+n} - 1] : u_{m+n-1} = 1, u_{m+n-2} = \cdots = u_{m+t} = 0, u_{i+m-1} = \cdots = u_i = 0 \}. \quad (17)$$

Referring to Figure 2, we claim that if $t - i \geqslant m$, then

$$\{ f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t}) \}_{j=1}^{l} = \{ \beta^{a+zs^t} : a \in S_i, z \in [0, n-k-1] \} \subseteq \{ \beta^u : u \in S_i \cup S'_{i,t} \}.$$

By considering the s-ary expansions of a and zs^t, we see that if $u = a + zs^t \notin S_i$, then the addition must have generated a carry from coordinate $m + t - 1$ to coordinate $m + n - 1$, which motivates (17). Claim 3 now follows because

$$|S'_{i,t}| = \frac{l}{s^{m+n-t-1}}. \quad \square$$

Finally, we bound (15) from above by (14). An upper bound on (15) is

$$\frac{\Big(n - 2(m-1) + 2(m-1)(n-k) \Big) l}{n-k} + \sum_{t=0}^{i-m} \frac{l}{s^{i-t}} + \sum_{t=i+m}^{n-1} \frac{l}{s^{m+n-t-1}}. \quad (18)$$

If $i < m$ or if $i > n - 1 - m$, then empty sums in (18) are taken as zero by convention. The first term in (18) comes from summing the $l/(n-k)$ terms in Claim 2 and Claim 3 and using the trivial bound

$$\dim_F \left(\{ f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t}) \}_{j=1}^{l} \right) \leqslant l \quad (19)$$

for all $t \in [i - (m-1), i + (m-1)]$. The second and third terms in (18) come from Claim 2 and Claim 3, respectively. Using well-known formulas for geometric series, along with the fact that $s \geqslant 2$, we can bound the second term in (18) from above by

$$\sum_{t=1}^{i-m} \frac{l}{s^{i-t}} < \frac{2l}{s^m}. \quad (20)$$

In a similar manner, we can bound the last term in (18) by

$$\sum_{t=i+m}^{n-1} \frac{l}{s^{m+n-t-1}} < \frac{2l}{s^m}. \quad (21)$$

Summing the first term of (18) and the right-hand-sides of (20) and (21) shows that (15) is bounded from above by (14). This completes the proof of Theorem 8. $\square$

4. Optimal-Bandwidth and Optimal-Update Codes

Recall that, in [4], Ye and Barg construct optimal-bandwidth and optimal-update (n, k, r^n) MDS codes with diagonal encoding matrices. In this section, we adapt this construction and improve the subpacketization at the cost of an asymptotically negligible increase in repair bandwidth.

Table 2 compares our optimal-update MDS code construction with that of Ye and Barg [4]. If $r = 2^m$, for example, we achieve the subpacketization of 2^{m+n-1}, which improves upon the subpacketization of 2^{mn} in the constructions by Ye and Barg.

In the Ye–Barg construction [4], optimal repair bandwidth is achieved because each surviving node needs to transmit one scalar in F to recover r coordinates in the failed node. Our construction achieves asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth because all but a constant number of surviving nodes need to transmit one scalar in F to repair r coordinates in the failed node.

In an MDS code, each parity node is a function of the entire information stored in the system. Consequently, when any information element changes its value, each parity node needs to update at least one of its elements. Here, we regard (the content stored at) each node as a vector in F^l and refer to symbols in F as its *elements*. An *optimal-update code* is one in which each parity node needs to update *exactly one* of its elements when an information element changes. Optimal-update codes are desirable since updating is a frequent operation.

One way to construct optimal-update MDS codes is to encode the parity nodes with diagonal encoding matrices. In other words, each parity node $C_{k+i} \in F^l$ for $i \in [r]$ is defined by

$$C_{k+i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} D_{i,j} C_j, \tag{22}$$

where $C_1, \ldots, C_k \in F^l$ are the systematic nodes and $D_{i,j}$ is an $l \times l$ diagonal matrix. In [4], Ye and Barg construct optimal-bandwidth and optimal-update (n, k, r^n) MDS codes with diagonal encoding matrices.

We adapt the Ye–Barg construction in Construction 1 and improve the subpacketization at the expense of an asymptotically negligible increase in the repair bandwidth. Theorem 9 shows that the resulting code has asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth while being optimal-update. When r is not an integral power, we show how to obtain optimal update MDS codes with near-optimal bandwidth in Corollary 10.

Note that, with our level of subpacketization, our MDS codes cannot meet the cut-set bound (1) because a result of [25] shows that an optimal-bandwidth (n, k, l) MDS code with diagonal encoding matrices satisfies $l \geqslant r^k$. For fixed $r = s^m$, as $n \to \infty$, we have $s^{m+n-1} < r^k$, so the most we can hope for is asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth.

Let $\mathscr{C}$ be an (n, k, l) MDS code with nodes $C_i \in F^l$ represented as column vectors for $i \in [n]$. We consider codes defined in the following parity-check form

$$\mathscr{C} = \left\{ (C_1, \ldots, C_n) : \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{t,i} C_i = \mathbf{0}, t \in [r] \right\}, \tag{23}$$

where $A_{t,i}$ is an $l \times l$ matrix over F for $t \in [r]$ and $i \in [n]$. Given positive integers r and n, define an (n, k, l) MDS code $\mathscr{C}$ by setting in (23)

$$A_{t,i} = A_i^{t-1}, t \in [r], i \in [n], \tag{24}$$

where $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are $l \times l$ matrices that will be specified in Construction 1. We use the convention $A^0 = I$.

Definition 4. *Let $s \geqslant 2$ and $m \geqslant 1$ be positive integers. Let $l = s^{m+n-1}$. Given $a \in [0, l-1]$, we can write its s-ary expansion as $(a_{m+n-1}, \ldots, a_1)$; that is*

$$a = \sum_{j=1}^{m+n-1} a_j s^{j-1},$$

where $a_j \in [0, s-1]$ for $j \in [m+n-1]$. For $i \in [n]$, let $a_{(i+m-1,\ldots,i)}$ be the unique $x \in [0, s^m - 1]$ such that the s-ary representation of x is $(a_{i+m-1}, \ldots, a_i)$.

To illustrate Definition 4 consider the following example.

Example 1. Let $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $n = 10$, and $l = 2^{11}$. Let $a = 6$ whose binary expansion is $(0, \ldots, 0, 1, 1, 0)$. We have

$$6_{(2,1)} = 2,\ 6_{(3,2)} = 3,\ 6_{(4,3)} = 1,\ 6_{(i+1,i)} = 0 \text{ if } i \in [4, 10].$$

We now show how to adapt Construction 1 of Ye and Barg in [4].

Construction 1. *Let n and k be fixed integers and suppose that $n - k \geqslant s^m$, where $s \geqslant 2$ and $m \geqslant 1$. Let F be a finite field of size $|F| \geqslant s^m n$ and let $l = s^{m+n-1}$. Let $\{\lambda_{i,j}\}_{i\in[n],j\in[0,s^m-1]}$ be $s^m n$ distinct elements in F. Consider the code family given by* (23) *and* (24) *where we take*

$$A_i = \sum_{a=0}^{l-1} \lambda_{i,a_{(i+m-1,\ldots,i)}} e_a e_a^\top, \quad i \in [n].$$

Here, $\{e_0, \ldots, e_{l-1}\}$ is the standard basis for F^l over F, viewed as column vectors.

Since the A_i for $i \in [n]$ are diagonal matrices, we can write out the parity-check equations coordinatewise. Letting $c_{i,a}$ denote the a^{th} coordinate of the column vector C_i, we have for all integers $a \in [0, l-1]$ and $t \in [0, r-1]$ that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{i,a_{(i+m-1,\ldots,i)}}^t c_{i,a} = 0. \tag{25}$$

To illustrate (25) consider the following example.

Example 2. Suppose $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $r = 4$, $n = 10$, and $l = 2^{11}$. For $a \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ and $t \in [0, 3]$, the equations in (25) are

$$\lambda_{1,0}^t c_{1,0} + \lambda_{2,0}^t c_{2,0} + \lambda_{3,0}^t c_{3,0} + \lambda_{4,0}^t c_{4,0} + \sum_{j=5}^{10} \lambda_{j,0}^t c_{j,0} = 0.$$

$$\lambda_{1,2}^t c_{1,2} + \lambda_{2,1}^t c_{2,2} + \lambda_{3,0}^t c_{3,2} + \lambda_{4,0}^t c_{4,2} + \sum_{j=5}^{10} \lambda_{j,0}^t c_{j,2} = 0.$$

$$\lambda_{1,0}^t c_{1,4} + \lambda_{2,2}^t c_{2,4} + \lambda_{3,1}^t c_{3,4} + \lambda_{4,0}^t c_{4,4} + \sum_{j=5}^{10} \lambda_{j,4}^t c_{j,4} = 0.$$

$$\lambda_{1,2}^t c_{1,6} + \lambda_{2,3}^t c_{2,6} + \lambda_{3,1}^t c_{3,6} + \lambda_{4,0}^t c_{4,6} + \sum_{j=5}^{10} \lambda_{j,6}^t c_{j,6} = 0.$$

Theorem 9 addresses the repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 1 when $r = s^m$. The full proof of Theorem 9 is presented in Appendix B.

Theorem 9. *If $n - k = s^m$, the exact repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 1 is at most*

$$\left(\frac{n - 1 + 2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1}(s^v - 1)}{n - k} \right) l, \tag{26}$$

and hence asymptotically meets (1) *for fixed $n - k$ as $n \to \infty$.*

As in Corollary 7, even if r is not an integral power, we can still use the ideas in Theorem 9. We can choose any positive integers s and m such that $s^m \leqslant r$. The statement and proof of Theorem 9 still hold if we replace by s^m every occurrence of $n-k$. For fixed r, as $n \to \infty$, the ratio between the repair bandwidth of the resulting codes and (1) would be r/s^m, which is at most 2. We summarize this result in the following corollary.

Corollary 10. *If $n-k \geqslant s^m$, the exact repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 1 is at most*

$$\left(\frac{n-1+2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1}(s^v-1)}{s^m}\right) l. \tag{27}$$

For fixed $n-k$, as $n \to \infty$, the ratio between (27) *and* (1) *would be $(n-k)/s^m$, which is at most* 2.

In this section, we prove Theorem 11, a version of Theorem 9 with a slightly weaker bound on the repair bandwidth. In conjunction with the proof of Theorem 11, the reader may find it useful to consult Example 3, which illustrates the notation in Theorem 11.

Theorem 11. *If $n-k = s^m$, the exact repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 1 is at most*

$$\left(\frac{n-1+2(m-1)s^m-2m+2}{n-k}\right) l, \tag{28}$$

and hence asymptotically meets (1) *for fixed $n-k$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. For $(w_m,\ldots,w_1) \in [0,s-1]^m$ and $a \in [0,l-1]$, define $a(i;w_m,\ldots,w_1) \in [0,l-1]$ to be the integer whose s-ary representation is obtained from the s-ary representation of a by replacing the m coordinates $a_{i+m-1},\ldots,a_i$ with $w_m,\ldots,w_1$ respectively; that is

$$\begin{aligned} &a(i;w_m,\ldots,w_1) \\ &= (a_{n+m-1},\ldots,a_{i+m},w_m,\ldots,w_1,a_{i-1},\ldots,a_1). \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

For $i \in [n]$ and $a \in [0,l-1]$, let $S_{a,i}$ be the set of integers in $[0,l-1]$ whose s-ary representation is obtained from the s-ary representation of a by replacing the m coordinates $a_{i+m-1},\ldots,a_i$ with $w_m,\ldots,w_1$ respectively for all $(w_m,\ldots,w_1) \in [0,s-1]^m$; that is

$$S_{a,i} = \{a(i;w_m,\ldots,w_1) : (w_m,\ldots,w_1) \in [0,s-1]^m\}. \tag{30}$$

For $a \in [0,l-1]$ and $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, we define elements in F by

$$u_{j,i}^{(a)} = \sum_{a' \in S_{a,i}} c_{j,a'}. \tag{31}$$

We will show that for any $i \in [n]$ and $a \in [0,l-1]$, the r coordinates

$$\{c_{i,a'} : a' \in S_{a,i}\} \tag{32}$$

in C_i are functions of the following set $D_i^{(a)} \subset F$,

$$D_i^{(a)} = \{u_{j,i}^{(a)} : |j-i| \geqslant m\} \sqcup \{c_{j,a'} : |j-i| < m, a' \in S_{a,i}\}.$$

To repair r coordinates in the failed node, a surviving node j needs to transmit one scalar in F if $|j-i| \geqslant m$ and r scalars otherwise. Consequently,

$$|D_i^{(a)}| \leqslant (n-1)-2(m-1)+2(m-1)r,$$

and so the repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 1 is at most (28).

We write (25) for $t \in [0, r-1]$ and sum over $a' \in S_{a,i}$. When $t = 0$, we obtain

$$\sum_{a' \in S_{a,i}} c_{i,a'} = -\sum_{j \neq i} u_{j,i}^{(a)}. \tag{33}$$

Notice that if $|j-i| \geqslant m$, then for all $a' \in S_{a,i}$, the value of $a'(j+m-1,\ldots,j)$ is the same. For j such that $|j-i| \geqslant m$ define $l_{a,j} \in [0, r-1]$ to be the value of $a'(j+m-1,\ldots,j)$ for any $a' \in S_{a,i}$. When $1 \leqslant t \leqslant r-1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{a' \in S_{a,i}} \lambda_{i,a'_{(i+m-1,\ldots,i)}}^{t} c_{i,a'} &= -\sum_{j:|j-i| \geqslant m} \lambda_{j,l_{a,j}}^{t} u_{j,i}^{(a)} \\ &- \sum_{j:|j-i|<m} \sum_{a' \in S_{a,i}} \lambda_{j,a'_{(j+m-1,\ldots,j)}}^{t} c_{j,a'}.\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

For $t = 0$, let B_0 denote the right-hand-side of (33). Similarly, for $1 \leqslant t \leqslant r-1$, let B_t denote the right-hand-side of (34). Writing the system of equations given by (33) and (34) in matrix form yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \lambda_{i,0} & \cdots & \lambda_{i,r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_{i,0}^{r-1} & \cdots & \lambda_{i,r-1}^{r-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{i,a(i;0,\ldots,0)} \\ \vdots \\ c_{i,a(i;s-1,\ldots,s-1)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} B_0 \\ \vdots \\ B_{r-1} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{35}$$

Since $B_0,\ldots,B_{r-1}$ are functions of the elements in $D_i^{(a)}$ and since $\lambda_{i,0},\ldots,\lambda_{i,r-1}$ are distinct, we can solve the system in (35) for the r coordinates in (32) given $D_i^{(a)}$. □

To illustrate Theorem 11, consider the following example.

Example 3. Suppose $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $r = 4$, $n = 10$, and $l = 2^{11}$. Suppose node 2 has failed so $i = 2$. Letting $a = 0$, we have in (29) that

$$0(2;0,0) = 0,\ 0(2;0,1) = 2,\ 0(2;1,0) = 4,\ 0(2;1,1) = 6.$$

Hence, $S_{0,2} = \{0,2,4,6\}$ and

$$u_{j,2}^{(0)} = c_{j,0} + c_{j,2} + c_{j,4} + c_{j,6}. \tag{36}$$

The four coordinates in (32) are $\{c_{2,0}, c_{2,2}, c_{2,4}, c_{2,6}\}$ and we claim these coordinates are functions of the set

$$\begin{aligned}D_2^{(0)} &= \{u_{j,2}^{(0)} : 4 \leqslant j \leqslant 10\} \cup \\ &\{c_{j,a'} : j \in \{1,3\}, a' \in \{0,2,4,6\}\}.\end{aligned}$$

To see why the coordinates $c_{2,0}, c_{2,2}, c_{2,4}, c_{2,6}$ are functions of the set $D_2^{(0)}$, sum the equations in Example 2. When $t = 0$, we obtain

$$c_{2,0} + c_{2,2} + c_{2,4} + c_{2,6} = -\sum_{j \neq 2} u_{j,2}^{(0)}. \tag{37}$$

We have $l_{0,j} = 0$ for $4 \leqslant j \leqslant 10$, so when $1 \leqslant t \leqslant 3$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda_{2,0}^{t} c_{2,0} + \lambda_{2,1}^{t} c_{2,2} + \lambda_{2,2}^{t} c_{2,4} + \lambda_{2,3}^{t} c_{2,6} \\ &= -\lambda_{1,0}^{t}(c_{1,0} + c_{1,4}) - \lambda_{1,2}^{t}(c_{1,2} + c_{1,6}) - \lambda_{3,0}^{t}(c_{3,0} + c_{3,2}) \\ &- \lambda_{3,1}^{t}(c_{3,4} + c_{3,6}) - \sum_{j=4}^{10} \lambda_{j,0}^{t} u_{j,2}^{(0)}.\end{aligned}$$

We now show that the code in Construction 1 is MDS.

Theorem 12. *The code $\mathscr{C}$ given by Construction 1 is MDS.*

Proof. Writing the parity check equations (23) coordinatewise, we have for all $a \in [0, l-1]$ that

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \lambda_{1,a(m,\ldots,1)} & \cdots & \lambda_{n,a(n+m-1,\ldots,n)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_{1,a(m,\ldots,1)}^{r-1} & \cdots & \lambda_{n,a(n+m-1,\ldots,n)}^{r-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{1,a} \\ \vdots \\ c_{n,a} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{38}$$

Since every r columns of the parity-check matrix in (38) have rank r, any k out of n elements in the set $\{c_{1,a} \ldots, c_{n,a}\}$ can recover the whole set. As this holds for all $a \in [0, l-1]$, any k nodes of a codeword in $\mathscr{C}$ can recover the whole codeword. □

Finally, we show that the code constructed in Construction 1 has diagonal encoding matrices and is thus optimal-update.

Theorem 13. *The code $\mathscr{C}$ given by Construction 1 has diagonal encoding matrices and is thus optimal-update.*

Proof. We assume that the first k nodes $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ are the systematic nodes, and we seek diagonal encoding matrices $D_{i,j}$ satisfying (22). Let

$$V_1^{(a)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \lambda_{k+1,a(k+m,\ldots,k+1)} & \cdots & \lambda_{n,a(n+m-1,\ldots,n)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_{k+1,a(k+m,\ldots,k+1)}^{r-1} & \cdots & \lambda_{n,a(n+m-1,\ldots,n)}^{r-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$V_2^{(a)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \lambda_{1,a(m,\ldots,1)} & \cdots & \lambda_{k,a(k+m-1,\ldots,k)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_{1,a(m,\ldots,1)}^{r-1} & \cdots & \lambda_{k,a(k+m-1,\ldots,k)}^{r-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By (38), we have

$$V_1^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} c_{k+1,a} \\ \vdots \\ c_{n,a} \end{bmatrix} = -V_2^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} c_{1,a} \\ \vdots \\ c_{k,a} \end{bmatrix},$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_{k+1,a} \\ \vdots \\ c_{n,a} \end{bmatrix} = -\left(V_1^{(a)}\right)^{-1} V_2^{(a)} \begin{bmatrix} c_{1,a} \\ \vdots \\ c_{k,a} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Letting $M^{(a)} = -\left(V_1^{(a)}\right)^{-1} V_2^{(a)}$, we have for each $i \in [r]$ and $a \in [0, l-1]$ that

$$c_{k+i,a} = M^{(a)}(i,1)c_{1,a} + \cdots + M^{(a)}(i,k)c_{k,a},$$

where $M^{(a)}(i,j)$ is the (i,j) entry of the matrix $M^{(a)}$. Defining an $l \times l$ diagonal matrix $D_{i,j}$ by

$$D_{i,j}(a,a) = M^{(a)}(i,j),$$

we have that (22) is satisfied. □

5. A Framework for Constructing Optimal-Bandwidth MDS Codes

In [25], Tamo, Wang, and Bruck show that constructing optimal-bandwidth (n,k,l) MDS codes is equivalent to finding encoding matrices and repairing subspaces that satisfy certain properties. In this section, we adapt their framework for use in constructing (n,k,l) MDS codes that have repair-by-transfer schemes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth.

We represent the n nodes $C_1,\dots,C_n \in F^l$ as column vectors and for $a \in [0,l-1]$, we let $c_{i,a}$ denote the a^{th} coordinate of C_i. We assume that the first k nodes $C_1,\dots,C_k$ are systematic and that the parity nodes C_{k+i} for $i \in [r]$ are defined by

$$C_{k+i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} A_{i,j} C_j, \tag{39}$$

where $A_{i,j}$ is an invertible $l \times l$ *encoding matrix*. Hence, the code is uniquely determined by the matrix

$$\mathcal{A} = (A_{i,j})_{i\in[r],j\in[k]} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1} & \cdots & A_{1,k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ A_{r,1} & \cdots & A_{r,k} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{40}$$

The code is MDS if and only if any $1\times 1, 2\times 2, \dots, r\times r$ block submatrix of $\mathcal{A}$ is invertible.

We will make some additional assumptions on the encoding matrices $A_{i,j}$. Denote the matrix $A_{2,j}$ by A_j. We will assume the matrix A_j is diagonalizable and has r distinct nonzero eigenvalues corresponding to r eigenspaces, each of dimension l/r. We define the matrix $A_{i,j} = A_j^{i-1}$ for $i \in [r]$ and $j \in [k]$. Consequently, all the matrices $A_{i,j}$ are diagonalizable. Moreover, if $V_{j,0},\dots,V_{j,r-1}$ are the left eigenspaces of the matrix A_j corresponding to eigenvalues $\lambda_{j,0},\dots,\lambda_{j,r-1}$, then the matrix $A_{i,j}$ also has left eigenspaces $V_{j,0},\dots,V_{j,r-1}$ corresponding to eigenvalues $\lambda_{j,0}^{i-1},\dots,\lambda_{j,r-1}^{i-1}$.

For each systematic node $j \in [k]$, we will define a repairing subspace S_j of dimension $\dim(S_j) = l/r$. During the repair process of systematic node h, parity node $k+i$ projects its data onto the repairing subspace S_h. By (39), parity node $k+i$ for $i \in [r]$ transmits

$$S_h C_{k+i} = S_h \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} A_{i,j} C_j \right). \tag{41}$$

Rearranging (41) and recalling that $A_{i,h} = A_h^{i-1}$, we obtain

$$S_h A_h^{i-1} C_h = S_h C_{k+i} - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j\neq h}}^{k} S_h A_j^{i-1} C_j. \tag{42}$$

Writing (42) for each $i \in [r]$ yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_h \\ S_h A_h \\ \vdots \\ S_h A_h^{r-1} \end{bmatrix} C_h = \begin{bmatrix} S_h C_{k+1} \\ S_h C_{k+2} \\ \vdots \\ S_h C_{k+r} \end{bmatrix} - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j\neq h}}^{k} \begin{bmatrix} S_h \\ S_h A_j \\ \vdots \\ S_h A_j^{r-1} \end{bmatrix} C_j. \tag{43}$$

To compute the erased node C_h from (43), the matrix on the left-hand-side of (43) must be invertible; an equivalent condition is that

$$S_h + S_h A_h + \cdots + S_h A_h^{r-1} = F^l. \tag{44}$$

Node index i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Basis for 1st	e_2	e_1	e_0	e_0	e_0	e_0	e_0	e_0
eigenspace of A_i	e_3	e_5	e_1	e_4	e_1	e_4	e_1	e_4
Basis for 2nd	e_4	e_2	e_4	e_2	e_2	e_1	e_2	e_1
eigenspace of A_i	e_5	e_6	e_5	e_6	e_3	e_5	e_3	e_5
Basis for 3rd	e_6	e_3	e_6	e_3	e_6	e_3	e_4	e_2
eigenspace of A_i	e_7	e_7	e_7	e_7	e_7	e_7	e_5	e_6
Basis for 4th	w	y	w	y	w	y	w	y
eigenspace of A_i	x	z	x	z	x	z	x	z
Basis for repairing	e_0	e_0	e_2	e_1	e_4	e_2	e_6	e_3
subspace S_i	e_1	e_4	e_3	e_5	e_5	e_6	e_7	e_7
S_i not invariant	A_2	A_2	A_6	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_6	A_3
subspace of	A_4	A_5	A_8	A_5	A_4	A_7	A_8	A_7

Table 5: An $(n = 12, k = 8, l = 8)$ MDS code.
Define $w = e_0 + e_2 + e_4 + e_6$, $x = e_1 + e_3 + e_5 + e_7$, $y = e_0 + e_1 + e_2 + e_3$, and $z = e_4 + e_5 + e_6 + e_7$.

Moreover, systematic node $j \neq h$ must transmit enough information to compute

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_h \\ S_h A_j \\ \vdots \\ S_h A_j^{r-1} \end{bmatrix} C_j. \tag{45}$$

The code is optimal-bandwidth when systematic node $j \neq h$ transmits l/r symbols or, equivalently, when the matrix on the left-hand-side of (45) has dimension l/r. Since $\dim(S_h) = l/r$, the code is optimal-bandwidth when

$$S_h = S_h A_j = \cdots = S_h A_j^{r-1}, \tag{46}$$

or equivalently when S_h is an invariant subspace of A_j for all $j \in [k] \setminus \{h\}$. Since A_j is diagonalizable, S_h is an invariant subspace of A_j if and only if there exists a basis of S_h consisting of eigenvectors of A_j.

Wang, Tamo, and Bruck [5,25] construct an optimal-bandwidth (n,k,l) code by designing encoding matrices A_j and repairing subspaces S_j for $j \in [k]$ such that (44) and (46) hold. A similar argument yields a sufficient condition to construct (n,k,l) codes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth.

Theorem 14. *To construct an (n,k,l) code which can repair systematic nodes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth, it suffices to*

1. *define diagonalizable matrices A_j for $j \in [k]$ with r distinct nonzero eigenvalues corresponding to r eigenspaces, each of dimension l/r,*
2. *define repairing subspaces S_j for $j \in [k]$ of dimension*
$$\dim(S_j) = l/r,$$
3. *show that, for each $h \in [k]$, the repairing subspace S_h is an invariant subspace of A_j (equivalently that* (46) *holds), for all but a constant number of nodes $j \in [k] \setminus \{h\}$,*
4. *show that, for each $h \in [k]$,* (44) *holds.*

Moreover, we claim that an (n, k, l) code satisfying Theorem 14 has a repair-by-transfer scheme with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth if, for each systematic node $h \in [k]$, there exists a subset $V_h \subset [0, l-1]$ such that the row space of the matrix S_h equals $\langle e_a : a \in V_h \rangle$. By the third condition in Theorem 14, for each systematic node $h \in [k]$, there exists a set $K_h \subset [k]$ such that for all systematic nodes $j \in [k] \setminus K_h$, the repairing subspace S_h is an invariant subspace of the encoding matrix A_j. If the row space of S_h equals $\langle e_a : a \in V_h \rangle$, then to repair systematic node h, it suffices for a node $j \in [n] \setminus K_h$ to send the symbols $\{c_{j,a} : a \in V_h\}$. Since the size of K_h is a constant depending only on r, such a repair scheme would have asymptotically optimal bandwidth because, in the worst case, all nodes in K_h could send all their symbols.

6. Repair-by-Transfer Schemes with Improved Subpacketization

When $r = s^m$ is an integral power, we can adapt the code construction in [5] to obtain, for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, a

$$(n = rt + r, k = rt, l = s^{m+t-1}) \tag{47}$$

MDS code with a repair-by-transfer scheme that can repair systematic nodes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth. If $r = 2^m$, for example, we achieve the subpacketization of $2^{k/r+m-1}$, which improves upon the subpacketization of $2^{mn/(r+1)}$ in the Wang–Tamo–Bruck construction. Table 3 compares our code construction with other state-of-the-art (n, k, l) MDS code constructions. When $m = 1$, our codes are equivalent to those in [26].

Definition 5. *Suppose that $r = s^m$, where $s \geqslant 2$ and $m \geqslant 1$. Let $l = s^{m+t-1}$. Given $a \in [0, l-1]$, we can write its s-ary expansion as $(a_1, \ldots, a_{m+t-1})$; that is*

$$a = \sum_{j=1}^{m+t-1} a_j s^{m+t-1-j}.$$

For $i \in [t]$, let $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)}$ be the unique $x \in [0, r-1]$ such that the s-ary representation of x is $(a_i, \ldots, a_{i+m-1})$.

To illustrate Definition 5, consider the following example.

Example 4. Suppose $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $r = 4$, $t = 5$, and $l = 64$. Let $a = 6$ whose binary expansion is $(0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)$. We have

$$6_{(i,i+1)} = 0 \text{ for } i \in [1, 2],\ 6_{(3,4)} = 1,\ 6_{(4,5)} = 3,\ 6_{(5,6)} = 2.$$

For $a \in [0, l-1]$ and $i \in [t]$, we define $M_{a,i}$ to be the set of r indices in $[0, l-1]$ that differ from a in at most their i^{th}, $(i+1)^{\text{st}}, \ldots, (i+m-1)^{\text{th}}$ digits. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{a,i} = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_{m+t-1}) \in [0, l-1] : x_j = a_j \\ \text{for } j \notin [i, i+m-1]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

To illustrate (48), consider the following example.

Example 5. Suppose $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $r = 4$, $t = 2$, and $l = 8$. We have $M_{(0,0,0),1} = \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$. Notice that $M_{(0,0,0),1}$ is the same set as $M_{(0,1,0),1}$, $M_{(1,0,0),1}$, and $M_{(1,1,0),1}$.

We now define some subspaces that will be used to define the left eigenspaces of our encoding matrices and our repairing subspaces.

Definition 6. *Suppose that $r = s^m$, where $s \geqslant 2$ and $m \geqslant 1$. Let $l = s^{m+t-1}$. Let $\{e_a : a \in [0, l-1]\}$ be the standard basis of F^l over F. For $i \in [t]$ and $u \in [0, r-1]$,*

$$P_{i,u} = \mathsf{span}\left(e_a : a_{(i,i+1,\ldots,i+t-1)} = u\right),$$
$$P_{i,r} = \mathsf{span}\left(\sum_{a' \in M_{a,i}} e_{a'} : a \in [0, s^{m+t-1} - 1]\right).$$

To illustrate Definition 6, consider the following example.

Example 6. Suppose $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $r = 4$, $t = 2$, and $l = 8$.

$$P_{1,0} = \mathsf{span}\left(e_a : a_{(1,2)} = 0\right) = \langle e_0,\, e_1\rangle$$
$$P_{1,4} = \langle e_0 + e_2 + e_4 + e_6,\, e_1 + e_3 + e_5 + e_7\rangle$$

When $r = s^m$ is an integral power, we can adapt the code construction in [5] to obtain, for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, an (n, k, l) MDS code with parameters given by (47) that has a repair-by-transfer scheme which can repair systematic nodes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth.

Construction 2. *Suppose that $r = s^m$, where $s \geqslant 2$ and $m \geqslant 1$. Let $l = s^{m+t-1}$. Let $u \in [0, r-1]$ and let $i \in [t]$. For each integer $ut + i \in [k]$, define the encoding matrix A_{ut+i}. The left eigenspaces of A_{ut+i} are $P_{i,u'}$ for $u' \in [0, r] \setminus \{u\}$ and correspond to distinct nonzero eigenvalues. Furthermore, let $P_{i,u}$ be the repairing subspace for node $ut + i$, namely $S_{ut+i} = P_{i,u}$.*

To illustrate Construction 2, consider the example in Table 5. Suppose node 1 is erased. Since S_1 is an invariant subspace of A_j, for $j \in \{3, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$, we can compute (45) for $j \in \{3, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$ and $h = 1$ if node j sends the symbols $c_{j,0}$ and $c_{j,1}$. Similarly, parity nodes $8 + i$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ must send the symbols $c_{8+i,0}$ and $c_{8+i,1}$.

To repair node 1, it remains to describe the symbols that node 2 and node 4 send. Observe that e_1 is an eigenvector of A_2, but e_0 is not. Since $e_0 + e_1 + e_2 + e_3$ is an eigenvector of A_2, we have that $e_0 A_2$, $e_0 A_2^2$, $e_0 A_2^3$ lie in $\langle e_0, e_1, e_2, e_3\rangle$. Consequently, to compute (45) for $h = 1$ and $j = 2$, it suffices for node 2 to send the four symbols $c_{2,0}$, $c_{2,1}$, $c_{2,2}$, and $c_{2,3}$. Similarly, to compute (45) for $h = 1$ and $j = 4$, it suffices for node 4 to send the four symbols $c_{4,0}$, $c_{4,1}$, $c_{4,2}$ and $c_{4,3}$.

Theorem 15 shows that the code in Construction 2 has a repair-by-transfer scheme with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth.

Theorem 15. *The code in Construction 2 has a repair-by-transfer scheme with repair bandwidth at most*

$$\left(\frac{(n-1) + 2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1}(r - s^v)}{n-k}\right) l, \tag{49}$$

which asymptotically meets (1) *for fixed $n - k$ as $n \to \infty$.*

To verify that the code constructed in Construction 2 can repair systematic nodes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth, we check the conditions of Theorem 14; all proofs are presented in Appendix C. Similarly, the full proof of Theorem 15 is presented in Appendix C.




Figure 3: The s-ary expansions of a, zs^t, and $u = a + zs^t$ in Claim 5 when $m = 3$, $t = i - 2$, and $u \in S_{i,t,1}$




Figure 4: The s-ary expansions of a, zs^t, and $u = a + zs^t$ in Claim 6 when $m = 3$, $t = i + 2$, and $u \in S_{i,t,1}$

A. Proof of Theorem 6

In this section, we prove Theorem 6. We first improve the bound in Claim 2. If S is a set and $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is a positive integer, recall that S^d is the Cartesian product of S taken d times. Define

$$X_d = [0, s-1]^d \setminus \{(s-1, \ldots, s-1)\}, \tag{50}$$

$$Y_d = [0, s-1]^d \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}. \tag{51}$$

Claim 4. *If $t \in [0, i-1]$ and $i - t \geqslant m$, then*

$$\dim_F(\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^{l}) \leqslant \frac{l}{n-k} + \frac{(s^m-1)l}{s^{i-t+m}}.$$

Proof. Define the set

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,t} = \{u \in [0, l-1] :\ & u_{i+m-1} = \cdots = u_{i+1} = 0, \\ & u_i = 1, u_{i-1} = \cdots = u_{t+m} = 0, \qquad (52) \\ & (u_{t+m-1}, \ldots, u_t) \in X_m\}. \qquad (53) \end{aligned}$$

We claim that if $t \in [0, i-1]$ and $i - t \geqslant m$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^{l} &= \{\beta^{a+zs^t} : a \in S_i, z \in [0, n-k-1]\} \\ &\subseteq \{\beta^u : u \in S_i \cup S_{i,t}\}. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Claim 2, if $u = a + zs^t \notin S_i$, then the addition must have generated a carry from coordinate $t + m - 1$ to coordinate i, which motivates (52). Moreover, let $c = zs^t$ and let $y \in [t, t+m-1]$ denote the first coordinate from which there is a carry in u. Since a_y and c_y lie in $[0, s-1]$, this implies that $u_y \in [0, s-2]$ and that (53) holds. Consequently, if $u \notin S_i$ then $u \in S_{i,t}$. Claim 4 follows because

$$|S_i| = \frac{l}{n-k} \text{ and } |S_{i,t}| = \frac{(s^m-1)l}{s^{i-t+m}}. \quad \square$$

In Theorem 8, we proved a weaker version of Theorem 6 by using, for all $t \in [i-(m-1), i+(m-1)]$, the trivial bound (19). We now improve (19) in this case.

Claim 5. *If $t \in [0, i-1]$ and $i - t < m$, write $t = i - w$ where $w \in [m-1]$. We have*

$$\dim_F(\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^{l}) \leqslant \frac{l}{n-k} + \frac{(s^m-1)l}{s^{m+w}}.$$

Proof. Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,t,1} = \{u \in [0, l-1] : & u_{i+m-1} = \cdots = u_{i+m-w+1} = 0, \\ & u_{i+m-w} = 1, \\ & u_{i+m-w-1} = \cdots = u_i = 0, \\ & (u_{i-1}, \ldots, u_{i-w}) \in X_w\}, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,t,0} = \{u \in [0, l-1] : & u_{i+m-1} = \cdots = u_{i+m-w} = 0, \\ & (u_{i+m-w-1}, \ldots, u_i) \in Y_{m-w}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that if $t \in [0, i-1]$ and $i - t < m$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^{l} &= \{\beta^{a+zs^t} : a \in S_i, z \in [0, n-k-1]\} \\ &\subseteq \{\beta^u : u \in S_i \cup S_{i,t,1} \cup S_{i,t,0}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Please refer to Figure 3 and let $u = a + zs^t$. By considering the s-ary expansions of a and zs^t, we have $u_{i+m-w} \in \{0,1\}$. In order for $u_{i+m-w} = 1$, we need

$$u_i = \cdots = u_{i+m-w-1} = 0$$

and carries from coordinate $i-1$ to coordinate $i+m-w$. As in Claim 4, we must have that (54) holds because the position of first carry occurs in $[i-w, i-1]$. Hence, if $u_{i+m-w} = 1$ then $u \in S_{i,t,1}$.

If $u_{i+m-w} = 0$ and $u \notin S_i$ then $u \in S_{i,t,0}$. Claim 5 holds because

$$|S_{i,t,1}| = \frac{(s^w-1)l}{s^{m+w}}, \text{ and } |S_{i,t,0}| = \frac{(s^m-s^w)l}{s^{m+w}}. \quad \square$$

Claim 6. *If $t \in [i+1, n-1]$ and $t - i < m$, write $t = i + w$ where $w \in [m-1]$. We have*

$$\dim_F(\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^{l}) \leqslant \frac{l}{n-k} + \frac{(s^w-1)l}{s^{n+w-i-1}} + \frac{(s^{m-w}-1)l}{s^m}.$$

Proof. Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,t,1} = \{u \in [0, s^{m+n}-1] : & u_{m+n-1} = 1, \\ & u_{m+n-2} = \cdots = u_{m+w+i} = 0, \\ & (u_{i+m+w-1}, \ldots, u_{i+m}) \in X_w \\ & u_{i+w-1} = \cdots = u_i = 0\}, \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,t,0} = \{u \in [0, l-1] : & (u_{i+m-1}, \ldots, u_{i+w}) \in Y_{m-w}, \\ & u_{i+w-1} = \cdots = u_i = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that if $t \in [i+1, n-1]$ and $t - i < m$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\{f_{i,j}(\beta^{s^t})\}_{j=1}^{l} &= \{\beta^{a+zs^t} : a \in S_i, z \in [0, n-k-1]\} \\ &\subseteq \{\beta^u : u \in S_i \cup S_{i,t,1} \cup S_{i,t,0}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Please refer to Figure 4 and let $u = a + zs^t$. By considering the s-ary expansions of a and zs^t, we have $u_{m+n-1} \in \{0,1\}$. In order for $u_{m+n-1} = 1$, we need

$$u_{m+w+i} = \cdots = u_{m+n-2} = 0$$

and carries from the coordinate $i + w + m - 1$ to the coordinate $m + n - 1$. As in Claim 4, we have that (55) holds because the position of first carry lies in the interval $[i+m, i+w+m-1]$. Hence, if $u_{n+m-1} = 1$ then we must have $u \in S_{i,t,1}$.

If $u_{n+m-1} = 0$ and $u \notin S_i$ then $u \in S_{i,t,0}$. Claim 6 holds because

$$|S_{i,t,1}| = \frac{(s^w - 1)l}{s^{n+w-i-1}}, \text{ and } |S_{i,t,0}| = \frac{(s^{m-w} - 1)l}{s^m}. \quad \square$$

Finally, we bound (15) from above by (12). Let

$$M = \min\{m-1, n-1-i\}$$

denote the minimum of $m-1$ and $n-1-i$. Summing the bounds in Claim 4, Claim 5, Claim 6, and Claim 3 respectively, an upper bound on (15) is

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{(n-1)l}{n-k} + \sum_{t=1}^{i} \frac{(s^m - 1)l}{s^{m+t}} + \sum_{w=1}^{M} \frac{(s^w - 1)l}{s^{n+w-i-1}} \\ &\qquad + \sum_{w=1}^{M} \frac{(s^{m-w} - 1)l}{s^m} + \sum_{t=i+m}^{n-1} \frac{l}{s^{m+n-t-1}}.\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

If $i > n - 1 - m$, then the last sum in (56) is omitted.

The first sum in (56) comes from combining the bounds in Claim 4 and Claim 5, and holds regardless of whether $i < m$ or $i \geqslant m$. Using well-known formulas for geometric series, we can bound the first sum in (56) from above by

$$\sum_{t=1}^{i} \frac{(s^m - 1)l}{s^{m+t}} \leqslant \frac{(s^{m-1} + \cdots + 1)l}{s^m}. \tag{57}$$

Note that the second sum in (56) only appears if $i < n - 1$. Hence, we can bound the second sum in (56) from above by

$$\sum_{w=1}^{M} \frac{(s^w - 1)l}{s^{n+w-i-1}} \leqslant \frac{Ml}{s^{n-i-1}} < \frac{l}{s}. \tag{58}$$

Similarly, we can bound the third sum in (56) by

$$\sum_{w=1}^{M} \frac{(s^{m-w} - 1)l}{s^m} \leqslant \frac{(s^{m-1} + \cdots + s - (m-1))l}{s^m}. \tag{59}$$

Finally, using well-known formulas for geometric series, we can bound the last sum in (56) by (21). Summing the right-hand-sides of (57), (58), (59), and (21) yields that (15) is bounded above by (12). This completes the proof of Theorem 6. $\square$

B. Proof of Theorem 9

In this section, we prove Theorem 9. We proved a weaker version of Theorem 9 in Theorem 11 by allowing, in the repair of node i, for node j to transmit all of its elements if $|j-i| < m$. We now show that node i can still be repaired if node j transmits only $s^{|j-i|}$ scalars in F when $|j-i| < m$. The proof of Theorem 9 uses notation defined in the proof of Theorem 11. In conjunction with the proof of Theorem 9, the reader may find it useful to consult Example 7, which illustrates the notation of Theorem 9.

Proof of Theorem 9. For integers $a \in [0, l-1]$ and $i \in [n]$, we will show that the r coordinates in (32) are functions of a set of at most $n - 1 + 2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1}(s^v - 1)$ elements of F.

For $a \in [0, l-1]$, $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ such that $|j-i| = w < m$, and $(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) \in [0, s-1]^{m-w}$, we must first define a set $T_{a,j,i}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1)$. If $j > i$, then $T_{a,j,i}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1)$ is the set of all integers in $[0, l-1]$ whose s-ary representation is obtained from a by replacing the m coordinates $a_{i+m-1}, \ldots, a_i$ with $b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1, d_w, \ldots, d_1$ respectively for all tuples $(d_w, \ldots, d_1) \in [0, s-1]^w$. If $j < i$, then $T_{a,j,i}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1)$ is the set of all integers in $[0, l-1]$ whose s-ary representation is obtained from a by replacing the m coordinates $a_{i+m-1}, \ldots, a_i$ with $d_m, \ldots, d_{m-w+1}, b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1$ respectively for all $(d_m, \ldots, d_{m-w+1}) \in [0, s-1]^w$; that is

$$T_{a,j,i}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) = \begin{cases} \{a(i; b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1, d_w, \ldots, d_1) \\ : (d_w, \ldots, d_1) \in [0, s-1]^w\} & \text{if } j > i \\ \{a(i; d_m, \ldots, d_{m-w+1}, b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) \\ : (d_m, \ldots, d_{m-w+1}) \in [0, s-1]^w\} & \text{if } j < i. \end{cases} \tag{60}$$

For $(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) \in [0, s-1]^{m-w}$, $a \in [0, l-1]$, and $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, we define elements in F by

$$u_{j,i}^{(a)}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) = \sum_{a' \in T_{a,j,i}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1)} c_{j,a'}. \tag{61}$$

Recall the definition of $u_{j,i}^{(a)}$ from (31). We claim that the r coordinates in (32) are functions of the set $E_i^{(a)} \subset F$,

$$E_i^{(a)} = \{u_{j,i}^{(a)} : |j-i| \geqslant m\} \sqcup \{u_{j,i}^{(a)}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) : |j-i| = w < m, (b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) \in [0, s-1]^{m-w}\}.$$

It may be useful to consult Example 7, which illustrates this claim for $a = 0$ and $i = 2$ in our running example of $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $r = 4$, $n = 10$, and $l = 2^{11}$. To repair r coordinates in the failed node i, a surviving node j needs to transmit one scalar in F if $|j-i| \geqslant m$ and $s^{|j-i|}$ scalars in F otherwise. Consequently, the size of $E_i^{(a)}$ is at most $n - 1 + 2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1}(s^v - 1)$, and so the repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 1 is at most (26).

We write (25) for $t \in [0, r-1]$ and sum over $a' \in S_{a,i}$. When $t = 0$, we still obtain (33). If $|i-j| = w < m$, then the value $a'(j+m-1, \ldots, j)$ is the same over all a' in $T_{a,j,i}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1)$ for a fixed $(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1)$ in $[0, s-1]^{m-w}$. For j satisfying $|i-j| = w < m$ and a fixed $(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) \in [0, s-1]^{m-w}$, define $l_{a,j}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1) \in [0, r-1]$ to be the value of $a'(j+m-1, \ldots, j)$ for any $a' \in T_{a,j,i}(b_{m-w}, \ldots, b_1)$. Re-

calling the definition of $l_{a,j}$ from the proof of Theorem 11, we obtain when $1 \leqslant t \leqslant r-1$ that

$$\sum_{a' \in S_{a,i}} \lambda^t_{i,a'_{(i+m-1,\ldots,i)}} c_{i,a'} = - \sum_{j:|j-i| \geqslant m} \lambda^t_{j,l_{a,j}} u^{(a)}_{j,i}$$
$$- \sum_{j:|j-i|=w<m} \sum_{\substack{(b_{m-w},\ldots,b_1) \\ \in [0,s-1]^{m-w}}} \lambda^t_{j,l_{a,j}(b_{m-w},\ldots,b_1)} u^{(a)}_{j,i}(b_{m-w},\ldots,b_1). \tag{62}$$

For $t = 0$, let B_0 denote the right-hand-side of (33). Similarly, for $1 \leqslant t \leqslant r-1$, let B_t denote the right-hand-side of (62). Since $B_0, \ldots, B_{r-1}$ are functions of the elements in $E^{(a)}_i$ and since $\lambda_{i,0}, \ldots, \lambda_{i,r-1}$ are distinct, we can solve the system in (35) for the r coordinates in (32) given $E^{(a)}_i$. □

To illustrate Theorem 9, consider the following example.

Example 7. Suppose $s = 2$, $m = 2$, $r = 4$, $n = 10$, and $l = 2^{11}$. Suppose node 2 has failed so $i = 2$. Letting $a = 0$, we have from Example 3 that $S_{0,2} = \{0,2,4,6\}$ and the four coordinates in (32) are $\{c_{2,0}, c_{2,2}, c_{2,4}, c_{2,6}\}$.

In this example, equations (60) and (61) are

$$T_{0,1,2}(0) = \{0,4\},\ T_{0,1,2}(1) = \{2,6\},$$
$$T_{0,3,2}(0) = \{0,2\},\ T_{0,3,2}(1) = \{4,6\},$$
$$u^{(0)}_{1,2}(0) = c_{1,0} + c_{1,4},\ u^{(0)}_{1,2}(1) = c_{1,2} + c_{1,6},$$
$$u^{(0)}_{3,2}(0) = c_{3,0} + c_{3,2},\ u^{(0)}_{3,2}(1) = c_{3,4} + c_{3,6}.$$

Recalling the definition of $u^{(0)}_{j,2}$ from (36), we claim these coordinates are functions of the set

$$E^{(0)}_2 = \{u^{(0)}_{j,2} : 4 \leqslant j \leqslant 10\} \cup$$
$$\{u^{(0)}_{1,2}(0), u^{(0)}_{1,2}(1), u^{(0)}_{3,2}(0), u^{(0)}_{3,2}(1)\}. \tag{63}$$

To see why the coordinates $c_{2,0}, c_{2,2}, c_{2,4}, c_{2,6}$ are functions of the set $E^{(0)}_2$ in (63), sum the equations in Example 2. When $t = 0$, we still obtain (37). We have $l_{0,j} = 0$ for $4 \leqslant j \leqslant 10$, $l_{0,1}(0) = 0$, $l_{0,1}(1) = 2$, $l_{0,3}(0) = 0$, and $l_{0,3}(1) = 1$, so when $1 \leqslant t \leqslant 3$, we obtain

$$\lambda^t_{2,0}c_{2,0} + \lambda^t_{2,1}c_{2,2} + \lambda^t_{2,2}c_{2,4} + \lambda^t_{2,3}c_{2,6}$$
$$= -\lambda^t_{1,0}(c_{1,0} + c_{1,4}) - \lambda^t_{1,2}(c_{1,2} + c_{1,6}) - \lambda^t_{3,0}(c_{3,0} + c_{3,2})$$
$$- \lambda^t_{3,1}(c_{3,4} + c_{3,6}) - \sum_{j=4}^{10} \lambda^t_{j,0}(c_{j,0} + c_{j,2} + c_{j,4} + c_{j,6})$$
$$= -\lambda^t_{1,0}u^{(0)}_{1,2}(0) - \lambda^t_{1,2}u^{(0)}_{1,2}(1) - \lambda^t_{3,0}u^{(0)}_{3,2}(0) - \lambda^t_{3,1}u^{(0)}_{3,2}(1)$$
$$- \sum_{j=4}^{10} \lambda^t_{j,0}u^{(0)}_{j,2}.$$

C. Verifying Construction 2 and Proof of Theorem 15

To show that the code constructed in Construction 2 can repair systematic nodes with asymptotically optimal repair bandwidth, we check the conditions of Theorem 14. We have specified the left eigenspaces of the en-

coding matrix A_j in Construction 2. We claim that these eigenspaces each have dimension l/r and that, for $u \in [0,r]$, any r eigenspaces of the form $P_{i,u}$ span F^l, as required in the first condition of Theorem 14

Lemma 16. *For $i \in [t]$ and $u \in [0,r]$, we have $\dim(P_{i,u}) = l/r$. Moreover, for any $u' \in [0,r]$, we have*

$$\dim\left(\bigvee_{\substack{u=0\\u\neq u'}}^{r} P_{i,u}\right) = l. \tag{64}$$

Proof. Since $r = s^m$, $l = s^{m+t-1}$, and m coordinates of a are fixed, by Definition 6, there are l/r standard basis vectors e_a in $P_{i,u}$ for $u \in [0, r-1]$. Hence, for $u \in [0, r-1]$, we have $\dim(P_{i,u}) = l/r$. Observe that $P_{i,r}$ is spanned by sums of standard basis vectors, which we will refer to as *basis sums*. For any fixed $u' \in [0, r-1]$, observe that in $P_{i,r}$, each $a' \in [0, l-1]$ satisfying $a'_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u'$ appears exactly once in each basis sum. The remaining $e_{a'}$ (those with $a'_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} \neq u'$) in each basis sum belong to a subspace in $\{P_{i,0}, \ldots, P_{i,r-1}\} \setminus \{P_{i,u'}\}$. Therefore, $\dim(P_{i,r}) = l/r$ and (64) holds for any $u' \in [0,r]$. □

We have demonstrated the first two conditions of Theorem 14 by defining the encoding matrices and the repairing subspaces in Construction 2 and by checking that the left eigenspaces of the encoding matrices have the required properties in Lemma 16. We now turn to the task of demonstrating the third condition of Theorem 14, namely proving that, for each $h \in [k]$, the repairing subspace S_h is an invariant subspace of A_j for all but a constant number of nodes $j \in [k] \setminus \{h\}$. Lemma 17, Lemma 18 and Lemma 19 give sufficient conditions for the repairing subspace S_{ut+i} to be an invariant subspace of the encoding matrix $A_{u't+i'}$.

We will show that, for distinct integers $ut+i$, $u't+i' \in [k]$, where $u, u' \in [0, r-1]$ and $i, i' \in [t]$, the repairing subspace S_{ut+i} is an invariant subspace of $A_{u't+i'}$ when $i = i'$, $|i-i'| \geqslant m$, or $|i-i'| < m$ and for all $a \in [0, l-1]$ such that $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$, we have $a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} \neq u'$. The proofs are similar to the corresponding cases in [27, Theorem 1].

Lemma 17. *If $i = i'$ and $u \neq u'$, then $S_{ut+i} A_{u't+i'} = S_{ut+i}$.*

Proof. By Construction 2, the left eigenspaces of $A_{u't+i}$ are $\{P_{i,0}, \ldots, P_{i,r}\} \setminus \{P_{i,u'}\}$. Since $u \neq u'$, we have that $P_{i,u}$ is a left eigenspace of $A_{u't+i}$ so

$$S_{ut+i} A_{u't+i} = P_{i,u} A_{u't+i} = P_{i,u} = S_{ut+i}. \quad \square$$

Now, we show that S_{ut+i} is an invariant subspace of $A_{u't+i'}$ when $|i-i'| \geqslant m$.

Lemma 18. *If $|i-i'| \geqslant m$, then $S_{ut+i} A_{u't+i'} = S_{ut+i}$.*

Proof. We claim that

$$P_{i,u} = \sum_{\substack{u''=0\\u''\neq u'}}^{r} \left(P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',u''}\right). \tag{65}$$

If $u'' \in [0, r-1] \setminus \{u'\}$ then

$$P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',u''} = \mathsf{span}\{e_a : a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u, a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} = u''\}. \tag{66}$$

Since $|i-i'| \geqslant m$, there are $2m$ coordinates of a fixed in (66). As $r = s^m$ and $l = s^{m+t-1}$, there are l/r^2 standard basis vectors e_a in (66). Thus, $\dim(P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',u''}) = l/r^2$ for $u'' \in [0, r-1] \setminus \{u'\}$.

We claim that

$$P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',r} = \mathsf{span}\left(\sum_{a' \in M_{a,i'}} e_{a'} : a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u\right).$$

Notice that if $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$, then every $a' \in M_{a,i'}$ satisfies $a'_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$ since $|i-i'| \geqslant m$. Hence, if $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$, then for all $a' \in M_{a,i'}$, we have $e_{a'} \in P_{i,u}$ so

$$\sum_{a' \in M_{a,i'}} e_{a'} \in P_{i,u}$$

and $\dim(P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',r}) = l/r^2$.

Each e_a such that $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$ and $a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} = u'$ appears exactly once in each basis sum in $P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',r}$. Consequently, since $|i-i'| \geqslant m$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i,u} &= \sum_{\hat{u}=0}^{r-1} \mathsf{span}\left(e_a : a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u, a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} = \hat{u}\right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{\substack{\hat{u}=0 \\ \hat{u}\neq u'}}^{r-1} P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',\hat{u}}\right) \vee (P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',r}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{u''=0 \\ u''\neq u'}}^{r} (P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',u''}), \end{aligned}$$

so (65) is verified.

By definition, $S_{ut+i} = P_{i,u}$ so by (65)

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ut+i}A_{u't+i'} &= P_{i,u}A_{u't+i'} \\ &= \left(\sum_{\substack{u''=0 \\ u''\neq u'}}^{r} P_{i,u} \cap P_{i,u''}\right) A_{u't+i'} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{u''=0 \\ u''\neq u'}}^{r} (P_{i,u} \cap P_{i,u''})A_{u't+i'} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{u''=0 \\ u''\neq u'}}^{r} (P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',u''}) \\ &= P_{i,u} \\ &= S_{ut+i}. \quad \square \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Finally, we show that S_{ut+i} is an invariant subspace of $A_{u't+i'}$ when $0 < |i-i'| < m$ and for all $a \in [0, l-1]$ such that $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$, we have $a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} \neq u'$

Lemma 19. *If $0 < |i-i'| < m$ and for all $a \in [0, l-1]$ such that $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$, we have $a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} \neq u'$ then*

$$S_{ut+i}A_{u't+i'} = S_{ut+i}.$$

Proof. Let

$$R_{i,i',u} = \left\{a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} : a \in [0, l-1] \text{ and } a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u\right\} \tag{68}$$

be the set of all possible values of $a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} \in [0, r-1]$ given that $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$. By assumption, $u' \notin R_{i,i',u}$ so

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i,u} &= \mathsf{span}\left(e_a : a_{(i,\ldots i+m-1)} = u\right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in R_{i,i',u}} \mathsf{span}\left(e_a : a_{(i,\ldots i+m-1)} = u, a_{(i',\ldots i'+m-1)} = x\right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in R_{i,i',u}} (P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',x}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{u''=0 \\ u'' \neq u'}}^{r} (P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',u''}). \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Therefore, (65) is verified and the proof of the lemma follows from the argument of (67). □

We claim that we have now demonstrated the third condition of Theorem 14, namely that, for each $h \in [k]$, the repairing subspace S_h is an invariant subspace of A_j for all but a constant number of nodes $j \in [k] \setminus \{h\}$. By Lemma 17, Lemma 18, Lemma 19, and (68), if $h = ut + i$ for some $u \in [0, r-1]$ and $i \in [t]$, then only nodes $u't + i'$ where $|i - i'| < m$ and $u' \in R_{i,i',u}$ could have S_h not be an invariant subspace of $A_{u't+i'}$. For each $i' \in [t]$ with $|i - i'| < m$, there are $|R_{i,i',u}| = s^{|i-i'|}$ nodes $u't + i'$ for which S_h may not be an invariant subspace of $A_{u't+i'}$ by (68). Consequently, S_h is an invariant subspace of A_j for all but at most

$$2 \sum_{v=1}^{m-1} s^v \tag{70}$$

nodes $j \in [k] \setminus \{h\}$.

We claim that the last condition of Theorem 14 holds. The proof is similar to the proof of the case $i = i'$ and $u = u'$ in [27, Theorem 1].

Lemma 20. *For each $h \in [k]$, (44) holds.*

Proof. We only prove the case $u = 0$ as the remaining cases are proved similarly. Denote $A = A_{ut+i}$ and $S_{ut+i} = S$.

For an integer $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_{m+t-1}) \in [0, l-1]$ and integers $i \in [t]$ and $u \in [0, r-1]$, define the integer $a_i(u)$ to be the unique element $a' \in M_{a,i}$ with $a'_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$. Notice that

$$S = \mathsf{span}(P_{i,0}) = \mathsf{span}\{e_{a_i(0)} : a \in [0, l-1]\}$$

and

$$P_{i,u} = \mathsf{span}\{e_{a_i(u)} : a \in [0, l-1]\} \text{ for } u \in [0, r-1].$$

Let eigenvalue λ_0 correspond to the eigenspace $P_{i,r}$ and let eigenvalue $\lambda_{\hat{u}}$ correspond to the eigenspace $P_{i,\hat{u}}$ for $\hat{u} \in [1, r-1]$. We then have for $s \in [0, r-1]$ that

$$\begin{aligned} e_{a_i(0)} A^s &= \left(\left(\sum_{u=0}^{r-1} e_{a_i(u)}\right) - e_{a_i(1)} - \cdots - e_{a_i(r-1)}\right) A^s \\ &= \lambda_0^s \left(\sum_{u=0}^{r-1} e_{a_i(u)}\right) - \lambda_1^s e_{a_i(1)} - \cdots - \lambda_{r-1}^s e_{a_i(r-1)} \\ &= \lambda_0^s e_{a_i(0)} + \sum_{u=1}^{r-1} (\lambda_0^s - \lambda_u^s) e_{a_i(u)} \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Writing the equations in (71) for all $s \in [0, r-1]$ in matrix form yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} e_{a_i(0)} \\ e_{a_i(0)}A \\ \vdots \\ e_{a_i(0)}A^{r-1} \end{bmatrix} = M \begin{bmatrix} e_{a_i(0)} \\ e_{a_i(1)} \\ \vdots \\ e_{a_i(r-1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

with

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \lambda_0 & \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 & \cdots & \lambda_0 - \lambda_{r-1} \\ \lambda_0^2 & \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_1^2 & \cdots & \lambda_0^2 - \lambda_{r-1}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_0^{r-1} & \lambda_0^{r-1} - \lambda_1^{r-1} & \cdots & \lambda_0^{r-1} - \lambda_{r-1}^{r-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

After a sequence of elementary column operations, M becomes the following Vandermonde matrix

$$M' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \lambda_0 & \lambda_1 & \cdots & \lambda_{r-1} \\ \lambda_0^2 & \lambda_1^2 & \cdots & \lambda_{r-1}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_0^{r-1} & \lambda_1^{r-1} & \cdots & \lambda_{r-1}^{r-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{r-1}$ are distinct, we know M' and hence M is nonsingular. Therefore,

$$\mathsf{span}\{e_{a_i(0)}, e_{a_i(0)}A, \ldots, e_{a_i(0)}A^{r-1}\} = \mathsf{span}\{e_{a_i(0)}, e_{a_i(1)}, \ldots, e_{a_i(r-1)}\}.$$

Since S contains $e_{a_i(0)}$ for $a \in [0, l-1]$, we have

$$S + SA + \cdots + SA^{r-1} = F^l,$$

so (44) holds. □

C.1. Proof of Theorem 15 and MDS Property

From (70), we can obtain a weak upper bound on the repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 2. Let $h = ut + i$ for some $u \in [0, r-1]$ and $i \in [t]$. We can have any node $u't + i'$ not satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 17, Lemma 18, or Lemma 19 send all of its symbols in the repair of failed node h. The number of nodes not satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 17, Lemma 18, or Lemma 19 is bounded above by (70). The repair bandwidth of the code in Construction 2 is thus at most

$$\left(\frac{\left(n - 1 - 2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1} s^v\right) + 2\left(2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1} s^v\right)(n-k)}{n-k} \right) l, \tag{72}$$

which asymptotically meets (1) for fixed $n - k$ as $n \to \infty$.

For $u \in [0, r-1]$, we have $S_{ut+i} = P_{i,u}$, so by Definition 6 and the remarks after Theorem 14, the code in Construction 2 has a repair-by-transfer scheme with asymptotically optimal bandwidth.

To prove Theorem 15, we show that if $h = ut + i$ for integers $u \in [0, r-1]$ and $i \in [t]$, then in the repair of failed node h, it suffices for any node $u't + i' \in [k] \setminus \{h\}$ that does not satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 17, Lemma 18, or Lemma 19 to send $l/r + s^{t-|i-i'|-1}(r-2)$ symbols.

Lemma 21. *If $0 < |i - i'| < m$ and there exists $a \in [0, l-1]$ such that $a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u$ and $a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} = u'$, then there exists a set $S_{i,u,i',u'} \subset [0, l-1]$ of size*

$$\frac{l}{r} + s^{t-|i-i'|-1}(r - s^{|i-i'|}) \tag{73}$$

such that, to compute (45) *for $h = ut + i$ and $j = u't + i'$, it suffices for node $u't + i'$ to send the symbols $\{c_{u't+i',a} : a \in S_{i,u,i',u'}\}$.*

Proof. By (68), we have $u' \in R_{i,i',u}$. Let

$$P_{i,u,u'} = \sum_{x \in R_{i,i',u} \setminus \{u'\}} (P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',x}).$$

For all $x \in R_{i,i',u} \setminus \{u'\}$, the subspace $P_{i',x}$ is a left eigenspace of $A_{u'm+i'}$, so the subspace $P_{i,u,u'}$ is an invariant subspace of $A_{u'm+i'}$. The vectors

$$V_{i,u,i',u'} = \{e_a : a_{(i,\ldots,i+m-1)} = u, a_{(i',\ldots,i'+m-1)} = u'\}$$

lie in $P_{i,u} \cap P_{i',u'}$ and are not eigenvectors of $A_{u'm+i'}$. We have $P_{i,u} = P_{i,i',u} \oplus \mathsf{span}(V_{i,u,i',u'})$ by (69) and

$$\dim \mathsf{span}(V_{i,u,i',u'}) = s^{(m+t-1)-(m+|i-i'|)} = s^{t-|i-i'|-1}. \tag{74}$$

To compute (45) when $h = ut + i$ and $j = u't + i'$, we must compute $e_a A^p_{u't+i'}$ for $e_a \in V_{i,u,i',u'}$ and $p \in [1, r-1]$. Since $e_a \in V_{i,u,i',u'}$, we have $\sum_{a' \in M_{a,i'}} e_{a'}$ is an eigenvector of $A_{u't+i'}$. Hence, for $p \in [1, r-1]$, we have $e_a A^p_{u't+i'} \in \langle e_{a'} : a' \in M_{a,i'} \rangle$. Observe that the set $\{a : e_a \in P_{i,u}\}$ is contained in the set $\{a' : e_a \in V_{i,u,i',u'}, a' \in M_{a,i'}\}$. Hence, to compute (45) when $h = ut + i$ and $j = u't + i'$, it suffices for node $u't + i'$ to send the symbols $\{c_{u't+i',a} : a \in S_{i,u,i',u'}\}$, where

$$S_{i,u,i',u} = \{a' : e_a \in V_{i,u,i',u'}, a' \in M_{a,i'}\}.$$

To see why the size of $S_{i,u,i',u'}$ is given by (73), note that if e_a and $e_{\hat{a}}$ are distinct elements of $V_{i,u,i',u'}$ then $M_{a,i'}$ is disjoint from $M_{\hat{a},i'}$. By (74), the size of $S_{i,u,i',u'}$ is $s^{t-|i-i'|-1}r$, which equals (73). □

We now derive the bound (49) in Theorem 15. Recall that, if $h = ut + i$ for some $u \in [0, r-1]$ and $i \in [t]$, then by Lemma 17, Lemma 18, Lemma 19, and (68), only nodes $u't + i'$ where $|i - i'| < m$ and $u' \in R_{i,i',u}$ do not have S_h as an invariant subspace of $A_{u't+i'}$. By Lemma 21, each such node must transmit $l/r + s^{t-|i-i'|-1}(r - s^{|i-i'|})$ symbols. Hence, by (68) and (70), the repair bandwidth bound is at most

$$(n-1)\frac{l}{r} + 2\sum_{v=1}^{m-1} s^v s^{t-v-1}(r - s^v),$$

which equals (49) since $s^{t-1} = l/r$.

Finally, we address the MDS property of the code in Construction 2. By arbitrarily assigning r distinct nonzero eigenvalues to each encoding matrix A_j, the code in Construction 2 can be made MDS over a large enough field; the proof is the same as the proof of [27, Theorem 4].

Acknowledgement

We thank Mary Wootters and Hoang Dau for their advice.

References

[1] A. G. Dimakis, P. B. Godfrey, Y. Wu, M. J. Wainwright, and K. Ramchandran, "Network coding for distributed storage systems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4539–4551, 2010.

[2] A. S. Rawat, I. Tamo, V. Guruswami, and K. Efremenko, "ε-MSR codes with small sub-packetization," in *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 2043–2047.

[3] M. Ye and A. Barg, "Explicit constructions of MDS array codes and RS codes with optimal repair bandwidth," in *Information Theory (ISIT), 2016 IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1202–1206.

[4] ——, "Explicit constructions of high-rate MDS array codes with optimal repair bandwidth" *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 2001–2014, 2017.

[5] Z. Wang, I. Tamo, and J. Bruck, "Explicit minimum storage regenerating codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 4466–4480, 2016.

[6] O. Alrabiah, and V. Guruswami, "An exponential lower bound on the sub-packetization of MSR codes," *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pp. 979–985, 2019.

[7] S. Goparaju, I. Tamo, and R. Calderbank, "An improved sub-packetization bound for minimum storage regenerating codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2770–2779, 2014.

[8] A. Chowdhury and A. Vardy, "Improved schemes for asymptotically optimal repair of MDS codes," *2017 55th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pp. 950–957, 2017.

[9] A. Chowdhury and A. Vardy, "New constructions of MDS codes with asymptotically optimal repair," *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1944–1948, 2018.

[10] V. Guruswami and H. Jiang, "Near-optimal Repair of Reed-Solomon Codes with Low Sub-packetization," *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1077–1081, 2019.

[11] V. Guruswami and A. S. Rawat, "MDS code constructions with small sub-packetization and near-optimal repair bandwidth," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2017, pp. 2109–2122.

[12] I. Tamo, Z. Wang, and J. Bruck, "Zigzag codes: MDS array codes with optimal rebuilding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1597–1616, 2013.

[13] V. R. Cadambe, C. Huang, and J. Li, "Permutation code: Optimal exact-repair of a single failed node in MDS code based distributed storage systems," in *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2011 IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1225–1229.

[14] V. Guruswami and M. Wootters, "Repairing Reed–Solomon codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2017.

[15] I. Tamo, M. Ye, and A. Barg, "Optimal repair of Reed-Solomon codes: Achieving the cut-set bound," in *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 216–227.

[16] I. Tamo, M. Ye, and A. Barg, "The repair problem for Reed–Solomon codes: Optimal repair of single and multiple erasures with almost optimal node size," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2673–2695, 2018.

[17] H. Dau, I. M. Duursma, H. M. Kiah, and O. Milenkovic, "Repairing Reed–Solomon codes with multiple erasures," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 6567–6582, 2018.

[18] H. Dau, I. Duursma, H. M. Kiah, and O. Milenkovic, "Repairing Reed–Solomon codes with two erasures," in *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 351–355.

[19] I. Duursma and H. Dau, "Low bandwidth repair of the $RS(10,4)$ Reed–Solomon code," in *2017 Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–10.

[20] H. Dau and O. Milenkovic, "Optimal repair schemes for some families of full-length Reed–Solomon codes," in *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 346–350.

[21] B. Bartan and M. Wootters, "Repairing multiple failures for scalar MDS codes," in *2017 55th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1145–1152.

[22] K. Shanmugam, D. S. Papailiopoulos, A. G. Dimakis, and G. Caire, "A repair framework for scalar MDS codes," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 998–1007, 2014.

[23] W. Li, Z. Wang, and H. Jafarkhani, "Repairing Reed–Solomon codes over $GF(2l)$," *IEEE Communications Letters*, 2019.

[24] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The theory of error-correcting codes*. Elsevier, 1977.

[25] I. Tamo, Z. Wang, and J. Bruck, "Access versus bandwidth in codes for storage," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 2028–2037, 2014.

[26] V. R. Cadambe, C. Huang, J. Li, and S. Mehrotra, "Polynomial length MDS codes with optimal repair in distributed storage," in *Signals, Systems and Computers (ASILOMAR), 2011 Conference Record of the Forty Fifth Asilomar Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1850–1854.

[27] Z. Wang, I. Tamo, and J. Bruck, "Explicit MDS codes for optimal repair bandwidth," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.6328*, 2014.