

Variants on Block Design Based Gradient Codes for Adversarial Stragglers

Animesh Sakorikar and Lele Wang

University of British Columbia

5500 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T1Z4, Canada

Emails: animesh.sakorikar@alumni.ubc.ca, lelewang@ece.ubc.ca

Abstract—Gradient coding is a coding theoretic framework to provide robustness against slow or unresponsive machines, known as stragglers, in distributed machine learning applications. Recently, Kadhe et al. proposed a gradient code based on a combinatorial design, called balanced incomplete block design (BIBD), which is shown to outperform many existing gradient codes in worst-case adversarial straggling scenarios [1]. However, parameters for which such BIBD constructions exist are very limited [2]. In this paper, we aim to overcome such limitations and construct gradient codes which exist for a wide range of parameters while retaining the superior performance of BIBD gradient codes. Two such constructions are proposed, one based on a probabilistic construction that relax the stringent BIBD gradient code constraints, and the other based on taking the Kronecker product of existing gradient codes. Theoretical error bounds for worst-case adversarial straggling scenarios are derived. Simulations show that the proposed constructions can outperform existing gradient codes with similar redundancy per data piece.

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to recent increases in size of available training data, a variety of machine learning tasks are distributed across multiple computing nodes to speed up the learning process. However, the theoretical speedup from distributing computations and parallelization may not be achieved in practise due to slow or unresponsive computing nodes, known as *stragglers*. Stragglers can significantly impact the accuracy and efficiency of the computation [3]–[5]. Therefore, mitigating stragglers is one of the major challenges in the design of distributed machine learning systems.

Basic approaches to mitigate stragglers include ignoring stragglers, detecting and avoiding stragglers [5], or replicating tasks across workers [3], [6]. Recently, several coding theoretic based schemes were proposed to allow more efficient use of redundant computations in mitigating stragglers [7]–[10].

Gradient coding is one of the coding theoretic schemes, proposed by [4], to mitigate stragglers. In a gradient coding scheme, a central processor partitions the uncoded training data into pieces and distributes them among multiple computing nodes, called workers. Each worker computes a linear combination of the gradients on its assigned training data pieces. The central processor aggregates the returned linear combinations to obtain the gradient sum. The goal is to design the set of linear combinations such that the gradient sum can be recovered *exactly* when any s set of linear combinations are

lost. Several gradient codes under the *exact recovery* criterion are proposed in [4], [11], [12].

While exact recovery is a natural criterion that extends from traditional coding theory, it has some limitations for distributed learning applications. Firstly, the computational loads for exact recovery are proportional to the number of stragglers [4], and therefore an accurate estimate of the number of stragglers is needed to minimize unnecessary computation. Moreover, in many learning algorithms, such as stochastic gradient descent, an approximation of the actual gradient sum is sufficient [13]. For these reasons, it is common to consider gradient codes that *approximately* recover the gradient sum such that the squared 2-norm of the difference between the actual gradient sum and its approximation is minimized, referred to as *squared error* [13]. A variety of approximate gradient code constructions are proposed in [1], [7], [13]–[19].

In approximate gradient coding, common assumptions on the straggling scenarios include (1) random straggling, where stragglers are assumed to follow some stochastic assumptions, and (2) worst-case straggling with no stochastic assumptions, where any s subset of workers can be straggled. In this paper, we consider the squared error in the worst-case straggling scenario, referred to as *worst-case squared error*, because it may be difficult to estimate the statistical model of stragglers in real time for some applications, such as massive-scale elastic and serverless systems [1].

Under this performance criterion, we discuss two existing gradient codes: fractional repetition codes (FRCs) [4] and balanced incomplete block design (BIBD) gradient codes [1]. An FRC is constructed by partitioning workers and gradients into equal subsets, such that each worker in a partition is assigned every gradient in the same gradient partition. FRCs are easy to construct and exist for a wide range of distributed system parameters, but perform poorly in worst-case straggling scenarios [14]. BIBD gradient codes are constructed from combinatorial block designs, and are robust in worst-case straggling scenarios. However, the set of system parameters for which a BIBD gradient code is known to exist is very limited [2].

This motivates us to ask the following question: *Is it possible to construct gradient codes that exist for a wide range of system parameters while retaining the superior worst-case performance produced by BIBD gradient codes?* We answer this affirmatively by providing two new constructions. In the

first construction (Section III), we propose a probabilistic gradient code that relaxes the stringent BIBD gradient code constraints. Unlike the BIBD gradient codes, which require constant computation load on each worker and constant number of shared gradients between any pair of workers, in our construction, we only require these constraints to be satisfied on average. We show that the expected worst-case squared error of our construction is lower than that of the BIBD gradient code with the same design parameters. In the second construction (Section IV), we propose new gradient codes by taking the Kronecker product of existing gradient codes. Upper bounds on the normalized worst-case squared error are derived for three types of constructions: the Kronecker products of (1) an FRC with an FRC, (2) an FRC with a BIBD, and (3) a BIBD with a BIBD. Simulations show that the Kronecker product of two BIBDs can have superior worst-case performance than other constructions with a similar redundancy per data piece, including a single BIBD, a single FRC, and the Kronecker product of an FRC and a BIBD.




Fig. 1. Comparison of Kronecker Product codes with FRCs and BIBDs.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We use bold capital script \mathbf{G} for random matrices, capital script G for deterministic matrices, and bold script \mathbf{f} for vectors. Let I_n be the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $J_{k \times n}$ be the $k \times n$ all-one matrix. Let $\mathbf{1}_k$ denote the $k \times 1$ all-one column vector and $\mathbf{0}_k$ denote the $k \times 1$ all-zero column vector.

A. Distributed Learning

In many machine learning algorithms, the goal is to find a model θ_{\min} that minimizes some loss function L over a training data set. Specifically, given training data $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^k$, the aim is to compute

$$\theta_{\min} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k L(\theta, x_i, y_i). \quad (1)$$

Gradient descent (GD) is an iterative algorithm that estimates the optimal model θ_{\min} . Starting with some initial guess $\theta^{(0)}$, the model $\theta^{(t)}$ at iteration t is updated as

$$\theta^{(t+1)} = \theta^{(t)} + \frac{\alpha}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \nabla L(\theta^{(t)}, x_i, y_i), \quad (2)$$

where $\nabla L(\theta^{(t)}, x_i, y_i)$ is the gradient of loss function L , and α is the learning rate.

When the training data size k is large, the gradient sum computation in (2) is a computational bottleneck. To avoid this computational bottleneck, we can distribute the gradient computations over multiple workers, known as distributed learning, or distributed gradient descent. In each iteration of distributed GD, a central processor transmits the current model to each worker in the distributed system. Each worker computes some subset of the k gradients, and return the sum to the central processor. The central processor computes the gradient sum from the returned results, and updates the model as done in (2). Henceforth we will focus on a single iteration of distributed GD.

B. Gradient Coding

Consider a distributed learning (or distributed GD) setting with n workers \mathcal{W} and k data $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. The goal of gradient coding is to introduce redundancy in gradient computations so that the distributed system is robust against stragglers [4].

A gradient code (GC) can be characterized by a $k \times n$ binary encoding matrix G . Row $i \in [k] := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ of G corresponds to data piece d_i , and column $j \in [n]$ corresponds to worker j , where $G_{ij} = 1$ if worker j computes the gradient of d_i , and $G_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The worker load is the number of gradient computations assigned to a worker, and data redundancy is the number of workers computing the gradient of a data piece. When each worker has the same worker load l , and each data piece has redundancy r , G is called an (n, k, l, r) -GC.

The goal is to compute the gradient sum in (2). Since we consider only one iteration of distributed GD, we omit the dependence on time t . Then the goal is to compute

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \nabla L(x_i, y_i) = \mathbf{f} \mathbf{1}_k,$$

where $\mathbf{f} = (\nabla L(x_1, y_1), \dots, \nabla L(x_k, y_k))$. Let s be the number of stragglers, $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{W}$ be the set of non-stragglers, $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ be the sub-matrix of G with columns indexed by \mathcal{U} . Then, the central processor receives $\mathbf{f} G_{\mathcal{U}}$ from the workers in \mathcal{U} . The goal is to recover $\mathbf{f} \mathbf{1}_k$ from $\mathbf{f} G_{\mathcal{U}}$ for any \mathcal{U} such that $|\mathcal{U}| = n - s$. Notice that $\mathbf{f} G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is a $1 \times (n - s)$ vector. Each entry of $\mathbf{f} G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is a result (partial gradient sum) returned by a non-stragglers worker in \mathcal{U} . To approximate the gradient sum, we take a linear combination of returned results

$$\mathbf{f} G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v},$$

where $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-s}$ is called the decoding vector. Then the difference between the gradient sum approximation $\mathbf{f}G_U\mathbf{v}$ and the target computation $\mathbf{f}\mathbf{1}_k$ is

$$\mathbf{f}G_U\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{f}\mathbf{1}_k = \mathbf{f}(G_U\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_k). \quad (3)$$

Note that (3) depends on \mathbf{f} , which we do not know a priori. Thus we focus on minimizing the squared 2-norm of $(G_U\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_k)$. We can now define the optimal decoding vector as

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) := \arg \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-s}} \|G_U\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2.$$

Then the normalized worst-case squared error when s workers are straggled is defined as

$$\text{err}(G, s) = \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{W} \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \|G_U\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2. \quad (4)$$

This normalization allows us to compare between gradient codes with different number of gradients to compute. Note that to make an objective comparison, one should choose gradient codes with the same fractional redundancy r/n , since each data-piece is redundantly assigned to the same fraction of total workers in each gradient code being compared. We then compare the normalized worst-case squared errors as a function of the fraction of straggling workers.

C. Existing constructions

In [4], the authors show that an (n, k, l, r) -GC can exactly recover all k gradients for any set of s stragglers if

$$l \geq \frac{k(s+1)}{n}. \quad (5)$$

In the following, we focus on two constructions relating to the technical sections of our paper. In [4], a gradient code construction called FRC is provided. An FRC with n workers, k data pieces, worker load l , and redundancy r is called an (n, k, l, r) -FRC. The encoding matrix G^{F} is given by

$$G^{\text{F}} = \begin{bmatrix} J_{l \times r} & 0_{l \times r} & \dots & 0_{l \times r} \\ 0_{l \times r} & J_{l \times r} & \dots & 0_{l \times r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{l \times r} & 0_{l \times r} & \dots & J_{l \times r} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $0_{l \times r}$ is the $l \times r$ all-zero matrix. An (n, k, l, r) -FRC can exactly recover all gradients if condition (5) is satisfied. FRCs can also be used to approximately recover the gradient sum. The normalized worst-case squared error of an (n, k, l, r) -FRC G^{F} with s stragglers is [14, Section 4.1]

$$\text{err}(G^{\text{F}}, s) = \frac{l}{k} \left\lfloor \frac{s}{r} \right\rfloor. \quad (6)$$

For completeness, we include a proof of (6) error in Appendix A.

Gradient codes can also be constructed from combinatorial balanced incomplete block designs (BIBD) as proposed in [1]. A combinatorial design is a pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$, where $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ is a set of elements called points, and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$ is a collection of subsets of \mathcal{X} , called

blocks. A design $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$ is called a (n, k, l, r, λ) -BIBD if there are k points in \mathcal{X} , n blocks in \mathcal{A} , each of size l , where every point is contained in r blocks, and any pair of distinct points is contained in exactly λ blocks. We can represent a BIBD by an $k \times n$ incidence matrix M , where $M_{i,j} = 1$ iff $x_i \in A_j$ and 0 otherwise. A BIBD is called *symmetric* if its incidence matrix satisfies $M = M^T$. For any (n, k, l, r, λ) -BIBD with incidence matrix M , its dual-design is defined as the design with incidence matrix M^T .

A key observation in [1] is that one can design a gradient code from a BIBD (with incidence matrix M) by setting the encoding matrix of the gradient code $G^{\text{B}} = M$. Clearly the gradient code G^{B} is an (n, k, l, r) gradient code. Moreover, if G^{B} is designed from a symmetric or dual BIBD, then every pair of distinct workers of G^{B} share exactly λ gradients to compute. This introduces redundancy and provides robustness against stragglers. Throughout this paper, we only consider BIBD gradient codes constructed from symmetric BIBDs and dual-designs of BIBDs. We call these codes (n, k, l, r, λ) -BIBDs, or (n, k, l, λ) -BIBDs when the parameter r is not relevant. For convenience, the number of shared gradient computations between any pair of workers λ is known as the number of intersections.

BIBDs provide superior performance against worst-case stragglers: the optimal decoding vector and normalized worst-case squared error of a BIBD depends only on the number of stragglers, and not on the specific straggling scenario. Specifically, an (n, k, l, λ) -BIBD G^{B} with s stragglers has a constant optimal decoding vector, and the normalized worst-case squared error of G^{B} with s stragglers is given by [1, Theorem 1]

$$\text{err}(G^{\text{B}}, s) = 1 - \frac{l^2(n-s)}{kl + k\lambda(n-s-1)}. \quad (7)$$

For the same set of parameters (n, k, l, r) , an (n, k, l, r) -BIBD promises better worst-case straggling performance than an (n, k, l, r) -FRC when it exists. However, the set of parameters (n, k, l, λ) for which a BIBD is known to exist is very limited [2]. This motivates us to propose a new gradient code that exists for a wide range of parameters, while retaining the superior performance of BIBD.

III. PROBABILISTIC BIBD GRADIENT CODES

In this section, we propose a new gradient code, referred to as *probabilistic BIBD* gradient codes. We generate the random encoding matrix G^{PB} such that *on average* the desired BIBD properties (such as worker load l and λ shared computations between any two workers) are satisfied. The construction of probabilistic BIBD gradient codes is provided in Section III-A, and we show that probabilistic BIBD gradient codes have smaller average error than that of combinatorial BIBDs in Section III-B.

A. Existence and Construction

We define a joint distribution $p(x^n)$ on the n entries of the first row in the encoding matrix G^{PB} and generate all k rows

in the encoding matrix i.i.d. according to $p(x^n)$. We discuss the constraints $p(x^n)$ should satisfy to ensure the desired BIBD properties.

- 1) In order for each column $j \in [n]$ of \mathbf{G}^{PB} to have l ones on average, the marginal distribution on the entry in column j , denoted by X_j , must satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(X_j = 1) = \sum_{\substack{x^n \in \{0,1\}^n \\ x_j=1}} p(x^n) = \frac{l}{k}. \quad (8)$$

- 2) In order for each pair of columns $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ to have λ intersections on average, the distribution on the entries in columns i and j must satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(X_i = X_j = 1) = \sum_{\substack{x^n \in \{0,1\}^n \\ x_i=x_j=1}} p(x^n) = \frac{\lambda}{k}. \quad (9)$$

- 3) Since $p(x^n)$ is a probability distribution, it must satisfy

$$\sum_{x^n \in \{0,1\}^n} p(x^n) = 1, \quad (10)$$

$$p(x^n) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x^n \in \{0,1\}^n. \quad (11)$$

Now the problem of finding $p(x^n)$ reduces to finding a non-negative solution to the linear system $A\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{b}$. We arrange the linear system so that equation (10) corresponds to first row of A , equations (8) correspond to the next n rows, followed by $\binom{n}{2}$ rows from equations (9). Observe that A is an $(1 + n + \binom{n}{2}) \times 2^n$ binary matrix, whose entries are the coefficients of $p(x^n)$ in equations (8), (9), and (10). The entry in row $i \in [2^n]$ of \mathbf{p} is $p(x^n)$, where x^n is the binary expansion of $i - 1$. Lastly, \mathbf{b} is a column vector with $(1 + n + \binom{n}{2})$ entries, where the first entry is 1, the next n entries are l/k , and the remaining entries are λ/k . The system for size $n = 3$ is shown below:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} p(000) \\ p(001) \\ p(010) \\ p(011) \\ p(100) \\ p(101) \\ p(110) \\ p(111) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ l/k \\ l/k \\ l/k \\ \lambda/k \\ \lambda/k \\ \lambda/k \\ \lambda/k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

The main theorem of this section provides the parameters n, k, l and λ for which a non-negative solution $p(x^n)$ to the system $A\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{b}$ exists.

Theorem 1. *For all $n \geq l \geq \lambda$, a solution exists for the linear system $A\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{b}$ defined by equations (8), (9), and (10). Additionally, if $l \geq \lambda$, $2\lambda \geq l$, and $k \geq 3l - 2\lambda$, a non-negative solution exists for $A\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{b}$.*

A key observation in establishing Theorem 1 is that matrix A turns out to be the same as the generator matrix of a Reed-Muller (RM) code of order 2 and block length 2^n , which are defined as follows [20, p. 373].

Definition 1. *The binary Reed-Muller code of order 2 and block length 2^n is the set of all vectors $f(v_1, \dots, v_n)$, where f is a boolean function which is a polynomial of degree at most 2, and (v_1, \dots, v_n) is any length n binary vector.*

One can verify that the matrix in equation (12) constitutes a basis for the Reed-Muller code of order 2 and length 2^3 , and therefore is a generator matrix for this code. In general, this equivalence is true for any n .

Lemma 1. *The matrix A defined by constraints (8), (9), and (10) is a generator matrix of the Reed-Muller code of order 2 and length n .*

Proof of Theorem 1: A solution to the system of equations $A\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{b}$ exists if and only if the rank of the augmented coefficient matrix $\hat{A} = [A|\mathbf{b}]$ is equal to the rank of A . It is known that generator matrices for Reed-Muller codes have full rank, thus from Lemma 1 we have $\text{rank}(A) = 1 + n + \binom{n}{2}$, and $\text{rank}(\hat{A}) \geq \text{rank}(A) = 1 + n + \binom{n}{2}$. Since \hat{A} is a $(1 + n + \binom{n}{2}) \times (2^n + 1)$ matrix, $\text{rank}(\hat{A}) \leq 1 + n + \binom{n}{2}$. Thus $\text{rank}(\hat{A}) = \text{rank}(A)$, and a solution to the system exists for all $n \geq l \geq \lambda$.

To show a non-negative solution exists, consider a solution of the form $\mathbf{p} = (\alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, \gamma)$, where $p(0^n) = \alpha$, $p(1^n) = \gamma$, and $p(x^n) = \beta$ for all $x^n \notin \{0^n, 1^n\}$. Then equations (10), (8) and (9) become:

$$\alpha + \beta(2^n - 2) + \gamma = 1, \quad (13)$$

$$\beta(2^{n-1} - 1) + \gamma = \frac{l}{k}, \quad (14)$$

$$\beta(2^{n-2} - 1) + \gamma = \frac{\lambda}{k}. \quad (15)$$

Solving equations (13), (14), and (15) for α, β and γ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \frac{l - \lambda}{k(2^{n-2})}, \\ \gamma &= \frac{1}{k} \left[2\lambda - l + \frac{l - \lambda}{2^{n-2}} \right], \\ \alpha &= 1 + \frac{2\lambda - 3l}{k} + \frac{l - \lambda}{k(2^{n-2})}. \end{aligned}$$

For a positive solution \mathbf{p} to the system, we require α, β and γ to be non-negative. One can check they are indeed non-negative when $l \geq \lambda$, $2\lambda \geq l$, and $k \geq 3l - 2\lambda$. ■

Theorem 1 shows that probabilistic BIBD gradient codes exist for a wider range of system parameters than that of BIBD gradient codes.

B. Error of Probabilistic Gradient Codes

In this section, we analyze the normalized worst-case squared error performance of probabilistic BIBD gradient codes. Let n, k, l and λ satisfy the conditions in Theorem 1, and \mathbf{G}^{PB} be an n worker and k gradients to compute probabilistic BIBD gradient code, with worker load l and intersections λ in expectation. Then \mathbf{G}^{PB} is called an (n, k, l, λ) probabilistic BIBD. Since \mathbf{G}^{PB} is a randomly generated matrix, the performance depends on the specific realization

\mathbf{G}^{PB} . Thus we redefine the normalized worst-case squared error in (4) for an (n, k, l, λ) probabilistic BIBD with s stragglers as

$$\text{err}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{PB}}, s) = \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{W} \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{PB}}, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2].$$

The following theorem characterizes the error of an (n, k, l, λ) probabilistic BIBD with s stragglers.

Theorem 2. *Let $n \geq l \geq \lambda$, $2\lambda \geq l$, and $k \geq 3l - 2\lambda$. For a probabilistic (n, k, l, λ) -BIBD gradient code \mathbf{G}^{PB} generated from the probability distribution specified in Section III-A, we have*

$$\text{err}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{PB}}, s) \leq 1 - \frac{l^2(n-s)}{kl + k\lambda(n-s-1)},$$

where s is the number of stragglers.

Theorem 2 shows that probabilistic BIBD gradient codes have lower normalized worst-case squared errors than BIBD gradient codes on average. Thus, we can construct probabilistic BIBD gradient codes to retain the superior performance of BIBD gradient codes even if a BIBD gradient code does not exist for the desired system parameters.

To prove Theorem 2, we first state the following result from [1], which gives the optimal decoding vector and normalized worst-case squared error of a BIBD with s stragglers.

Lemma 2. *[Theorem 1 in [1]] For a non-random (n, k, l, λ) -BIBD gradient code \mathbf{G}^{B} with s stragglers, the optimal decoding vector is*

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{B}}, s) = \left(\frac{l}{l + \lambda(n-s-1)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{n-s},$$

and the worst-case squared error is

$$\max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \|\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{B}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{B}}, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2 = k - \frac{l^2(n-s)}{l + \lambda(n-s-1)}. \quad (16)$$

Then dividing both sides of the worst-case squared error in equation (16) by k , we obtain the BIBD error expression in (7).

To prove Theorem 2, we bound the normalized worst-case squared error of a (n, k, l, λ) probabilistic BIBD gradient code by decoding with the optimal decoding vector of an (n, k, l, λ) -BIBD provided in Lemma 2.

Proof of Theorem 2: Since \mathbf{G}^{PB} is a random matrix with probability distribution specified in Section III-A, the expected number of ones in each column of is l , and the expected number of intersections between any two columns is λ . Then for any set of $n-s$ non-straggling worker indices \mathcal{U}

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}})^T \mathbf{1}_k] = l \mathbf{1}_{n-s}, \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}})^T (\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}})] = (l-\lambda)I_{n-s} + \lambda J_{(n-s) \times (n-s)}. \quad (18)$$

Define the constant decoding vector

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \left(\frac{l}{l + \lambda(n-s-1)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{n-s}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{err}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{PB}}, s) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{PB}}, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \max_{|\mathcal{U}|=n-s} \left[\sum_g \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{PB}} = g) \|g_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(g, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \left[\sum_g \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{G}^{\text{PB}} = g) \|g_{\mathcal{U}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{1}_k)^T (\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{1}_k)] \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_k^T \mathbf{1}_k - 2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T (\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}})^T \mathbf{1}_k \\ &\quad + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T (\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}})^T \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T] \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \left(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_k^T \mathbf{1}_k] - 2\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}})^T \mathbf{1}_k] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}})^T \mathbf{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{PB}}] \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{k} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} (k - 2l\tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T \mathbf{1}_{n-s} + \tilde{\mathbf{v}}^T ((l-\lambda)I_{n-s} + \lambda J_{n-s}) \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \\ &= 1 - \frac{l^2(n-s)}{kl + k\lambda(n-s-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows because $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ is a constant decoding vector that may not be optimal, and (b) follows from equations (17) and (18). ■

IV. KRONECKER PRODUCT GRADIENT CODES

In the previous section, we constructed probabilistic gradient codes that satisfy the desired BIBD properties on average. We now switch to a different construction, referred to as *product gradient codes*, which are constructed by taking the Kronecker product of matrices of existing gradient codes. We first define the Kronecker product.

Definition 2. *If A is a $k_1 \times n_1$ matrix, and B is a $k_2 \times n_2$ matrix, then the Kronecker product $A \otimes B$ is a $k_1 k_2 \times n_1 n_2$ matrix given by*

$$A \otimes B := \begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1}B & \cdots & A_{1,n_1}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{k_1,1}B & \cdots & A_{k_1,n_1}B \end{bmatrix}.$$

We establish the normalized worst-case squared error performance for Kronecker products of two FRCs, an FRC with a BIBD, and two BIBDs in Theorems 3, 4, and 5 respectively. For convenience, we extend the domain of FRC

error expression in (6) to the set of real numbers. For an (n, k, l, r) -FRC G^F and any real number $0 \leq s \leq n$, let

$$\text{err}(G^F, s) = \frac{l}{k} \left\lfloor \frac{s}{r} \right\rfloor.$$

Theorem 3. Let G^{F_i} be an (n_i, k_i, l_i, r_i) -FRC for $i = 1, 2$. Then for any $s \in [n_1 n_2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(G^{F_1} \otimes G^{F_2}, s) &= \frac{l_1}{k_1} \text{err}\left(G^{F_2}, \frac{s}{r_1}\right) \\ &= \frac{l_2}{k_2} \text{err}\left(G^{F_1}, \frac{s}{r_2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4. Let G^F be an (n_1, k_1, l_1, r_1) -FRC and G^B be an $(n_2, k_2, l_2, r_2, \lambda_2)$ -BIBD GC. Then the error of $G^F \otimes G^B$ with s stragglers is bounded as

$$\text{err}(G^F \otimes G^B, s) \leq \text{err}\left(G^F, \frac{s}{n_2}\right) + \frac{l_1}{k_1} \text{err}(G^B, b),$$

where $b = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{r_1} \left(s - \left\lfloor \frac{s}{r_1 n_2} \right\rfloor r_1 n_2 \right) \right\rfloor$. In addition, for any G^F, G^B , and any s ,

$$\text{err}(G^F \otimes G^B, s) = \text{err}(G^B \otimes G^F, s).$$

Theorem 5. Let G^{B_i} be an $(n_i, k_i, l_i, r_i, \lambda_i)$ -BIBD for $i = 1, 2$. The error of $G^{B_1} \otimes G^{B_2}$ with any $s \in [n_1 n_2]$ stragglers is bounded as

$$\text{err}(G^{B_1} \otimes G^{B_2}, s) \leq 1 - \frac{(l_1 l_2)^2 (n_1 n_2 - s)}{k_1 k_2 (d + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 (n_1 n_2 - s))},$$

where

$$d = (l_1 - \lambda_1)(l_2 - \lambda_2) + n_2(l_1 \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2) + n_1(\lambda_1 l_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2).$$

We first find the error of Kronecker product of FRCs.

Proof of Theorem 3: Notice that $G^{F_1} \otimes G^{F_2}$ is an $(n_1 n_2, k_1 k_2, l_1 l_2, r_1 r_2)$ -FRC. Then the result follows from the error of an FRC. ■

We now establish Theorem 4. In order to prove Theorem 4, we need Lemmas 3–6. In Lemmas 3 and 4, an (n, k, l, r) gradient code with exactly λ intersections between any pair of workers is considered. We define it as an (n, k, l, r, λ) -GC. Notice that an (n, k, l, r, λ) -GC is not necessarily a BIBD gradient code, since it may not satisfy the BIBD gradient code constraint

$$r(l-1) = \lambda(k-1).$$

However, such a code has the same optimal decoding vector and error expression as a BIBD with the same parameters (n, k, l, λ) .

Lemma 3. Let G be an (n, k, l, r, λ) -GC, where $l > \lambda$. Then for any set of $s \in [n]$ stragglers \mathcal{U} , the optimal decoding vector is given by

$$v_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) = \left(\frac{l}{l + \lambda(n - s - 1)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{n-s},$$

and the squared error is

$$\|G_{\mathcal{U}} v_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2 = k - \frac{l^2(n-s)}{l + \lambda(n-s-1)}.$$

The proof follows essentially from the proof of Theorem 1 in [1], and is included in Appendix B for completeness.

Lemma 4. Let G^B be an $(n_1, k_1, l_1, \lambda_1)$ -BIBD gradient code G^B , and $G = G^B \otimes \mathbf{1}_{k_2}$ for some positive integer k_2 . Then for any integer $0 \leq s \leq n_1$, for any \mathcal{U} such that $|\mathcal{U}| = n - s$,

$$\|(G^B \otimes \mathbf{1}_{k_2})_{\mathcal{U}} v_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2 = k_1 k_2 \text{err}(G^B, s).$$

Equivalently, the normalized worst-case squared errors satisfy

$$\text{err}(G^B \otimes \mathbf{1}_{k_2}, s) = \text{err}(\mathbf{1}_{k_2} \otimes G^B, s) = \text{err}(G^B, s).$$

The proof of Lemma 4 is deferred to Appendix C. A key observation in establishing Theorem 4 is that the squared error of a block diagonal gradient code is the sum of squared errors from each block. The following lemma makes this observation precise. The proof is provided in Appendix D.

Lemma 5. Let G be a block-diagonal gradient code given by

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} G^{(1)} & 0_{l \times r} & \dots & 0_{l \times r} \\ 0_{l \times r} & G^{(2)} & \dots & 0_{l \times r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{l \times r} & 0_{l \times r} & \dots & G^{(\tau)} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, and each block $G^{(m)}$ is a gradient code with n workers and k gradients to compute for each $m \in [\tau]$. Let $\mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$, where \mathbf{v}_m is a decoding vector for each $m \in [\tau]$. Then for any set of non-stragglers \mathcal{U}

$$\|G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k\tau}\|_2^2 = \sum_{m=1}^{\tau} \|G_{\mathcal{U}_m}^{(m)} \mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2$$

where

$$\mathcal{U}_m = \mathcal{U} \cap \{(m-1)n+1, (m-1)n+2, \dots, mn\}$$

is the set of non-stragglers of $G^{(m)}$.

Another important observation in establishing Theorem 4 is that the error function of a BIBD is a convex sequence. The proof is deferred to Appendix E.

Lemma 6. Let G^B be an (n, k, l, λ) -BIBD GC. Then $\{\text{err}(G^B, s)\}_{s=0}^n$ is a convex sequence, i.e.,

$$2 \text{err}(G^B, s) \leq \text{err}(G^B, s-1) + \text{err}(G^B, s+1)$$

for all $s \in [n-1]$.

We are ready to prove Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4: For convenience, let $G := G^F \otimes G^B$. Recall that for any s stragglers and $\tilde{s} = n_1 n_2 - s$ non-stragglers,

$$\text{err}(G, s) = \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}|=\tilde{s}} \min_{\mathbf{v}} \|G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2.$$

We simplify the squared error $\|G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2$ for any set \tilde{s} non-stragglers \mathcal{U} by decomposing G into blocks and sub-blocks. Then, we fix the decoding vector \mathbf{v} , and find the worst-case set of stragglers to determine $\text{err}(G, s)$.

By construction, G is a block-diagonal matrix given by

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} J_{l_1 \times r_1} \otimes G^B & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & J_{l_1 \times r_1} \otimes G^B & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & J_{l_1 \times r_1} \otimes G^B \end{bmatrix},$$

where each zero block $\mathbf{0}$ is the $l_1 k_2 \times r_1 n_2$ all-zero matrix. For each block $m \in [k_1/l_1]$, let $\mathcal{U}_m = \mathcal{U} \cap \{(m-1)n_2 r_1 + 1, (m-1)n_2 r_1 + 1, \dots, mn_2 r_1\}$ be the set of non-stragglers in block m . Denote $\tilde{s}_m = |\mathcal{U}_m|$ as the number of non-stragglers and $s_m = n_1 r_2 - \tilde{s}_m$ as the number of straggling workers in block m .

Now, represent each decoding vector in the following form

$$\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1^T, \mathbf{v}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{k_1/l_1}^T)^T,$$

where \mathbf{v}_m is a length \tilde{s}_m vector for each block m . Then, the squared error can be expressed, by Lemma 5, as

$$\|G\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2 = \sum_{m=1}^{k_1/l_1} \|(J_{l_1 \times r_1} \otimes G^B)_{\mathcal{U}_m} \mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{1}_{l_1 k_2}\|_2^2.$$

We now further decompose each block m into r_1 sub-blocks to analyze the squared error. Observe that each block of G is given by

$$J_{l_1 \times r_1} \otimes G^B = [\mathbf{1}_{l_1} \otimes G^B \quad \mathbf{1}_{l_1} \otimes G^B \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{1}_{l_1} \otimes G^B],$$

and consists of r_1 copies of $\mathbf{1}_{l_1} \otimes G^B$, which we denote as sub-blocks. Each sub-block $j \in [r_1]$ of block $m \in [k_1/l_1]$ has workers

$$\mathcal{B}_{m_j} = (m-1)n_2 r_1 + \{(j-1)n_2 + 1, (j-1)n_2 + 2, \dots, jn_2\},$$

where for any set A and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha + A := \{\alpha + a : a \in A\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{U}_{m_j} = \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B}_{m_j}$$

be the set of non-stragglers of sub-block j of block m . Denote

$$\tilde{s}_{m_j} = |\mathcal{U}_{m_j}|$$

as the number of non-stragglers and $s_{m_j} = n_2 - \tilde{s}_{m_j}$ as the number of stragglers of sub-block j of block m . Let

$$j'(m) = \arg \min_{j \in [r_1]} s_{m_j}$$

be the sub-block in block $m \in [k_1/l_1]$ with the minimum number of stragglers. Consider the decoding vector

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_m &= (\mathbf{0}_{\tilde{s}_{m_1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{\tilde{s}_{m_{j'(m)-1}}}, \\ &\quad \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{1}_{l_1} \otimes G^B, \mathcal{U}_{m_{j'(m)}}), \mathbf{0}_{\tilde{s}_{m_{j'(m)+1}}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{\tilde{s}_{m_{r_1}}}). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Since all r_1 sub-blocks in any block $m \in [k_1/l_1]$ compute the same set of gradients, this decoding vector can be interpreted as estimating the gradients of block m using only the results returned from the sub-block with the least number of stragglers. Then

$$\|G\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{m=1}^{k_1/l_1} \|(J_{l_1 \times r_1} \otimes G^B)_{\mathcal{U}_m} \mathbf{v}_m - \mathbf{1}_{l_1 k_2}\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{k_1/l_1} \|(\mathbf{1}_{l_1} \otimes G^B)_{\mathcal{U}_{m_{j'(m)}}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(\mathbf{1}_{l_1} \otimes G^B, \mathcal{U}_{m_{j'(m)}}) - \mathbf{1}_{l_1 k_2}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{m=1}^{k_1/l_1} l_1 k_2 \text{err}(G^B, s_{m_{j'(m)}}), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows since the choice of decoding vector \mathbf{v}_m in (19) may not be optimal, and (b) follows from Lemma 4 since each sub-block $j \in [r_1]$ of each block $m \in [k_1/l_1]$ is an $(n_2, k_2 l_1, l_1 l_2, r_2, \lambda_2 l_1)$ -GC.

Now the worst-case squared error can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}|=\tilde{s}} \min_{\mathbf{v}} \|G\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}_{m_j}|=\tilde{s}_{m_j}} \sum_{m=1}^{k_1/l_1} l_1 k_2 \text{err}(G^B, s_{m_{j'(m)}}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}_m|=\tilde{s}_m} \sum_{m=1}^{k_1/l_1} l_1 k_2 \text{err}\left(G^B, \left\lfloor \frac{s_m}{r_1} \right\rfloor\right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{m=1}^c l_1 k_2 \text{err}\left(G^B, \left\lfloor \frac{s_m}{r_1} \right\rfloor\right) + l_1 k_2 \text{err}\left(G^B, \left\lfloor \frac{s_{c+1}}{r_1} \right\rfloor\right) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \left\lfloor \frac{s}{n_2 r_1} \right\rfloor l_1 k_2 + l_1 k_2 \text{err}(G^B, b). \end{aligned}$$

Here (a) follows since $s_{m_{j'(m)}} \leq \lfloor s_m/r_1 \rfloor$ for any block m , thus $\text{err}(G^B, s_{m_{j'(m)}})$ is maximized when $s_{m_1} = s_{m_2} = \dots = s_{m_{r_1}} = \lfloor s_m/r_1 \rfloor$. Above, (b) follows since the error expression of G^B is a convex sequence in s as shown in Lemma 6, therefore

$$\sum_{m=1}^{k_1/l_1} l_1 k_2 \text{err}\left(G^B, \left\lfloor \frac{s_m}{r_1} \right\rfloor\right)$$

is maximized when all workers in

$$c := \left\lfloor \frac{s}{n_2 r_1} \right\rfloor$$

blocks are straggled, i.e., $s_1 = s_2 = \dots = s_c = r_1 n_2$, and the remaining stragglers are placed in block $c+1$. Lastly, (c) follows by observing that the first c blocks each have $r_1 n_2$ stragglers and $\text{err}(G^B, \lfloor (r_1 n_2)/r_1 \rfloor) = 1$. Dividing by $k_1 k_2$ gives the desired result.

Observe that for any $s \in [n_1 n_2]$ stragglers,

$$\text{err}(G^F \otimes G^B, s) = \text{err}(G^B \otimes G^F, s)$$

since $G^F \otimes G^B$ and $G^B \otimes G^F$ are permutation equivalent. Then, we can repeat the analysis of $G^B \otimes G^F$ above, with a decoding vector and worst-case set of stragglers that are permutation equivalent to our choice of decoding vector and corresponding worst-case set of stragglers for $G^F \otimes G^B$. ■

We now establish Theorem 5 that upper bounds the normalized worst-case squared error of the Kronecker product of two BIBDs. We need the following technical lemma (see Appendix F for the proof).

Lemma 7. Let G^{Bi} be an $(n_i, k_i, l_i, r_i, \lambda_i)$ -BIBD for $i = 1, 2$, and $G = G^{\text{Bi}} \otimes G^{\text{Bi}}$. Then for any set of \tilde{s} non-stragglers $\mathcal{U} \subset [n_1 n_2]$

$$\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}} \leq \tilde{s}d + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \tilde{s}^2,$$

where

$$d = (l_1 - \lambda_1)(l_2 - \lambda_2) + n_2(l_1 \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2) + n_1(\lambda_1 l_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2).$$

Notice that the Kronecker product of two BIBD gradient codes is not necessarily another BIBD gradient code. As a result, a constant decoding vector may not be optimal. However, even the sub-optimal constant decoding vectors provide reasonable error performance in simulations. In the following, we establish Theorem 5 by upper bounding the error using the error corresponding to a constant decoding vector.

Proof of Theorem 5: For convenience we write $G := G^{\text{Bi}} \otimes G^{\text{Bi}}$. Consider a constant decoding vector \mathbf{v} given by

$$\mathbf{v}_a = a \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}},$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ will be specified later, and $\tilde{s} := n_1 n_2 - s$ is the number of non-stragglers. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{err}(G, s) \\ &= \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}|=\tilde{s}} \min_{\mathbf{v}} \|G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}|=\tilde{s}} \min_a \|G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_a - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}|=\tilde{s}} \min_a (k_1 k_2 - 2\mathbf{v}_a^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2} + \mathbf{v}_a^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_a) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \max_{\mathcal{U}: |\mathcal{U}|=\tilde{s}} \min_a (k_1 k_2 - 2a l_1 l_2 \tilde{s} + a^2 (\tilde{s}d + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \tilde{s}^2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \min_a (k_1 k_2 - 2a l_1 l_2 \tilde{s} + a^2 (\tilde{s}d + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \tilde{s}^2)) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \frac{(l_1 l_2)^2 (\tilde{s})}{k_1 k_2 (d + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \tilde{s})}. \end{aligned}$$

Firstly, (a) follows since for any set of \tilde{s} non-stragglers \mathcal{U} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_a - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}\|_2^2 \\ &= (G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_a - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2})^T (G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_a - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2}) \\ &= k_1 k_2 - 2\mathbf{v}_a^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2} + \mathbf{v}_a^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_a. \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, (b) follows since by construction, each column of $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ has exactly $l_1 l_2$ ones, thus

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbf{v}_a^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2} &= 2a \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2} \\ &= 2a l_1 l_2 \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}}^T \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}} \\ &= 2a l_1 l_2 \tilde{s}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from Lemma 7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_a^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_a &= a^2 \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}} \\ &\leq a^2 (\tilde{s}d + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \tilde{s}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, (c) follows by observing that $l_1 \geq \lambda_1, l_2 \geq \lambda_2$, and $\tilde{s} \geq 0$, thus we are minimizing over a convex quadratic function in a , where the minimizing constant a^* is given by

$$a^* = \frac{l_1 l_2}{d + \tilde{s} \lambda_1 \lambda_2} = \frac{l_1 l_2}{d + (n_1 n_2 - s) \lambda_1 \lambda_2}.$$

■

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we provided two approximate gradient code constructions. We show that our first construction, called probabilistic BIBD gradient codes, exist for a wider range of system parameters than BIBD gradient codes, and have lower average error than BIBD gradient codes. Our second construction, called product gradient codes, allow us to construct new gradient codes from existing gradient codes in a scalable manner. We derive upper bounds on the normalized worst-case squared errors of various product gradient codes. The simulation in Fig. 1 shows that the Kronecker product of BIBDs has lower error than a BIBD gradient code with similar redundancy per data piece.

APPENDIX A FRC ERROR

Lemma 8. If G^{F} is an (n, k, l, r) -FRC, then the error under s stragglers is

$$\text{err}(G^{\text{F}}, s) = \frac{l}{k} \left\lfloor \frac{s}{r} \right\rfloor.$$

for any $s \in [n_1]$.

Proof: Since G^{F} is an FRC, its corresponding bipartite graph consists of $\frac{n}{r}$ disjoint sub-graphs, which we will call ‘‘blocks’’. Each block has r workers and l gradients to be computed. From algorithm 1 in [4], the optimal decoding vector recovers all gradients in a block if there is at least one non straggler in the block. Thus only gradients in blocks where all r workers are stragglers cannot be recovered. With s stragglers, at most $\lfloor \frac{s}{r} \rfloor$ blocks can be fully straggled, so at most $l \lfloor \frac{s}{r} \rfloor$ gradients cannot be recovered. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{err}(G^{\text{F}}, s) &= \max_{\substack{\mathcal{U} \subset [n] \\ |\mathcal{U}|=n-s}} \frac{\|G_{\mathcal{U}}^{\text{F}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G^{\text{F}}, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2}{k} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\left\| \mathbf{1}_{l \lfloor \frac{s}{r} \rfloor} \right\|_2^2}{k} \\ &= \frac{l}{k} \left\lfloor \frac{s}{r} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that at most $l \lfloor \frac{s}{r} \rfloor$ gradients cannot be recovered when there are s stragglers. ■

APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 3

The proof follows essentially from the proof of Theorem 1 in [1], and is included here for completeness.

We first obtain the optimal decoding vector of G for any set of $\tilde{s} := n - s$ non-stragglers \mathcal{U} . Recall

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) := \arg \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-s}} \|G_{\mathcal{U}}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2.$$

An optimal solution to the above optimization problem is given by $\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) = G_{\mathcal{U}}^\dagger \mathbf{1}_k$, where $G_{\mathcal{U}}^\dagger$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse of $G_{\mathcal{U}}$. It is known that $G_{\mathcal{U}}^\dagger = (G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}})^{-1} G_{\mathcal{U}}^T$ when $G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is invertible. Observe that

$$G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} = (l - \lambda)I_{\tilde{s}} + \lambda J_{\tilde{s} \times \tilde{s}} \quad (20)$$

since each column of $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ has l ones, and any pair of columns of $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ has λ intersections. Since $l > \lambda$ by assumption, $G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}}$ is invertible. Thus

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) = (G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}})^{-1} G_{\mathcal{U}}^T \mathbf{1}_k.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} (G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}})^{-1} &= \left((l - \lambda)I_{\tilde{s}} + \lambda J_{\tilde{s} \times \tilde{s}} \right)^{-1} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{l - \lambda} I_{\tilde{s}} + \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr} \left(\frac{\lambda}{l - \lambda} J_{\tilde{s}} \right)} \frac{\lambda}{(l - \lambda)^2} J_{\tilde{s}} \\ &= \frac{1}{l - \lambda} \left(I_{\tilde{s}} + \frac{\lambda}{l + \lambda(\tilde{s} - 1)} J_{\tilde{s}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where (a) follows from the matrix inversion lemma [21]. Thus the optimal decoding vector is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) &= (G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}})^{-1} G_{\mathcal{U}}^T \mathbf{1}_k \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} (G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}})^{-1} l \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{l}{l + \lambda(\tilde{s} - 1)} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where (a) follows since each column of $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ has l ones, and (b) follows from equation (21).

We now find the normalized worst-case squared error of G with s stragglers. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|G_{\mathcal{U}}\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2 \\ &= (G_{\mathcal{U}}\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k)^T (G_{\mathcal{U}}\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_k) \\ &= \left(\mathbf{1}_k^T \mathbf{1}_k - 2\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}^T(G, \mathcal{U}) G_{\mathcal{U}}^T \mathbf{1}_k \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}^T(G, \mathcal{U}) G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left(k - 2l\mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}^T \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}^T(G, \mathcal{U}) \left((l - \lambda)I_{\tilde{s}} + \lambda J_{\tilde{s} \times \tilde{s}} \right) \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \left(k - \frac{2l^2 \tilde{s}}{l + \lambda(\tilde{s} - 1)} + \frac{l^2 \left((l - \lambda)\tilde{s} + (\lambda)\tilde{s}^2 \right)}{(l + \lambda(\tilde{s} - 1))^2} \right) \\ &= k - \frac{l^2 \tilde{s}}{l + \lambda(\tilde{s} - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows since each column of $G_{\mathcal{U}}$ has l ones, and from equation (20). Above, (b) follows from equation (22).

APPENDIX C PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Notice that $G^{\text{B}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{k_2}$ is an $(n_1, k_1 k_2, l_1 k_2, r_1, \lambda_1 k_2)$ -GC, thus by Lemma 3

$$\begin{aligned} &\| (G^{\text{B}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{k_2})_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2} \|_2^2 \\ &= k_1 k_2 - \frac{(l_1 k_2)^2 (n_1 - s)}{l_1 k_2 + \lambda_1 k_2 (n_1 - s - 1)} \\ &= k_1 k_2 \left(1 - \frac{l_1^2 (n_1 - s)}{l_1 k_1 + \lambda_1 k_1 (n_1 - s - 1)} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} k_1 k_2 \text{err}(G^{\text{B}}, s), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from equation (7). Observe that $\mathbf{1}_{k_2} \otimes G^{\text{B}}$ is also an $(n_1, k_1 k_2, l_1 k_2, r_1, \lambda_1 k_2)$ -GC, thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\| (\mathbf{1}_{k_2} \otimes G^{\text{B}})_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2} \|_2^2 \\ &= \| G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{v}_{\text{opt}}(G, \mathcal{U}) - \mathbf{1}_{k_1 k_2} \|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by $k_1 k_2$ gives the desired equality.

APPENDIX D PROOF OF LEMMA 5

The workers and gradients of $G^{(j)}$ and $G^{(j')}$ are disjoint if $j \neq j'$ for any $1 \leq j, j' \leq n\tau$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_{\mathcal{U}}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{1}_{k\tau}\|_2^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{k\tau} ((G_{\mathcal{U}}\mathbf{v})_i - 1)^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^k \left((G_{\mathcal{U}_j}^{(j)} \mathbf{v}_j)_i - 1 \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \|G_{\mathcal{U}_j}^{(j)} \mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{1}_k\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX E PROOF OF LEMMA 6

We first show that if a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex, then $\{f(m)\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ is a convex sequence. If f is convex, then for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f(tx_1 + (1-t)x_2) \leq tf(x_1) + (1-t)f(x_2).$$

Set $t = \frac{1}{2}$, and let $x_1 = m - 1$ and $x_2 = m + 1$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the above expression becomes

$$f(m) \leq \frac{f(m-1) + f(m+1)}{2},$$

thus $\{f(m)\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ is a convex sequence. It remains to show that the BIBD error expression is a convex function. Let $f : [0, n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function given by

$$f(x) = 1 - \frac{l^2(n-x)}{kl + k\lambda(n-x-1)}$$

for any $x \in [0, n]$, and notice that $\{\text{err}(G^{\text{B}}, s)\}_{s=0}^n = \{f(s)\}_{s=0}^n$. Since

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} = \frac{2l^2 \lambda (\lambda - l)}{k(\lambda(x - n - 1) + 1)}$$

is non-negative for any $x \in [0, n]$, f is a convex function, and $\{\text{err}(G^{\text{B}}, s)\}_{s=0}^n$ is a convex sequence.

APPENDIX F
PROOF OF LEMMA 7

We write

$$G_{\mathcal{U}} = \begin{bmatrix} | & | & \cdots & | \\ \mathbf{w}_1 & \mathbf{w}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{w}_{\tilde{s}} \\ | & | & \cdots & | \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{\tilde{s}}$ are column vectors of size $k_1 k_2$. Then

$$(G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}})_{i,j} = \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{w}_j$$

is the number of intersections between non-straggling workers $i, j \in \mathcal{U}$. To determine the number of intersections between workers i and j , we partition the $[n_1 n_2]$ workers of G into ‘‘blocks’’ and ‘‘classes’’. Let block $m \in [n_1]$ refer to the set of n_2 workers

$$\mathcal{B}_m := \{(m-1)n_2 + 1, (m-1)n_2 + 2, \dots, mn_2\}.$$

Similarly, class $m' \in [n_1]$ refers to the set of n_1 workers

$$\mathcal{C}_{m'} := \{m', m' + n_2, m' + 2n_2, \dots, m' + n_1 - 1n_2\}.$$

Let i_b and j_b be the block that i and j are from respectively i.e. $i \in \mathcal{B}_{i_b}$ and $j \in \mathcal{B}_{j_b}$. Similarly, we denote by i_c and j_c the classes that workers i and j are in. By construction of G , notice that

$$\mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{w}_j = \begin{cases} l_1 l_2 & i = j, \\ l_1 \lambda_2 & i \neq j, i_b = j_b, \\ \lambda_1 l_2 & i \neq j, i_c = j_c, \\ \lambda_1 \lambda_2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\tilde{s}_{i_b} = |\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B}_{i_b}|$ be the number of non-straggling workers in block i_b , and $\tilde{z}_{i_c} = |\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{C}_{i_c}|$ be the number of non-straggling workers in class i_c . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{w}_i^T \mathbf{w}_j \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \left(l_1 l_2 + (\tilde{s}_{i_b} - 1) l_1 \lambda_2 + (\tilde{z}_{i_c} - 1) (\lambda_1 l_2) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (\tilde{s} - \tilde{s}_{i_b} - \tilde{z}_{i_c} + 1) \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \right) \\ &= (l_1 - \lambda_1)(l_2 - \lambda_2) \tilde{s} + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \tilde{s}^2 \\ & \quad + (l_1 \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \tilde{s}_{i_b} + (l_2 \lambda_1 - \lambda_1 \lambda_2) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \tilde{z}_{i_c}. \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \tilde{s}_{i_b} &= \sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B}_m} \tilde{s}_{i_b} \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{B}_m} \tilde{s}_m \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \tilde{s}_m^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $0 \leq \tilde{s}_m \leq n_2$ for each $m \in [n_1]$, and $\sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \tilde{s}_m = \tilde{s}$. Therefore

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \tilde{s}_{i_b} = \sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \tilde{s}_m^2 \leq \sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \tilde{s}_m n_2 = n_2 \tilde{s}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U}} \tilde{z}_{i_c} &= \sum_{m'=1}^{n_2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{C}_{m'}} \tilde{z}_{i_c} \\ &= \sum_{m'=1}^{n_2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{C}_{m'}} \tilde{z}_{m'} \\ &= \sum_{m'=1}^{n_2} \tilde{z}_{m'}^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{m'=1}^{n_2} \tilde{z}_{m'} n_1 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} n_1 \tilde{s}. \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows since $0 \leq \tilde{z}_{m'} \leq n_1$ for any $m' \in [n_2]$, and (b) follows since $\tilde{z}_1 + \tilde{z}_2 + \dots + \tilde{z}_{n_2} = \tilde{s}$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}}^T G_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{s}} \leq \tilde{s} d + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \tilde{s}^2.$$

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank Ziqiao Lin, who participated as a summer intern student in the initial stage of this work. This work was supported in part by the NSERC Discovery Launch Supplement DGECR-2019-00447, in part by the NSERC Discovery Grant RGPIN-2019-05448, and in part by the NSERC Collaborative Research and Development Grant CRDPJ 543676-19.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Kadhe, O. O. Koyluoglu, and K. Ramchandran, ‘‘Gradient coding based on block designs for mitigating adversarial stragglers,’’ in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2019, pp. 2813–2817.
- [2] C. J. Colbourn and J. H. Dinitz, *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, Second Edition (Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications)*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2006.
- [3] J. Chen, X. Pan, R. Monga, S. Bengio, and R. Jozefowicz, ‘‘Revisiting distributed synchronous SGD,’’ 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.00981>
- [4] R. Tandon, Q. Lei, A. G. Dimakis, and N. Karampatziakis, ‘‘Gradient coding: Avoiding stragglers in distributed learning,’’ in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, D. Precup and Y. W. Teh, Eds., vol. 70, 06–11 Aug 2017, pp. 3368–3376.
- [5] N. J. Yadwadkar, B. Hariharan, J. E. Gonzalez, and R. Katz, ‘‘Multi-task learning for straggler avoiding predictive job scheduling,’’ *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 106, pp. 1–37, 2016.
- [6] D. Wang, G. Joshi, and G. Wornell, ‘‘Using straggler replication to reduce latency in large-scale parallel computing,’’ *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, vol. 43, no. 3, p. 7–11, Nov. 2015.
- [7] M. F. Aktas, P. Peng, and E. Soljanin, ‘‘Effective straggler mitigation: Which clones should attack and when?’’ *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, vol. 45, no. 2, p. 12–14, Oct. 2017.
- [8] K. Lee, M. Lam, R. Pedarsani, D. Papailiopoulos, and K. Ramchandran, ‘‘Speeding up distributed machine learning using codes,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1514–1529, 2018.
- [9] S. Li, S. M. Mousavi Kalan, A. S. Avestimehr, and M. Soltanolkotabi, ‘‘Near-optimal straggler mitigation for distributed gradient methods,’’ in *IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops*, 2018, pp. 857–866.

- [10] Q. Yu, M. A. Maddah-Ali, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Straggler mitigation in distributed matrix multiplication: Fundamental limits and optimal coding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1920–1933, 2020.
- [11] W. Halbawi, N. Azizian, F. Salehi, and B. Hassibi, "Improving distributed gradient descent using reed-solomon codes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2018, pp. 2027–2031.
- [12] A. Reiszadeh, S. Prakash, R. Pedarsani, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Tree gradient coding," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2019, pp. 2808–2812.
- [13] N. Raviv, R. Tandon, A. Dimakis, and I. Tamo, "Gradient coding from cyclic MDS codes and expander graphs," in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, J. Dy and A. Krause, Eds., vol. 80, 10–15 Jul 2018, pp. 4305–4313.
- [14] Z. B. Charles, D. S. Papailiopoulos, and J. S. Ellenberg, "Approximate gradient coding via sparse random graphs," 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.06771>
- [15] Z. Charles and D. Papailiopoulos, "Gradient coding via the stochastic block model," 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.10378>
- [16] H. Wang, Z. Charles, and D. Papailiopoulos, "Erasurehead: Distributed gradient descent without delays using approximate gradient coding," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.09671>
- [17] S. Wang, J. Liu, and N. Shroff, "Fundamental limits of approximate gradient coding," *Proc. ACM Meas. Anal. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 3, no. 3, Dec. 2019.
- [18] M. Glasgow and M. Wootters, "Approximate gradient coding with optimal decoding," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.09638>
- [19] S. Sarmasarkar, V. Lalitha, and N. Karamchandani, "On gradient coding with partial recovery," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.10163>
- [20] F. MacWilliams and N. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*, ser. North-Holland Mathematical Library. Elsevier, 1977, vol. 16.
- [21] K. S. Miller, "On the inverse of the sum of matrices," *Mathematics Magazine*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 67–72, 1981. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2690437>