

A Generalization of Array Codes with Local Properties and Efficient Encoding/Decoding

Hanxu Hou, *Member, IEEE*, Yunghsiang S. Han, *Fellow, IEEE*, Patrick P. C. Lee, *Senior Member, IEEE*, You Wu, Guojun Han, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Mario Blaum, *Life Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract

A maximum distance separable (MDS) array code is composed of $m \times (k+r)$ arrays such that any k out of $k+r$ columns suffice to retrieve all the information symbols. Expanded-Blaum-Roth (EBR) codes and Expanded-Independent-Parity (EIP) codes are two classes of MDS array codes that can repair any one symbol in a column by locally accessing some other symbols within the column, where the number of symbols m in a column is a prime number. By generalizing the constructions of EBR and EIP codes, we propose new MDS array codes, such that any one symbol can be locally recovered and the number of symbols in a column can be not only a prime number but also a power of an odd prime number. Also, we present an efficient encoding/decoding method for the proposed generalized EBR (GEBR) and generalized EIP (GEIP) codes based on the LU factorization of a Vandermonde matrix. We show that the proposed decoding method has less computational complexity than existing methods. Furthermore, we show that the proposed GEBR codes have both a larger minimum symbol distance and a larger recovery ability of erased lines for some parameters when compared to EBR codes. We show that EBR codes can recover any r erased lines of a slope for any parameter r , which was an open problem in [2].

This paper was presented in part at the IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), 2020 [1]. H. Hou is with the School of Electrical Engineering & Intelligentization, Dongguan University of Technology (E-mail: houhanxu@163.com). Y. S. Han is with the Shenzhen Institute for Advanced Study, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (E-mail: yunghsiang@gmail.com). P. P. C. Lee is with Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (E-mail: pclee@cse.edu.cuhk.hk). Y. Wu and G. Han are with the School of Information Engineering, Guangdong University of Technology (E-mail: 278008313@qq.com, gjhan2000@gmail.com). M. Blaum is with IBM Research Division-Almaden (E-mail: mblaum@hotmail.com). This work was partially supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2020YFA0712300) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62071121), Research Grants Council of HKSAR (AoE/P-404/18) and Innovation and Technology Fund (ITS/315/18FX).

Index Terms

Array codes, Expanded-Blaum-Roth codes, Expanded-Independent-Parity codes, local repair, efficient encoding/decoding.

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern distributed storage systems require data redundancy to maintain data availability and durability in the presence of failures. Two major redundancy mechanisms are replication and erasure coding. Compared to replication, erasure coding can deliver higher data reliability with much lower storage overhead.

There are many constructions of erasure correcting codes. In this work, we focus on *array codes*, which are a class of erasure correcting codes with only XOR and cyclic-shift operations being involved in the coding process. Array codes have been widely used in storage systems, such as Redundant Array of Independent Disk (RAID) [3]. Consider an array code of size $m \times (k+r)$ elements, in which each element stores one *symbol* in the array code. Among the $k+r$ columns, the first k columns store $m \times k$ *information* symbols to form k information columns, and the remaining r columns store $m \times r$ *parity* symbols, encoded from the $m \times k$ information symbols, to form r parity columns. The value of m depends on the code construction, and the m symbols in each column are stored in the same disk (or node) of a storage system.

Maximum distance separable (MDS) array codes are a special class of array codes, where any k out of the $k+r$ columns can retrieve all $m \times k$ information symbols stored in the k information columns (i.e., providing fault tolerance against any r disk failures). There are many existing MDS array codes in the literature, and most of them are designed to tolerate two or three failed columns. For example, EVENODD [4], [5] and RDP [6] are two important codes that can correct double disk failures. STAR codes [7], [8] and triple-fault-tolerance codes [9] can correct three disk failures. Examples of array codes that can tolerate four or more column failures include Generalized RDP codes [10], Independent-Parity (also called generalized EVENODD) codes [11], Blaum-Roth (BR) codes [12], the codes in [13], and Rabin-like codes [14], [15].

In addition to a column failure (i.e., all m symbols are failed in the failure column), another failure pattern is that one symbol of a column is failed. Recently, Expanded-Blaum-Roth (EBR) [2], [16] codes and Expanded-Independent-Parity (EIP) codes [2] extend BR codes [12] and Independent-Parity codes [11], respectively, and propose to tolerate any r column failures and locally repair one failed symbol within any column (called *local repair property*) by adding some

parity symbols into each column. This improves the performance of repairing a failed symbol, as the repair can be locally done within a column, without the need of accessing the symbols in other columns.

A. Basics of EBR and EIP Codes

An EBR code is represented by an $m \times m$ array, where $m = k + r$ and $m > 2$ is a prime number. It stores $\alpha \times k$ information symbols in the k information columns with α information symbols each, for some $\alpha < m$, and uses the $\alpha \times k$ sub-array of information symbols as input for encoding. Specifically, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, let $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_q$ be the element in row i and column j of the $m \times m$ array, where q is a power of 2. For $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, the m symbols $a_{0,j}, a_{1,j}, \dots, a_{m-1,j}$ in column j are represented as an *information polynomial*

$$a_j(x) = a_{0,j} + a_{1,j}x + \dots + a_{m-1,j}x^{m-1}$$

over the quotient ring $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x^m)$. Given the α information symbols $a_{0,j}, a_{1,j}, \dots, a_{\alpha-1,j}$, we compute $m - \alpha$ symbols $a_{\alpha,j}, a_{\alpha+1,j}, \dots, a_{m-1,j}$ for local repair, such that the polynomial $a_j(x)$ is a multiple of $(1+x)g(x)$, where $g(x)$ is a factor of $1+x+\dots+x^{m-1}$. Similarly, the m symbols in column j with $j = k, k+1, \dots, m-1$ are represented as a *parity polynomial* $a_j(x)$ over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x^m)$. The relationship between the information polynomials and the parity polynomials is given as

$$\mathbf{H}_{r \times m} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} a_0(x) & a_1(x) & \dots & a_{m-1}(x) \end{bmatrix}^T = \mathbf{0}^T,$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{r \times m}$ is the $r \times m$ parity-check matrix

$$\mathbf{H}_{r \times m} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & \dots & x^{m-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x^{r-1} & x^{2(r-1)} & \dots & x^{(r-1)(m-1)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

and $\mathbf{0}^T$ is an all-zero column of length r . In solving the above linear equations, all the r parity polynomials are multiples of $(1+x)g(x)$. The resulting codes with the parity-check matrix in Eq. (1) are denoted by $\text{EBR}(m, r, q, g(x))$.

An EIP code is an $m \times (m+r)$ array, where $m = k$ and m is a prime number. It stores $\alpha \times m$ information symbols in m columns with α information symbols each, for some $\alpha < m$, and uses the $\alpha \times m$ sub-array of information symbols for encoding. Let $a_{i,j}$ be the element in row i and

column j , where $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, m+r-1$. For $j = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, given the α information symbols $a_{0,j}, a_{1,j}, \dots, a_{\alpha-1,j}$, we compute $m - \alpha$ symbols $a_{\alpha,j}, a_{\alpha+1,j}, \dots, a_{m-1,j}$ for local repair, such that the information polynomial

$$a_j(x) = a_{0,j} + a_{1,j}x + \dots + a_{m-1,j}x^{m-1}$$

is in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x^m)$ and is a multiple of $(1+x)g(x)$, where $g(x)$ is a factor of $1+x+\dots+x^{m-1}$. For $j = m, m+1, \dots, m+r-1$, the parity polynomials $a_j(x)$ representing the m symbols stored in column j are computed by

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_m(x) & a_{m+1}(x) & \cdots & a_{m+r-1}(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_0(x) & a_1(x) & \cdots & a_{m-1}(x) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & x & \cdots & x^{r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x^{m-1} & \cdots & x^{(r-1)(m-1)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The above code is denoted by $\text{EIP}(m, r, q, g(x))$.

B. Contributions

In this paper, we propose a generalization that can be used to construct MDS array codes with new parameters. The following are our main contributions:

- 1) First, we give constructions of generalized EBR (GEBR) codes and generalized EIP (GEIP) codes that can support more parameters when compared to EBR codes and EIP codes, respectively. We show that the $m \times (m = k + r)$ GEBR codes satisfy the MDS property (i.e., all the information symbols can be reconstructed from any k out of $k + r$ columns) if m is a power of an odd prime. The $m \times m$ EBR codes [2] are a special case of our GEBR codes with m a prime number.
- 2) Second, we present an efficient decoding method for GEBR codes and GEIP codes based on the LU factorization of a Vandermonde matrix. We show that the proposed LU decoding method has less decoding complexity than existing methods.
- 3) Third, we show that GEBR codes have a larger minimum symbol distance than EBR codes for some parameters. We also show that GEBR codes can recover more erased lines than EBR codes for some parameters. In addition, we solve an open problem proposed in [2], i.e., whether EBR codes of size $m \times m$ can recover any r erased lines of slope i for $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$ and $4 \leq r \leq m - 3$. We show that EBR codes can recover any r erased lines of slope i for $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$ for any r such that $1 \leq r \leq m - 3$. Note that the lines

of slope i are taken toroidally and an erased line of slope i means that the m symbols in a line of slope i are erased.

Locally recoverable codes (LRC) [17] can also locally repair any one symbol. Given $k\alpha$ information symbols, an LRC creates $r\alpha$ global parity symbols by encoding all the information symbols, divides all $(k+r)\alpha$ symbols (including $k\alpha$ information symbols and $r\alpha$ global parity symbols) into $k+r$ groups and obtains $m-\alpha$ local parity symbols for each group. The main difference between LRC and ours is as follows. LRC contain both local parity symbols and global parity symbols, while all the parity symbols in our codes are local parity symbols. Each symbol in our codes can be repaired by either some symbols in the same column or the symbols along a line, while not in LRC [17].

C. Paper Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II gives the generalized coding method. Section III presents the construction of GEBR codes based on the coding method and proposes the LU decoding method. Section IV presents the construction of GEIP codes. Section V discusses the minimum symbol distance for the proposed codes. Section VI shows that GEBR codes can recover some erased lines. Section VII concludes the paper.

II. GENERALIZED CODING METHOD OF ARRAY CODES WITH LOCAL PROPERTIES

In this section, we present a coding method for array codes that can encode an $\alpha \times k$ sub-array of information symbols into an $m \times (k+r)$ array, where each element in the array is in the finite field \mathbb{F}_q , q is a power of 2, $m = p\tau$, p is a prime number, and α, k, r, τ are positive integers with $\alpha \leq (p-1)\tau$. The primary objective of the coding method is to extend the constructions of EBR and EIP codes to support much more parameters. In particular, EBR codes can be viewed as a special construction of the proposed coding method with $\tau = 1$ and $k+r = p$, while EIP codes are an explicit construction of the coding method with $\tau = 1$ and $k = p$.

Let $s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_q$ be the element of the $m \times (k+r)$ array in row i and column j , where $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+r-1$. The αk information symbols are $s_{i,j}$ with $i = 0, 1, \dots, \alpha-1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, and the other $m(k+r) - \alpha k$ elements of the array are parity symbols.

For $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+r-1$, we represent the m symbols stored in column j (i.e., $s_{0,j}, s_{1,j}, \dots, s_{m-1,j}$) by a polynomial $s_j(x)$ of degree $m-1$ over the ring $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$, i.e.,

$$s_j(x) = s_{0,j} + s_{1,j}x + s_{2,j}x^2 + \dots + s_{m-1,j}x^{m-1},$$

where $s_j(x)$ with $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ is an information polynomial and $s_j(x)$ with $j = k, k+1, \dots, k+r-1$ is a parity polynomial. Let $\mathcal{R}_m(q) = \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x^m)$ be the ring of polynomials modulo $1+x^m$ with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_q . We observe that multiplication by x^i in $\mathcal{R}_m(q)$ can be interpreted as a *cyclic shift* and hence it does not involve finite field arithmetic nor XOR operations.

Given α information symbols $s_{0,j}, s_{1,j}, \dots, s_{\alpha-1,j}$, we need to determine $m-\alpha$ parity symbols $s_{\alpha,j}, s_{\alpha+1,j}, \dots, s_{m-1,j}$, where $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. Let $g(x)$ be a polynomial with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_q such that $g(x)$ divides $1+x^\tau + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau}$ and $\gcd(g(x), 1+x^\tau) = 1$. Let $1+x^\tau + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau} = g(x)h(x)$. Note that $g(x)$ may not be an irreducible polynomial, so we can factorize $g(x)$ as a product of powers of irreducible polynomials over \mathbb{F}_q , i.e.,

$$g(x) = (f_1(x))^{\ell_1} \cdot (f_2(x))^{\ell_2} \cdot \dots \cdot (f_t(x))^{\ell_t},$$

where $\ell_i \geq 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ and $\deg(f_i(x)) \geq \deg(f_j(x))$ for $i > j$.

Let $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ be the cyclic code of length $m = p\tau$ over \mathbb{F}_q with generator polynomial $(1+x^\tau)g(x)$ and minimum distance d . For $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, we create $m-\alpha$ parity symbols $s_{\alpha,j}, s_{\alpha+1,j}, \dots, s_{m-1,j}$ by encoding α information symbols $s_{0,j}, s_{1,j}, \dots, s_{\alpha-1,j}$, such that the polynomial $s_j(x)$ is in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$.

Given k information polynomials $s_0(x), s_1(x), \dots, s_{k-1}(x)$, we can compute the r parity polynomials $s_k(x), s_{k+1}(x), \dots, s_{k+r-1}(x)$ by taking the product

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_k(x) & s_{k+1}(x) & \dots & s_{k+r-1}(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s_0(x) & s_1(x) & \dots & s_{k-1}(x) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{P}_{k \times r} \quad (2)$$

with operations performed in $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$, where $\mathbf{P}_{k \times r}$ is the $k \times r$ encoding matrix which is the remainder sub-matrix of the systematic generator matrix by deleting the identity matrix. We can also compute the r parity polynomials by

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_0(x) & s_1(x) & \dots & s_{k+r-1}(x) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{r \times (k+r)}^T = \mathbf{0} \quad (3)$$

over $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$, where $\mathbf{H}_{r \times (k+r)}$ is an $r \times (k+r)$ *parity-check matrix*.

Note that $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ is an *ideal* in $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$, because

$$\forall c(x) \in \mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q), \forall s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d), c(x)s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d).$$

Recall that $g(x)h(x) = 1 + x^\tau + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau}$. The polynomial $h(x)$ is called *parity-check polynomial* of $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, since the multiplication of any polynomial in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ and $h(x)$ is zero. We show in the next theorem that $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/g(x)(1+x^\tau) \times \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$ under some specific condition.

Theorem 1. *When $\gcd(g(x), h(x)) = 1$ and $\gcd(1+x^\tau, h(x)) = 1$, the ring $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/g(x)(1+x^\tau) \times \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$.*

Proof. When $\gcd(g(x), h(x)) = 1$ and $\gcd(1+x^\tau, h(x)) = 1$, we have $\gcd(g(x)(1+x^\tau), h(x)) = 1$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we can find an isomorphism between $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$ and $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(g(x)(1+x^\tau)) \times \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$. The mapping θ is defined by

$$\theta(a(x)) = (a(x) \bmod (g(x)(1+x^\tau)), a(x) \bmod (h(x))),$$

where $a(x) \in \mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$.

Let $h(x) \bmod g(x)(1+x^\tau)$ be the remainder of dividing $h(x)$ by $g(x)(1+x^\tau)$ which is in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(g(x)(1+x^\tau))$ and $g(x)(1+x^\tau) \bmod h(x)$ be the remainder of dividing $g(x)(1+x^\tau)$ by $h(x)$ which is in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$. Since $\gcd(g(x)(1+x^\tau), h(x)) = 1$, there exists the inverse of $h(x) \bmod g(x)(1+x^\tau)$ in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(g(x)(1+x^\tau))$ and denote $(h(x) \bmod g(x)(1+x^\tau))^{-1}$ as the inverse. Similarly, denote $(g(x)(1+x^\tau) \bmod h(x))^{-1}$ as the inverse of $g(x)(1+x^\tau) \bmod h(x)$ in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$. The inverse mapping θ^{-1} is

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{-1}(a_1(x), a_2(x)) = & (a_1(x) \cdot h(x) \cdot (h(x) \bmod (g(x)(1+x^\tau)))^{-1} + \\ & a_2(x) \cdot g(x)(1+x^\tau) \cdot ((g(x)(1+x^\tau) \bmod (h(x))))^{-1}) \bmod (1+x^{p\tau}), \end{aligned}$$

where $a_1(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(g(x)(1+x^\tau))$ and $a_2(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(\theta^{-1}(a_1(x), a_2(x))) &= \theta\left(\left(a_1(x) \cdot h(x) \cdot (h(x) \bmod (g(x)(1+x^\tau)))^{-1} + \right.\right. \\
& a_2(x) \cdot g(x)(1+x^\tau) \cdot \left.((g(x)(1+x^\tau)) \bmod (h(x)))^{-1}) \bmod (1+x^{p\tau})\right) \\
&= \left(\left(\left(a_1(x) \cdot h(x) \cdot (h(x) \bmod (g(x)(1+x^\tau)))^{-1} \bmod (g(x)(1+x^\tau)) + \right.\right.\right. \\
& a_2(x) \cdot g(x)(1+x^\tau) \cdot \left.((g(x)(1+x^\tau)) \bmod (h(x)))^{-1}) \bmod (1+x^{p\tau}) \bmod (g(x)(1+x^\tau))\right), \\
& \left.\left(\left(a_1(x) \cdot h(x) \cdot (h(x) \bmod (g(x)(1+x^\tau)))^{-1} \bmod (h(x)) + \right.\right.\right. \\
& a_2(x) \cdot g(x)(1+x^\tau) \cdot \left.((g(x)(1+x^\tau)) \bmod (h(x)))^{-1}) \bmod (1+x^{p\tau}) \bmod (h(x))\right)) \\
&= (a_1(x), a_2(x)),
\end{aligned}$$

and the theorem is proved. \square

Note that the result in Lemma 2 in [18] can be viewed as a special case of our Theorem 1 with $g(x) = 1$ and $q = 2$. By Theorem 1, we can directly obtain that $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$, and we give the isomorphism in the next lemma.

Lemma 2. *When $\gcd(g(x), h(x)) = 1$ and $\gcd(1+x^\tau, h(x)) = 1$, the ring $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$, the isomorphism $\theta : \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$ is $\theta(a(x)) = a(x) \bmod h(x)$ and the inverse isomorphism $\theta^{-1} : \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x)) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ is $\theta^{-1}(a(x)) = a(x) \cdot g(x)(1+x^\tau) \cdot (g(x)(1+x^\tau)) \bmod (h(x))^{-1} \bmod (1+x^{p\tau})$.*

In the next lemma, we show a necessary condition of a polynomial in the ring $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$.

Lemma 3. *If the polynomial $s_j(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} s_{i,j}x^i$ is in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, then the coefficients of polynomial $s_j(x)$ satisfy the following equation*

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\mu, j} = 0, \tag{4}$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, \dots, \tau - 1$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that given in Theorem 1 in [18]. \square

When $g(x) = 1$, the next lemma shows that the necessary condition given in Lemma 3 is also the sufficient condition.

Lemma 4. [18, Theorem 1] When $g(x) = 1$, the polynomial $s_j(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} s_{i,j}x^i$ is in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$ if and only if Eq. (4) holds.

When $g(x) = 1$, we have that the weight (the number of non-zero coefficients) of $s_j(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$ is a positive even integer by Lemma 4.

When $g(x) = 1$ and $q = 2$, the ring $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, 2, d)$ has been used in the literature to give efficient repair for a family of binary MDS array codes [9], [18] and to provide new constructions of regenerating codes with lower computational complexity [19]. When $g(x) = 1$, $q = 2$, and $\tau = 1$, the ring is discussed in [12], [13], [15], [20]–[22]. When $\tau = 1$, the ring is used to construct array codes with local properties [2].

When $g(x) = 1$, if we delete the last τ rows of the $m \times (k+r)$ array of our coding method, then the obtained $(p-1)\tau \times (k+r)$ array is reduced to the coding method given in [18].

Note that the ring $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, 2, 2)$ is reduced to a finite field of size $2^{(p-1)\tau}$ if and only if 2 is a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_p and $\tau = p^i$ for some non-negative integer i [23]. When τ is a power of p and p is a prime number such that 2 is a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_p , we have $g(x) = 1$, $d = 2$ and $h(x) = 1 + x^\tau + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau}$ is an irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$.

III. GENERALIZED EXPANDED-BLAUM-ROTH CODES

In this section, we first give the construction of GEBR codes and then propose the LU decoding method that can be used in the encoding/decoding procedures of GEBR codes.

A. Construction

The proposed GEBR code is a set of the arrays of size $m \times (k+r)$ by encoding $k\alpha$ information symbols, where $m = p\tau$, $\alpha < m$, $k+r \leq m$, τ is a positive integer and p is an odd prime number. The constructed GEBR code is denoted by $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ with parity-check matrix given as

$$\mathbf{H}_{r \times (k+r)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & \dots & x^{k+r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x^{r-1} & x^{2(r-1)} & \dots & x^{(r-1)(k+r-1)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Note that we have more than one solution of $s_k(x), s_{k+1}(x), \dots, s_{k+r-1}(x)$ in Eq. (5). We need to choose one solution such that all r polynomials $s_k(x), s_{k+1}(x), \dots, s_{k+r-1}(x)$ are in

$\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$. Since we will show the MDS condition of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ in Theorem 5 and Theorem 9, we assume that the parameters $p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x)$ satisfy the MDS condition given in Theorem 5 or Theorem 9, and there exists only one solution such that all r polynomials $s_k(x), s_{k+1}(x), \dots, s_{k+r-1}(x)$ are in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$. The encoding procedure is described as follows. We first replace each entry $a(x)$ of the parity-check matrix in Eq. (5) by $a(x) \cdot g(x)(1 + x^\tau) \cdot ((g(x)(1 + x^\tau)) \bmod (h(x))^{-1} \bmod (1 + x^{p\tau}))$ that is in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ by Lemma 2 and then solve the r polynomials $s_k(x), s_{k+1}(x), \dots, s_{k+r-1}(x)$ based on the modified parity-check matrix over $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$.

From row i of the parity-check matrix in Eq. (5), where $i = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$, the summation of the $k+r$ symbols in each line of slope i of the $m \times (k+r)$ array is zero, i.e.,

$$s_{\ell,0} + s_{\ell-i,1} + s_{\ell-2i,2} + \dots + s_{\ell-(k+r-1)i,k+r-1} = 0,$$

for $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$. The indices are taken modulo m throughout the paper unless otherwise specified. For example, when $i = 1$, we have

$$s_0(x) + xs_1(x) + x^2s_2(x) + \dots + x^{k+r-1}s_{k+r-1}(x) = 0 \bmod (1 + x^m).$$

Recall that

$$x^j s_j(x) = x^j \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} s_{\ell,j} x^\ell \right) = s_{m-j,j} + s_{m-j+1,j}x + \dots + s_{0,j}x^j + s_{1,j}x^{1+j} + \dots + s_{m-j-1,j}x^{m-1},$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k+r-1$. We can obtain that the summation of the $k+r$ symbols $s_{\ell,0}, s_{\ell-1,1}, \dots, s_{\ell-(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ in each line of slope $i = 1$ is zero. The following array is an example of $m = 5$ and $k+r = 4$, where the symbols $s_{1,0}, s_{0,1}, s_{4,2}, s_{3,3}$ with bold front are in one line of slope $i = 1$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_{0,0} & \mathbf{s}_{0,1} & s_{0,2} & s_{0,3} \\ \mathbf{s}_{1,0} & s_{1,1} & s_{1,2} & s_{1,3} \\ s_{2,0} & s_{2,1} & s_{2,2} & s_{2,3} \\ s_{3,0} & s_{3,1} & s_{3,2} & \mathbf{s}_{3,3} \\ s_{4,0} & s_{4,1} & \mathbf{s}_{4,2} & s_{4,3} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the code proposed in [16] is a special case as $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau = 1, k, r = p-k, q, g(x) = 1)$, and $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau = 1, k, r = p-k, q, g(x))$ is the EBR code in [2].

B. MDS Property

When we say that a code is MDS or satisfies the MDS property, it means that the code can recover up to any r erased columns out of the $k+r$ columns. One necessary and sufficient MDS condition of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ with $\gcd(g(x), h(x)) = 1$ and $\gcd(1 + x^\tau, h(x)) = 1$ is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 5. *When $\gcd(g(x), h(x)) = 1$ and $\gcd(1 + x^\tau, h(x)) = 1$, we can compute all the $k\alpha$ information symbols from any k out of $k+r$ polynomials $s_0(x), s_1(x), \dots, s_{k+r-1}(x)$, if and only if, the two polynomials $1+x^i$ and $h(x)$ are relatively prime over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, k+r-1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, it is sufficient to show that the determinant of any $r \times r$ sub-matrix of $\mathbf{H}_{r \times (k+r)}$ in Eq. (5) is invertible over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/h(x)$. Any $r \times r$ sub-matrix of $\mathbf{H}_{r \times (k+r)}$ is a Vandermonde matrix, the determinant can be written as the multiplication of a power of x and r different factors $1 + x^i$, where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+r-1\}$. Note that the coefficient of constant term of $h(x)$ is non-zero, we have $\gcd(x^j, h(x)) = 1$ for any positive integer j . The determinant can be viewed as a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/h(x)$ after modulo $h(x)$, and is invertible over the ring $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/h(x)$. Therefore, we can compute all the $k\alpha$ information symbols from any k out of $k+r$ polynomials, if and only if, $1+x^i$ is invertible over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/h(x)$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, k+r-1$. \square

If τ is a power of 2 and $g(x) = 1$, we have

$$h(x) = 1 + x^\tau + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau} = (1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1})^\tau.$$

We can check that $\gcd(g(x) = 1, h(x)) = 1$ and $\gcd(1 + x^\tau, h(x)) = (1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1})^\tau = 1$. The MDS condition in Theorem 5 is reduced to that $1 + x^i$ and $1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1}$ are relatively prime over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ when τ is a power of 2. Note that $1 + x^i$ and $1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1}$ are relatively prime over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ [12]. Therefore, when τ is a power of 2 and $g(x) = 1$, $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ are MDS codes if $k+r \leq p$ and are not MDS codes if $k+r > p$.

According to Theorem 5, $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ are MDS codes if and only if $\gcd(h(x), 1+x^i) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k+r-1$. In the following, we present an equivalent necessary and sufficient MDS condition.

Lemma 6. *The codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ are MDS codes if and only if the following equation*

$$(1 + x^i)s(x) = c(x) \pmod{1 + x^{p\tau}} \quad (6)$$

has a unique solution $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, given that $c(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k + r - 1\}$.

Proof. First we prove that Eq. (6) has a unique solution $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, given that $c(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, if and only if, $1 + x^i$ and $h(x)$ are relatively prime over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k + r - 1\}$.

(\implies) Since both $s(x)$ and $c(x)$ are in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, we have

$$(1 + x^i)s(x) = c(x) \pmod{1 + x^{p\tau}} \quad (7)$$

$$\leftrightarrow (1 + x^i)a(x)(1 + x^\tau)g(x) = b(x)(1 + x^\tau)g(x) \pmod{(1 + x^\tau)g(x)h(x)} \quad (8)$$

$$\leftrightarrow (1 + x^i)a(x) = b(x) \pmod{h(x)}. \quad (9)$$

Assume that $\gcd(1 + x^i, h(x)) = d(x)$. Then, $d(x) | b(x)$. Since $c(x)$ is any element in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, this is possible only when $d(x) = 1$.

(\impliedby) Note that, in Eq. (9), both $\deg(a(x))$ and $\deg(b(x))$ are less than $\deg(h(x))$. Given any valid $b(x)$, we need to prove that there exists only one solution $a(x)$ for Eq. (9). Let $1 + x^i \pmod{h(x)} = e(x)$. Since $\gcd(1 + x^i, h(x)) = 1$, we have $\gcd(e(x), h(x)) = 1$ such that the inverse of $e(x)$ exists. Note that $\deg(a(x)) < \deg(h(x))$ and the only solution $a(x)$ for Eq. (9) is $a(x) = e(x)^{-1}b(x) \pmod{h(x)}$. By Theorem 5, this completes the proof. \square

Next we prove that to determine the condition given in Eq. (6), we only need to check for the case $c(x) = 0$.

Lemma 7. *Eq. (6) has a unique solution $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, given that $c(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ if and only if Eq. (6) has a unique solution $s(x) = 0$ when $c(x) = 0$.*

Proof. The ‘‘if’’ part is obvious such that we only need to prove the ‘‘only if’’ part. By Eq. (6), we define the transformation $g_i : \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ as

$$g_i(s(x)) = (1 + x^i)s(x) \pmod{1 + x^{p\tau}},$$

where $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$. It is easy to see that this transformation is linear. Since $(1 + x^i)s(x) = 0$ has unique solution $s(x) = 0$, the kernel of g_i is of dimension 0. According to the

rank theorem, the dimension of the range of g_i is the same as the dimension of $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$. Hence, g_i is a one-to-one and onto mapping such that, for any $g_i(s(x)) = c(x)$, Eq. (6) has a unique solution $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, given that $c(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$. \square

In the following, we investigate the necessary and sufficient MDS condition when $g(x) = 1$. When $g(x) \neq 1$, the MDS condition of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ is a subject of future work.

Theorem 8. *Let $\tau = \gamma p^\nu$, where $\nu \geq 0$, $0 < \gamma$ and $\gcd(\gamma, p) = 1$. Then, the codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ are MDS codes if and only if $k + r \leq p^{\nu+1}$.*

Proof. We need to show that the codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ are MDS codes if $k + r \leq p^{\nu+1}$ and are not MDS codes if $k + r > p^{\nu+1}$.

We first consider that $k + r \leq p^{\nu+1}$. Let $1 \leq i \leq k + r - 1 \leq p^{\nu+1} - 1$. In order to prove that $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ are MDS codes, we have to show that Eq. (6) has a unique solution $s(x) = 0$ when $c(x) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p^{\nu+1} - 1$ by Lemma 7.

Suppose that we can find a non-zero polynomial $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$ such that $(1 + x^i)s(x) = 0 \pmod{(1 + x^{p\tau})}$ holds, we can deduce a contradiction as follows. Without loss of generality, let $s(x) = \sum_{v=0}^{p\tau-1} s_v x^v$ and $s_0 = 1$. Then we have

$$s_{((\ell-1)i) \bmod p\tau} + s_{(\ell i) \bmod p\tau} = 0,$$

for $0 \leq \ell \leq p\tau - 1$. By induction, we have

$$s_{(\ell i) \bmod p\tau} = 1. \tag{10}$$

Let $c = \gcd(i, p\tau)$. Recall that $1 \leq i \leq p^{\nu+1} - 1$, we have $c = \gcd(i, p\tau) = \gcd(i, \gamma p^{\nu+1}) = \gcd(i, \gamma p^\nu) = \gcd(i, \tau)$. Then,

$$\{(\ell i) \bmod p\tau : 0 \leq \ell \leq p\tau - 1\} = \{\ell c : 0 \leq \ell \leq \frac{p\tau}{c} - 1\}. \tag{11}$$

Since, in particular, c divides τ , we have

$$\{\ell\tau : 0 \leq \ell \leq p - 1\} \subset \{\ell c : 0 \leq \ell \leq \frac{p\tau}{c} - 1\}. \tag{12}$$

By Eq. (10), Eq. (11) and Eq. (12), we have $s_{\ell\tau} = 1$ for all $0 \leq \ell \leq p - 1$ and therefore $\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau} = 1$, which contradicts to $\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau} = 0$ (since $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$).

Next, we consider that $k + r > p^{\nu+1}$. We will show that Eq. (6) has a non-zero solution $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$ when $c(x) = 0$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k + r - 1\}$.

Note that $m = p\tau = \gamma p^{\nu+1}$. Let

$$s_0(x) = 1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}} + x^{2p^{\nu+1}} + \cdots + x^{(\gamma-1)p^{\nu+1}}, \quad (13)$$

$$s_1(x) = x^{p^\nu} + x^{p^\nu+p^{\nu+1}} + x^{p^\nu+2p^{\nu+1}} + \cdots + x^{p^\nu+(\gamma-1)p^{\nu+1}}, \quad (14)$$

and $s(x) = s_0(x) + s_1(x) \pmod{(1+x^m)}$. We first show that the polynomial $s(x) = s_0(x) + s_1(x)$ is in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$.

Note that $s_1(x) = x^{p^\nu} s_0(x)$, we have $1 + x^m = 1 + x^{\gamma p^{\nu+1}}$ and $(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}})s_0(x) = 1 + x^{\gamma p^{\nu+1}}$. Note that $1 + x^\tau = 1 + x^{\gamma p^\nu}$ divides $1 + x^{\gamma p^{\nu+1}}$. Since $\gcd(\gamma, p) = 1$, by Euclidean algorithm, $\gcd(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}}, 1 + x^{\gamma p^\nu}) = 1 + x^{p^\nu}$. Since $(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}})(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}} + x^{2p^{\nu+1}} + \cdots + x^{(\gamma-1)p^{\nu+1}}) = 1 + x^{\gamma p^{\nu+1}} = (1 + x^{\gamma p^\nu})q(x)$ and $\gcd(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}}, 1 + x^{\gamma p^\nu}) = 1 + x^{p^\nu}$, we have $(1 + x^{\gamma p^\nu}) \mid (1 + x^{p^\nu})(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}} + x^{2p^{\nu+1}} + \cdots + x^{(\gamma-1)p^{\nu+1}})$. Hence, $s(x) = s_0(x) + s_1(x) = (1 + x^{p^\nu})(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}} + x^{2p^{\nu+1}} + \cdots + x^{(\gamma-1)p^{\nu+1}}) \pmod{(1+x^m)}$ is also divided by $1 + x^{\gamma p^\nu} = 1 + x^\tau$, i.e., $s(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$. It is clear that $s_0(x) + s_1(x) \neq 0$.

From the definitions of $s_0(x)$ and $s_1(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{p^{\nu+1}} s_0(x) &= x^{p^{\nu+1}} + x^{2p^{\nu+1}} + x^{3p^{\nu+1}} + \cdots + x^{\gamma p^{\nu+1}} \\ &= x^{p^{\nu+1}} + x^{2p^{\nu+1}} + x^{3p^{\nu+1}} + \cdots + 1 \\ &= s_0(x) \pmod{(1+x^m)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation above comes from that $x^{\gamma p^{\nu+1}} = x^m = 1 \pmod{(1+x^m)}$. Similarly, we can obtain that $x^{p^{\nu+1}} s_1(x) = s_1(x) \pmod{(1+x^m)}$. Therefore, we have

$$(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}})s(x) = (1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}})(s_0(x) + s_1(x)) = 0 \pmod{(1+x^m)},$$

and $s(x) \neq 0$ is a solution to $(1 + x^{p^{\nu+1}})s(x) = 0 \pmod{(1+x^m)}$. The theorem is proved. \square

We can directly obtain the following corollary from Theorem 8.

Corollary 9. *The codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ with $k + r = p\tau$ are MDS codes if and only if $\tau = p^\nu$, where ν is a non-negative integer.*

By Theorem 5, the codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ are MDS codes if and only if $\gcd(1 + x^i, h(x)) = 1$ all $i = 1, 2, \dots, k + r - 1$. When $g(x) = 1$, we have $h(x) = 1 + x^\tau + \cdots + x^{(p-1)\tau}$. According to Corollary 9, the codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r = m - k, q, 1)$ are MDS codes if p is an odd prime and τ is a power of p . Combining the results in Theorem 5 and Corollary 9, we can directly obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 10. *If p is an odd prime and τ is a power of p , then we have $\gcd(1 + x^i, 1 + x^\tau + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau}) = 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p\tau - 1$.*

Since $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ is a cyclic code, the proposed $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ can recover either a burst of up to $\tau + \deg(g(x))$ (consecutive) erased symbols or up to $d - 1$ erased symbols in a column. Specifically, we can recover a burst of up to $\tau + \deg(g(x))$ erased symbols as follows. First, cyclic-shift the polynomial such that the $\tau + \deg(g(x))$ erased symbols are in the last $\tau + \deg(g(x))$ locations. Then, encode systematically the first α symbols of the obtained shifted polynomial. Finally, apply the inverse cyclic-shift to the encoded polynomial to obtain the decoded polynomial.

Example 1. *Consider the code $\text{GEBR}(3, 3, 6, 3, 2, 1)$, i.e., $\tau = p = 3$, $k = 6$ and $r = 3$. The entries of an array in the code can be represented by the nine polynomials*

$$s_j(x) = s_{0,j} + s_{1,j}x + s_{2,j}x^2 + s_{3,j}x^3 + s_{4,j}x^4 + s_{5,j}x^5 + (s_{0,j} + s_{3,j})x^6 + (s_{1,j} + s_{4,j})x^7 + (s_{2,j} + s_{5,j})x^8,$$

where $0 \leq j \leq 8$ and the 36 information symbols are $s_{i,0}, s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, s_{i,3}, s_{i,4}, s_{i,5}$ with $0 \leq i \leq 5$.

The parity-check matrix of the code is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 & x^4 & x^5 & x^6 & x^7 & x^8 \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 & x^8 & x^{10} & x^{12} & x^{14} & x^{16} \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to Corollary 9, the code $\text{GEBR}(3, 3, 6, 3, 2, 1)$ is MDS. Also, each column can recover up to three consecutive erasures.

C. Efficient Decoding

In the encoding/decoding procedures of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$, we need to solve a Vandermonde linear system over $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$ such that the solved polynomials are in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$. In the following, we present an efficient decoding method for solving the Vandermonde linear system over $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$ based on the LU factorization of the Vandermonde matrix.

1) *Efficient Division by $1 + x^b$ over $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$:* We need to first give an efficient decoding algorithm for dividing by $1 + x^b$ over $\mathcal{R}_{p\tau}(q)$ before showing the efficient LU decoding method, where b is a positive integer such that $1 + x^b$ and $h(x)$ are relatively prime. Given the integer

b and the polynomial $f(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, we want to solve $r(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ from the equation

$$(1 + x^b)r(x) = f(x) \pmod{(1 + x^{p\tau})}. \quad (15)$$

The next lemma shows a decoding algorithm for solving $r(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ from Eq. (15) when $\gcd(b, p) = 1$.

Lemma 11. *Consider Eq. (15) with $1 \leq b < p\tau$ and $\gcd(b, \tau) = a$. If $\gcd(b, p) = 1$, then we can first compute the coefficients r_j of the polynomial $r(x)$ with $j = 0, 1, \dots, a - 1$ by*

$$r_j = \sum_{u=1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{(2u-1)\tau b + \ell b + j} \quad (16)$$

and the other coefficients of $r(x)$ iteratively by

$$r_{b\ell+j} = f_{b\ell+j} + r_{b(\ell-1)+j} \quad (17)$$

with the index ℓ running from 1 to $p\tau/a - 1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, a - 1$.

Proof. We first show that $r_0 = \sum_{u=1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{(2u-1)\tau b + \ell b}$. According to Eq. (15), we have

$$r_{\tau b + \ell b} = r_{\tau b + (\ell-1)b} + f_{\tau b + \ell b}, \quad (18)$$

where $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, p\tau - 1$. Summing both sides of Eq. (18) from $\ell = 0$ to $\ell = (i-1)\tau$, we have

$$r_{i\tau} = r_{\tau b - b} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{(i-1)\tau} f_{\tau b + \ell b}, \quad (19)$$

where $i = 1, 2, \dots, p - 1$. Summing both sides of Eq. (19) from $i = 1$ to $i = p - 1$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} r_{i\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} r_{i\tau} = (p-1)r_{\tau b - b} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{(i-1)\tau} f_{\tau b + \ell b}, \quad (20)$$

where the first equation above comes from that $\gcd(b, p) = 1$. By Eq. (3) in Lemma 3, we have

$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} r_{i\tau} = r_0$. Since p is an odd prime number, we have $(p-1)r_{\tau b - b} = 0$. We can compute

$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{(i-1)\tau} f_{\tau b + \ell b}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{(i-1)\tau} f_{\tau b + \ell b} &= (p-1)f_{\tau b} + (p-2) \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{\tau b + \ell b} + (p-3) \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{2\tau b + \ell b} + \dots \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{(p-3)\tau b + \ell b} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{(p-2)\tau b + \ell b} \\ &= \sum_{u=1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{(2u-1)\tau b + \ell b}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain that $r_0 = \sum_{u=1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_{(2u-1)\tau b + \ell b}$. Similarly, we can show that Eq. (16) holds for $j = 0, 1, \dots, a-1$. Once r_0 is known, we can compute other $\frac{p\tau}{a} - 1$ coefficients recursively by Eq. (17) with $j = 0$ and $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{p\tau}{a} - 1$. Similarly, we can compute $\frac{p\tau}{a} - 1$ coefficients recursively by Eq. (17) with $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{p\tau}{a} - 1$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, a-1$, after solving r_j .

Next, we need to show that the solved $r(x)$ is in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, i.e., $g(x)(1+x^\tau)$ divides $r(x)$. First, $(1+x^\tau)$ divides $r(x)$, as we can show that $\sum_{\ell=0}^{p-1} r_{\ell\tau+\mu} = 0$ for $\mu = 0, 1, \dots, \tau-1$. Second, since $g(x)$ divides $f(x)$, if $\gcd(1+x^b, g(x)) = 1$, then $g(x)$ divides $r(x)$. As $\gcd(g(x), 1+x) = 1$ and $\gcd(p, b) = 1$, we have that $\gcd(1+x^b, g(x)) = 1$ by Lemma 19 in [2]. Therefore, $g(x)(1+x^\tau)$ divides $r(x)$ and the lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 20 in [2] and Lemma 4 in [18] are special case of Lemma 11 with $\tau = 1$ and $g(x) = 1$, respectively. By Lemma 11, there are $a(\frac{p-1}{2} \cdot \tau - 1) + (p\tau - a)$ XORs involved in solving $r(x)$ from Eq. (15). In particular, if $a = 1$, we have that the number of involved XORs is $\frac{3p\tau - \tau - 4}{2}$.

Example 2. Consider the example of $p = 7$ and $\tau = 2$. Let $f(x) = 1 + x + x^6 + x^7 + x^{10} + x^{11} + x^{12} + x^{13} \in \mathcal{C}_{7,2}((1 + x^2 + x^6), 2, 4)$, i.e., $f_0 = f_1 = f_6 = f_7 = f_{10} = f_{11} = f_{12} = f_{13} = 1$ and $f_2 = f_3 = f_4 = f_5 = f_8 = f_9 = 0$. We want to solve $r(x)$ from $(1 + x^3)r(x) = f(x)$. According to Eq. (16), we have

$$r_0 = f_6 + f_{12} + f_{18 \bmod 14} = 0.$$

The other coefficients can be computed as

$$r_1 = r_4 = r_6 = r_9 = r_{10} = r_{11} = 1,$$

$$r_2 = r_3 = r_5 = r_7 = r_8 = r_{12} = r_{13} = 0,$$

according to Eq. (17). Therefore, $r(x) = x + x^4 + x^6 + x^9 + x^{10} + x^{11}$. We can check that $r(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{7,2}((1 + x^2 + x^6), 2, 4)$.

When τ is a power of an odd prime p and $g(x) = 1$, $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r = m - k, q, 1)$ are MDS codes by Corollary 9. If $\gcd(b, p) = 1$, then we can solve Eq. (15) by Lemma 11; otherwise, if b is a multiple of p , then the decoding method is as follows.

Lemma 12. Consider that $\tau = p^\nu$, where ν is a positive integer. Let $b = up^s$, where $\gcd(u, p) = 1$ and $1 \leq s \leq \nu$. We can compute the coefficients $r_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s+j}$ of the polynomial $r(x)$ in Eq. (15) with $j = 0, 1, \dots, p^s - 1$ by

$$r_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s+j} = \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{p^{\nu-s+1}-3}{2}} f_{2iup^s+up^s+j}, \quad (21)$$

and the other coefficients of $r(x)$ iteratively by

$$r_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s+j+\ell up^s} = f_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s+j+\ell up^s} + r_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s+j+(\ell-1)up^s},$$

where $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, p^{\nu-s+1} - 1$. Recall that the indices are taken modulo $m = p^{\nu+1}$ throughout the paper.

Proof. Since $\gcd(b, m) = \gcd(up^s, p^{\nu+1}) = p^s$ and $\gcd(u, p) = 1$, we have that $\gcd(u, p^{\nu+1}) = 1$. In the following, we show that

$$\{0, up^s, 2up^s, \dots, u(p^{\nu+1} - 2p^s)\} \bmod p^{\nu+1} = \{0, p^s, 2p^s, \dots, p^{\nu+1} - 2p^s\}. \quad (22)$$

First, we prove that if $i \neq j \in \{0, p^s, 2p^s, \dots, p^{\nu+1} - 2p^s\}$, then $u \cdot i \neq u \cdot j \bmod p^{\nu+1}$. Suppose that $u \cdot i = u \cdot j \bmod p^{\nu+1}$, then there exists an integer ℓ such that

$$u \cdot i = u \cdot j + \ell p^{\nu+1},$$

and we can further obtain that

$$u \cdot (i - j) = \ell p^{\nu+1}.$$

Since $\gcd(u, p^{\nu+1}) = 1$, we have $p^{\nu+1} \mid (i - j)$, which contradicts to that $i \neq j \in \{0, p^s, 2p^s, \dots, p^{\nu+1} - 2p^s\}$. Similarly, we can show that

$$u \cdot i \neq p^{\nu+1} - p^s.$$

Therefore, Eq. (22) holds. According to Eq. (15), we have

$$f_{2iup^s+up^s} = r_{2iup^s+up^s} + r_{2iup^s}, \quad (23)$$

where $i = 0, 1, \dots, p^{\nu-s+1} - 1$. Summing both sides of Eq. (23) from $i = 0$ to $i = \frac{p^{\nu-s+1}-3}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{p^{\nu-s+1}-3}{2}} f_{2iup^s+up^s} &= \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{p^{\nu-s+1}-3}{2}} (r_{2iup^s+up^s} + r_{2iup^s}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{p^{\nu-s+1}-2} r_{iup^s} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{p^{\nu-s+1}-2} r_{ip^s} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$= r_{(p^{\nu-s+1}-1)p^s} = r_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s}, \quad (25)$$

where Eq. (24) comes from Eq. (22), Eq. (25) comes from that

$$\{0, p^s, 2p^s, \dots, p^{\nu+1} - 2p^s\} = \begin{cases} \{0, p^\nu, \dots, (p-1)p^\nu\} \cup \{p^s, p^\nu + p^s, 2p^\nu + p^s, \dots, (p-1)p^\nu + p^s\} \\ \cup \dots \cup \{2p^\nu - p^s, 3p^\nu - p^s, \dots, (p-1)p^\nu - p^s\}, & \text{if } \nu > s, \\ \{0, p^\nu, 2p^\nu, \dots, (p-2)p^\nu\}, & \text{if } \nu = s. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we can show that Eq. (21) holds for $j = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$. Once $r_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s+j}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, p^s - 1$ are known, we can compute the other coefficients recursively.

Recall that $\sum_{i=0}^{\frac{p^{\nu-s+1}-3}{2}} f_{2iup^s+up^s+j} = r_{p^{\nu+1}-p^s+j}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ by Eq. (25), we have

$$r_i = f_{up^s+p^s+i} + f_{3up^s+p^s+i} + \dots + f_{(p^{\nu-s+1}-2)up^s+p^s+i}$$

for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Recall that the indices are taken modulo $m = p^{\nu+1}$. We have

$$r(x) = (x^{p^{\nu+1}-up^s-p^s} + x^{p^{\nu+1}-3up^s-p^s} + \dots + x^{2up^s-p^s})f(x).$$

Since $f(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$, we have that $r(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ and the lemma is proved. \square

By Lemma 12, there are $p^s(\frac{p^{\nu-s+1}-3}{2}) + p^{\nu+1} - p^s = \frac{3p\tau-5p^s}{2}$ XORs involved in solving $r(x)$ from Eq. (15).

Example 3. Consider the example of $p = \tau = 3$. Let $f(x) = 1 + x + x^3 + x^7 \in \mathcal{C}_{3,3}(1, 2, 2)$, i.e., $f_0 = f_1 = f_3 = f_7 = 1$ and $f_2 = f_4 = f_5 = f_6 = f_8 = 0$. We want to solve $r(x)$ from $(1 + x^3)r(x) = f(x)$. According to Eq. (21) in Lemma 12, we have

$$r_3 = f_0 = 1,$$

$$r_4 = f_1 = 1,$$

$$r_5 = f_2 = 0,$$

and the other coefficients are $r_0 = r_2 = r_5 = r_7 = r_8 = 0$ and $r_1 = r_6 = 1$. Therefore, $r(x) = x + x^3 + x^4 + x^6$, which is in $\mathcal{C}_{3,3}(1, 2, 2)$.

2) *LU Decoding Method:* Let $\mathbf{V}_{r \times r}(\mathbf{a})$ be an $r \times r$ Vandermonde matrix,

$$\mathbf{V}_{r \times r}(\mathbf{a}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^{a_1} & \cdots & x^{(r-1)a_1} \\ 1 & x^{a_2} & \cdots & x^{(r-1)a_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x^{a_r} & \cdots & x^{(r-1)a_r} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$ and a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r are distinct integers that range from 1 to $k + r - 1$. Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_1(x), \dots, u_r(x)) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)^r$ and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1(x), \dots, v_r(x)) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)^r$. Consider the linear equations

$$\mathbf{u}\mathbf{V}_{r \times r}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{v} \bmod (1 + x^{p\tau}). \quad (27)$$

We first review the LU factorization of a Vandermonde matrix given in [24], and then show the LU decoding algorithm for solving \mathbf{u} from the Vandermonde linear system in Eq. (27).

Theorem 13. [24] For a positive integer r , the $r \times r$ Vandermonde matrix $\mathbf{V}_{r \times r}(\mathbf{a})$ in Eq. (26) can be factorized into

$$\mathbf{V}_{r \times r}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{L}_r^{(1)} \mathbf{L}_r^{(2)} \cdots \mathbf{L}_r^{(r-1)} \mathbf{U}_r^{(r-1)} \mathbf{U}_r^{(r-2)} \cdots \mathbf{U}_r^{(1)}$$

where $\mathbf{U}_r^{(\ell)}$ is the upper triangular matrix

$$\mathbf{U}_r^{(\ell)} = \left[\begin{array}{c|cccccc} \mathbf{I}_{r-\ell-1} & & & & & \\ \hline & 1 & x^{a_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & x^{a_2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & x^{a_i} \\ & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

and $\mathbf{L}_r^{(\ell)}$ is the lower triangular matrix

$$\left[\begin{array}{c|ccccc} \mathbf{I}_{r-\ell-1} & & & & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & x^{a_{r-\ell+1}} + x^{a_{r-\ell}} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ & 0 & 0 & \cdots & x^{a_{r-1}} + x^{a_{r-\ell}} & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & x^{a_r} + x^{a_{r-\ell}} \end{array} \right]$$

for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, r - 1$.

When $r = 3$, the 3×3 Vandermonde matrix $\mathbf{V}_{3 \times 3}(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ can be factorized as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{L}_3^{(1)} \mathbf{L}_3^{(2)} \mathbf{U}_3^{(2)} \mathbf{U}_3^{(1)} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^{a_3} + x^{a_2} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & x^{a_2} + x^{a_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^{a_3} + x^{a_1} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \\ & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^{a_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^{a_2} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^{a_1} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

With the LU factorization of Vandermonde matrix in Theorem 13, we can solve the Vandermonde linear system in Eq. (27) by solving the following linear equations

$$\mathbf{u} \mathbf{L}_r^{(1)} \mathbf{L}_r^{(2)} \cdots \mathbf{L}_r^{(r-1)} \mathbf{U}_r^{(r-1)} \mathbf{U}_r^{(r-2)} \cdots \mathbf{U}_r^{(1)} = \mathbf{v}.$$

The decoding algorithm for solving the Vandermonde linear system based on the LU factorization of a Vandermonde matrix is given in Algorithm 1. In Algorithm 1, Steps 2-4 require $r(r-1)/2$ additions and $r(r-1)/2$ multiplications and Steps 5-11 require $r(r-1)/2$ backward additions and $r(r-1)/2$ divisions by factors of the form $x^{a_j} + x^{a_{r-i}}$.

Example 4. Continue from Example 1, where $\tau = p = 3$, $k = 6$ and $r = 3$. We have six

Algorithm 1 Solving a Vandermonde Linear System

Input: positive integer r , prime number p , integers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r , and $\mathbf{v} = (v_1(x), v_2(x), \dots, v_r(x)) \in \mathcal{C}_{p^r}(g(x), q, d)^r$.

Output: $\mathbf{u} = (u_1(x), u_2(x), \dots, u_r(x)) \in \mathcal{C}_{p^r}(g(x), q, d)^r$ that satisfies $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{V}_{r \times r}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{v} \bmod (1 + x^{p^r})$.

Require: $x^{a_{i_1}} + x^{a_{i_2}}$ is relatively prime to $h(x)$ over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ for all $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq r$.

1: $\mathbf{u} \leftarrow \mathbf{v}$

2: **for** i from 1 to $r - 1$ **do**

3: **for** j from $r - i + 1$ to r **do**

4: $u_j(x) \leftarrow u_j(x) + u_{j-1}(x)x^{a_i+j-r}$

5: **for** i from $r - 1$ down to 1 **do**

6: Solve $g(x)$ from $(x^{a_r} + x^{a_i+j-r})g(x) = u_r(x)$ by Lemma 11 or Lemma 12

7: $u_r(x) \leftarrow g(x)$

8: **for** j from $r - 1$ down to $r - i + 1$ **do**

9: Solve $g(x)$ from $(x^{a_j} + x^{a_r-i})g(x) = (u_j(x) + u_{j+1}(x))$ by Lemma 11 or Lemma 12

10: $u_j(x) \leftarrow g(x)$

11: $u_{r-i}(x) \leftarrow u_{r-i}(x) + u_{r-i+1}(x)$

12: **return** $\mathbf{u} = (u_1(x), \dots, u_r(x))$

information polynomials

$$s_0(x) = 1 + x + x^3 + x^4,$$

$$s_1(x) = x + x^2 + x^4 + x^5,$$

$$s_2(x) = x + x^4,$$

$$s_3(x) = 1 + x^2 + x^3 + x^5,$$

$$s_4(x) = x + x^2 + x^7 + x^8,$$

$$s_5(x) = x + x^7,$$

where each polynomial is in $\mathcal{C}_{3,3}(1, 2, 2)$. The parity-check matrix of the code is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 & x^4 & x^5 & x^6 & x^7 & x^8 \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 & x^8 & x^{10} & x^{12} & x^{14} & x^{16} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we can obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_6(x) & s_7(x) & s_8(x) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^6 & x^{12} \\ 1 & x^7 & x^{14} \\ 1 & x^8 & x^{16} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x + x^2 + x^4 + x^8 \\ 1 + x + x^4 + x^5 + x^6 + x^8 \\ 1 + x^5 + x^6 + x^8 \end{bmatrix}^T.$$

According to Theorem 13, the above Vandermonde matrix can be factorized as

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^6 & x^{12} \\ 1 & x^7 & x^{14} \\ 1 & x^8 & x^{16} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^7 + x^8 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & x^6 + x^7 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^6 + x^8 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^6 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^7 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^6 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Algorithm 1, we can solve the three parity polynomials as follows. First, we solve the following linear system

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_6'''(x) & s_7'''(x) & s_8'''(x) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^6 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x + x^2 + x^4 + x^8 \\ 1 + x + x^4 + x^5 + x^6 + x^8 \\ 1 + x^5 + x^6 + x^8 \end{bmatrix}^T$$

to obtain

$$(s_6'''(x), s_7'''(x), s_8'''(x)) = (x + x^2 + x^4 + x^8, 1 + x + x^4 + x^5 + x^6 + x^8, 1 + x + x^2 + x^3 + x^7 + x^8).$$

Then, we solve the following linear system

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_6''(x) & s_7''(x) & s_8''(x) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^6 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^7 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x + x^2 + x^4 + x^8 \\ 1 + x + x^4 + x^5 + x^6 + x^8 \\ 1 + x + x^2 + x^3 + x^7 + x^8 \end{bmatrix}^T$$

to obtain

$$(s_6''(x), s_7''(x), s_8''(x)) = (x + x^2 + x^4 + x^8, 1 + x^4 + x^6 + x^7, 1 + x + x^3 + x^4 + x^5 + x^8).$$

Next, we solve the following linear system

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_6'(x) & s_7'(x) & s_8'(x) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & x^6 + x^7 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^6 + x^8 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x + x^2 + x^4 + x^8 \\ 1 + x^4 + x^6 + x^7 \\ 1 + x + x^3 + x^4 + x^5 + x^8 \end{bmatrix}^T$$

to obtain

$$(s'_6(x), s'_7(x), s'_8(x)) = (x^4 + x^5 + x^7 + x^8, x + x^2 + x^5 + x^7, x^2 + x^3 + x^5 + x^6).$$

Finally, we solve the following linear system

$$[s_6(x) \ s_7(x) \ s_8(x)] \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & x^7 + x^8 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x^4 + x^5 + x^7 + x^8 \\ x + x^2 + x^5 + x^7 \\ x^2 + x^3 + x^5 + x^6 \end{bmatrix}^T$$

to obtain

$$(s_6(x), s_7(x), s_8(x)) = (x^4 + x^5 + x^7 + x^8, x + x^2 + x^4 + x^5, x^4 + x^7).$$

Table I shows the example of $\text{GEBR}(3, 3, 6, 3, 2, 1)$.

Table I
EXAMPLE OF $\text{GEBR}(3, 3, 6, 3, 2, 1)$.

1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

In the following, we only evaluate the encoding complexity, and we can obtain the decoding complexity similarly. We define the normalized encoding complexity as the ratio of the total number of XORs involved in the encoding procedure to the number of information symbols. In the encoding procedure of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$, we first compute τ parity symbols for the first k columns that takes $k\tau(p-2)$ XORs. Then, we compute the multiplication of k polynomials and the $r \times k$ Vandermonde matrix that requires $(k-1)rp\tau$ XORs, and solve the Vandermonde linear system. In solving the $r \times r$ Vandermonde linear system, there are $r(r-1)$ additions that

require $r(r-1)p\tau$ XORs, $r(r-1)/2$ divisions that require $(r(r-1)/2) \cdot ((3p\tau - \tau - 4)/2)$ XORs.¹ Therefore, the normalized encoding complexity of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ is

$$\frac{\frac{1}{4}r(r-1)(7p\tau - \tau - 4) + (k-1)rp\tau + k\tau(p-2)}{k(p-1)\tau}.$$

The encoding/decoding method of EBR is given in [2], [16], and the normalized encoding complexity is

$$\frac{(\frac{1}{2}r^2 - \frac{5}{2}r + 2^r + rk - 1)p + \frac{1}{4}r(r-1)(3p-5) + k(p-2)}{k(p-1)},$$

where $k = p - r$.

We give the comparison of EBR and our proposed codes about the encoding complexity in Table II. The results of Table II show that the proposed LU decoding method has less encoding complexity compared with the decoding methods in [2], [16].

Table II
COMPARISON OF ENCODING ALGORITHMS.

p	τ	r	$k = p - r$	EBR	GEBR	Improvement %
5	1	3	2	8.88	8.25	7.0
7	1	4	3	13.22	11.28	14.7
11	1	5	6	14.42	11.48	20.4
17	1	7	10	25.63	15.11	41.0
19	1	8	11	38.69	17.67	54.3
23	1	10	13	100.72	22.88	77.3

IV. GENERALIZED EXPANDED INDEPENDENT PARITY CODES

In this section, we present the construction of generalized expanded independent parity (GEIP) codes. The constructed GEIP code is denoted by $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ with encoding matrix given in Eq. (28).

$$\mathbf{P}_{k \times r} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & \cdots & x^{r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x^{k-1} & x^{2(k-1)} & \cdots & x^{(r-1)(k-1)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

¹Suppose that $\gcd(b, \tau) = 1$.

As the first k polynomials are in $\mathcal{C}_{pr}(g(x), q, d)$, the computed r polynomials are also in $\mathcal{C}_{pr}(g(x), q, d)$. Note that the EIP code proposed in [2] is a special case as $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau = 1, k, r, q, g(x))$.

Table III
EXAMPLE OF $\text{GEIP}(p = 3, \tau = 3, k = 3, r = 2, q, g(x) = 1)$.

Column 0	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
$s_{0,0}$	$s_{0,1}$	$s_{0,2}$	$s_{0,3} = s_{0,0} + s_{0,1} + s_{0,2}$	$s_{0,4} = s_{0,0} + s_{8,1} + s_{7,2}$
$s_{1,0}$	$s_{1,1}$	$s_{1,2}$	$s_{1,3} = s_{1,0} + s_{1,1} + s_{1,2}$	$s_{1,4} = s_{1,0} + s_{0,1} + s_{8,2}$
$s_{2,0}$	$s_{2,1}$	$s_{2,2}$	$s_{2,3} = s_{2,0} + s_{2,1} + s_{2,2}$	$s_{2,4} = s_{2,0} + s_{1,1} + s_{0,2}$
$s_{3,0}$	$s_{3,1}$	$s_{3,2}$	$s_{3,3} = s_{3,0} + s_{3,1} + s_{3,2}$	$s_{3,4} = s_{3,0} + s_{2,1} + s_{1,2}$
$s_{4,0}$	$s_{4,1}$	$s_{4,2}$	$s_{4,3} = s_{4,0} + s_{4,1} + s_{4,2}$	$s_{4,4} = s_{4,0} + s_{3,1} + s_{2,2}$
$s_{5,0}$	$s_{5,1}$	$s_{5,2}$	$s_{5,3} = s_{5,0} + s_{5,1} + s_{5,2}$	$s_{5,4} = s_{5,0} + s_{4,1} + s_{3,2}$
$s_{6,0} = s_{0,0} + s_{3,0}$	$s_{6,1} = s_{0,1} + s_{3,1}$	$s_{6,2} = s_{0,2} + s_{3,2}$	$s_{6,3} = s_{6,0} + s_{6,1} + s_{6,2}$	$s_{6,4} = s_{6,0} + s_{5,1} + s_{4,2}$
$s_{7,0} = s_{1,0} + s_{4,0}$	$s_{7,1} = s_{1,1} + s_{4,1}$	$s_{7,2} = s_{1,2} + s_{4,2}$	$s_{7,3} = s_{7,0} + s_{7,1} + s_{7,2}$	$s_{7,4} = s_{7,0} + s_{6,1} + s_{5,2}$
$s_{8,0} = s_{2,0} + s_{5,0}$	$s_{8,1} = s_{2,1} + s_{5,1}$	$s_{8,2} = s_{2,2} + s_{5,2}$	$s_{8,3} = s_{8,0} + s_{8,1} + s_{8,2}$	$s_{8,4} = s_{8,0} + s_{7,1} + s_{6,2}$

Example 5. Consider $\alpha = 6, p = \tau = k = 3, r = 2$ and $g(x) = 1$. The 18 information symbols are $s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_q$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 5$ and $j = 0, 1, 2$. The encoding matrix of $\text{GEIP}(p = 3, \tau = 3, k = 3, r = 2, q, g(x) = 1)$ is

$$\mathbf{P}_{3 \times 2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x \\ 1 & x^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Example 5 is illustrated in Table III.

A. The MDS Property

The codes $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ are MDS, if the determinant of any square sub-matrix of $\mathbf{P}_{k \times r}$ in Eq. (28) is invertible in $\mathcal{C}_{pr}(g(x), q, d)$. Recall that $\mathcal{C}_{pr}(g(x), q, d)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$ by Lemma 2, the MDS condition is reduced to that the determinant of any square sub-matrix of $\mathbf{P}_{k \times r}$ in Eq. (28), after reducing modulo $h(x)$, is invertible in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(h(x))$.

Theorem 14. Let p be a prime number such that 2 is a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_p and τ be a power of p . If

$$(p-1)\tau > \frac{1}{4}kr \min(k, r) - \frac{1}{12}(\min(k, r))^3 - \frac{9}{4} \max(k, r) + \frac{25}{12} \min(k, r) - 4 \quad (29)$$

holds, then the codes $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, 2, g(x) = 1)$ are MDS for $r \geq 9$.

Proof. When 2 is a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_p and τ be a multiple of p , then $h(x) = 1 + x^\tau + x^{2\tau} + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau}$ is irreducible polynomial [23]. If a polynomial whose degree is less than $(p-1)\tau$, then the polynomial is relatively prime to $h(x)$. It is sufficient to show that the maximum degree of the determinants or all the factors of the determinants of all square sub-matrix is less than $(p-1)\tau$. It is shown by Theorem 4 in [25] that the maximum degree of the determinants or all the factors of the determinants is equal to the value on the left side in Eq. (29) when $r \geq 9$. Therefore, $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, 2, g(x) = 1)$ are MDS for $r \geq 9$, if Eq. (29) holds. \square

If τ is a power of 2, then

$$1 + x^\tau + x^{2\tau} + \dots + x^{(p-1)\tau} = (1 + x + x^2 + \dots + x^{p-1})^\tau.$$

Recall that, since 2 is a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_p , $1 + x + x^2 + \dots + x^{p-1}$ is irreducible over \mathbb{F}_2 . It is sufficient to show that the maximum degree of the determinants or all the factors of the determinants of all square sub-matrix is less than $p-1$, and we can obtain the following theorem with a proof similar to that of Theorem 14.

Theorem 15. *If 2 is a primitive element in \mathbb{Z}_p , τ is a power of 2 and*

$$p-1 > \frac{1}{4}kr \min(k, r) - \frac{1}{12}(\min(k, r))^3 - \frac{9}{4} \max(k, r) + \frac{25}{12} \min(k, r) - 4 \quad (30)$$

holds, then the codes $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, 2, g(x) = 1)$ are MDS for $r \geq 9$.

When $r \leq 3$, the determinant of any square sub-matrix can be written as a multiplication of factors $1 + x^i$, where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\}$. Therefore, $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x) = 1)$ are MDS for $r \leq 3$, if $1 + x^i$ and $h(x)$ are relatively prime. When $4 \leq r \leq 8$, we can list the prime numbers p for which $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x) = 1)$ are MDS with similar proof of the MDS condition in [20].

Note that EIP codes share the same MDS condition as IP codes (also called generalized EVENODD codes [4], [11] or Blaum-Bruck-Vardy (BBV) codes [25] in the literature). By letting τ be a power of p , our $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x) = 1)$ codes not only support much more parameters, but the codes may be MDS for some parameters with $p < k$, compared with EIP codes. Example 5 is an MDS code, as $1 + x^i$ is relatively prime to $1 + x^3 + x^6$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

B. Encoding/Decoding Procedure

The encoding procedure of $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ is as follows. Given $k\alpha$ information symbols $s_{i,j}$ with $i = 0, 1, \dots, \alpha - 1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$, we obtain $(m - \alpha)k$ parity symbols $s_{i,j}$ with $i = \alpha, \alpha + 1, \dots, m - 1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$ by systematically encoding such that $s_j(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$. Note that when $g(x) = 1$, we can do the systematic encoding by Eq. (4); when $g(x) \neq 1$, the systematic encoding is similar to that of cyclic codes [26, Ch. 7.8]. Then, we compute the last r polynomials by Eq. (2) with encoding matrix $\mathbf{P}_{k \times r}$ in Eq. (28).

Next, we consider the encoding complexity of $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x) = 1)$. First, we compute $s_{(p-1)\tau+\mu,j} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{p-2} s_{\ell\tau+\mu,j}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$ and $\mu = 0, 1, \dots, \tau - 1$, which takes $k\tau(p - 2)$ XORs. Then, we compute the r parity polynomials by Eq. (2) with encoding matrix $\mathbf{P}_{k \times r}$ in Eq. (28), which takes $r(k - 1)p\tau$ XORs. The encoding complexity is $k\tau(p - 2) + r(k - 1)p\tau$ XORs. Recall that the encoding complexity of EIP code with $g(x) = 1$ is $k(p - 2) + r(k - 1)p$ XORs. Therefore, the normalized encoding complexity of $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x) = 1)$ is equal to that of EIP code with $g(x) = 1$.

Suppose that r information columns are failed and up to $d - 1$ symbols or a burst of up to $\tau + \deg(g(x))$ symbols in each of other k columns are failed. We can first recover up to $d - 1$ erased symbols in each of the k columns or a burst of up to $\tau + \deg(g(x))$ erased symbols. Suppose that $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ is MDS. Then, we can recover r failed columns by first subtracting the other $k - r$ non-failed information polynomials from each of r parity polynomials and then solving the $r \times r$ Vandermonde linear equations by applying the LU decoding method in Algorithm 1. Note that if some of the erased columns are among the r parity columns, we can not formulate a $r \times r$ Vandermonde linear equations and the LU decoding method is not applicable.

Example 6. *Suppose that columns 0 and 1 in Example 5 are failed. We can obtain three polynomials*

$$s_j(x) = s_{0,j} + s_{1,j}x + s_{2,j}x^2 + s_{3,j}x^3 + s_{4,j}x^4 + s_{5,j}x^5 + s_{6,j}x^6 + s_{7,j}x^7 + s_{8,j}x^8,$$

for $j = 2, 3, 4$. By subtracting $s_2(x)$ from each of $s_3(x)$ and $s_4(x)$, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_3(x) - s_2(x) & s_4(x) - x^2 s_2(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s_0(x) & s_1(x) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we can solve $s_0(x)$ as

$$s_0(x) = \frac{s_4(x) - x^2 s_2(x) - x(s_3(x) - s_2(x))}{1 - x},$$

by Lemma 11 and $s_1(x) = s_3(x) - s_2(x) - s_0(x)$.

V. MINIMUM SYMBOL DISTANCE

In this section, we consider the symbol distance of the proposed array codes, which is the number of symbols in which two codewords differ. Minimum symbol distance is a measure of the maximum number of failed symbols that the codes can tolerate.

Theorem 16. *Let D be the minimum symbol distance of an MDS array codes constructed by the coding method in Section II. Then, we have $D \geq d(r + 1)$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 28 in [2]. For completeness, we present the proof. Since the code is MDS, there are at least $r + 1$ non-zero columns, and since each non-zero column has weight at least d , we obtain $D \geq d(r + 1)$. \square

We first consider the MDS array codes with each entry of the encoding matrix $\mathbf{P}_{k \times r}$ being a power of x .

Theorem 17. *If each entry of $\mathbf{P}_{k \times r}$ is a power of x , then $D = d(r + 1)$.*

Proof. Let $k - 1$ out of the k data polynomials be zero and the remaining data polynomial be a non-zero polynomial in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ with weight d . Note that the multiplication of x^i and a polynomial can be implemented by cyclic-shifting i positions of the polynomial. By encoding the k data polynomials, we have that the obtained r parity polynomials are all in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(g(x), q, d)$ with weight d . Therefore, we obtain a code with symbol distance being $d(r + 1)$ and we can obtain the result by Theorem 16. \square

By Theorem 17, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEIP}(p, \tau, k, r, q, g(x))$ is $d(r + 1)$. Next, we consider the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$.

Lemma 18. *Let $s(x) = x^i(1 + x^{j\tau}) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, 2)$ with weight 2, where i, j are integers with $0 \leq i < p\tau$ and $1 \leq j < p \neq 2$. If $c(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$ such that $(1 + x^a)c(x) = (1 + x^b)s(x) \pmod{1 + x^{p\tau}}$, where $0 < a, b < \tau$ and $a \neq b$, then the weight of $c(x)$ is larger than 2.*

Proof. Note that $d > 1$ because $(1 + x^\tau) \mid f(x)$, where $f(x)$ is the generator polynomial of $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$. We assume that the weight of $c(x)$ is 2, we can always obtain a contradiction as follows and therefore the weight of $c(x)$ is larger than 2. Let $c(x) = x^\ell(1 + x^c)$ with $0 \leq \ell < p\tau$. Since $c(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$, $c \neq 0$ is a multiple of τ . From $(1 + x^a)c(x) = (1 + x^b)s(x)$, we have

$$x^{\ell-i}(1 + x^a + x^c + x^{a+c}) = 1 + x^b + x^{j\tau} + x^{b+j\tau}.$$

Let $e = \ell - i$. Then $0 \leq e < p\tau$. When $e = 0$, we have $\{0, a, c, a+c\} = \{0, b, j\tau, b+j\tau\} \pmod{p\tau}$. By the assumption, $a \neq b$, $a \neq 0$ and $a \neq j\tau$. Thus, $a = b + j\tau \pmod{p\tau}$. Since $b < \tau$ and $j < p$, we have $a = b + j\tau$ which is impossible due to $a < \tau$ and $j \geq 1$.

Next, we consider that $e \neq 0$ and we have $\{e, e+a, e+c, e+a+c\} = \{0, b, j\tau, b+j\tau\} \pmod{p\tau}$. Note that $\ell + c < p\tau$. Since $c \neq 0$ is a multiple of τ , we have $\ell < (p-1)\tau$. Assume that $e = 0 \pmod{p\tau}$. This is impossible since $e < p\tau$. Assume that $e+a = 0 \pmod{p\tau}$, i.e., $\ell - i + a = p\tau$. That is, $a - i = p\tau - \ell > \tau$ which contradicts to the fact $a < \tau$. Assume that $e+c = 0 \pmod{p\tau}$, i.e., $\ell - i + c = p\tau$. Since $\ell + c < p\tau$, it is impossible. Finally, assume that $e+a+c = 0 \pmod{p\tau}$. We have $\ell - i + a + c = p\tau$ due to $\ell + c < p\tau$ and $a - i < \tau$. Since $b < j\tau < b + j\tau$ and $e < e+a < e+c$, $e = b < \tau$, $e+a = j\tau < 2\tau$, and $e+c = b + j\tau$. Hence, $j = 1$ and $c = \tau$. Therefore, $a + b = p\tau - \tau = (p-1)\tau$ and $e + a = b + a = j\tau = \tau$. Since $p > 2$, we have contradiction. Therefore, the weight of $c(x)$ is larger than 2. \square

Theorem 19. *Suppose the codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ are MDS codes. When $r = 2$ and $\tau \leq \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor$, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ is $2(r+1) = 6$. When $r = 2$ and $\tau > k+1$, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ is 8. When $r = 3$, and $\tau \leq \lfloor \frac{k+2}{3} \rfloor$, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ is $2(r+1) = 8$.*

Proof. By Theorem 16, if we can find a codeword composed of $r+1$ non-zero polynomials each with weight 2 and $k-1$ zero polynomials, then the minimum symbol distance is $2(r+1)$.

When $r = 2$, by Theorem 16, each non-zero codeword contains at least three non-zero polynomials. Without loss of generality, suppose that the three non-zero polynomials are $s_\alpha(x)$, $s_\beta(x)$, $s_\gamma(x)$ and the other $k-1$ polynomials are zero, where $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < \gamma \leq k+1$. Suppose that the weight of $s_\alpha(x)$ is 2. According to Eq. (5), we obtain that

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_\alpha(x) \\ x^\alpha s_\alpha(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ x^\beta & x^\gamma \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} s_\beta(x) \\ s_\gamma(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we can compute that $(x^\beta + x^\gamma)s_\gamma(x) = (x^\alpha + x^\beta)s_\alpha(x)$ and $(x^\beta + x^\gamma)s_\beta(x) = (x^\alpha + x^\tau)s_\alpha(x)$. If $\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor \geq \tau$, we have $k+1 \geq 2\tau$. Let $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = (0, \tau, 2\tau)$ and $s_0(x) = 1+x^\tau \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, 2)$ with weight 2, then we can obtain $s_\tau(x) = x^\tau + x^{p\tau-\tau}$ and $s_{2\tau}(x) = 1 + x^{p\tau-\tau}$, which are both with weight 2. Therefore, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor \geq \tau, k, r = 2, q, 1)$ is $2(r+1) = 6$.

If $k+1 < \tau$, we have $0 < \gamma - \alpha \leq k+1 < \tau$ and $0 < \gamma - \beta \leq k < \tau$. Suppose that the weight of $s_\alpha(x)$ is 2, by Lemma 18, the weight of s_β is larger than 2. Since $s_\beta(x) \in \mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, 2)$ (the number of non-zero coefficients of $s_\beta(x)$ is an even number by Lemma 4) and the weight of $s_\beta(x)$ is larger than 2, the weight of $s_\beta(x)$ is no less than 4. Consider the polynomial $s_\gamma(x)$. Since the weight of $s_\gamma(x)$ is at least 2, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau > k+1, k, r = 2, q, 1)$ is at least 8. Let $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = (0, \beta, 2\beta)$ and $s_0 = 1+x^\tau$, where $\beta \leq (k+1)/2 < \tau$. Then we obtain $s_{2\beta}(x) = x^{p\tau-\beta} + x^{(p\tau-\beta+\tau) \bmod p\tau}$, which has weight 2. Since $1+x^{2\beta} = (1+x^\beta)^2$, we can obtain $s_\beta(x) = x^{p\tau-\beta}(1+x^\tau)(1+x^\beta)$, i.e., $s_\beta(x) = 1+x^\tau + x^{p\tau-\beta} + x^{(p\tau-\beta+\tau) \bmod p\tau}$, which is with weight 4. We can thus obtain that the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau > k+1, k, r = 2, q, 1)$ is 8.

When $r = 3$, by Theorem 16, we have at least four non-zero polynomials. Without loss of generality, suppose that the four non-zero polynomials are $s_\alpha(x), s_\beta(x), s_\gamma(x), s_\eta(x)$ and the other $k-1$ polynomials are zero, where $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < \gamma < \eta \leq k+2$. We assume that the weight of $s_\alpha(x)$ is 2. By Eq. (5), we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_\alpha(x) \\ x^\alpha s_\alpha(x) \\ x^{2\alpha} s_\alpha(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ x^\beta & x^\gamma & x^\eta \\ x^{2\beta} & x^{2\gamma} & x^{2\eta} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} s_\beta(x) \\ s_\gamma(x) \\ s_\eta(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\lfloor \frac{k+2}{3} \rfloor \geq \tau$, we have $k+2 \geq 3\tau$. Let $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta) = (0, \tau, 2\tau, 3\tau)$ and $s_0(x) = 1+x^\tau$, then we can compute $s_\tau(x), s_{2\tau}(x), s_{3\tau}(x)$ as follows,

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_\tau(x) \\ s_{2\tau}(x) \\ s_{3\tau}(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x^\tau + x^{p\tau-2\tau} \\ 1 + x^{p\tau-3\tau} \\ x^{p\tau-3\tau} + x^{p\tau-2\tau} \end{bmatrix},$$

which are all with weights 2. Therefore, the minimum symbol distance is $2(r+1) = 8$ when $\lfloor \frac{k+2}{3} \rfloor \geq \tau$ and $r = 3$. \square

By Theorem 19, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau > k+1, k, r = 2, q, 1)$ is larger than that of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau = 1, k, r = 2, q, 1)$, i.e., EBR codes with $r = 2$.

Theorem 20. *Suppose the codes $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ are MDS codes. When $r = 4$, $g(x) = 1$ and $\tau \leq \lfloor \frac{k+3}{4} \rfloor$, the minimum symbol distance of $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, 4, q, 1)$ is no larger than 12.*

Proof. It is sufficient to find a codeword such that the symbol distance is 12 when $r = 4$. As the code $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ is MDS, each codeword contains at least $r + 1$ non-zero polynomials that are in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$, with the weight d of each non-zero polynomial being a multiple of 2 by Lemma 4.

Consider that $r = 4$. Without loss of generality, suppose that the five non-zero polynomials are $s_\alpha(x), s_\beta(x), s_\gamma(x), s_\delta(x), s_\eta(x)$ and the other $k - 1$ polynomials are zero, where $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < \gamma < \delta < \eta \leq k + 3$. Suppose that the weight of $s_\alpha(x)$ is 2. According to Eq. (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} s_\alpha(x) & x^\alpha s_\alpha(x) & x^{2\alpha} s_\alpha(x) & x^{3\alpha} s_\alpha(x) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} s_\beta(x) & s_\gamma(x) & s_\delta(x) & s_\eta(x) \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^\beta & x^{2\beta} & x^{3\beta} \\ 1 & x^\gamma & x^{2\gamma} & x^{3\gamma} \\ 1 & x^\delta & x^{2\delta} & x^{3\delta} \\ 1 & x^\eta & x^{2\eta} & x^{3\eta} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau \leq \lfloor \frac{k+3}{4} \rfloor$, we have $4\tau \leq k + 3$. Let $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \eta) = (0, \tau, 2\tau, 3\tau, 4\tau)$ and $s_0(x) = 1 + x^\tau$, then we can take

$$\begin{aligned} s_\tau(x) &= (x^{(p-3)\tau} + x^{(p-2)\tau} + x^{(p-1)\tau} + 1)s_0(x) = x^\tau + x^{(p-3)\tau}, \\ s_{2\tau}(x) &= (x^{(p-5)\tau} + x^{(p-4)\tau} + x^{(p-2)\tau} + x^{(p-1)\tau})s_0(x) = x^{(p-5)\tau} + x^{(p-3)\tau} + x^{(p-2)\tau} + 1, \\ s_{3\tau}(x) &= (x^{(p-6)\tau} + x^{(p-5)\tau} + x^{(p-4)\tau} + x^{(p-3)\tau})s_0(x) = x^{(p-6)\tau} + x^{(p-2)\tau}, \\ s_{4\tau}(x) &= x^{(p-6)\tau} s_0(x) = x^{(p-6)\tau} + x^{(p-5)\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the minimum symbol distance is no larger than 12 when $r = 4$ and $\tau \leq \lfloor \frac{k+3}{4} \rfloor$. \square

Lemma 30 in [2] is a special case of Theorem 19 with $\tau = 1$ and $2 \leq r \leq 3$. To determine the minimum symbol distance of other parameters is an open problem.

VI. RECOVERY OF ERASED LINES OF SLOPE i IN $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ CODES

In this section, we assume $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ are MDS and want to show that $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ can recover some erased lines of slope i with $i = 0, 1, \dots, r - 1$. We first consider the code $\text{GEBR}(p, 1, k, r, q, 1)$ with $\tau = 1$, that is, an EBR code. Recall that the $k + r$ symbols in line

ℓ of slope i of the $m \times (k+r)$ codeword array are $s_{\ell,0}, s_{\ell-1,1}, s_{\ell-2,2}, \dots, s_{\ell-(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ for $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$.

Theorem 21. *The code $GEBR(p, 1, k, r, q, 1)$ can recover any r erased lines of slope i for $0 \leq i \leq r-1$, where $k+r \leq p$.*

Proof. When $\tau = 1$, we have $p \geq k+r$. Suppose that r lines e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r of slope 0 are erased, where $0 \leq e_1 < e_2 < \dots < e_r \leq p-1$. For $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$, we represent $k+r$ symbols $s_{\ell,0}, s_{\ell,1}, \dots, s_{\ell,k+r-1}$ by the polynomial

$$\bar{s}_\ell(x) = s_{\ell,0} + s_{\ell,1}x + \dots + s_{\ell,k+r-1}x^{k+r-1}$$

over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x^p)$. As

$$s_{\ell,0} + s_{\ell,1} + \dots + s_{\ell,k+r-1} = 0,$$

by Lemma 4, we have²

$$\bar{s}_\ell(x) \in \mathcal{C}_p(1, q, d) = \{(1+x)a(x) \bmod (1+x^p), a(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x^p)\}.$$

$\mathcal{C}_p(1, q, d)$ is an ideal of $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x^p)$ and is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1+x+\dots+x^{p-1})$ by Lemma 2. For $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+r-1$, the summation of the p symbols in column j is zero, we can thus compute

$$s_{e_1,j} + s_{e_2,j} + \dots + s_{e_r,j} = \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq e_2-e_1, \dots, e_r-e_1}^{p-1} s_{\ell+e_1,j},$$

i.e.,

$$\bar{s}_{e_1}(x) + \bar{s}_{e_2}(x) + \dots + \bar{s}_{e_r}(x) = \sum_{\ell=1, \ell \neq e_2-e_1, \dots, e_r-e_1}^{p-1} \bar{s}_{\ell+e_1}(x). \quad (31)$$

According to row ℓ of Eq. (5), we have

$$\bar{s}_0(x) + x^\ell \bar{s}_1(x) + x^{2\ell} \bar{s}_2(x) + \dots + x^{(p-1)\ell} \bar{s}_{p-1}(x) = 0,$$

where $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, r-1$, then we can compute

$$x^{e_1\ell} \bar{s}_{e_1}(x) + x^{e_2\ell} \bar{s}_{e_2}(x) + \dots + x^{e_r\ell} \bar{s}_{e_r}(x) = \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2-e_1, \dots, e_r-e_1}^{p-1} x^{(u+e_1)\ell} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x). \quad (32)$$

²we can set $s_{\ell,k+r}, s_{\ell,k+r+1}, \dots, s_{\ell,p-1}$ all zeros.

By Eq. (31) and Eq. (32), we can obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ x^{e_1} & x^{e_2} & \cdots & x^{e_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x^{e_1(r-1)} & x^{e_2(r-1)} & \cdots & x^{e_r(r-1)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \bar{s}_{e_1}(x) \\ \bar{s}_{e_2}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \bar{s}_{e_r}(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2-e_1, \dots, e_r-e_1}^{p-1} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2-e_1, \dots, e_r-e_1}^{p-1} x^{u+e_1} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2-e_1, \dots, e_r-e_1}^{p-1} x^{(u+e_1)(r-1)} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Since $1 + x^\ell$ is relatively prime to $1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1}$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$, by applying the isomorphism $\theta : \mathcal{C}_p(1, q, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1})$ in Lemma 2 for the above linear equations, we can show that the determinant of the above $r \times r$ Vandermonde matrix is invertible over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1})$ and we can compute $\bar{s}_{e_1}(x), \bar{s}_{e_2}(x), \dots, \bar{s}_{e_r}(x)$ by first solving the linear equations over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1 + x + \dots + x^{p-1})$ and then applying the inverse isomorphism θ^{-1} .

Next, we consider that r lines e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r of slope i are erased, where $0 \leq e_1 < e_2 < \dots < e_r \leq p-1$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, r-1$. For $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$, we represent the $k+r$ symbols $s_{\ell,0}, s_{\ell-1,1}, s_{\ell-2,2}, \dots, s_{\ell-i(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ in the line of slope i by the polynomial

$$\bar{s}_\ell(x) = s_{\ell,0} + s_{\ell-1,1}x + s_{\ell-2,2}x^2 + \dots + s_{\ell-i(k+r-1),k+r-1}x^{k+r-1},$$

which is in $\mathcal{C}_p(1, q, d)$, as the summation of the $k+r$ symbols is zero. According to row $i+1$ of Eq. (5), we have that the summation of the $k+r$ symbols in the line of slope $i+1$ is zero, i.e.,

$$s_{j,0} + s_{j-(i+1),1} + s_{j-2(i+1),2} + \dots + s_{j-(k+r-1)(i+1),k+r-1} = 0 \quad (34)$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$. Note that all the indices are taken modulo p in the proof and $s_{j,k+r}, s_{j,k+r+1}, \dots, s_{j,p-1}$ are all zero. Then, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{s}_0(x) + x\bar{s}_1(x) + x^2\bar{s}_2(x) + \dots + x^{p-1}\bar{s}_{p-1}(x) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} s_{-ij,j}x^j + x\left(\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} s_{1-ij,j}x^j\right) + x^2\left(\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} s_{2-ij,j}x^j\right) + \dots + x^{p-1}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} s_{p-1-ij,j}x^j\right) \\ &= (s_{0,0} + s_{p-1-i,1} + s_{p-2-2i,2} + \dots + s_{1-(p-1)i,p-1}) + (s_{-i,1} + s_{1,0} + s_{2-(p-1)i,p-1} + \dots + s_{p-1-2i,2})x \\ & \quad + (s_{-2i,2} + s_{1-i,1} + s_{2,0} + \dots + s_{p-1-3i,3})x^2 + \dots + \\ & \quad (s_{-i(p-1),p-1} + s_{1-i(p-2),p-2} + s_{2-i(p-3),p-3} + \dots + s_{p-1,0})x^{p-1} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation comes from Eq. (34). Similarly, according to row $i + \ell$ of Eq. (5), we can compute that

$$\bar{s}_0(x) + x^\ell \bar{s}_1(x) + x^{2\ell} \bar{s}_2(x) + \cdots + x^{(p-1)\ell} \bar{s}_{p-1}(x) = 0,$$

where $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, r - i - 1, -1, -2, \dots, -i$, then we can compute

$$x^{e_1 \ell} \bar{s}_{e_1}(x) + x^{e_2 \ell} \bar{s}_{e_2}(x) + \cdots + x^{e_r \ell} \bar{s}_{e_r}(x) = \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{(u+e_1)\ell} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x). \quad (35)$$

Since the summation of the p symbols in each column is zero, we have

$$\bar{s}_0(x) + \bar{s}_1(x) + \cdots + \bar{s}_{p-1}(x) = 0,$$

together with Eq. (35), we can obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ x^{e_1} & x^{e_2} & \cdots & x^{e_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x^{e_1(r-i-1)} & x^{e_2(r-i-1)} & \cdots & x^{e_r(r-i-1)} \\ x^{-e_1} & x^{-e_2} & \cdots & x^{-e_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x^{-e_1 i} & x^{-e_2 i} & \cdots & x^{-e_r i} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \bar{s}_{e_1}(x) \\ \bar{s}_{e_2}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \bar{s}_{e_r}(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{u+e_1} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{(u+e_1)(r-1)} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{-(u+e_1)} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{-(u+e_1)(r-1)} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r - 2$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ x^{-e_1} & x^{-e_2} & \cdots & x^{-e_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x^{-e_1(r-1)} & x^{-e_2(r-1)} & \cdots & x^{-e_r(r-1)} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \bar{s}_{e_1}(x) \\ \bar{s}_{e_2}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \bar{s}_{e_r}(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{u+e_1} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{(u+e_1)(r-1)} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{-(u+e_1)} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{u=1, u \neq e_2 - e_1, \dots, e_r - e_1}^{p-1} x^{-(u+e_1)(r-1)} \bar{s}_{u+e_1}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

when $i = r - 1$. If the most-left $r \times r$ matrices in Eq. (36) and Eq. (37) are invertible in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]/(1 + x + \cdots + x^{p-1})$, then we can compute the erased r polynomials. By multiplying

column ℓ of the $r \times r$ matrix in Eq. (36) by $x^{e_\ell i}$ for $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, r$, we can obtain the following $r \times r$ Vandermonde matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} x^{ie_1} & x^{ie_2} & \dots & x^{ie_r} \\ x^{(i+1)e_1} & x^{(i+1)e_2} & \dots & x^{(i+1)e_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x^{(r-1)e_1} & x^{(r-1)e_2} & \dots & x^{(r-1)e_r} \\ x^{(i-1)e_1} & x^{(i-1)e_2} & \dots & x^{(i-1)e_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x^{e_1} & x^{e_2} & \dots & x^{e_r} \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x^{e_1} & x^{e_2} & \dots & x^{e_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x^{(r-1)e_1} & x^{(r-1)e_2} & \dots & x^{(r-1)e_r} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By a similar argument to that just below Eq. (33), we can recover the erased r lines (r polynomials $\bar{s}_{e_1}(x), \bar{s}_{e_2}(x), \dots, \bar{s}_{e_r}(x)$) of slope i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$. \square

Theorem 40 in [2] is a special case of Theorem 21 with $r = 1, 2, 3$ and $k + r = p$.

Example 7. Consider the code $GEBR(p = 11, \tau = 1, k = 7, r = 4, q, 1)$. We have $k + r = 11$ polynomials

$$s_j(x) = s_{0,j} + s_{1,j}x + s_{2,j}x^2 + \dots + s_{10,j}x^{10},$$

where $j = 0, 1, \dots, 10$ and

$$s_{10,j} = s_{0,j} + s_{1,j} + s_{2,j} + \dots + s_{9,j}.$$

The parity-check matrix of the code is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 & x^4 & x^5 & x^6 & x^7 & x^8 & x^9 & x^{10} \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 & x^8 & x^{10} & x^{12} & x^{14} & x^{16} & x^{18} & x^{20} \\ 1 & x^3 & x^6 & x^9 & x^{12} & x^{15} & x^{18} & x^{21} & x^{24} & x^{27} & x^{30} \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to row ℓ of the parity-check matrix, we have

$$s_{i,0} + s_{i-\ell,1} + s_{i-2\ell,2} + s_{i-3\ell,3} + s_{i-4\ell,4} + s_{i-5\ell,5} + s_{i-6\ell,6} + s_{i-7\ell,7} + s_{i-8\ell,8} + s_{i-9\ell,9} + s_{i-10\ell,10} = 0, \quad (38)$$

where $\ell = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $i = 0, 1, \dots, 10$. Note that the indices are operated modulo $p = 11$ in the example. Suppose that the following 44 symbols in four lines of slope 1

$$\begin{aligned} & s_{0,0}, s_{10,1}, s_{9,2}, s_{8,3}, s_{7,4}, s_{6,5}, s_{5,6}, s_{4,7}, s_{3,8}, s_{2,9}, s_{1,10}, \\ & s_{1,0}, s_{0,1}, s_{10,2}, s_{9,3}, s_{8,4}, s_{7,5}, s_{6,6}, s_{5,7}, s_{4,8}, s_{3,9}, s_{2,10}, \\ & s_{2,0}, s_{1,1}, s_{0,2}, s_{10,3}, s_{9,4}, s_{8,5}, s_{7,6}, s_{6,7}, s_{5,8}, s_{4,9}, s_{3,10}, \\ & s_{3,0}, s_{2,1}, s_{1,2}, s_{0,3}, s_{10,4}, s_{9,5}, s_{8,6}, s_{7,7}, s_{6,8}, s_{5,9}, s_{4,10}, \end{aligned}$$

are erased. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, 10$, we represent the following 11 symbols

$$s_{i,0}, s_{i-1,1}, s_{i-2,2}, s_{i-3,3}, s_{i-4,4}, s_{i-5,5}, s_{i-6,6}, s_{i-7,7}, s_{i-8,8}, s_{i-9,9}, s_{i-10,10},$$

in the line of slope 1 by the polynomial

$$\bar{s}_i(x) = s_{i,0} + s_{i-1,1}x + s_{i-2,2}x^2 + \dots + s_{i-10,10}x^{10}. \quad (39)$$

By row $\ell = 1$ (the second row) of the parity-check matrix, we have that the summation of all the coefficients of $\bar{s}_i(x)$ is zero. Therefore, $\bar{s}_i(x) \in \mathcal{C}_p(1, q, d)$. We need to recover four polynomials $\bar{s}_0(x), \bar{s}_1(x), \bar{s}_2(x), \bar{s}_3(x)$ from the other 7 polynomials. By Eq. (38) with $\ell = 0$, we have

$$s_{i,0} + s_{i,1} + s_{i,2} + s_{i,3} + s_{i,4} + s_{i,5} + s_{i,6} + s_{i,7} + s_{i,8} + s_{i,9} + s_{i,10} = 0,$$

where $i = 0, 1, \dots, 10$. Recall that the polynomial $\bar{s}_i(x)$ is given in Eq. (39), we have

$$\bar{s}_0(x) + x^{10}\bar{s}_1(x) + x^9\bar{s}_2(x) + \dots + x\bar{s}_{10}(x) = 0.$$

When $\ell = 2, 3$, with the same argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{s}_0(x) + x\bar{s}_1(x) + x^2\bar{s}_2(x) + \dots + x^{10}\bar{s}_{10}(x) = 0, \\ & \bar{s}_0(x) + x^2\bar{s}_1(x) + x^4\bar{s}_2(x) + \dots + x^{20}\bar{s}_{10}(x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since the summation of the 11 symbols in each column is zero, we have

$$\bar{s}_0(x) + \bar{s}_1(x) + \bar{s}_2(x) + \dots + \bar{s}_{10}(x) = 0.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^{10} & x^9 & x^8 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \bar{s}_0(x) \\ \bar{s}_1(x) \\ \bar{s}_2(x) \\ \bar{s}_3(x) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} x^7 \bar{s}_4(x) + x^6 \bar{s}_5(x) + x^5 \bar{s}_6(x) + x^4 \bar{s}_7(x) + x^3 \bar{s}_8(x) + x^2 \bar{s}_9(x) + x \bar{s}_{10}(x) \\ \bar{s}_4(x) + \bar{s}_5(x) + \bar{s}_6(x) + \bar{s}_7(x) + \bar{s}_8(x) + \bar{s}_9(x) + \bar{s}_{10}(x) \\ x^4 \bar{s}_4(x) + x^5 \bar{s}_5(x) + x^6 \bar{s}_6(x) + x^7 \bar{s}_7(x) + x^8 \bar{s}_8(x) + x^9 \bar{s}_9(x) + x^{10} \bar{s}_{10}(x) \\ x^8 \bar{s}_4(x) + x^{10} \bar{s}_5(x) + x^{12} \bar{s}_6(x) + x^{14} \bar{s}_7(x) + x^{16} \bar{s}_8(x) + x^{18} \bar{s}_9(x) + x^{20} \bar{s}_{10}(x) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^{10} & x^9 & x^8 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{column } 1 \times x, \text{ column } 2 \times x^2, \text{ column } 3 \times x^3} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 \\ 1 & x^3 & x^6 & x^9 \end{bmatrix},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^{10} & x^9 & x^8 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 \end{bmatrix} &= x^6 \cdot \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^3 \\ 1 & x^2 & x^4 & x^6 \\ 1 & x^3 & x^6 & x^9 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= x^6(1+x)(1+x^2)(1+x^3)(x+x^2)(x+x^3)(x^2+x^3), \end{aligned}$$

which is relatively prime to $1+x+\dots+x^{10}$. Therefore, we can solve $\bar{s}_0(x), \bar{s}_1(x), \bar{s}_2(x), \bar{s}_3(x)$. Specifically, we can compute the four polynomials by Algorithm 1.

We can not employ the above method for the case of $\tau \geq 2$ in general, as the polynomial representing the $k+r$ erased symbols in the line of a slope is not in $\mathcal{C}_{p\tau}(1, q, d)$. We show in the next theorem that the code $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ can recover up to τ erased lines of a slope, when $\tau \geq 2$. Note that the erased τ lines are not arbitrary.

Theorem 22. *The code $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ can recover any τ erased lines e_1, e_2, \dots, e_τ of slope i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$, where $\tau \nmid (e_\alpha - e_\beta)$ for $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, 2, \dots, \tau\}$.*

Proof. Suppose that τ lines e_1, e_2, \dots, e_τ of slope i are erased, where $\tau \nmid (e_\alpha - e_\beta)$ for $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, 2, \dots, \tau\}$. For $\ell = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\tau$, the erased $k+r$ symbols in the line of slope i are $s_{\ell,0}, s_{\ell-i,1}, s_{\ell-2i,2}, \dots, s_{\ell-(k+r-1)i, k+r-1}$. By Lemma 4, we have

$$s_{\ell,j} = \sum_{\mu=1}^{p-1} s_{\mu\tau+\ell,j},$$

where $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, p\tau - 1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+r-1$. For any $\ell = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\tau$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+r-1$, the symbol $s_{\ell-j,i,j}$ is erased and the other $p-1$ symbols $s_{\ell-j+i\tau,j}, s_{\ell-j+2\tau,j}, \dots, s_{\ell-j+(p-1)\tau,j}$ are not erased, as $\tau \nmid (e_\alpha - e_\beta)$ for $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, 2, \dots, \tau\}$. Therefore, we can recover the erased symbol $s_{\ell-j,i,j}$ by

$$s_{\ell-j,i,j} = s_{\ell-j+i\tau,j} + s_{\ell-j+2\tau,j} + \dots + s_{\ell-j+(p-1)\tau,j}.$$

□

By Theorem 22, $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ can recover up to τ specified erased lines of slope i , for general parameter r . In the following, we consider the code with $r = 2$ and $\tau \geq 2$.

Theorem 23. *If $\tau \geq 2$ and $p\tau > 2(k+r-1)$, then the code $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r = 2, q, 1)$ can recover any two erased lines of slope i for $i = 0, 1$.*

Proof. Recall that $s_{i,j}$ is the entry in row i and column j of the array in $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, 2, q, 1)$, where $i = 0, 1, \dots, p\tau - 1$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+r-1$. Suppose that two lines of slope 0 are erased, i.e., rows α and β of the array are erased, where $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq p\tau - 1$. We need to recover $s_{\alpha,j}$ and $s_{\beta,j}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k+r-1$ from the other symbols.

As $r = 2$, according to Eq. (5), we have that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k+r-1} s_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \dots, p\tau - 1, \quad (40)$$

and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k+r-1} s_{i-j,j} = 0 \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \dots, p\tau - 1. \quad (41)$$

If $\tau \nmid (\beta - \alpha)$, then we can recover $s_{\alpha,j}$ and $s_{\beta,j}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\alpha,j} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\alpha,j}, \\ s_{\beta,j} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\beta,j}, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

according to Eq. (4).

Next, we assume that $\tau \mid (\beta - \alpha)$. By Eq. (41) with $i = \alpha$ and $i = \beta$, we have

$$s_{\alpha,0} + s_{\alpha-1,1} + \dots + s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),k+r-1} = 0,$$

$$s_{\beta,0} + s_{\beta-1,1} + \dots + s_{\beta-(k+r-1),k+r-1} = 0.$$

If $0 \leq \alpha - (k + r - 1)$, or $0 \geq \alpha - (k + r - 1)$ and $\beta < p\tau + \alpha - (k + r - 1)$, then we can recover $s_{\alpha,0}$ by

$$s_{\alpha,0} = s_{\alpha-1,1} + s_{\alpha-2,2} + \dots + s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),k+r-1}.$$

Otherwise, we have $\beta \geq p\tau + \alpha - (k + r - 1)$, then $\beta - (k + r - 1) \geq p\tau + \alpha - 2(k + r - 1) > \alpha$ by assumption and we can recover $s_{\beta,0}$ by

$$s_{\beta,0} = s_{\beta-1,1} + s_{\beta-2,2} + \dots + s_{\beta-(k+r-1),k+r-1}.$$

Once $s_{\alpha,0}$ or $s_{\beta,0}$ is known, we can recover $s_{\beta,0}$ or $s_{\alpha,0}$ by Eq. (42) with $j = 0$. By repeating the above procedure for $i = \alpha + 1, \alpha + 2, \dots, \alpha + k + r - 1$ and $i = \beta + 1, \beta + 2, \dots, \beta + k + r - 1$, we can recover all $2n$ symbols $s_{\alpha,j}$ and $s_{\beta,j}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k + r - 1$.

Next, we assume that two lines of slope 1 are erased, i.e., $s_{\alpha,0}, s_{\alpha-1,1}, \dots, s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ and $s_{\beta,0}, s_{\beta-1,1}, \dots, s_{\beta-(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ are erased. If $\tau \nmid (\beta - \alpha)$, we can recover $s_{\alpha-j,j}$ and $s_{\beta-j,j}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\alpha-j,j} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\alpha-j,j}, \\ s_{\beta-j,j} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\beta-j,j}, \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

within the column. When $\tau \mid (\beta - \alpha)$, we can recover the symbol $s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ by

$$s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),k+r-1} = s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),0} + s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),1} + \dots + s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),k+r-2}$$

if $\alpha - (k + r - 1) \geq 0$ or $\alpha - (k + r - 1) < 0$ and $p\tau + \alpha - (k + r - 1) > \beta$, or recover the symbol $s_{\beta,0}$ by

$$s_{\beta,0} = s_{\beta,1} + s_{\beta,2} + \dots + s_{\beta,k+r-1}$$

if $\beta > p\tau + \alpha - (k + r - 1)$. Once $s_{\alpha-(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ or $s_{\beta,0}$ is known, we can recover $s_{\beta-(k+r-1),k+r-1}$ or $s_{\alpha,0}$ by Eq. (42) with $j = k + r - 1$ or $j = 0$. Similarly, we can recover all $2n$ symbols in the erased two lines of slope 1. \square

The next theorem shows that $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r = 2, q, 1)$ can recover more than two erased lines of slope i , if τ is large.

Theorem 24. *If $\tau > k + r - 1$, then the code $GEBR(p, \tau, k, r = 2, q, 1)$ can recover any three erased lines of slope i for $i = 0, 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that rows α , β and γ of the array are erased, where $0 \leq \alpha < \beta < \gamma \leq p\tau - 1$. We want to recover $s_{\alpha,j}$, $s_{\beta,j}$ and $s_{\gamma,j}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k + r - 1$ from the other symbols.

According to Eq. (5), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{k+r-1} s_{i,j} &= 0 \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \dots, p\tau - 1, \\ \sum_{j=0}^{k+r-1} s_{i-j,j} &= 0 \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \dots, p\tau - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

If $\tau \nmid (\beta - \alpha)$ and $\tau \nmid (\gamma - \beta)$, then we can recover $s_{\alpha,j}$, $s_{\beta,j}$ and $s_{\gamma,j}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\alpha,j} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\alpha,j}, \\ s_{\beta,j} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\beta,j}, \\ s_{\gamma,j} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-1} s_{\ell\tau+\gamma,j}, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

according to Eq. (4). If $\tau \mid (\beta - \alpha)$ and $\tau \nmid (\gamma - \beta)$, then we can first recover $s_{\gamma,j}$ by Eq. (45) and then recover $s_{\alpha,j}$ and $s_{\beta,j}$ by Theorem 23. Similarly, we can recover the erased symbols if $\tau \nmid (\beta - \alpha)$ and $\tau \mid (\gamma - \beta)$.

In the following, we assume that $\tau \mid (\beta - \alpha)$ and $\tau \mid (\gamma - \beta)$. By Eq. (44), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\alpha+j,0} + \dots + s_{\alpha+1,j-1} + s_{\alpha,j} + s_{\alpha-1,j+1} + \dots + s_{\alpha-(k+r-1)+j,k+r-1} &= 0, \\ s_{\beta+j,0} + \dots + s_{\beta+1,j-1} + s_{\beta,j} + s_{\beta-1,j+1} + \dots + s_{\beta-(k+r-1)+j,k+r-1} &= 0, \\ s_{\gamma+j,0} + \dots + s_{\gamma+1,j-1} + s_{\gamma,j} + s_{\gamma-1,j+1} + \dots + s_{\gamma-(k+r-1)+j,k+r-1} &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $j = 0, 1, \dots, k + r - 1$. As $\tau > k + r - 1$, we have

$$\alpha + j < \beta, 0 < \alpha - (k + r - 1) + j \text{ or } 0 > \alpha - (k + r - 1) + j \text{ and } p\tau + \alpha - (k + r - 1) + j > \gamma,$$

$$\alpha < \beta - (k + r - 1) + j \text{ and } \gamma > \beta + j,$$

$$\beta < \gamma - (k + r - 1) + j \text{ and } p\tau + \alpha > \gamma + j,$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k + r - 1$ and we can recover $s_{\alpha,j}$, $s_{\beta,j}$, $s_{\gamma,j}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\alpha,j} &= s_{\alpha+j,0} + \dots + s_{\alpha+1,j-1} + s_{\alpha-1,j+1} + \dots + s_{\alpha-(k+r-1)+j,k+r-1}, \\ s_{\beta,j} &= s_{\beta+j,0} + \dots + s_{\beta+1,j-1} + s_{\beta-1,j+1} + \dots + s_{\beta-(k+r-1)+j,k+r-1}, \\ s_{\gamma,j} &= s_{\gamma+j,0} + \dots + s_{\gamma+1,j-1} + s_{\gamma-1,j+1} + \dots + s_{\gamma-(k+r-1)+j,k+r-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can recover all $2n$ symbols in any erased three lines of slope 1. \square

The recovery of erased lines of slope i in $\text{GEBR}(p, \tau, k, r, q, 1)$ for general parameters τ and r is an open problem and is a subject of future work.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose a coding method of array codes that has local repair property. We present the constructions of GEBR codes and GEIP codes based on the proposed coding method that can support much more parameters, compared with EBR codes and EIP codes, respectively. We propose an efficient LU decoding method for GEBR codes and GEIP codes based on the LU factorization of Vandermonde matrix. When τ is large, we show that GEBR codes have both larger minimum symbol distance and larger recovery ability of erased lines for some parameters, compared with EBR codes.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. You, H. Hou, Y. S. Han, P. P. C. Lee, and G. Han, "Generalized Expanded-Blaum-Roth Codes and Their Efficient Encoding/Decoding," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2020.
- [2] M. Blaum and S. R. Hetzler, "Array Codes with Local Properties," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 3675–3690, 2020.
- [3] D. A. Patterson, P. Chen, G. Gibson, and R. H. Katz, "Introduction to Redundant Arrays of Inexpensive Disks (RAID)," in *Digest of Papers. COMPCON Spring 89. Thirty-Fourth IEEE Computer Society International Conference: Intellectual Leverage*, 1989, pp. 112–117.
- [4] M. Blaum, J. Brady, J. Bruck, and Jai Menon, "EVENODD: An Efficient Scheme for Tolerating Double Disk Failures in RAID Architectures," *IEEE Trans. on Computers*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 192–202, 1995.
- [5] H. Hou and P. P. C. Lee, "A New Construction of EVENODD Codes With Lower Computational Complexity," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 1120–1123, 2018.
- [6] P. Corbett, B. English, A. Goel, T. Gracanac, S. Kleiman, J. Leong, and S. Sankar, "Row-Diagonal Parity for Double Disk Failure Correction," in *Proceedings of the 3rd USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies*. San Francisco, CA, 2004, pp. 1–14.
- [7] C. Huang and L. Xu, "STAR: An Efficient Coding Scheme for Correcting Triple Storage Node Failures," *IEEE Trans. on Computers*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 889–901, 2008.
- [8] H. Hou and P. P. C. Lee, "STAR+ Codes: Triple-Fault-Tolerant Codes with Asymptotically Optimal Updates and Efficient Encoding/Decoding," in *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW 2021)*, 2021.
- [9] H. Hou, P. P. C. Lee, Y. S. Han, and Y. Hu, "Triple-Fault-Tolerant Binary MDS Array Codes with Asymptotically Optimal Repair," in *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2017, pp. 839–843.
- [10] M. Blaum, "A Family of MDS Array Codes with Minimal Number of Encoding Operations," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2006.
- [11] M. Blaum, J. Brady, J. Bruck, J. Jai Menon, and V. Alexander, "The EVENODD Code and its Generalization: An Efficient Scheme for Tolerating Multiple Disk Failures in RAID Architectures," in *High Performance Mass Storage and Parallel I/O*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 2002, ch. 8, pp. 187–208.

- [12] M. Blaum and R. M. Roth, "New Array Codes for Multiple Phased Burst Correction," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 66–77, 1993.
- [13] H. Hou, K. W. Shum, M. Chen, and H. Li, "New MDS Array Code Correcting Multiple Disk Failures," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2014, pp. 2369–2374.
- [14] G. L. Feng, R. H. Deng, F. Bao, and J.-C. Shen, "New Efficient MDS Array Codes for RAID. Part II. Rabin-Like Codes for Tolerating Multiple (≥ 4) Disk Failures," *IEEE Trans. on Computers*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 1473–1483, 2005.
- [15] H. Hou and Y. S. Han, "A New Construction and an Efficient Decoding Method for Rabin-Like Codes," *IEEE Trans. Communications*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 521–533, 2018.
- [16] M. Blaum, V. Deenadhayalan, and S. Hetzler, "Expanded Blaum-Roth Codes With Efficient Encoding and Decoding Algorithms," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 954–957, 2019.
- [17] I. Tamo and A. Barg, "A Family of Optimal Locally Recoverable Codes," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4661–4676, 2014.
- [18] H. Hou, Y. S. Han, P. P. C. Lee, Y. Hu, and H. Li, "A New Design of Binary MDS Array Codes with Asymptotically Weak-Optimal Repair," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 7095C–7113, 2019.
- [19] H. Hou, Y. S. Han, P. P. C. Lee, and Q. Zhou, "New Regenerating Codes over Binary Cyclic Codes," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2019, pp. 216–220.
- [20] M. Blaum, J. Bruck, and A. Vardy, "MDS Array Codes with Independent Parity Symbols," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 529–542, 1996.
- [21] H. Hou, K. W. Shum., M. Chen, and H. Li, "BASIC Codes: Low-Complexity Regenerating Codes for Distributed Storage Systems," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3053–3069, 2016.
- [22] H. Hou, Y. S. Han, K. W. Shum, and H. Li, "A Unified Form of EVENODD and RDP Codes and Their Efficient Decoding," *IEEE Trans. Communications*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 5053–5066, 2018.
- [23] T. Itoh, "Characterization for a Family of Infinitely Many Irreducible Equally Spaced Polynomials," *Information Processing Letters*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 273–277, 1991.
- [24] S.-L. Yang, "On The LU factorization of The Vandermonde Matrix," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 146, no. 1, pp. 102–105, 2005.
- [25] H. Hou, K. W. Shum, and H. Li, "On the MDS Condition of Blaum-Bruck-Vardy Codes With Large Number Parity Columns," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 644–647, 2016.
- [26] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. Elsevier, 1977, vol. 16.