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#### Abstract

The product code of two Reed-Solomon codes can be regarded as an evaluation codes of bivariate polynomials, whose degrees in each variable are bounded. We propose to decode these codes with a generalization of the Guruswami-Sudan interpolation-based list decoding algorithm. A relative decoding radius of $1-\sqrt[6]{4 R}$ is found, where is the rate of the product code. We also discuss a generalization to the $M$ variables base, where we get a figure of $1-\sqrt[M(M+1)]{R}$. Finally the Pellikaan and Wu decoding algorithm is used to improve the decdoing radius.


## 1 Introduction

The product code $C_{1} \otimes C_{2}$ of two codes $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ is the set of matrices whose every row belongs to $C_{1}$ and every column belong to $C_{2}$. In the case when $C_{1}$ is a Reed-Solomon code of dimension $k_{1}$, minimum distance $d_{1}=n-k_{1}+1$, defined as an evaluation code over the set $A=\left\{\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n_{1}}\right\} \subset \mathbb{F}_{q}$ and and $C_{2}$ a Reed-Solomon code of dimension $k_{2}$, minimum distance $d_{2}$, defined as an evaluation code over the set $B=\left\{\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n_{2}}\right\} \subset \mathbb{F}_{q}$, we get an evaluation code defined by the evaluation map:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ev}^{2}: \mathbb{F}_{q}[X, Y] & \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{F}_{q}\right)^{n_{1} n_{2}} \\
f(X, Y) & \mapsto\left(f\left(\alpha_{i}, \beta_{j}\right),(i, j) \in\left\{1 \ldots n_{1}\right\} \times\left\{1 \ldots n_{2}\right\}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

And the code is defined as

$$
C_{1} \otimes C_{2}=\operatorname{ev}^{2}(L)
$$

where

$$
L=\left\{f \in \mathbb{F}_{q}[X, Y], \operatorname{deg}_{X} f<k_{1} \text { and } \operatorname{deg}_{Y} f<k_{2}\right\} .
$$

[^0]This code has dimension $k_{1} k_{2}$ and minimum distance $d_{1} d_{2}$. A polynomial in $L$ has the form

$$
f=\sum_{i=0}^{k_{1}^{\prime}} \sum_{j=0}^{k_{2}^{\prime}} f_{i, j} X^{i} Y^{j}
$$

where $k_{1}^{\prime}=k_{1}-1$ and $k_{2}^{\prime}=k_{2}-1$. We also defines the rates $R_{1}=\frac{k_{1}}{n_{1}}$ and $R_{2}=\frac{k_{2}}{n_{2}}$, and $R=R_{1} R_{2}$ is the rate of the product code.

It is well known that the half the distance bound is not always attainable by iteratively decoding the component codes. For example, if the decoding algorithms for the row and column component codes are capable of correcting $\left(d_{1}-1\right) / 2$ and $\left(d_{2}-1\right) / 2$ errors respectively, and an error rectangular block of $\left(\left(d_{1}-1\right) / 2+1\right)\left(\left(d_{2}-1\right) / 2+1\right)$ occurs, iterative decoding fails although the number of errors is less than or equal to $\left(d_{1} d_{2}-1\right) / 2$. Thus it is natural to wonder wether the algebraic list-decoding algorithms [1] can be generalized to these codes. This is furthermore motivated by another multivariate generalization, which gives a very high decoding radius $[3,2]$

## 2 The algorithm and its analysis

We need this preliminary Theorem, stated withour proof, before introducing the algorithm.

Theorem 1 The number of zeros, counted with multiplicites, of a non zero polynomial $Q=Q(X, Y)$ over the set $\left\{\left(\alpha_{i}, \beta_{j}\right) ;(i, j) \in\left\{1 \ldots n_{1}\right\} \times\left\{1 \ldots n_{2}\right\}\right\}$ is bounded by wdeg ${ }_{n_{2}, n_{1}} Q$.
Let $y=\left(y_{i, j}\right)_{(i, j) \in\left\{1 \ldots n_{1}\right\} \times\left\{1 \ldots n_{2}\right\}}$, be the word to be decoded. We want to recover codewords at distance $t$, or equivalently find those $f=f(X, Y) \in L$ such that

$$
\mu=\#\left\{(i, j) \mid f\left(\alpha_{i}, \beta_{j}\right)=y_{i, j}\right\} \geq n_{1} n_{2}-t .
$$

Similarly to the Guruswami-Sudan decoding algorithm, we will look for a polynomial with one more variable $Y, Q=Q(X, Y, X)$ such that

1. $Q \neq 0$
2. $\operatorname{wdeg}_{n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{1} k_{2}^{\prime}+n_{2} k_{1}^{\prime}} Q<\Delta$, where $d$ is auxiliary, to be determined
3. $\operatorname{mult}\left(Q ;\left(\alpha_{i}, \beta_{j}, y_{i j}\right)\right)=m,(i, j) \in\left\{1 \ldots n_{1}\right\} \times\left\{1 \ldots n_{2}\right\}$, where $m$ a parameter of the algorithm. Note at this is linear algebra problem, whose unknowns are the cofficients of $Q$.

We will show that if $f$ is solution to the decoding problem, then $Q(X, Y, f)=0$. We need three Lemmas to analyse the algorithm.

Lemma 1 Let $D$ be the $\left(n_{2}, n_{1}\right)$-weighted degree of $Q(X, Y, f)$. If $m \mu>D$, then $Q(X, Y, f)=0$.

Proof Direct consequence of Theorem 1.
Lemma 2 The $\left(n_{2}, n_{1}\right)$-weighted degree of $Q(X, Y, f)$ is less than or equal to the $\left(n_{1}, n_{2}, k_{1}^{\prime} n_{2}+k_{2}^{\prime} n_{1}\right)$-weighted degree of $Q(X, Y, Z)$.

Lemma 3 Let $Q=Q(X, Y, Z)$ be of ( $\left.n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{1} k_{2}^{\prime}+n_{2} k_{1}^{\prime}\right)$-weighted degree less than $\Delta$, than the number $N(\Delta)$ of monomials of $Q$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(\Delta)<\frac{1}{6} \frac{\Delta^{3}}{n_{1} n_{2}\left(n_{1} k_{2}^{\prime}+n_{2} k_{1}^{\prime}\right)} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 2 Assume that the distance between $y=y_{i, j}$ and evf is less than or equal to $t$. Then one construct a polynomial $Q(X, Y, Z)$ such that $Q(X, Y, f)=$ 0 , provided that

$$
\begin{equation*}
t \leq\left\lfloor n_{1} n_{2}\left(1-\sqrt[3]{\left(R_{1}+R_{2}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{m}\right)\left(1+\frac{2}{m}\right)}\right)-\frac{1}{m}\right\rfloor \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof On one hand, to ensure that a non zero $Q(X, Y, Z)$, of $\left(n_{1}, n_{2}, n_{1} k_{2}^{\prime}+\right.$ $n_{2} k_{1}^{\prime}$ )-weighted degree $\Delta$, can be found we must have (more unknowns than equations)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{6} \frac{\Delta^{3}}{n_{1} n_{2}\left(n_{1} k_{2}^{\prime}+n_{2} k_{1}^{\prime}\right)}>n_{1} n_{2} \frac{m(m+1)(m+2)}{6} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other, to ensure that $Q(X, Y, f)$ is identically zero, one must have

$$
\begin{equation*}
m \mu=m\left(n_{1} n_{2}-t\right)>\Delta . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining these two inequalities gives (2).

## 3 The $M$ variables case

One can work out the case of $M$ variables. For simplicity, we assume that all the codes are the same, that is to say, we take $C$ to be the Reed-Solomon code with support $S=\left\{\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right\} \subset \mathbb{F}_{q}$, and dimension $k$, and we get

$$
C^{M}=C \otimes C \otimes \ldots C=\bigotimes_{i=1}^{M} C
$$

The corresponding evaluation map is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{ev}^{M}: \mathbb{F}_{q}\left[X_{1}, \ldots, X_{M}\right] & \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{F}_{q}\right)^{n^{M}} \\
f\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{M}\right) & \mapsto\left(f\left(x_{i_{1}}, \ldots, x_{i_{M}}\right)\right)_{\left(x_{i_{1}} \ldots, x_{i_{M}}\right) \in S^{m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

and the space $L$ of polynomials to evaluate is:

$$
L=\left\{f \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\left[X_{1}, \ldots, X_{M}\right], \operatorname{deg}_{X_{i}} f<k ; i \in\{1 \ldots m\}\right\} .
$$

We get

Theorem 3 Let the received word be $y=y_{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{M}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}^{n^{M}}$, and let $f=f\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{M}\right)$ be such that $d\left(e v^{M} f, y\right) \leq t$, then, provided that

$$
\frac{t}{n^{M}} \leq 1-\sqrt[M+1]{\frac{M^{M+1}}{M!} \cdot R \cdot\left(1+\frac{1}{m}\right) \cdots\left(1+\frac{M}{m}\right)}
$$

then one can construct a polynomial $Q\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{M}, Y\right)$ such that $Q\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}, f\right)=$ 0 .

## 4 Decoding with Pellikaan-Wu interpretation

Let us consider the $q$-ary Reed-Muller code, with $m$ variables, of order $r$, with $r<q$, denoted $\mathrm{RM}_{q}(r, m)$. It is defined by the same evaluation map $\mathrm{ev}^{M}$, but the space $L$ of polynomials to evaluate

$$
L=\left\{f \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\left[X_{1}, \ldots, X_{M}\right] ; \operatorname{deg} f \leq r\right\}
$$

where deg denotes the total degree.
We consider the decoding algorithm of Pellikaan and Wu [4], based on the interpretation of (shortened) Reed-Muller as cyclic codes. They show that it is possible to decode up to $q^{n}\left(1-\sqrt{\frac{r}{q}}\right)$

One can see that, when $\left\{\alpha_{1} \ldots, \alpha_{n_{1}}\right\}=\left\{\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n_{1}}\right\}=\mathbb{F}_{q}$, the code $C_{1} \otimes C_{2}$ is a subcode of $\operatorname{RM}\left(k_{1}+k_{2}, 2\right)$. Applying the Pellikaan-Wu algorithm, we get a decoding radius of

$$
t<q^{2}\left(1-\sqrt{R_{1}+R_{2}}\right)
$$

For the $M$-variable case, the code $C^{m}$ is a subcode of $\mathrm{RM}_{q}\left(R_{1} M, m\right)$, and we get a decoding radius of $t<q^{M}\left(1-\sqrt{M R_{1}}\right)$.
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