

# A note on Efremenko's Locally Decodable Codes

Parikshit Gopalan  
MSR-Silicon Valley  
parik@microsoft.com

There have been three beautiful recent results on constructing short locally decodable codes or LDCs [Yek07, Rag07, Efr09], culminating in the construction of LDCs of subexponential length. The initial breakthrough was due to Yekhanin who constructed 3-query LDCs of sub-exponential length, assuming the existence of infinitely many Mersenne primes [Yek07]. Raghavendra presented a clean formulation of Yekhanin's codes in terms of group homomorphisms [Rag07]. Building on these works, Efremenko recently gave an elegant construction of 3-query LDCs which achieve sub-exponential length unconditionally [Efr09].

In this note, we observe that Efremenko's construction can be viewed in the framework of Reed-Muller codes: the code consists of a linear subspace of (multilinear) polynomials in  $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , evaluated at all points in  $(\mathbb{F}_q^*)^n$ . We stress that this is not a new construction, but just a different view of [Efr09]. In this view, the decoding algorithm is similar to traditional local decoders for Reed-Muller codes, where the decoder essentially shoots a line in a random direction and decodes along it (see for instance [STV01]). The difference is that the monomials which are used are not of low-degree, they are chosen according to a suitable set-system. Further, the lines for decoding are *multiplicative*, a notion we will define shortly.

**The Code Construction.** Let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be a finite field with  $q$  elements,  $\mathbb{F}_q^*$  its multiplicative group, and let  $m = |\mathbb{F}_q^*|$ . We think of  $q$  and  $m$  as constants (say 7 and 6 for concreteness). Given  $L \subset \mathbb{Z}_m$  and an integer  $x$ , we say  $x \in L \bmod m$  if  $x \bmod m \in L$ .

**Definition 1.** Let  $L \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_m \setminus \{0\}$ . A set system  $\mathcal{F}$  consisting of subsets of a universe  $[n]$  is said to be  $L$ -intersecting if the following conditions hold:

- For every set  $S \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $|S| \equiv 0 \pmod m$ .
- For every  $S \neq T \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $|S \cap T| \in L \bmod m$ .

If  $m$  is a prime power, then  $|\mathcal{F}|$  can be at most polynomial in  $n$  [Gop06]. For composite  $m$  with two or more prime factors, Grolmusz shows that  $|\mathcal{F}|$  can be super-polynomial in  $n$  [Gro00].

**Lemma 2.** *If  $m$  has  $t$  distinct prime factors, then there is an (explicit)  $L$ -intersecting family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $[n]$  such that  $\ell = |L| \leq 2^t - 1$  and  $f = |\mathcal{F}| \geq \exp\left(\frac{(\log n)^t}{(\log \log n)^{t-1}}\right)$ .*

We now describe the code  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

- **Message Space:** For each set  $S \in \mathcal{F}$ , define a monomial  $X_S = \prod_{i \in S} X_i$ . The messages in  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$  correspond to polynomials of the form  $P(X) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{F}} \lambda_S X_S$  where  $\lambda_S \in \mathbb{F}_q$ .

- **Encoding:** The encoding is the evaluation of the polynomial  $P$  at all points in  $(\mathbb{F}_q^*)^n$ .

It follows that  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is linear over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , it has dimension  $f$  and length  $(q-1)^n$ . We will give a local decoder for it with query complexity  $\ell+1$ .

**The Local Decoder.** Let  $\gamma$  be a generator of  $\mathbb{F}_q^*$ . Let  $B = \{\gamma^c | c \in L\} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^*$ . Note that  $1 \notin B$ . For a scalar  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , a vector  $a \in (\mathbb{F}_q^*)^n$ , and  $T \subset [n]$  let  $\lambda \odot_S a$  denote the vector obtained by multiplying co-ordinates of  $a$  in  $S$  by  $\lambda$  (and leaving the rest unchanged).

The following lemma is the key to decoding.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $S, T \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then for any  $i \geq 0$ ,*

- $X_S(\gamma^i \odot_S a) = X_S(a)$
- $X_T(\gamma^i \odot_S a) = \mu^i X_T(a)$  where  $\mu = \gamma^{|S \cap T|} \in B$ .

*Proof.* We prove the claim when  $i = 1$ , the case of general  $i$  follows by repeated application of this claim. It is easy to see that  $X_T(\gamma \odot_S a) = \gamma^{|S \cap T|} X_S(a)$ . If  $S = T$ , then  $|S \cap T| = |S| \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ , hence  $\gamma^{|S \cap T|} = 1$ . Whereas if  $S \neq T$ , then  $\gamma^{|S \cap T|} = \mu \in B$ .  $\square$

Let us define the *multiplicative line* through  $a \in (\mathbb{F}_q^*)^n$  in the direction  $S \subseteq [n]$  as the set of points  $\{a, \gamma \odot_S a, \gamma^2 \odot_S a, \dots\}$ . Lemma 3 says that  $X_S$  is the unique monomial that stays constant along this line. The decoder uses this to recover  $\lambda_S$ . We need the following claim from [Efr09]

**Claim 4.** *There exist  $c_0, \dots, c_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_q$  such that  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i = 1$  and  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i \mu^i = 0$  for  $\mu \in B$ .*

The  $c_i$ s are the coefficients of a univariate polynomial that vanishes on  $B$ , suitably rescaled.

We now state the decoding algorithm. The algorithm has query access to  $P$  and is given  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  as input. The goal is to return  $\lambda_S$ .

1. Pick  $a \in (\mathbb{F}_q^*)^n$  at random, query the values  $P(a), P(\gamma \odot_S a), \dots, P(\gamma^\ell \odot_S a)$ .
2. Return  $(\sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i P_i(\lambda^i \odot_S a)) \cdot (X_S(a))^{-1}$ .

In step 2, the algorithm needs to compute  $X_S(a)^{-1}$ , which is easy given  $S$  and  $a$ .

**Theorem 5.** *The Decoding Algorithm returns the coefficient  $\lambda_S$ .*

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i P_i(\gamma^i \odot_S a) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{F}} \lambda_T X_T(\gamma^i \odot_S a) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{F}} \lambda_T \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i X_T(\gamma^i \odot_S a) \\ &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{F}; T \neq S} \lambda_T \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i \mu^i X_T(a) + \lambda_S \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} c_i X_S(a) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{F}; T \neq S} \lambda_T X_T(a) \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i \mu^i + \lambda_S X_S(a) \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} c_i \\ &= \lambda_S X_S(a) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where Equation 1 uses Lemma 3, and Equation 2 uses Claim 4. We note that  $\mu = \gamma^{|S \cap T|}$  in Equation 1 depends on the monomial  $T$ , but we suppress this for notational clarity.  $\square$

With Grolmusz’s construction, the code  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$  gives encoding length  $(q-1)^n$ , dimension  $f = n^\omega(1)$  and query complexity  $2^t$ . Put differently, messages of length  $k$  are encoded by codewords of length  $\exp(\exp(O((\log k)^{\frac{1}{t}}(\log \log k)^{1-\frac{1}{t}})))$ , which can be decoded using  $2^t$  queries.

**Summary.** A better construction of set-systems with restricted intersections will give LDCs with better parameters. The set-system construction due to Grolmusz in turn uses low-degree polynomials representing the OR function on  $\{0,1\}^n$  modulo composites, which were discovered by Barrington *et al.* [BBR94]. These polynomials have now found diverse combinatorial applications; LDCs, set-systems and Ramsey graphs to name a few, yet there is an exponential gap in the known degree bounds for these polynomials [Gop06]. There is also no strong evidence for what the right bound should be. We pose closing this gap as a natural open question.

**Acknowledgments.** I thank Venkatesan Guruswami, Prasad Raghavendra, Sergey Yekhanin and Klim Efremenko for useful discussions, and Sergey again for encouraging me to write this note.

## References

- [BBR94] David A. Barrington, Richard Beigel, and Steven Rudich. Representing Boolean functions as polynomials modulo composite numbers. *Computational Complexity*, 4:367–382, 1994. [3](#)
- [Efr09] Klim Efremenko. 3-query locally decodable codes of subexponential length. In *Proceedings of the 41<sup>st</sup> Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC’09)*, pages 39–44, 2009. [1](#), [2](#)
- [Gop06] Parikshit Gopalan. *Computing with Polynomials over Composites*. PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2006. [1](#), [3](#)
- [Gro00] Vince Grolmusz. Superpolynomial size set-systems with restricted intersections mod 6 and explicit Ramsey graphs. *Combinatorica*, 20(1):71–86, 2000. [1](#)
- [Rag07] Prasad Raghavendra. A note on Yekhanin’s locally decodable codes. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, TR07-016, 2007. [1](#)
- [STV01] Madhu Sudan, Luca Trevisan, and Salil P. Vadhan. Pseudorandom generators without the XOR lemma. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):236–266, 2001. [1](#)
- [Yek07] Sergey Yekhanin. Towards 3-query locally decodable codes of subexponential length. *Journal of ACM*, pages 1–16, 2007. [1](#)