

Algebraic Geometric Rook Codes for Coded Distributed Computing

Gretchen L. Matthews & Pedro Soto

Department of Mathematics

Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 USA

{gmatthews, pedrosoto}@vt.edu

Abstract—We extend coded distributed computing over finite fields to allow the number of workers to be larger than the field size. We give codes that work for fully general matrix multiplication and show that in this case we serendipitously have that all functions can be computed in a distributed fault-tolerant fashion over finite fields. This generalizes previous results on the topic. We prove that the associated codes achieve a recovery threshold similar to the ones for characteristic zero fields but now with a factor that is proportional to the genus of the underlying function field. In particular, we have that the recovery threshold of these codes is proportional to the classical complexity of matrix multiplication by a factor of at most the genus.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider the problem of coded distributed computation over a finite field. Coded distributed computing and, in particular, coded distributed matrix multiplication has attracted a large surge of research interest as of late [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16]. In this paper we will extend the batch matrix multiplication problem in [10], [11], [8], [9], [17] to the case where there are more workers than there are elements in the field. We show that over finite fields, our rook codes can encode all functions. We use codes constructed from algebraic function fields. Prior works that use algebraic geometry codes include [18], [19], [20], and evaluation codes [21].

This paper is organized as follows. Section II gives an implicit construction that solves the general coded distributed matrix-matrix multiplication problem that is optimal to a factor of $2(g+1)$ where g is the genus of a particular function field, Section III gives an explicit construction that is good for small values, and Section IV gives a construction that computes any function which is optimal up to a factor of $\ell(g+1)$ where ℓ is the degree of the function and g is also the genus of a yet unspecified function field.

Background and Notation: Consider a function field F of genus g over a finite field \mathbb{F} . The set of places of F is denoted by \mathbb{P}_F . The divisor of a nonzero rational function $f \in F$ is $(f) = (f)_0 - (f)_\infty$ where $(f)_0 := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}_F, v_P(f) > 0} v_P(f)P$ and $(f)_\infty := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}_F, v_P(f) > 0} v_P(f)P$ denote the zero and pole divisors of f and $v_P(f)$ denotes the discrete valuation of f at the place P .

Consider a divisor $G = \sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}_F} a_P P$ of F . Its degree is $\deg(G) := \sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}_F} a_P \deg(P)$, and its support is

$\text{supp}(G) := \{P \in \mathbb{P}_F : a_P \neq 0\}$. The Riemann-Roch space of G is $\mathcal{L}(G) := \{f : (f) \geq -G\} \cup \{0\}$, meaning $f \in \mathcal{L}(G)$ if and only if f has a zero of order at least $-a_P$ for each $P \in \text{supp}(G)$ with $a_P < 0$ and the only poles of f are at $P \in \text{supp}(G)$ with $a_P > 0$ and of pole order at most a_P . The dimension of the divisor G is $\ell(G) := \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{L}(G)$. If $\deg(G) > 2g - 2$, then according to the Riemann-Roch Theorem, $\ell(G) = \deg G + 1 - g$.

Given divisors G and $D := P_1 + \dots + P_n$ on F with disjoint support where each P_i is a rational place, the associated algebraic geometry code is $C(D, G) := \{(f(P_1), \dots, f(P_n)) : f \in \mathcal{L}(G)\}$. It is well known that $C(D, G)$ is an $[n, k, d]$ code over \mathbb{F} , with length n , dimension $k = \ell(G) - \ell(G - D)$ and minimum distance $d \geq n - \deg G$. Hence, if $2g - 2 < \deg(G) < n$, then $k = \deg(G) + 1 - g$. For additional details, see [22].

II. DIAGONAL ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRIC ROOK PRODUCT

A. Batch Matrix Multiplication

We will consider the following problem: given k pairs of matrices

$$A_1, B_1, \dots, A_k, B_k,$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{F}^{t_1 \times t_2}$ and $B_i \in \mathbb{F}^{t_2 \times t_3}$ for $i \in [k]$ and a field \mathbb{F} , compute the products

$$A_1 B_1, \dots, A_k B_k$$

in the distributed master worker topology in which the master node gives n worker nodes coded matrices of the form

$$\tilde{A}_w = \sum_{i \in [k]} \alpha_i^{(w)} A_i \in \mathbb{F}^{t_1 \times t_2}, \tilde{B}_w = \sum_{i \in [k]} \beta_i^{(w)} B_i \in \mathbb{F}^{t_2 \times t_3}$$

where $\alpha_i^{(w)} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $w \in [n]$ indexes over the worker nodes. We are concerned with the minimum number of worker nodes that need to return their values so that the master can recover the desired products. This will be formalized in Definition 1. Before we move on to constructing the actual codes, we will show that this batch matrix problem is actually the most general form of the distributed matrix multiplication problem since it implicitly solves the **general matrix-matrix** multiplication problem.

B. General Matrix-Matrix Multiplication

Given two matrices

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1} & \dots & A_{1,\zeta} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{\chi,1} & \dots & A_{\chi,\zeta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{1,1} & \dots & B_{1,v} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B_{\zeta,1} & \dots & B_{\zeta,v} \end{bmatrix},$$

with $A_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}^{t_1 \times t_2}$ and $B_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}^{t_2 \times t_3}$, we can take an optimal (χ, v, ζ) fast matrix multiplication tensor of rank r , i.e., for $t \in [r]$, take

$$\hat{A}_t = \sum_{i,j \in [\chi] \times [\zeta]} \gamma_{i,j}^{(t)} A_{i,j}, \quad \hat{B}_t = \sum_{i,j \in [\zeta] \times [v]} \delta_{i,j}^{(t)} B_{i,j},$$

and then $A_i, B_i := \hat{A}_i, \hat{B}_i$ as in [23], which shows that the general matrix-matrix multiplication problem reduces exactly to the batch matrix multiplication. It seems that computing the linear functions defined by γ, δ is an undesirable overhead, but one must compute the functions given by α, β anyways; in particular, one may compose the α, β and the γ, δ so that there is no overhead. The number r above is often called the tensor-rank or the bilinear complexity.

The primary goal of this paper is to generalize the main result of [23] (which only holds in true generality generally for characteristic zero) to more general cases over finite fields. This paper overcomes the major obstacle when the field is finite, namely the number of evaluation points (meaning the number of workers) or more generally, the length of the code.

C. Implicit Construction

Let F/\mathbb{F}_q be a function field of transcendence degree 1.

Definition 1. Given a divisor G on F , we say that $\mathcal{L}(G)$ is R -recoverable for a positive integer R if there exist functions $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{L}(G_1)$, $y_1, \dots, y_k \in \mathcal{L}(G_2)$ for some divisors G_1 and G_2 of F with $G = G_1 + G_2$ so that the values of $A_i B_i$ (i.e., the diagonal elements) can be recovered from any R columns of the product

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 y_1(P_1) & x_1 y_1(P_2) & \dots & x_1 y_1(P_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ x_1 y_k(P_1) & x_1 y_k(P_2) & \dots & x_1 y_k(P_n) \\ x_2 y_1(P_1) & x_2 y_1(P_2) & \dots & x_2 y_1(P_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ x_2 y_k(P_1) & x_2 y_k(P_2) & \dots & x_2 y_k(P_n) \\ x_k y_1(P_1) & x_k y_1(P_2) & \dots & x_k y_1(P_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ x_k y_k(P_1) & x_k y_k(P_2) & \dots & x_k y_k(P_n) \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

for some matrix

$$C = (A_1 B_1 \cdots A_1 B_k A_2 B_1 \cdots A_2 B_k \cdots A_k B_1 \cdots A_k B_k) \quad (2)$$

where $A_i B_j \in \mathbb{F}^{t_1 \times t_3}$ for all $i, j \in [k]$. In this case, we may say that G is R -recoverable.

Definition 2. Let G and $D = P_1 + \dots + P_n$ be divisors with disjoint supports on $F/\mathbb{F}_q(x)$. We call $\mathcal{C}(G, D)$ a (diagonal)

$[n, k]_q$ -**rook code** if there exist bases $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ for $\mathcal{L}(G_1)$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ for $\mathcal{L}(G_2)$ satisfying for all $i, j \in [k]$ and $l \in [n]$

$$P_l \notin \text{supp}(x_i y_j) \iff i = j = l \quad (3)$$

where G_1 and G_2 are divisors on $F/\mathbb{F}_q(x)$ such that $G = G_1 + G_2$.

Lemma 1. An $[n, k]_q$ rook code given by bases $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ satisfies the following generalization of the decodability condition of [17] for all i, j, k

$$(x_k) + (y_k) = (x_i) + (y_j) \iff k = i \wedge k = j.$$

Proof. The proof is immediate from the fact that $(x_i y_j) = (x_i) + (y_j)$. Thus, the two expressions have the same supports. \square

Remark 1. The term rook code is inspired by the name given to the codes in [17], since Lemma 1 shows that Definition 2 is a generalization of the decodability condition presented in [17]. They are equivalent up to code equivalence.

Lemma 2. If $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{L}(G_1)$ and $y_1, \dots, y_k \in \mathcal{L}(G_2)$ satisfy Equation 3 and $\text{supp}(G_1 + G_2) \cap \text{supp}(D) = \emptyset$, then $G_1 + G_2$ is R -recoverable for some $R \leq d(G)$.

Proof. Worker w will receive the values

$$\tilde{A}(P_w) = \sum_{i \in [k]} A_i x_i(P_w), \quad \tilde{B}(P_w) = \sum_{i \in [k]} B_i x_i(P_w).$$

The matrix consisting of their products will be exactly the matrix given by Equation 1. In particular, worker w will return

$$\tilde{C}(P_w) = \tilde{A}(P_w) \tilde{B}(P_w)$$

to the master node. The proof now follows from the fact that $n - \deg(G) \leq d$, where d denotes the minimum distance of $\mathcal{C}(D, G)$, is the maximum number of rational places needed to recover the k blocks of data $A_i B_i$ which is a subset of the indices in Equation 2. \square

D. Existence of Codes for All Fields and Numbers of Rational Places

Next, we demonstrate that diagonal rook codes exist over every field.

Theorem 1. Given a function field F/\mathbb{F}_q with at least n rational places, there exists an $[n, k]_q$ -rook code for any $k \in [n]$.

Proof. Fix an element $x \in F$ that is transcendental over \mathbb{F}_q and rational places P_1, \dots, P_k of F . By repeated application of the Approximation Theorem (see [22, Theorem 1.3.1] for instance), there exists some $a_1, \dots, a_k \in F$ such that

$$v_{P_i}(x - a_i) = 0$$

and

$$v_{P_j}(x - a_i) = 1$$

for $i \neq j$. Then the functions

$$x_i = y_i = \prod_{j \in [k] \setminus \{i\}} x - a_i.$$

satisfy Equation 3 by construction. \square

Remark 2. The proof of Theorem 1 suggests another possible generalization of the decodability condition of [17], namely,

$$v_{P_k}(x_k) + v_{P_k}(y_k) = v_{P_k}(x_i) + v_{P_k}(y_j) \iff k = i \wedge k = j.$$

E. A More Efficient Construction

For $i \in [k]$, let $r_i := \min \{\alpha \in H(P_i) : \alpha > 0\}$ where $H(P) = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N} : \ell(\alpha P) \neq \ell((\alpha - 1)P)\}$ is the Weierstrass semigroup of a rational place P . Then there exist functions z_i such that

$$\langle 1, z_i \rangle = \mathcal{L}(r_i P_i).$$

Then we define

$$x_i := \prod_{j \in [k] \setminus \{i\}} z_j^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

Our coding scheme will send matrices

$$\tilde{A}(P_w) = \sum_{i \in [k]} A_i x_i(P_w), \quad \tilde{B}(P_w) = \sum_{i \in [k]} B_i x_i(P_w)$$

to worker w . Let

$$b = \sum_{i \in [k]} r_i \deg(P_i).$$

Then we have that

$$\langle 1, x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle \subset \mathcal{L}(Q_1 + \dots + Q_k),$$

where $Q_i = (z_i^{-1})_\infty$ and $\deg(\sum_i Q_i) \leq b$. Assume further that there exist rational places P_{k+1}, \dots, P_{n+k} of F so that

$$\text{supp}(D) \cap \text{supp}(G) = \emptyset$$

where $G = Q_1 + \dots + Q_b$ and $D = P_{k+1} + \dots + P_{n+k}$. Then consider the code $\mathcal{C}(D, G)$.

Before proving that the previous construction is indeed a rook code we introduce the following measure of complexity which will turn out to (upper) bound the recovery threshold.

Definition 3. Given a place P of F/\mathbb{F}_q , the **min pole number** of P , denoted $\mu(P)$ as the smallest integer r such that there exists a non-constant $z \in F$ such that

$$\langle 1, z \rangle = \mathcal{L}(rP);$$

that is, the min pole number of P is the multiplicity of the Weierstrass semigroup of the place P . We define the (k^{th}) **min pole sum** as

$$\sigma_k(F) := \min \left\{ \sum_{i \in [k]} \mu(P_i) : \begin{array}{l} P_i \in \mathbb{P}_F, \deg(P_i) = 1, \\ P_i \neq P_j \ \forall i, j \in [k], \\ \text{with } i \neq j \end{array} \right\}.$$

Theorem 2. The functions x_i given in (4) satisfy Equation 3. The associated construction has recovery threshold given by

$$R = 2\sigma_k(F). \quad (5)$$

Proof. Since the P_i were chosen to be distinct and $\text{supp}(z_i^{-1})_0 = \text{supp}(z_i)_\infty = \{P_i\}$, we have that

$$\bigcup_{j \in [k] \setminus \{i\}} \text{supp}(z_j)_\infty = \bigcup_{j \in [k] \setminus \{i\}} \text{supp}(z_j^{-1})_0 = \text{supp}(x_i)_0$$

We have that

$$P_i \notin \text{supp}(z_j)_\infty,$$

for $i \neq j$ by construction. Therefore,

$$P_i \notin \bigcup_{j \in [k] \setminus \{i\}} \text{supp}(z_j)_\infty = \text{supp}(x_i)_0.$$

Similarly, we have that $P_\ell \in \text{supp}(z_j)_\infty$ for $\ell = j$ by construction; therefore,

$$P_\ell \in \bigcup_{j \in [k] \setminus \{i\}} \text{supp}(z_j)_\infty = \text{supp}(x_i)_0,$$

for any $\ell \in [k]$ such that $\ell \neq i$, by construction. Therefore, Equation 3 is satisfied. We then have that

$$b = \sum_{i \in [k]} r_i \deg(P_i) = \sigma_k(F),$$

for an optimal choice of P_1, \dots, P_k . \square

F. Analysis: Upper Bounds on the Recovery Threshold

The bound in Theorem 2 can be given a coarse upper bound as stated in the next result.

Theorem 3. The codes defined by Equation 4 have the following upper bound:

$$R(n, k, q) \leq (g_{n,q} + 1)k$$

where $g_{n,q}$ is the smallest genus of a function field over \mathbb{F}_q with at least $(g_{n,k} + 1)k + n$ rational places.

Proof. According to the Weierstrass Gap Theorem, for any rational place P of a function field F of genus g , $\mathbb{N} \setminus H(P) \subseteq [1, \dots, 2g - 1]$ and $|\mathbb{N} \setminus H(P)| = g$. Hence, $\mu(P) \leq g + 1$ and $\sigma_k(F) \leq (g + 1)k$ provided \mathbb{F} has at least k rational places. The result then follows from the fact that the scheme requires n reserved rational places. \square

Corollary 1. The recovery threshold R of a scheme that computes the corresponding general matrix-matrix coded distributed version satisfies the bound

$$\mathcal{T} \leq R \leq 2\sigma_{\mathcal{T}}(F) \leq (g_{n,q} + 1)\mathcal{T}.$$

In particular, if we take $\chi = \zeta = v = \tau$, then we have that the recovery threshold asymptotically bounded as

$$R = O(\sigma_{\tau^\omega}(F)) = O(g_{n,q}\tau^\omega),$$

where ω is the matrix multiplication exponent.

Proof. Repeating the arguments in [23] and Section II-B, the recovery threshold for batch matrix multiplication bounds the complexity of general matrix multiplication by a factor of two. \square

Remark 3. It is possible that the recovery threshold is far smaller than the genus. In particular, for hyperelliptic function fields we have that $\sigma_k(F) = 2k$. Future research would involve finding other families of curves where we can replace the genus bound on recovery threshold with the *gonality*.

III. ENTANGLED ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRIC ROOK PRODUCT

In order to separate the different constructions, we will call the rook codes from the previous section *diagonal rook codes* (diagonal codes for short) and the code from this section *entangled rook codes* (entangled codes for short). However, we will see in Section IV that diagonal rook codes can code the most general functions in a straightforward way when the field is finite. We will see that the difference between the two is that the diagonal codes implicitly encode matrix multiplication while the entangled codes attempt to do two things at once: 1) code the matrices and 2) be a fast matrix multiplication tensor. Diagonal codes, in contrast, simply take an already optimal fast matrix multiplication tensor and encode that as a batch matrix multiplication.

A. Entangled Codes Do Matrix-Matrix Multiplication Well for Small Cases

In the classic characteristic zero case, codes of this form achieve the naive cubic recovery threshold at best and thus it is unlikely they perform as well as the diagonal ones. However, for small values of k they do better. For example, using the entangled polynomial codes construction from [23], we get that for A a 2×2 matrix and B a 2×2 matrix, that the entangled polynomial codes have a recovery threshold of $9 = 2*2*2+2-1$ while the LCC [10] and CSA [11] constructions achieves a recovery threshold of $13 = 2*7-1$. For more explanation, please see [23].

B. Entangled Codes as an Explicit Construction

In the entangled rook code case, instead of implicitly giving the general matrix multiplication as a batch of $k = \mathcal{T}$ matrix multiplications, one directly looks for code that also performs fast matrix multiplication simultaneously. Since the implicit batch multiplication can already bring the recovery threshold to within a factor of $\sigma_K(F) \leq 2(g+1)$ (or just a factor of 2 in the case where \mathbb{F} is an infinite field, since one can use MDS-codes without running out of rational place), this entails trying to get the factor down beneath the diagonal rook codes.

For the entangled codes, we need to redefine what recovery and rook codes means.

Definition 4. Given $x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{\chi,\zeta} \in \mathcal{L}(G_1)$, $y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{\zeta,v} \in \mathcal{L}(G_2)$, and $x_{i,j}y_{k,\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(G_1 + G_2)$, we say that $\mathcal{L}(G_1 + G_2)$ is R -recoverable if the values of $\sum_{j \in \zeta} A_{i,j}B_{j,k}$ (i.e., the dot

products) can be recovered from any R columns of the result of

$$C \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,1}y_{1,1}(P_1) & x_{1,1}y_{1,1}(P_2) & \dots & x_{1,1}y_{1,1}(P_n) \\ x_{1,1}y_{1,2}(P_1) & x_{1,1}y_{1,2}(P_2) & \dots & x_{1,1}y_{1,2}(P_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{\chi,\zeta}y_{\zeta,v}(P_1) & x_{\chi,\zeta}y_{\zeta,v}(P_2) & \dots & x_{\chi,\zeta}y_{\zeta,v}(P_n) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$C = [A_{1,1}B_{1,1} \quad A_{1,1}B_{1,2} \quad \dots \quad A_{\chi,\zeta}B_{1,1} \quad \dots \quad A_{\chi,\zeta}B_{\zeta,v}].$$

Definition 5. Let $G = G_1 + G_2$ and $D = P_1 + \dots + P_n$. We call $\mathcal{C}(G, D)$ a $[n, k]_q$ -**entangled rook code**, if there are bases $x_{i,j}$ for $\mathcal{L}(G_1)$ and $y_{k,\ell}$ for $\mathcal{L}(G_2)$ such that,

$$(x_{i,j}y_{k,\ell}) = (x_{i',j'}y_{k',\ell'}) \iff j = k = j' = k'. \quad (6)$$

is satisfied.

Assume there is some r such that $\langle 1, z \rangle = \mathcal{L}(rP)$ for some rational places P . Then we define

$$x_{i,j} := (z^{v\zeta i + j})^{-1}, \quad y_{k,\ell} := (z^{\zeta\ell + \zeta - k})^{-1}$$

then we have that

$$(x_{i,j}y_{k,\ell})_0 = r((v\zeta i + j + \zeta\ell + \zeta - k)P_0).$$

It should be clear that only when $j = k$ do we have

$$(x_{i,j}y_{k,\ell})_0 = r_0(v\zeta i + \zeta\ell + \zeta)P_0,$$

and thus (after normalizing the $x_{i,j}$ and $y_{k,\ell}$) we have that the coefficient of $x_{i,k}y_{k,\ell}$ in the product $(\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j}x_{i,j})(\sum_{k,\ell} B_{k,\ell}y_{k,\ell})$ is equal to $\sum_k A_{i,k}B_{k,\ell}$. Thus we have an alternate coding scheme that achieves a cubic recovery threshold.

Remark 4. We postpone the analysis of the previous construction since it would asymptotically give a cubic recovery threshold (i.e., the complexity of naive matrix multiplication) up to a factor proportional to the genus. It is likely that one can extend the impossibility results from [17] that were proven using additive combinatorics to the case of the semigroup of only one point. The main intuition behind the diagonal design is to consider semigroups of many points, allowing for more elbow room in the construction so that such impossibility results do not hinder us.

IV. DIAGONAL ROOK CODES FOR TENSORS

A. Multi-linear Functions

By a **tensor**, T , we mean a function $T : V_1, \dots, V_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$

$$\begin{aligned} T(v_1, \dots, \alpha v_i + \beta w, \dots, v_\ell) \\ = \alpha T(v_1, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_\ell) + \beta T(v_1, \dots, w, \dots, v_\ell) \end{aligned}$$

for all i ; we call ℓ the order of the tensor. Given bases B_i for the V_i we can represent a tensor by the values T .

Definition 6. Given linear functions $w_i : V_i \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, we define the **rank-1 tensor** associated to (w_1, \dots, w_ℓ) as $w_1 w_2 \dots w_\ell(v_1, \dots, v_\ell) :=$

$$\prod_{i \in [\ell]} w_i(v_i) = [v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_\ell](v_1, \dots, v_\ell).$$

If $V_1 = \dots = V_\ell$, then we can further define the ℓ^{th} power of a linear form as the rank-1 tensor

$$v^\ell = v \cdots v.$$

Remark 5. For simplicity, we consider the case where $V_1 = \dots = V_\ell$.

B. Implicit Construction

Definition 7. Given $x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_k^{(i)} \in \mathcal{L}(G_i)$, and $\prod_{i \in [L]} x_{j_i}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{L}(G_1 + \dots + G_\ell)$ for all $(j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \in [k]^\ell$, we say that $\mathcal{L}(G_1 + \dots + G_\ell)$ is R -recoverable if the values of $w_i^\ell(v_1, \dots, v_\ell)$, i.e., the diagonal elements, can be recovered from any R columns of the result of the product of $C =$

$$\begin{bmatrix} w_1 \dots w_1 & w_1 \dots w_2 & \dots & w_k \dots w_1 & \dots & w_k \dots w_k \\ & & & & & (v_1, \dots, v_\ell) \end{bmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1^{(1)} \dots x_1^{(\ell)}(P_1) & x_1^{(1)} \dots x_1^{(\ell)}(P_2) & \dots & x_1^{(1)} \dots x_1^{(\ell)}(P_n) \\ x_1^{(1)} \dots x_2^{(\ell)}(P_1) & x_1^{(1)} \dots x_2^{(\ell)}(P_2) & \dots & x_1^{(1)} \dots x_2^{(\ell)}(P_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_k^{(1)} \dots x_k^{(\ell)}(P_1) & x_k^{(1)} \dots x_k^{(\ell)}(P_2) & \dots & x_k^{(1)} \dots x_k^{(\ell)}(P_n) \end{bmatrix}$$

Here, C is the result of applying all of the possible products $w_{i_1} \dots w_{i_\ell}$ to (v_1, \dots, v_ℓ) .

Definition 8. Let $G = G_1 + \cdots + G_\ell$ and $D = P_1 + \cdots + P_n$. We call $\mathcal{C}(G, D)$ a $[n, k]_q$ -**tensor rook code**, if there are bases $x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_k^{(i)} \in \mathcal{L}(G_i)$ such that

$$P_k \notin \text{supp}(x_{i_1}^{(1)} \dots x_{i_\ell}^{(\ell)}) \iff i_1 = \dots = i_\ell = k.$$

is satisfied.

Remark 6. Definition 8 seems to only encode the “symmetric” tensors. This is true for infinite fields but as we will see, over finite fields this models all possible functions, so that we don’t have to bother encoding more general tensors; thus, for simplicity, we only consider the symmetric case. However, it is straightforward to generalize the construction implied by Definition 8 for non-symmetric tensors.

C. True Generality Over Finite Fields

Definition 9. A tensor $T : V^\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is *symmetric* if

$$T(v_1, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_j, \dots, v_\ell) = T(v_1, \dots, v_j, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_\ell)$$

for all $i, j \in [l]$, and we call the **symmetric rank** the smallest number r such that there exists some $w_1, \dots, w_r \in V^*$ such that

$$T(v_1, \dots, v_\ell) = \sum_{i \in [r]} w_i^\ell(v_1, \dots, v_\ell).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Lee, M. Lam, R. Pedarsani, D. Papailiopoulos, and K. Ramchandran, "Speeding Up Distributed Machine Learning Using Codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, pp. 1514–1529, 2018.
- [2] Q. Yu, M. A. Maddah-Ali, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Polynomial codes: An optimal design for high-dimensional coded matrix multiplication," in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2017, p. 4406–4416.
- [3] S. Dutta, M. Fahim, F. Haddadpour, H. Jeong, V. Cadambe, and P. Grover, "On the optimal recovery threshold of coded matrix multiplication," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, pp. 278–301, 2020.
- [4] Q. Yu, M. A. Maddah-Ali, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Straggler mitigation in distributed matrix multiplication: Fundamental limits and optimal coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1920–1933, 2020.
- [5] S. Dutta, Z. Bai, H. Jeong, T. M. Low, and P. Grover, "A unified coded deep neural network training strategy based on generalized polydot codes," p. 1585–1589, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2018.8437852>
- [6] R. Tandon, Q. Lei, A. G. Dimakis, and N. Karampatziakis, "Gradient coding: Avoiding stragglers in distributed learning," in *ICML*, 2017, pp. 3368–3376.
- [7] P. J. Soto, I. Ilmer, H. Guan, and J. Li, "Lightweight projective derivative codes for compressed asynchronous gradient descent," in *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri, S. Jegelka, L. Song, C. Szepesvari, G. Niu, and S. Sabato, Eds., vol. 162. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022, pp. 20 444–20 458. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/soto22a.html>
- [8] P. Soto and J. Li, "Straggler-free coding for concurrent matrix multiplications," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2020, pp. 233–238.
- [9] P. Soto, X. Fan, A. Saldivia, and J. Li, "Rook coding for batch matrix multiplication," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, pp. 1–1, 2022.
- [10] Q. Yu, S. Li, N. Raviv, S. M. M. Kalan, M. Soltanolkotabi, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Lagrange coded computing: Optimal design for resiliency, security, and privacy," in *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 89. PMLR, 2019, pp. 1215–1225. [Online]. Available: <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v89/yu19b.html>
- [11] Z. Jia and S. A. Jafar, "Cross subspace alignment codes for coded distributed batch computation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2821–2846, 2021.
- [12] M. Fahim and V. R. Cadambe, "Numerically stable polynomially coded computing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2758–2785, 2021.
- [13] M. Soleymani, H. MahdaviFar, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Analog lagrange coded computing," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 283–295, 2021.
- [14] N. Raviv and D. A. Karpuk, "Private polynomial computation from lagrange encoding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 553–563, 2020.
- [15] Z. Chen, Z. Jia, Z. Wang, and S. A. Jafar, "Gcsa codes with noise alignment for secure coded multi-party batch matrix multiplication," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 306–316, 2021.
- [16] Z. Jia and S. A. Jafar, "On the capacity of secure distributed batch matrix multiplication," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 7420–7437, 2021.
- [17] K. Censor-Hillel, Y. Machino, and P. Soto, "Near-optimal fault tolerance for efficient batch matrix multiplication via an additive combinatorics lens," 2023.
- [18] A. Fidalgo-Díaz and U. Martínez-Peñas, "Distributed matrix multiplication with straggler tolerance using algebraic function fields," 2024.
- [19] O. Makkonen and C. Hollanti, "General framework for linear secure distributed matrix multiplication with byzantine servers," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [20] R. A. Machado, G. L. Matthews, and W. Santos, "Hera scheme: Secure distributed matrix multiplication via hermitian codes," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2023, pp. 1729–1734.
- [21] H. H. López, G. L. Matthews, and D. Valvo, "Secure matdot codes: a secure, distributed matrix multiplication scheme," in *2022 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2022, pp. 149–154.
- [22] H. Stichtenoth, *Algebraic Function Fields and Codes*, 2nd ed. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2008.
- [23] Q. Yu, M. A. Maddah-Ali, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Straggler mitigation in distributed matrix multiplication: Fundamental limits and optimal coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1920–1933, 2020.
- [24] J. Landsberg, *Geometry and Complexity Theory*, ser. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com/books?id=210yDwAAQBAJ>