

COORDINATION AND DISCOORDINATION IN LINEAR ALGEBRA, LINEAR INFORMATION THEORY, AND CODED CACHING

JOEL FRIEDMAN AND AMIR TOOTOONI

ABSTRACT. In the first part of this paper we develop some theorems in linear algebra applicable to information theory when all random variables involved are linear functions of the individual bits of a source of independent bits.

We say that a collection of subspaces of a vector space are *coordinated* if the vector space has a basis such that each subspace is spanned by its intersection with the basis. We measure the failure of a collection of subspaces to be coordinated by an invariant that we call the *discoordination* of the family. We develop some foundational results regarding discoordination. In particular, these results give a number of new formulas involving three subspaces of a vector space.

We then apply a number of our results, along with a method of Tian in [Tia18], to obtain some new lower bounds in a special case of the basic coded caching problem. In terms of the usual notation for these problems, we show that for $N = 3$ documents and $K = 3$ caches, we have $6M + 5R \geq 11$ for a scheme that achieves the memory-rate pair (M, R) , assuming the scheme is linear.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Main Results in Linear Algebra	4
1.2. Additional Historical Context of Discoordination of Three Subspaces	6
1.3. Rough Description of Problems Regarded “Coded Caching”	7
1.4. Organization of the Rest of this Article	9
1.5. Acknowledgements	10
2. Basic Notation and Conventions Regarding Linear Algebra and Information Theory	10
2.1. Set Theoretic Notation	10
2.2. Sum, Direct Sum, and \oplus	10
2.3. Inequality Summation Principle	11
2.4. Basic Notation: \mathbb{F} -Universes, Sum, and Span	11
2.5. The Dimension Formula and Its Proof	12
2.6. Conventions Regarding Quotient Spaces and Relative Bases	12
2.7. Independent Subspaces and Decompositions	13
2.8. Basis Exchange and Independent Subspaces	16

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 94A15, 15A03 .

Key words and phrases. Linear algebra, information theory, coded caching.

Research supported in part by an NSERC grant.

Research supported in part by an NSERC grant.

2.9. A Review of Information Theory and the Definition of a Linear Random Variable	16
2.10. The Dimension Formula in Infinite Dimensions	21
3. Preliminary Remarks about Coordination and Discoordination, and Main Results	21
3.1. Coordination	21
3.2. Coordinate Subspaces	23
3.3. Discoordination and Minimizers	24
3.4. The Main Theorem Regarding Three Subspaces	24
3.5. The Discoordination Formula	27
3.6. Factorization and Discoordination	27
3.7. Addition Results about Coordination	28
4. Quasi-Increasing Sequences are Coordinated, and Applications	28
4.1. Statement of Some Coordination Theorems	28
4.2. Quasi-Increasing Sequences	29
4.3. Quasi-Increasing Sequences and Maximal Elements	31
4.4. Proof of Theorem 4.1	32
4.5. A Proof of Theorem 4.3 and a Partial Generalization	33
4.6. A Proof of Theorem 4.4	34
4.7. A Proof of Theorem 4.5	35
4.8. Strongly Quasi-Increasing Sequences	35
5. The Discoordination Formula, Minimizers, and Greedy Algorithms	36
5.1. Meet Numbers and Basic Greedy Considerations	37
5.2. The Greedy Algorithm for Minimizers	39
5.3. An Equivalent Discoordination Formula and Interpretation of the Greedy Algorithm	42
5.4. Decomposing Discoordination into “ j -Fold Intersection” Parts	44
6. Proof of the Main Theorems Regarding Three Subspaces	50
6.1. Theorem 3.6 in the Case When $S_2 = 0$	50
6.2. The Lifting Lemma	51
6.3. Proof of Theorem 3.6	52
6.4. Proof of Theorem 3.13	54
7. Coded Caching: Introduction and the Case $N = K = 3$	55
7.1. Introduction to Coded Caching and Informal Description	55
7.2. Formal Definition of a Classical and Linear Coded Caching Scheme	56
7.3. Preliminary Remarks	58
7.3.1. Concatenation of Caching Schemes	58
7.3.2. Limit Achievable and Lower (or “Outer”) Bounds	59
7.3.3. Easy Lower Bounds	59
7.3.4. Bounds on \mathbb{F} -Linear Caching Schemes	59
7.3.5. The Case $N = K = 2$	60
7.3.6. Recent Literature and Currently Open Problems	60
7.4. The Case $N = K = 3$ and The Methods of Tian	60
8. Symmetrization and Averaging	64
8.1. Symmetry and Averaging	64
8.2. Symmetric Coded Caching Schemes	66
8.3. A Lopsided Example: Average and Worst Case	66
9. The Z -Decomposition Lemma	67

9.1. Definitions and Statement of the Decomposition Lemma	67
9.2. Proof of the Decomposition Lemma	68
9.3. The Decomposition Lemma for Two and Four or More Subspaces	73
10. A New Coded Caching Scheme with $N = K = 3$: $(1/2, 5/3)$ is achievable	73
11. Coded Caching with $N = K = 3$: Two Discoordination Bounds	75
11.1. The Main Bounds for Linear Codes for $N = K = 3$	75
11.2. Proof of the First Discoordination Bound	76
11.3. Proof of the Second Discoordination Bound	78
12. A Hybrid Lower Bound Involving Tian’s Method	79
12.1. Notation for Linear Schemes for $N = 3$	79
12.2. Lower Bounds on Pure Schemes	80
12.3. Tian’s Method for Separated Schemes without Other Considerations	81
12.4. The Result $6M + 5R \geq 11$ for Separated Linear Schemes	82
12.5. Proof of Theorem 12.2	83
13. A Hybrid Bound Without Assuming Separability	87
13.1. Proof of Theorem 13.1	87
14. Concluding Remarks	91
References	92

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article we develop some tools in what might call *linear information theory*, by which we mean information theory that assumes that all random variables under discussion are linear functions of a source. There are a number of reasons to restrict a problem in information theory to the special case of linear random variables: first, in algorithms, it is often much simpler and more practical to work with linear functions than non-linear ones. Second, linear functions are often optimal or nearly optimal in terms of the objectives of a problem. Third, if we cannot completely solve a problem in information theory, a good starting point would be to solve it under the assumption of linearity, and then address the general case.

Theoretically, questions in information about linear random variables can be stated in terms of unknown matrices; however, in many applications, the usual tools of matrix analysis and linear algebra do not suffice. In this article we develop a new set of tools in linear algebra regarding what we call *coordinated* subspaces and the *discoordination* of a family of subspaces; we then give an application to linear information theory.

Some of the main tools we develop in linear algebra concern formulas involving three subspaces of a vector space, and their *discoordination*, an invariant that allows us to write many new formulas regarding the dimensions of subspaces obtained by taking the three subspaces and repeatedly taking sums and intersections. More generally, we develop a number of theorems regarding the *discoordination* of any number of subspaces of a vector space. We then apply these theorems to certain collections of three random variables to obtain some partial results on one instance of the problem of “coded caching,” a problem in information theory initiated by Maddah-Ali and Niesen [MAN14] that has received a lot of attention (see [YMAA19, Tia18, Sab20, TM22] and the many references therein).

The reader primarily interested in information theory can understand our linear algebra theorems in the following way: information theory often exploits the concept of the *mutual information* of two random variables, due to the many useful properties it satisfies. By contrast, the mutual information of three random variables is seldomly used to produce bounds in applications, due to the fact that it is much worse behaved: for example, it can be positive, zero, or negative. However, if three random variables are linear functions of a source, then we will show that there is a simple formula for their mutual information, namely as the dimension of their intersection minus their discoordination alluded to above. Our application to coded caching will not use this particular formula, but exploits related formulas involving three subspaces and their discoordination, along with some of the general theory of coordination and discoordination that we develop in this article.

We have written this article assuming a minimal background in linear algebra and information theory, to be readable to a wider audience. We hope to interest information theorists in the mathematical tools we introduce, which may have other applications. Also, we have mildly simplified the usual *coded caching* problem, so that it requires less background to formally state; we believe the coded caching problems deserve a wide mathematical audience and likely have applications beyond caching per se.

We emphasize that the linear algebra required to read this paper is no more than a typical one-term introductory “honors” (i.e., abstract) linear algebra course, as in [J94, Ax115]. However, we will briefly review this background, as well as briefly review information theory; most of these ideas are common in the literature, although terminology and notation differ. The second author’s MSc. thesis [TM22] contains some additional details and references.

We next describe some of the main results in this paper in rough terms; the formal mathematical definitions will appear in Section 2, the main results in linear algebra will be stated in Section 3, and we give a more precise statement of coded caching in Section 7.

We remark that the focus of this article is on three subspaces of a vector space, i.e., three linear random variables, and there are many more open questions regarding this situation and that of four or more subspaces or of random variables. Hence we believe that the study of coordination and discoordination will likely have more applications and merits further study.

During the revision of this article, Chao Tian pointed out to us: (1) the memory-rate tradeoff $(1/2, 5/3)$ of Chapter 10 has appeared in [GV18] (Corollary 1.1 there, page 4490, with $N = K = 3$ and $q = 2$), and (2) optimal memory-rate tradeoffs for the linear problem of coded-caching $N = K = 3$, which we study in Sections 7–13, have been determined by Cao and Xu, using computer-aided methods, in a preprint [CX20].

1.1. Main Results in Linear Algebra. The linear algebra we develop generalizes what is often called the “dimension formula,” that states that for vector subspaces A_1, A_2 of some finite-dimensional vector space, \mathcal{U} , we have

$$\dim(A_1 \cap A_2) = I(A_1; A_2),$$

where

$$I(A_1; A_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(A_1) + \dim(A_2) - \dim(A_1 + A_2),$$

where $A_1 + A_2$ denotes the sum (or the span) of A_1 and A_2 in the ambient vector space \mathcal{U} . Of course, the vector spaces $A_1 \cap A_2$ and $A_1 + A_2$ are not intrinsic to the isomorphism classes of A_1 and A_2 , but depends on the way they are related to each other in the ambient vector space, \mathcal{U} .

The reader familiar with information theory will recognize $I(A_1; A_2)$ as the *mutual information* of A_1, A_2 , when viewing them as random variables of a source that is the dual space of \mathcal{U} .

One of our main results in linear algebra concerns three subspaces $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subset \mathcal{U}$, and quantity

$$(1) \quad I(A_1; A_2; A_3) = \dim(A_1 + A_2 + A_3) - \dim(A_1 + A_2) - \dim(A_1 + A_3) \\ (2) \quad \quad \quad - \dim(A_2 + A_3) + \dim(A_1) + \dim(A_2) + \dim(A_3)$$

which, using the dimension formula, can also be written as

$$\dim(A_1 \cap A_2) + \dim(A_1 \cap A_3) - \dim(A_1 \cap (A_2 + A_3))$$

(typically $I(A_1; A_2; A_3)$ is called the *(three-way) mutual information* of A_1, A_2, A_3 in information theory). It is well known that in contrast to the dimension formula, $I(A_1; A_2; A_3)$ does not generally equal $\dim(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3)$. The equation does hold if the A_1, A_2, A_3 are *coordinated* in the sense that they have a *coordinating basis*, meaning a basis, X , of \mathcal{U} , such that for $i = 1, 2, 3$ the vectors $A_i \cap X$ span A_i ; in this case $I(A_1; A_2; A_3)$ equals $\dim(A_1, A_2, A_3)$, which is naively what “mutual information” is trying to capture. A simple example where the three subspace analog of the dimension formula fails to hold, i.e., where

$$I(A_1; A_2; A_3) \neq \dim(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3),$$

is for $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{F}^2$ for an arbitrary field, \mathbb{F} , and

$$(3) \quad A_1 = \text{Span}(e_1), \quad A_2 = \text{Span}(e_2), \quad A_3 = \text{Span}(e_1 + e_2),$$

where e_1, e_2 are the standard basis vectors; in this case $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3 = \{0\}$ but $I(A_1; A_2; A_3) = -1$. One fundamental result in this article is that (3) is essentially *the only* example where this formula fails: more precisely, if $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subset \mathcal{U}$ are three subspaces of a finite dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector space, \mathcal{U} , then we may decompose \mathcal{U} as a direct sum of subspaces \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 , through which A_1, A_2, A_3 factor (“factor” here is analogous to how a linear operator on a vector space factors through its generalized eigenspaces), such that

- (1) $A_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_1, A_2 \cap \mathcal{U}_1, A_3 \cap \mathcal{U}_1$ are coordinated, and
- (2) there is an isomorphism $\iota: \mathcal{U}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^2 \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$ for some $m \geq 0$, under which ι applied to the restriction of the A_1, A_2, A_3 equals
- (4) $\iota(A_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2) = \{e_1\} \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$, $\iota(A_2 \cap \mathcal{U}_2) = \{e_2\} \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$, $\iota(A_3 \cap \mathcal{U}_2) = \{e_1 + e_2\} \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$.

The integer m is uniquely determined, and we will prove that it equals the *discoordination* of A_1, A_2, A_3 , which we define for any number of subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m as

$$\text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})} \sum_{i=1}^m (\dim(A_i) - |X \cap A_i|),$$

where the minimum is taken over all X that are linearly independent subsets of \mathcal{U} , and we use $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ to denote the set of all such X . We easily see that

$$\text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) \geq 0,$$

with equality iff A_1, \dots, A_m are coordinated.

The above theory will imply that

$$I(A_1; A_2; A_3) = \dim(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3) - \text{DisCoord}(A_1, A_2, A_3) \leq \dim(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3),$$

and hence $I(A_1; A_2; A_3) = \dim(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3)$ iff A_1, A_2, A_3 are coordinated.

In this paper we will give some fundamental theorems regarding coordination and discoordination, many of which we use to study the discoordination of three subspaces.

We remark that discoordination is at the heart of the failure of a number of “would be” desirable properties in linear algebra, and it likely arises in many places in mathematics: for example, the first author has encountered this in the study of “2-independence,” a set of questions in linear algebra (that is equivalent to a question about sheaves on a graph with two vertices); it turns out that if all vector spaces involved are coordinated subspaces of some ambient space, then the questions regarding 2-independence are easy to answer; see [Izs15]. See also [Laf99, Laf01] as another place where the discoordination of three subspaces arises.

1.2. Additional Historical Context of Discoordination of Three Subspaces. Let us indicate the connection between the discoordination of three subspaces to “information inequalities” in information theory and to “representable matroids.”

We remark that certain well-known facts imply that for any subspaces A, B, C of a finite dimensional vector space, \mathcal{U} , the value of $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ has no bearing on what are commonly called “information inequalities” or (following Nick Pippenger) the “laws of information theory” for A, B, C (see Chapter 12 of the textbook [Yeu02] for definitions and references): to elaborate, these terms refer to any linear inequalities involving the dimensions of

$$A, B, C, A + B, A + C, B + C, A + B + C.$$

It is well-known [HRSV00], Theorem 3, page 453, that all such inequalities are generated by “nine basic inequalities” (equations (9) in [HRSV00]) that can be deduced by considering coordinated subspaces alone (see Figure 1, page 454, of [HRSV00]). By contrast, there are connections between $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ and these “nine basic inequalities:” namely, one these nine inequalities is

$$(5) \quad \dim(A) + \dim(A + B + C) \leq \dim(A + B) + \dim(A + C)$$

(and two others are obtained by permuting A, B, C). We will show, in Corollary 3.10 (item (6) there), that

$$(6) \quad \dim(A+B) + \dim(A+C) - \dim(A) - \dim(A+B+C) = \dim((B \cap C)/A) + \text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$$

We note that the left-hand-side of (6) is commonly written as $I(B; C|A)$ in the context of information theory (see, e.g., Section 1 of both [DFZ10, Dou14]). Hence $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ is related to “information inequalities.” Of course, the dimension formula implies that

$$\dim(A+B) + \dim(A+C) - \dim(A) - \dim(A+B+C) = \dim((A+B) \cap (A+C)) - \dim(A),$$

and hence the right- and left-hand-sides of (6) can be written as

$$(7) \quad \dim((B \cap C)/A) + \text{DisCoord}(A, B, C) = \dim((A+B) \cap (A+C)) - \dim(A)$$

The right-hand-side of (7) has the advantage of looking simpler than the left-hand-side. The advantage of the left-hand-side of (7), is that it is the sum of two more “elemental” terms, each of which is non-negative and has a simple meaning with the ideas we develop in this paper: $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ will be a focus of much of this paper, and $\dim((B + C)/A)$ corresponds to one piece in the “Venn diagram” of I, J, K in the case where $A = e_I, B = e_J, C = e_K$ are coordinated, namely the $(J \cap K) \setminus I$ piece, and so

$$\dim((B + C)/A) = \dim^{U/A}([B \cap C]_A) = |(J \cap K) \setminus I|.$$

See the discussion around Corollary 3.10 and Figure 1.

Discoordination has a similar—but perhaps more direct—connection to *Ingleton’s inequality* [HRSV00, Yeu02, Mat99, Kin11, NvdP18, DFZ10, Dou14]: Ingleton [Ing71] in Section 4 proves a theorem for *representable matroids*¹; the proof in [Ing71] uses the fact (see equations (2) on page 159) that

$$\dim((A + C) \cap (B + C)) \geq \dim((A \cap B) + C);$$

in our context, item (5) of our Corollary 3.10 shows that

$$\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C) = \dim((A + C) \cap (B + C)) - \dim((A \cap B) + C).$$

Hence $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ is directly related to Ingleton’s derivation of his inequality [Ing71].

We would be interested to know if there are further connections between discoordination (of three or more subspaces) and its properties, to the fields of “information inequalities” and “representable matroids.”

1.3. Rough Description of Problems Regarded “Coded Caching”. The second part of the paper shows how one can apply the discoordination of three subspaces and to new obtain results regarding a special case of the class of problems in information theory known collectively as *coded caching*. What makes the problems in this field so intriguing is that not only does it have practical applications, but it is quite an elegant mathematical puzzle that remains open in some very simple cases, despite an impressive number of different mathematical approaches to studying this problem (see the references mentioned above). Furthermore, we think coded caching will likely have applications beyond the original caching setting in the seminal work of Maddah-Ali and Niesen [MAN14]. Although we cannot do justice to the wide array of results in this field here (but see [YMAA19, Tia18, TM22]), the problem we study in this article requires only the original setting of [MAN14] and the results in [CFL16, Tia18]. Let us describe the problem and our results in rough terms.

A central server has access to N documents, each consisting of F bits of information. The server broadcasts information to K users (i.e., send the same message to all users). There are two phases where the server can broadcast information; during the second phase, for all $i = 1, \dots, K$, the i -th user will need to know the contents of exactly one document, say document number $d_i = 1, \dots, N$, but the value of the vector of requests $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_k)$, an arbitrary element of $\{1, \dots, N\}^k$, is unknown

¹Roughly speaking, a *representable matroid* [Ing71] refers to a matroid that can be realized by elements of a right-vector space over a division algebra (i.e., a skew field) Δ . A lot of recent literature, e.g., [Dou14, NvdP18] and the references therein, focuses on the case where Δ is a field. Note that Example 1, page 153 of [Ing71], i.e., the “non-Pappas matroid,” shows that some matroids are representable, but only when Δ is not a field (i.e., Δ is not commutative).

during the first phase. The first phase is a time of “low network usage,” where the server can broadcast all NF bits of information to all users; each user has their own “cache” that can store up to MF bits of information, i.e. some function of these NF bits, where M is a rational number less than N . Hence each user can store some—but not all—of the information contained in the N documents. Just before the second phase, the server and each user become aware of the value of \mathbf{d} . At this point—a time of “high network usage”—the server can broadcast at most RF bits of information where R is some rational number less than N . We are interested to know for which values of M, R, F, N, K there is a caching scheme, i.e., choice of values of the contents of the K caches (of at most MF bits each), such that for any $\mathbf{d} \in \{1, \dots, N\}^K$, the server can broadcast a message of at most RF bits that allows each user i to reconstruct document d_i . Specifically, we call (M, R) the *memory-rate pair* and say that it is *achievable* for a given N, K if for some F there exists a caching scheme and broadcasting scheme with the above parameters.

The reader who has never seen this problem before is encouraged to think about the case $N = K = 2$, settled in the seminal work of Maddah-Ali and Niesen [MAN14], where their solution involves a clever technique of combining information to obtain their bound $M + R \geq 3/2$ in their appendix, page 2866 there. The bounds we get for $N = K = 3$ are based on a variant of their technique.

At present the optimal value of R for the original coded caching problem is known to within a factor of roughly 2 for all N, K, M ; see [YMAA19]. There are a large number of variants of the original problem (see [Sab20]).

In this article we address only the case $N = K = 3$: this case was previously settled for $M \geq 1$ in the seminal work of Maddah-Ali and Niesen [MAN14], for $M \leq 1/3$ by [CFL16]; for $1/3 < M < 1$ the best lower bounds on R to date were given by Tian [Tia18] of

$$M + R \geq 2, \quad 2M + R \geq 8/3,$$

who also gave a rather ingenious argument to show that the meeting point of these two lower bounds, $(2/3, 4/3)$, cannot be achieved by caching schemes and broadcasting schemes that are all linear functions of the source of NF bits². Most of our work on coded caching is to use our theory of discoordination and generalize Tian’s argument to show that any linear coded caching scheme must satisfy

$$6M + 5R \geq 11.$$

We will also show that $(1/2, 5/3)$ is achievable. It therefore follows that:

- (1) Tian’s inequality $2M + R \geq 8/3$ is tight for $1/3 \leq M \leq 1/2$, and the problem remains open for $1/2 < M < 1$;
- (2) without the assumption of linearity, the best lower bounds are still Tian’s bounds $2M + R \geq 8/3$ for $1/2 < M \leq 2/3$, and $M + R \geq 2$ for $2/3 \leq M \leq 1$ (which meet at the point $(2/3, 4/3)$); and
- (3) assuming linearity, the best bounds are (Tian’s) $2M + R \geq 8/3$ for $1/2 \leq M \leq 7/12$, and our bound $6M + 5R \geq 11$ for $7/12 \leq M \leq 1$, which meet at the point $(M, R) = (7/12, 3/2)$.

In a bit more detail, we first review Tian’s method and show how it gives a lower bound of $3M + 2R \geq 5$ to the $(2/3, 4/3)$ caching scheme that Tian studied, under

²Later in this article we will explain, as does Tian, that Tian’s result on $(2/3, 4/3)$ assumes the accuracy of the results of a computer-aided floating point computation.

the assumption that Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are *separated* in the sense that they dependent on independent parts of each of W_1, W_2, W_3 . We next show that any Z_i of a linear caching scheme can be decomposed into a sum of copies of four basic schemes, and we show that one of these schemes leads to the achievability of $(M, R) = (1/2, 5/3)$. We next give a hybrid of Tian’s method and a direct computation to get a lower bound of $3M + 2R$ based on how many copies of each scheme is involved, assuming the scheme is separated. We get a second such lower bound, curiously also on $3M + 2R$, using our discoordination methods, which does not assume separation. (Visibly, each lower bound fails to give an optimal bound for one of the four schemes, and hence any blend of these lower bounds cannot be optimal.) Combining these bounds yields the lower bound

$$6M + 5R \geq 11$$

for separated linear schemes. We will also explain that we conjecture $4M + 3R \geq 7$, and explain a bit about what a scheme with $4M + 3R < 7$ would have to involve. Finally, in the last section we show how to give a (slightly weaker) version of our hybrid bound that holds without the assumption of separability; interestingly, we will make a different use of our decomposition theorem for three subspaces here. Although this bound that does not assume separability is slightly weaker (in the coefficient of part of one of the four schemes), we still get the bound $6M + 5R \geq 11$.

See also Tian’s work [Tia18] for results on a number of other results with small values of N and K , and [YMAA19] for a number of other recent results in this article and prior works.

1.4. Organization of the Rest of this Article. The first part of this article is devoted to proving theorems in linear algebra regarding coordination and discoordination of a collection of subspaces of an ambient vector space. In Section 2 we review some notation used throughout this article, especially that involving linear algebra. In Section 3 we give the basic definitions of coordination and discoordination, state all the main theorems we prove regarding these notions, and make some preliminary remarks about them. In Section 4 we give our main method to prove that a collection of subspaces is coordinated, and apply it to a number of such collections. In Section 5 we give a number of fundamental results regarding coordination and discoordination that we will need later. In Section 6 we use the previous subsection to prove our main theorem about three general subspaces of a vector space, and to prove some related results.

The second part of this article is devoted to studying a special case of coded caching. In Section 7 we review the problem of coded caching, and generalize a result of Tian [Tia18] in the case $N = K = 3$. In Section 8 we explain the technique of averaging, and—what is essentially equivalent—reducing the study of coded caching schemes to *symmetric* schemes. In Section 9 we prove that any cache in a coded caching scheme that is linear can be decomposed into a small number of special schemes. In Section 10 we take one of the special schemes in Section 9 and use it to show that the point $(1/2, 5/3)$ is achievable for $N = K = 3$. In Section 11 we prove two main lower bounds regarding the memory-rate trade-offs for linear coded caching schemes in the case $N = K = 3$ that involve the discoordination of a collection of three vector subspaces. In Section 12 we give another such lower bound by adapting an extremely clever method of Tian [Tia18] as part of the $N = K = 3$ analysis there, which we combine with a discoordination bound in

Section 11 to obtain and the inequality $6M + 5R \geq 11$ under the condition that the three caches are “separated,” in a sense we will define. In Section 13 we show that $6M + 5R \geq 11$ holds under the assumption of linearity alone; this involves a very different application of our main theorems on three subspaces to caching schemes that are not necessarily separated. We make some concluding remarks in Section 14.

1.5. Acknowledgements. The first author wishes to thank Seyed Ali Sabareli and Lutz Lampe for inviting him to Sabareli’s thesis defense and introducing him to their work and the literature on coded caching. He also thanks Alice Izsak and Lior Silberman for work on gapped sheaves that first brought to his attention the importance of coordination versus discoordination of subspaces. We also thank Luc Illusie for a biographical remark on discoordination of three subspaces, and to Sathish Gopalakrishnan for conversations.

We thank Chao Tian for bibliographical remarks added in the revision, including bringing to our attention the works of [GV18, CX20] and the suggestion to address the relationship of our methods to Ingleton’s inequality.

2. BASIC NOTATION AND CONVENTIONS REGARDING LINEAR ALGEBRA AND INFORMATION THEORY

In this section we will give some definitions and notions in linear algebra that we will need, and give a brief review of information theory. We refer to [J94, Ax15] for basic notions in linear algebra, quotient vector spaces, etc. We will briefly review these as needed.

2.1. Set Theoretic Notation. We use \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{R} to respectively denote the integers and the real numbers. We use \mathbb{N} to denote the natural numbers $\{1, 2, \dots\}$, and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we use $[n]$ to denote $\{1, \dots, n\}$. However, we alert the reader that square brackets will at times be used in the following notation: (1) $[a, b]$ denoting the closed real interval between a and b , where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$, and (2) $[u]$ and $[Y]$ as shorthand for $[u]_W = u + W$ and $[Y]_W = Y + W$, the image in the quotient vector space \mathcal{U}/W of a vector $u \in \mathcal{U}$ or a subset $Y \subset \mathcal{U}$ (see Subsection 2.6).

If A, B are sets we use $A \setminus B$ to denote the set difference of A and B

$$A \setminus B = \{a \in A \mid a \notin B\}.$$

The notation $A \subset B$ is used when A is a subset of a set, B , or a subspace of a vector space, B , which, in both cases, allows for $A = B$.

2.2. Sum, Direct Sum, and \oplus . In mathematics, \oplus usually denotes the direct sum, for example of vector spaces. However, in the coded caching literature, \oplus is usually used for addition in \mathbb{F}^n for the field $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. In order to avoid confusion, we will use $\underline{\oplus}$ for the direct sum of vector spaces: e.g., if U_1 and U_2 are vector spaces over a field \mathbb{F} , then $U_1 \underline{\oplus} U_2$ is their direct sum (also equal to their product), whose underlying set is the Cartesian product $U_1 \times U_2$ and where addition is given by component-wise addition.

The following convention will be very useful to discuss coded caching. Let \mathbb{F} be an arbitrary field, and let U_1, U_2 be finite-dimensional subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -vector space \mathcal{U} with $\dim(U_1) = \dim(U_2)$, and let $\nu: U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ be an isomorphism. Then we use $U_1 \oplus_\nu U_2$ to denote the subspace of \mathcal{U} consisting of all vectors $u_1 + \nu(u_1)$ with $u_1 \in U_1$. Often ν will be understood (or unimportant), in which case we

just write $U_1 \oplus U_2$. Hence $U_1 \oplus U_2$ always connotes that there is an understood isomorphism $U_1 \rightarrow U_2$. Our isomorphisms, such as those in Lemma 9.2, will be built by choosing an ordered basis b_1^1, \dots, b_1^k for U_1 and another b_2^1, \dots, b_2^k for U_2 , and taking $\nu: U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ to be the unique linear map $\nu(b_1^i) = b_2^i$.

Similarly, if U_1, U_2, U_3 are isomorphic subspaces of some \mathbb{F} -vector space, \mathcal{U} , and $\nu_i: U_1 \rightarrow U_i$ are isomorphisms for $i = 2, 3$, then $U_1 \oplus_{\nu_2} U_2 \oplus_{\nu_3} U_3$ denotes the subspace of \mathcal{U} given by all vectors $u_1 + \nu_2(u_1) + \nu_3(u_1)$ with $u_1 \in U_1$. We will use this notation in Lemma 9.2 and the discussion that follows.

2.3. Inequality Summation Principle. The following proposition is immediate; however, it will be helpful to signal the reader when we use it, so we name it the “Inequality Summation Principle.”

Proposition 2.1 (Inequality Summation Principle). *For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, say that for real numbers s_1, \dots, s_m and t_1, \dots, t_m we have*

$$(8) \quad s_1 \leq t_1, \dots, s_m \leq t_m.$$

Then

$$(9) \quad s_1 + \dots + s_m \leq t_1 + \dots + t_m,$$

and equality holds in (9) iff equality holds in all the inequalities in (8).

[Although this principle may seem trivial, it is the well-known idea behind *complementary slackness* in linear programming.]

2.4. Basic Notation: \mathbb{F} -Universes, Sum, and Span.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathbb{F} be an arbitrary field. By an \mathbb{F} -*universe*, \mathcal{U} , we mean we mean a finite-dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector space. By the term “ \mathbb{F} -universe,” without mention of \mathbb{F} , we understand that \mathbb{F} is an arbitrary field.

In this article the field \mathbb{F} and \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , are generally fixed or, at least, understood in context. Generally, \mathbb{F} is an arbitrary field for our theorems in linear algebra, and $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ in applications to information theory. At times we will work in more than one ambient universe \mathcal{U} , in which case for $S \subset \mathcal{U}$ a subspace we write $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(S)$ to emphasize \mathcal{U} .

At times we use results that hold when the ambient vector space \mathcal{U} can be infinite-dimensional; in this case we use the term “ \mathbb{F} -vector space,” and, similarly, we understand \mathbb{F} to be an arbitrary field unless explicitly mentioned otherwise. However, in this article we mostly limit ourselves to ambient vector spaces, \mathcal{U} , that are finite-dimensional.

The following notation is standard: if A, B are subsets of an \mathbb{F} -vector space, \mathcal{U} , the *sum of A and B* refers to the set

$$(10) \quad A + B = \{a + b \mid a \in A, b \in B\};$$

if $A, B \subset \mathcal{U}$ are subspaces, then we easily see that $A + B$ is also a subspace; we similarly define $A_1 + \dots + A_m$ for any subsets A_1, \dots, A_m of \mathcal{U} . If S_1, \dots, S_m are subsets of \mathcal{U} , we use

$$\text{Span}(S_1, \dots, S_m)$$

to denote the span of S_1, \dots, S_m ; if S_1, \dots, S_m are subspaces, then this span equals $S_1 + \dots + S_m$.

2.5. The Dimension Formula and Its Proof. Let us recall the *dimension formula* and its proof; for details, see, for example, [J94], Theorem 3 in Section 3.2 (page 49) (called there the “Dimension formula for subspaces”). We will make frequent use of this formula. Furthermore, the proof of this formula illustrates our main technique (of *quasi-increasing subspaces*, see Section 4) to show that certain subspaces of a universe are *coordinated* (we formally define this notion in the next section).

The “dimension formula” says that if $U_1, U_2 \subset \mathcal{U}$ are subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , then

$$(11) \quad \dim(U_1 \cap U_2) + \dim(U_1 + U_2) = \dim(U_1) + \dim(U_2).$$

The usual proof (see, e.g., [J94]) begins as follows:

- (1) let B_0 be a basis for $U_1 \cap U_2$;
- (2) extend B_0 (in an arbitrary fashion) to a basis $B_0 \cup B_1$ of U_1 ;
- (3) extend B_0 (in an arbitrary fashion) to a basis $B_0 \cup B_2$ of U_2 ;
- (4) we then verify that B_0, B_1, B_2 are disjoint and $B = B_0 \cup B_1 \cup B_2$ is a linearly independent set; we will see that this verification is equivalent to verifying that the sequence $U_1 \cap U_2, U_1, U_2$ is *quasi-increasing* in the language of our Section 4.

To finish the proof of the dimension theorem, we note that

$$\dim(U_1 + U_2) = |B_0| + |B_1| + |B_2|, \quad \dim(U_1 \cap U_2) = |B_0|, \quad \dim(U_i) = |B_0| + |B_i|$$

for $i = 1, 2$.

2.6. Conventions Regarding Quotient Spaces and Relative Bases. In this subsection, we recall the usual notion of a *quotient space* of vector spaces (see [Axl15, J94] for details); then we define the notion of a *relative basis*, which is a commonly used idea (but for which we know of no standard terminology); relative bases will feature prominently throughout this article.

Let \mathbb{F} be a field, U an \mathbb{F} -vector space, and $W \subset U$ a subspace. By a *W-coset* of U we mean any set of the form $u + W$ where $u \in U$ and $+$ is as in (10); it is convenient to denote $u + W$ by $[u]_W$, and we use U/W to denote the set of all W -cosets. (We easily see that $u_1 + W = u_2 + W$ iff $u_1 - u_2 \in W$, so that one can also view U/W as the set of equivalence classes under the equivalence $u_1 \sim u_2$ iff $u_1 - u_2 \in W$.) We easily check that the vector space structure on W gives rise to one on U/W , and that

$$\dim(U/W) = \dim(U) - \dim(W)$$

if U is finite-dimensional. If $Y \subset U$ is any subset of U , we use the notation $[Y]_W$ to denote the set of W -cosets $Y + W$, viewed as a subset of U/W ; we call $[Y]_W$ the *image of Y in U/W* ; hence if $u \in U$, then $[\{u\}]_W$ is just the one element set $[u]_W \in U/W$. At times we write $[u]$ and $[Y]$ for $[u]_W$ and $[Y]_W$ when W is understood.

If $W \subset U$, then a *complement of W in U* refers to any subspace $W' \subset U$ such that each vector in U can be written uniquely as a sum of an element in W plus one in W' . We easily see that this is equivalent to saying that the map $U \rightarrow U/W$ restricted to W' gives an isomorphism from $W' \rightarrow U/W$.

The following terminology is not standard but will be very useful in this article.

Definition 2.3. Let $W \subset U$ be vector spaces over some field, of finite dimensions m, n respectively. We say that a subset, $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{n-m}\}$, of U is a *basis of U relative to W* if the image, $[Y]_W = \{y_1 + W, \dots, y_{n-m} + W\}$ is a basis of U/W .

In the above, we easily see that if $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ is any basis for W , then $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_{n-m}\}$ is a basis of U relative to W iff $X \cup Y$ is a basis for U (which also implies that X and Y are disjoint). So while we may think of Y as what we add to X to complete the basis, the above definition shows that our choice of Y depends only on $W = \text{Span}(X)$. Moreover, we easily see that for each Y in Definition 2.3, i.e., for each Y that is a basis of U relative to W , we have that $W' = \text{Span}(Y)$ is a complement of W in U , and, conversely, if W' is any complement of W in U , and Y is any basis of W' , then Y is a basis for U relative to W .

At times, if $U, W \subset \mathcal{U}$ are two subspaces of a vector space \mathcal{U} , we alternatively use U/W to denote the subspace $[U]_W = U + W$ of \mathcal{U}/W .

If \mathcal{U} is an \mathbb{F} -universe, and $W \subset \mathcal{U}$ a subspace, part of our methods examines what happens to certain vector subspaces of \mathcal{U} when we consider their image in \mathcal{U}/W . We will often use the following remark: if $A \subset \mathcal{U}$ is another subspace, then $[A]_W$ is a subspace of \mathcal{U}/W , but (we easily check that) $[A]_W$, as a subspace of \mathcal{U}/W , is isomorphic to the \mathbb{F} -vector space $A/(A \cap W)$. Hence

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/W}([A]_W) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A \cap W).$$

2.7. Independent Subspaces and Decompositions. The notion of the linear independence of subspaces of a vector subspace is not a standard notion although likely occurs implicitly in many places in the literature, such as the decomposition of a vector space, V , into the generalized eigenspaces of an operator $V \rightarrow V$.

Consider subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m of an \mathbb{F} -universe, and for each $i \in [m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$, let X_i be a basis for A_i . Then each vector in $A_1 + \dots + A_m$ can be written as $a_1 + \dots + a_m$, and hence lies in the span of $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$. Therefore

$$\dim(A_1 + \dots + A_m) \leq |X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m| \leq |X_1| + \dots + |X_m|,$$

and hence

$$(12) \quad \dim(A_1 + \dots + A_m) \leq \dim(A_1) + \dots + \dim(A_m);$$

furthermore strict inequality holds in one of two cases: (1) the X_1, \dots, X_m are not distinct, or (2) some proper subset of $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ also spans $A_1 + \dots + A_m$. Both cases imply that for some $i \in [m]$, some $x \in X_i$ can be expressed as a linear combination in the vectors in $X_i \setminus \{x\}$ and the remaining X_j (i.e., such that $j \neq i$). Since the vectors in each of the bases are linearly independent, in this expression leads to an equation

$$a_1 + \dots + a_m = 0 \quad \text{where } a_j \in A_j \text{ for all } j \text{ and } a_i \neq 0.$$

Conversely, if equality holds in (12), then X_1, \dots, X_m are necessarily distinct and their union is a linearly independent set that spans $A_1 + \dots + A_m$; hence this union comprises a basis for $A_1 + \dots + A_m$. There are a number of equivalent ways of stating the condition of equality holding in (12), which are minor variants of these two conditions and which we state below (left as an easy exercise for the reader).

Definition 2.4. Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe \mathcal{U} . We say that A_1, \dots, A_m are *linearly independent* if any of the following conditions hold:

- (1) for all a_1, \dots, a_m with $a_i \in A_i$ for all $i \in [m]$, the equation

$$a_1 + \dots + a_m = 0$$

implies that $a_1 = \dots = a_m = 0$;

- (2) any $a \in A_1 + \dots + A_m$ has a unique representation as a sum $a = a_1 + \dots + a_m$ with $a_i \in A_i$ for all $i \in [m]$;
- (3) for any bases X_1, \dots, X_m of A_1, \dots, A_m respectively, the X_1, \dots, X_m are pairwise disjoint and $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ is a basis for $A_1 + \dots + A_m \subset \mathcal{U}$;
- (4) there exist bases X_1, \dots, X_m of A_1, \dots, A_m respectively, such that the X_1, \dots, X_m are pairwise disjoint and $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ is a basis for $A_1 + \dots + A_m \subset \mathcal{U}$; and
- (5)

$$(13) \quad \dim(A_1) + \dots + \dim(A_m) = \dim(A_1 + \dots + A_m).$$

We note that condition (5) makes use of the fact that \mathcal{U} is finite dimensional, whereas (1)–(4) above are equivalent when \mathcal{U} is any \mathbb{F} -vector space such that any subspace of \mathcal{U} has a basis³.

Example 2.5. If u_1, \dots, u_m are vectors in some vector space, we easily see that vectors are linearly independent iff all these vectors are nonzero and $\text{Span}(u_1), \dots, \text{Span}(u_m)$ are linearly independent subspaces. Hence the classical notion of linearly independent vectors can be described in terms of the linear independence of one-dimensional subspaces.

Example 2.6. If B_1, \dots, B_m is any partition of a set of linearly independent vectors in any vector space, then their spans are linearly independent subspaces.

Just as in Definition 2.4, we easily check that the three conditions in the following definition are equivalent.

Definition 2.7. By a *decomposition* of a subspace $U \subset \mathcal{U}$ of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , we mean subspaces $U_1, \dots, U_m \subset U$ such that any of the equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) each $u \in U$ can be written uniquely as $u_1 + \dots + u_m$ where $u_i \in U_i$ for all $i \in [m]$;
- (2) the subspaces U_1, \dots, U_m are independent and their span is all of U ;
- (3) the map $U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_m \rightarrow U$ taking (u_1, \dots, u_m) to $u_1 + \dots + u_m$ is an isomorphism.

Next we want to define what it means for a subspace $A \subset U$ to factor through a decomposition U_1, \dots, U_m of U . To do so, note that the first condition in Definition 2.4 implies that if U_1, \dots, U_m are any linearly independent subspaces, then so are $A \cap U_1, \dots, A \cap U_m$. Hence

$$(14) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A \cap U_i) \leq \dim(A).$$

We easily verify the conditions in the definition below are equivalent (and, again, leave these to the reader).

³The existence of a basis for any \mathbb{F} -vector space is typically assumed in linear algebra, although depending on the vector spaces, this assumption may require a set theoretic assumption such as the validity of transfinite induction.

Definition 2.8. Let U_1, \dots, U_m be a decomposition of a subspace U of some universe. We say that subspace $A \subset U$ *factors through* this decomposition if any of the equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) $A \cap U_1, \dots, A \cap U_m$ is a decomposition of A ;
- (2) any vector in A can be written as a sum of vectors in $A \cap U_1, \dots, A \cap U_m$ (which is necessarily unique);
- (3) the span of $A \cap U_1, \dots, A \cap U_m$ is all of A ;
- (4) we have

$$(15) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A \cap U_i) = \dim(A)$$

i.e., equality holds in (14).

If so, we refer to each of $A \cap U_1, \dots, A \cap U_m$ as a *factor* of A (in this decomposition).

The following proposition likely occurs in a number of places in the literature.

Proposition 2.9. *If $A, B \subset U$ factor through a decomposition U_1, \dots, U_m of a subspace, U , of some universe, then $A + B, A \cap B$ also factor through this decomposition.*

Proof. For any $i \in [m]$, the dimension formula applied to $A \cap U_i$ and $B \cap U_i$ implies that

$$\dim(A \cap U_i) + \dim(B \cap U_i) = \dim(A \cap B \cap U_i) + \dim((A \cap U_i) + (B \cap U_i)),$$

which is

$$\leq \dim(A \cap B \cap U_i) + \dim((A + B) \cap U_i)$$

since $A \cap U_i, B \cap U_i$ are both subspaces of $(A + B) \cap U_i$. Summing

$$\dim(A \cap U_i) + \dim(B \cap U_i) \leq \dim(A \cap B \cap U_i) + \dim((A + B) \cap U_i)$$

over all i , the left-hand-side is just $\dim(A) + \dim(B)$, and so the dimension formula implies that

$$(16) \quad \dim(A \cap B) + \dim(A + B) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A \cap B \cap U_i) + \sum_{i=1}^m \dim((A + B) \cap U_i).$$

But (14) implies that

$$(17) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A \cap B \cap U_i) \leq \dim(A \cap B),$$

$$(18) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \dim((A + B) \cap U_i) \leq \dim(A + B);$$

summing these inequalities and comparing with (16) shows that (17) and (18) must hold with equality. Hence $A + B$ and $A \cap B$ factor through the decomposition U_1, \dots, U_m . \square

We will have occasion to use the following almost immediate consequence.

Theorem 2.10. *Let U_1, \dots, U_m be a decomposition of a subspace U of some universe. Say that each of the subspaces $A_1, \dots, A_s \subset U$ factors through this decomposition. Then any subspace that can be written as an expression involving $+$ and \cap and the A_1, \dots, A_s (and parenthesis) factors through this decomposition as well.*

Similarly, “dim” applied to any such expression can be computed by the sum over $i \in [m]$ of “dim” applied the same expression on each factor, i.e., where each A_j replaced by $A_j \cap \mathcal{U}_i$; furthermore, the same holds for $\dim^{\mathcal{U}/B}([A]_B)$ where A, B are each such expressions.

Proof. The proof that each expression in $+, \cap, A_1, \dots, A_m$ (and parenthesis) factors through the decomposition follows immediately from Proposition 2.9, using induction on the *size* of the expression, meaning the number of \cap ’s and $+$ ’s in it. The fact that dim applied to such an expression is the sum of the same expression applied to each factor follows from (15). Finally, if A, B factor through such a decomposition, then we have

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/B}([A]_B) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A/(A \cap B)) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A \cap B)$$

and $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A)$ and $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A \cap B)$ can be computed as the sum of these dimensions over each factor of A and B ; hence $\dim^{\mathcal{U}/B}([A]_B) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A/(A \cap B))$ factors through the decomposition. (Alternatively one can write the expression displayed above as $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A + B) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(B)$ and reach the same conclusion.) \square

2.8. Basis Exchange and Independent Subspaces. In this article, we will use a number of variants of the basis exchange and basis extension principles. Let us state a few that we will need; they are easy exercises left to the reader in view of the usual Basis Exchange Lemma (e.g., Section 3.4 of [J94]).

Proposition 2.11. *Let U be a subspace of any \mathbb{F} -universe. Then*

- (1) *if $U = \text{Span}(S)$ for some subset, S , of \mathcal{U} , then some subset $S' \subset S$ is a basis for U ;*
- (2) *if $W \subset U$ is a subspace, and $S \subset U$ is a set such that $U = \text{Span}(W, S)$, then some subset $S' \subset S$ is a basis for U relative to W ;*
- (3) *if X is a basis of U , $X_0 \subset X$ a subset, and $Y \subset U$ such that Y is a linearly independent set, and $\text{Span}(X_0)$ and $\text{Span}(Y)$ are linearly independent, then there exists a basis for U consisting of $X_0 \cup Y$ plus a subset of vectors from $X \setminus X_0$; and*
- (4) *if X is a basis for U and Y a subset of linearly independent vectors in U , then there is a basis of U of the form $Y \cup X_0$ with $X_0 \subset X$ and Y, X_0 disjoint (this is the standard basis exchange principle).*

2.9. A Review of Information Theory and the Definition of a Linear Random Variable. In this subsection, we will review the notions in information theory that are most essential to this paper, such as the entropy of a random variable, and alert the reader to some particular assumptions and notation that we use. A more complete discussion of information theory can be found in a number of basic textbooks, such as [CT06]. We then motivate and discuss linear random variables, and our view of them as subspaces of the dual space of the source.

Throughout this subsection, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is the finite field of two elements. In this subsection we review the usual notion of entropy and explain what we mean by a *linear random variable* of an \mathbb{F} -vector space, S .

Let us first summarize this subsection, for the sake of the experts (who can likely read Definition 2.16 and skip most of the rest of this subsection). Classically, a random variable on a source (meaning, in this article, a finite probability space), S , is a map $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. We assume that S is an \mathbb{F} -vector space and—as a probability

space—is endowed with the uniform distribution. We say that Y is *classical linear random variable* if \mathcal{Y} can be given the structure of an \mathbb{F} -vector space so that Y is a linear transformation. In this case we will easily prove that Y is equivalent to a surjective map $S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^m$, where $m = \dim(\text{Image}(Y))$, which allows us to identify Y with an m -dimensional subspace, V , of the dual space, S^* , of S . Hence for fixed S we get a map

$$\{\text{classical linear random variables } Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\} \rightarrow \{\text{linear random variables on } S\},$$

where

$$\{\text{linear random variables on } S\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{subspaces, } V, \text{ of } \mathcal{U} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S^*\},$$

where equivalent classical random variables are mapped to the same subspace of \mathcal{U} ; for this and numerous other reasons, it is far simpler to work with subspaces of \mathcal{U} . Here are some further relations between a classical linear random variable, Y , and its associated $V \subset \mathcal{U} = S^*$: for one, $H_2(Y)$, the usual *entropy* of Y , is just $m = \dim(V)$. Finally, we will show that if Y_1, Y_2 are two classical linear random variables, and $V_1, V_2 \subset S^*$ the associated subsets of S^* then (1) Y_1 and Y_2 are equivalent iff $V_1 = V_2$, and (2) the subspace of S^* associated to the random variable (Y_1, Y_2) is just $V_1 + V_2$ (i.e., the span of V_1 and V_2); it follows that $I(Y_1; Y_2)$, the classical *mutual information of Y_1 and Y_2* , equals $\dim(V_1 \cap V_2)$. We remark that these ideas are implicit in a lot of the information theory literature, in particular in the way Maddah-Ali and Niesen [MAN14] and other papers on coded caching describe their coded caching schemes, all of which are linear. Hence this subsection simply gives a review of some parts of information theory in common use.

For the rest of this subsection we spell out the details for the statements in the previous paragraph. We remark that [HRSV00] also ties together linear algebra, Shannon entropy, and—in addition—Kolmogorov complexity.

Before reviewing classical information theory, let us give an example.

Example 2.12. Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and consider $S = \mathbb{F}^4$, with \oplus denoting addition (i.e., of components, modulo 2). If $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in S = \mathbb{F}^4$, then $Y_1 = x_1 \oplus x_2$ is an example of what we will call a “classical linear random variable.” Technically x_i are really maps $S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, i.e., elements of the dual space S^* , so $Y_1 \in S^*$. If $Y_2 = x_3$, then the random variable $Y_3 = (Y_1, Y_2)$ is the map taking $S = \mathbb{F}^4$ to \mathbb{F}^2 that takes x to $(x_1 \oplus x_2, x_3)$. Similarly the random variable $Y_4 = (x_2, x_3)$ is a two-dimensional random variable, and (Y_3, Y_4) , which is literally the random variable $S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^4$ taking s to

$$(x_1 \oplus x_2, x_3, x_2, x_3) = (x_1(s) \oplus x_2(s), x_3(s), x_2(s), x_3(s))$$

is equivalent to the random variable $Y_5 = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, and the entropy of Y_5 is $H_2(Y_5) = 3$ (not 4, since the map $S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^4$ above has a 3-dimensional image). Since the x_i are really elements of the dual space, S^* , of S , one can view the random variables here as a vector-valued random variable whose entries are elements of S^* ; the components of this vector span a subspace, V , of S^* , and the entropy of these vector-valued random variables is simply $\dim(V)$.

Let us now review some notions of classical information theory (see [CT06] for more details) and some assumptions we make, after which we define linear random variables.

In classical information theory, a *source*, S , is a finite set with a probability measure $P: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose values are positive and sum to one. (Hence we do not

allow $P(s) = 0$ for an $s \in S$.) A random variable is defined as a map $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ where \mathcal{Y} is a set. For each $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we define

$$(19) \quad p_y = \sum_{Y(s)=y} P(s),$$

and we define its (base 2) entropy to be

$$(20) \quad H(Y) = H_2(Y) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p_y \log_2(1/p_y),$$

where $p_y \log_2(1/p_y)$ is taken to be 0 if $p_y = 0$. We note that since (in this article) $P(s) > 0$ for all $s \in S$, for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ we have p_y in (19) is positive iff y lies in $\text{Image}(Y)$, the image of Y .

If Y is *uniformly distributed* in the sense that p_y is independent of y , it easily follows that $p_y = 1/|\mathcal{Y}|$, and so

$$(21) \quad H(Y) = \log_2(|\mathcal{Y}|).$$

Each random variable $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ induces a partition of S , namely

$$S = \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} Y^{-1}(y).$$

We say that another random variable $Y': S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ is *equivalent to Y* (respectively, a *refinement of Y*) if the partition that Y' induces on S is the same as (respectively, a refinement of) that induced by Y ; we easily see that this holds iff there is an isomorphism (respectively, morphism) $\mu: \text{Image}(Y') \rightarrow \text{Image}(Y)$ such that $Y = \mu \circ Y'$. We use the shorthand $Y' \Rightarrow Y$ (or say Y' implies Y) when Y' is a refinement of Y . We easily see if $Y' \Rightarrow Y$ and $Y \Rightarrow Y'$ then Y and Y' are equivalent.

(If Y_1, \dots, Y_m are equivalent, respectively, to Y'_1, \dots, Y'_m , then any expression involving the joint entropy, mutual information, conditional entropy, etc., involving the Y_1, \dots, Y_m equals the same expression when each Y_i is replaced with Y'_i .)

If Y_1, \dots, Y_m are random variables $Y_i: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_i$, then the *join of Y_1, \dots, Y_m* , denoted (Y_1, \dots, Y_m) , refers to the random variable $S \rightarrow (\mathcal{Y}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Y}_m)$. For random variables Y_1, Y_2 we define their mutual information

$$I(Y_1; Y_2) = H(Y_1) + H(Y_2) - H(Y_1, Y_2),$$

and it is known that $Y_1 \Rightarrow Y_3$ and $Y_2 \Rightarrow Y_3$ implies that $I(Y_1; Y_2) \geq H(Y_3)$. For the sake of discussing some results on coded caching, we will assume the notion of *conditional entropy* (see Section 2.2 of [CT06]) $H(Y|X)$ of random variables Y and X , which is usually defined as the expected value over $x \in \mathcal{X}$ of $H(Y|_x)$, where $Y|_x$ is the restriction of Y to $X^{-1}(x)$; one can show that $H(Y|X) = H(X, Y) - H(X)$. It turns out that $X \Rightarrow Y$ is equivalent to $H(Y|X) = 0$ (or, equivalently, $H(X, Y) = H(X)$).

If $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is any random variable, then Y is equivalent to the random variable where we discard any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $p_y = 0$; since we assume that each $s \in S$ has positive probability, this amounts to discarding all elements of \mathcal{Y} that are not in the image of Y . This amounts to replacing Y with the map it induces $S \rightarrow \text{Image}(Y)$, which is therefore a surjective map; we call this new random the *surjective version of Y* . If Y_1, Y_2 are surjective random variables, $Y_i: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_i$, then Y_1 is isomorphic to Y_2 iff there exists a bijection $\mu: \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$ with $Y_2 = \mu \circ Y_1$.

Definition 2.13. Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and let S be an \mathbb{F} -vector space. We view S as a probability space with the uniform distribution, i.e., each element occurs with probability $1/|S| = 1/2^n$ where $n = \dim(S)$. By a *classical linear random variable* we mean a linear map $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ where \mathcal{Y} is an \mathbb{F} -vector space.

Proposition 2.14. *To any classical linear random variable $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, there is an isomorphic random variable which is a quotient map $\tilde{Y}: S \rightarrow S/A$ where $A = \ker(Y) = \ker(\tilde{Y})$. Furthermore,*

$$(22) \quad H(Y) = H(\tilde{Y}) = \log_2(|S/A|) = \dim(S/A) = \dim(S) - \dim(A).$$

Proof. It is a standard fact (and easy to check) that any linear map $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ factors as

$$S \xrightarrow{f} S/\ker(Y) \xrightarrow{g} \mathcal{Y},$$

with f surjective and g injective (and g is uniquely determined). Note that Y is equivalent to its surjective form; hence it suffices to prove this proposition when Y is surjective. So assume that Y is surjective; then, since f is surjective, g is also surjective; in this case $g: S/A \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is (injective and surjective and hence) a bijection, and hence g gives an equivalence of the surjective form of Y and the map $\tilde{Y}: S \rightarrow S/A$ where $\ker(Y) = A$. Since \tilde{Y} is surjective and linear, it is uniform, and hence using (21) we have

$$H(Y) = H(\tilde{Y}) = \log_2(|S/A|)$$

and (22) follows. \square

We remark that if $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a classical linear random variable, then the image of Y is a subspace of \mathcal{Y} , and hence this image is isomorphic to \mathbb{F}^m for some m . Hence Y is equivalent to a surjective map $S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^m$, and $H_2(Y) = m$.

Proposition 2.15. *If $A_1, A_2 \subset S$ are two subsets of an \mathbb{F} -vector space, then the random variables $Y_i: S \rightarrow S/A_i$ are equivalent iff $A_1 = A_2$. In particular, each classical linear random variable $Y: S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is equivalent to a unique quotient map $S \rightarrow S/A$.*

Proof. Y_i partitions S into its A_i -cosets, one of which is A_i . Y_1 and Y_2 are equivalent iff they induce the same partition; since A_1, A_2 both contain the zero in S , if Y_1 and Y_2 are equivalent then $A_1 = A_2$. Conversely, if $A_1 = A_2$ then, of course, $S \rightarrow S/A_i$ are the same map and hence equivalent. \square

Recall that if $\mathcal{L}: V \rightarrow W$ is a linear map, then the map on dual spaces, $\mathcal{L}^*: W^* \rightarrow V^*$, has image equal to $(V/\ker(\mathcal{L}))^*$ viewed as “it sits” in V^* , i.e., viewed as the subspace of those elements of V^* that take $\ker(\mathcal{L})$ to zero. In particular, if $S \rightarrow S/A$ is a quotient map, then the image of the dual map is $(S/A)^*$ as it sits in S^* , i.e., the elements of S^* mapping all of A to zero.

Definition 2.16. Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and let S be an \mathbb{F} -vector space. By the *universe* associated to S we mean the dual space $\mathcal{U} = S^*$; by a *linear random variable* we mean a subspace $V \subset \mathcal{U}$, to which we associate the classical linear random variable $V_{\text{class}}: S \rightarrow S/A$ where A is the annihilator of V in S , i.e.,

$$A = \{s \in S \mid \forall \ell \in V, \ell(s) = 0\}.$$

Therefore, V equals the image of $(S/A)^*$ as it sits in S^* . We define the entropy $H_2(V)$ to be that of $H_2(V_{\text{class}})$. Conversely, to any classical linear random variable,

Y , we associate the unique linear random variable by setting $A = \ker(Y)$ (so that Y is equivalent to $S \rightarrow S/A$) and associating to Y the subspace of $V \subset S^*$ which is the image of $(S/A)^*$ as it sits in S^* .

In the above definition we have

$$H_2(V) = H_2(V_{\text{class}}) = \dim(S/A) = \dim((S/A)^*) = \dim(V).$$

Hence the entropy of V is just its dimension.

It will turn out to be far more convenient to think of a classical linear random variable as its associated linear random variable, a subspace of S^* .

The last thing to note is how joint random variables work in the above context, i.e., the linear case. If Y_1, Y_2 are two random variables, then their joint random variable (Y_1, Y_2) denotes the random variable that is the Cartesian product map

$$(Y_1, Y_2): S \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2, \quad \text{taking } s \text{ to } (Y_1(s), Y_2(s)).$$

If $S, \mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2$ are vector spaces and Y_1, Y_2 are linear maps, then $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2$ becomes a vector space—merely the direct sum of \mathcal{Y}_1 and \mathcal{Y}_2 —and (Y_1, Y_2) is a linear map.

Recall that if S is any finite-dimensional \mathbb{F} -vector space and $A \subset S$ is a subspace, then the *annihilator of A in S^** is the set of elements of S^* taking all of A to 0, which is a subspace of dimension $\dim(S) - \dim(A)$; similarly, if $V \subset S^*$, by the *annihilator of V (in S)* we mean the elements of S that each element of V takes to zero, and that this is a subspace of dimension $\dim(S) - \dim(V)$.

Proposition 2.17. *Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and let S be an \mathbb{F} -vector space. Let $V^1, V^2 \subset U = S^*$ be linear random variables, whose classical forms are $V_{\text{class}}^i: S \rightarrow S/A_i$ (hence $A_i \subset S$ is the annihilator in S of V_i). Then the linear random variable associated to the classical random variable $(V_{\text{class}}^1, V_{\text{class}}^2)$ is $V^1 + V^2$ (i.e., their span).*

[The essential point of the proof below is (a fairly standard fact) that the annihilator of $A_1 \cap A_2$ is $V_1 + V_2$; this can also be proven by observing (see below) that the annihilator of $V_1 + V_2$ is $A_1 \cap A_2$, and using the (standard fact) that the annihilator of the annihilator of a subspace is itself.]

Proof. The kernel of the map $(V_{\text{class}}^1, V_{\text{class}}^2)$ is the kernel of the map $S \rightarrow (S/A_1) \times (S/A_2)$, which is clearly $A_1 \cap A_2$. So let V be $(S/(A_1 \cap A_2))^*$ as it sits in S^* .

Notice the annihilator of $A^1 + A^2$ is precisely $V^1 \cap V^2$, since (1) $V^1 \cap V^2$ annihilates both $A^1 + A^2$, and (2) any element of S^* that does not lie in $V^1 \cap V^2$ fails to lie in at least one of V^1 or V^2 and hence fails to annihilate at least one of A^1 or A^2 . Hence

$$\dim(S/(A^1 + A^2)) = \dim(V^1 \cap V^2).$$

By the dimension theorem we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(V) &= \dim(S) - \dim(A_1 \cap A_2) = \dim(S) - \dim(A_1) - \dim(A_2) + \dim(A_1 + A_2) \\ &= \dim(V^1) + \dim(V^2) - \dim(S/(A^1 + A^2)) \\ &= \dim(V^1) + \dim(V^2) - \dim(V^1 \cap V^2) = \dim(V^1 + V^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since each V_i takes all of A_i to zero, each V_i certainly takes all of $A_1 \cap A_2$ to 0. Hence $V^1 + V^2 \subset V$. But the previous paragraph shows that $\dim(V) = \dim(V^1 + V^2)$, and hence $V^1 + V^2 = V$. Hence the annihilator of $A_1 \cap A_2$ is precisely $V^1 + V^2$. \square

When we study coded caching, we will often use the notation for joint random variables that is more common there.

Notation 2.18. If $V_1, \dots, V_m \subset \mathcal{U}$ are subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , we use the following notation as an alternative to $V_1 + \dots + V_m$ (i.e., the span of V_1, \dots, V_m): (1) (V_1, \dots, V_m) ; (2) V_1, \dots, V_m ; or, most simply, (3) $V_1 \dots V_m$.

2.10. The Dimension Formula in Infinite Dimensions. There is a better way to state the dimension formula (in Subsection 2.5) when $U_1, U_2 \subset \mathcal{U}$ are possibly infinite-dimensional subspaces of an infinite dimension \mathbb{F} -vector space \mathcal{U} , namely that

$$0 \rightarrow U_1 \cap U_2 \rightarrow U_1 \oplus U_2 \rightarrow U_1 + U_2 \rightarrow 0$$

is an *exact sequence* meaning that the kernel of any arrow equals the image of the preceding arrow. In algebraic topology (see, for example, Section 1.1 of [BT82]), one typically works with (co)chains of infinite-dimensional vector spaces, yet where typically the (co)homology groups are finite-dimensional. It is therefore likely that some of our discussion regarding subspaces of an ambient \mathbb{F} -universe hold in the infinite-dimensional setting, using tools that already exist. However, it is usually simpler to work with finite-dimensional vector spaces, and our applications to information theory in this article involve only finite-dimensional vector spaces; hence in this article we mostly limit ourselves to discussion and theorems regarding finite-dimensional vector spaces.

3. PRELIMINARY REMARKS ABOUT COORDINATION AND DISCOORDINATION, AND MAIN RESULTS

In this section we define the notion of the “discoordination” of a collection of subspaces of a universe, which is the focus of the linear algebra in this article. In case a collection of subspaces have zero discoordination, then they are “coordinated,” which gives very simple formulas regarding the dimensions of such subspaces and subspaces obtained by applying operations like $+$, \cap and taking quotients. The fact that two subspaces are always coordinated, but three subspaces are not, is well-known (see, for example, Exercise 9, Section 3.3 (page 51) [J94]).

After defining coordination and discoordination and discussing some of their basic properties, we will state most of the main results we will prove regarding linear algebra (i.e., in Sections 5 to 6), including all the results we require for our study of coded caching.

3.1. Coordination. If X is a set of linearly independent vectors in an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and $A \subset \mathcal{U}$ is a subspace, then $X \cap A$ is a set of linearly independent vectors in A , and hence

$$(23) \quad \dim(A) - |X \cap A| \geq 0$$

with equality iff $X \cap A$ is a basis of A . This observation leads to a number of definitions that are the focus of this article.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{U} be an \mathbb{F} -universe. We use the notation

$$\text{Ind}(\mathcal{U}) = \{X \subset \mathcal{U} \mid \text{the elements of } X \text{ are linearly independent}\}$$

to denote the set of linearly independent subsets of \mathcal{U} . Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of \mathcal{U} . We say that a subset, X , of \mathcal{U} *coordinates* A_1, \dots, A_m if

- (1) $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$, i.e., X is a set of linearly independent vectors in \mathcal{U} , and

(2) for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ we have

$$\dim(A_i) = |X \cap A_i|,$$

or, equivalently, $X \cap A_i$ is a basis for A_i (since $X \cap A_i$ is a linearly independent set of vectors in A_i whose size equals the dimension of A_i).

If such an X exists, we say that A_1, \dots, A_m are *coordinated*; we also say that the set $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ is *coordinated*.

Proposition 3.2. *If X coordinates subspaces A_1, A_2 of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , then X also coordinates $A_1 \cap A_2$ and $A_1 + A_2$.*

We will give two proofs of this proposition. The first uses the dimension formula (see Subsection 2.5). The second proof will be given at the end of Subsection 3.2.

Proof. In view of (23), for any $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ we have

$$(24) \quad |X \cap (A_1 + A_2)| \leq \dim(A_1 + A_2), \quad |X \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)| \leq \dim(A_1 \cap A_2);$$

X coordinates $A_1 + A_2$ and $A_1 \cap A_2$ iff both these inequalities hold with equality; the Inequality Summation Principle (Subsection 2.3) implies that equality holds in both iff their sum,

$$(25) \quad |X \cap (A_1 + A_2)| + |X \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)| \leq \dim(A_1 + A_2) + \dim(A_1 \cap A_2),$$

holds with equality. Let us show this.

By (set theoretic) inclusion-exclusion we have

$$|X \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)| + |X \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)| = |X \cap A_1| + |X \cap A_2|,$$

which, since X coordinates A_1, A_2 , equals

$$\dim(A_1) + \dim(A_2) = \dim(A_1 + A_2) + \dim(A_1 \cap A_2)$$

using the dimension formula. We conclude that

$$(26) \quad |X \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)| + |X \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)| = \dim(A_1 + A_2) + \dim(A_1 \cap A_2).$$

However $A_1 \cup A_2$ is a subset of $A_1 + A_2$, and hence

$$(27) \quad |X \cap (A_1 + A_2)| + |X \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)| \geq |X \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)| + |X \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)|,$$

and hence, by (26),

$$|X \cap (A_1 + A_2)| + |X \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)| \geq \dim(A_1 + A_2) + \dim(A_1 \cap A_2).$$

This is reverse inequality of (25), and hence both hold with equality. \square

We remark that the fact that (27) holds in the proof shows that $X \cap (A_1 + A_2)$ and $X \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)$ have the same size, i.e., any element of $X \cap (A_1 + A_2)$ must also lie in $A_1 \cup A_2$.

The proposition above has an easy consequence, whose proof we leave to the reader.

Proposition 3.3. *Say that X coordinates a subspace A_2 of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . Then $[X \setminus A_2]_{A_2}$ is a linearly independent set in \mathcal{U}/A_2 . If X also coordinates a subspace $A_1 \subset \mathcal{U}$, then $[X \setminus A_2]_{A_2}$ coordinates $[A_1]_{A_2} \subset \mathcal{U}/A_2$.*

It follows that if \mathcal{U} is an \mathbb{F} -universe and $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ coordinates a family of subspaces, \mathcal{A} , then X also coordinates any subspace obtained by a finite sequence of spans and intersections of members of \mathcal{A} .

Another basic observation about coordination is that if \mathcal{U} is an \mathbb{F} -universe of dimension n , and $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$, then X contains at most n vectors and hence X coordinates at most 2^n distinct subspaces of \mathcal{U} .

The main point of this article is to describe which subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m are coordinated, or, if not, to describe their “discoordination,” which measures the extent to which they “fail to be coordinated.” Before discussing discoordination, let us give a helpful way of thinking about coordinated subspaces.

3.2. Coordinate Subspaces. If \mathbb{F} is a field, we use \mathbb{F}^n to denote the usual product of n copies of \mathbb{F} , and use e_1, \dots, e_n to denote the standard basis vectors of \mathbb{F}^n (hence e_i is a vector with a 1 in the i -th coordinate and 0's elsewhere). For a subset $I \subset [n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, we set e_I to be

$$e_I = \text{Span}(\{e_i\}_{i \in I}) \subset \mathbb{F}^n;$$

hence e_I is a subspace of dimension $|I|$ which we call the I -coordinate subspace of \mathbb{F}^n ; hence $e_\emptyset = \{0\}$ and $e_{[n]} = \mathbb{F}^n$. We easily see that if $I, J \in [n]$, then

$$(28) \quad e_I + e_J = e_{I \cup J}, \quad e_I \cap e_J = e_{I \cap J}.$$

This gives us another view of coordination: if \mathcal{U} is an n -dimensional \mathbb{F} -universe and $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a basis of \mathcal{U} , then there is a unique isomorphism $f: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$ of vector spaces such that $x_i \in \mathcal{U}$ is taken to $e_i \in \mathbb{F}^n$. In this case a subspace $A \subset \mathcal{U}$ is coordinated by X iff $f(A)$ is a coordinate subspace in \mathbb{F}^n .

Alternate proof of Proposition 3.2. Let $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathcal{U}$ be coordinated by $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$; replace X by an extension of X to a basis of \mathcal{U} ; clearly such an extension also coordinates A_1, A_2 . Then, letting $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, there is a unique isomorphism $f: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$ taking x_i to $e_i \in \mathbb{F}^n$, and we have $f(A_1) = e_I$ for the subset $I \subset [n]$ consists of those $i \in [n]$ such that $e_i \in f(A_1 \cap X)$; similarly $f(A_2) = e_J$ for some $J \subset [n]$. Note that any isomorphism of vector spaces preserves the operations $+, \cup$, and in particular this is true of $f^{-1}: \mathbb{F}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Hence, in view of (28), we have that

$$A_1 + A_2 = f^{-1}(e_{I \cup J}), \quad A_1 \cap A_2 = f^{-1}(e_{I \cap J})$$

are coordinated by $\{f^{-1}(e_1), \dots, f^{-1}(e_n)\} = X$. \square

Remark 3.4. We warn the reader of one fundamental difference between subsets and subspaces: namely, if $I, J \subset [n]$ for some n , then their usual Venn diagram contains three pieces,

$$I \setminus J, I \cap J, J \setminus I,$$

all of which are subsets of $I \cup J$; I is the union of the first two pieces above, and J of the last two. However, the closest analogous “Venn diagram” for two subspaces $A, B \subset \mathcal{U}$ of some universe consists of the three “pieces”

$$(29) \quad A/B \subset \mathcal{U}/B, \quad A \cap B \subset \mathcal{U}, \quad B/A \subset \mathcal{U}/A,$$

each of which lies in a different universe. What is true is that if A' is a complement of $A \cap B$ in A , and B' one of $A \cap B$ in B , then

$$A', A \cap B, B' \subset (A + B) \subset \mathcal{U},$$

and A is isomorphic to the direct sum of its subspaces A' and $A \cap B$, and similarly for B . But the choice of A', B' is not canonical. One way to choose pick an A' is to pick a basis for A relative to $A \cap B$, as discussed in Subsection 2.6. We easily see that an equivalent way to construct A' (and similarly for B') is to choose an isomorphism $f: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$ as done in the proof above, with $f(A) = e_I$ and $f(B) = e_J$. Then e_I is isomorphic to the direct sum of its subspaces $e_{I \setminus J}$ and $e_{I \cap J}$, and so $A' = f^{-1}(e_{I \setminus J})$ is a complement of $A \cap B$ in A .

3.3. Discoordination and Minimizers. Next we define a measure of “the extent to which given subspaces of a universe may fail to be coordinated.”

Definition 3.5. If \mathcal{U} is an \mathbb{F} -universe, we use $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ to denote the set of all linearly independent subsets $X \subset \mathcal{U}$. Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . If $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ (i.e., X is a subset of linearly independent vectors in \mathcal{U}), we define the *discoordination of X with respect to A_1, \dots, A_m* to be

$$\text{DisCoord}_X(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\dim(A_i) - |X \cap A_i| \right).$$

We define the *discoordination of A_1, \dots, A_m* to be

$$\text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \min_{X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})} \text{DisCoord}_X(A_1, \dots, A_m),$$

where $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ denotes the set of all linearly independent subsets $X \subset \mathcal{U}$; and we call any $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ at which the above minimum is attained a *discoordination minimizer* (or simply a *minimizer*) of A_1, \dots, A_m .

In view of (23), A_1, \dots, A_m are coordinated iff their discoordination equals 0, and, if so, then X is a minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m iff X coordinates A_1, \dots, A_m .

Notice also that in the above definition, if $X \subset X'$ and $X' \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$, then

$$\text{DisCoord}_X(A_1, \dots, A_m) \geq \text{DisCoord}_{X'}(A_1, \dots, A_m).$$

It follows that if X is a minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m , then if X is not a basis of \mathcal{U} we can extend X to obtain a basis X' of \mathcal{U} containing X , which leaves the discoordination unchanged. Hence there exists a minimizer that is a basis for \mathcal{U} .

3.4. The Main Theorem Regarding Three Subspaces. In this article we develop some foundational theorems regarding coordination and discoordination. Our main theorem regarding three subspaces is the following.

Theorem 3.6. *Let A, B, C be three subspaces of an arbitrary \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . Then there is a decomposition $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ of \mathcal{U} through which A, B, C all factor, such that*

- (1) $A \cap \mathcal{U}_1, B \cap \mathcal{U}_1, C \cap \mathcal{U}_1$ are coordinated in \mathcal{U}_1 , and
- (2) there is an isomorphism $\mu: \mathcal{U}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^2 \times \mathbb{F}^m$ which takes $A \cap \mathcal{U}_2, B \cap \mathcal{U}_2, C \cap \mathcal{U}_2$, respectively, to

$$\text{Span}(e_1) \otimes \mathbb{F}^m, \text{Span}(e_2) \otimes \mathbb{F}^m, \text{Span}(e_1 + e_2) \otimes \mathbb{F}^m.$$

Furthermore, let

$$S_2 = S_2(A, B, C) = (A \cap B) + (A \cap C) + (B \cap C).$$

Then the following integers are equal:

- (1) m as above;
- (2) $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$;

- (3) the minimum of $\dim(C) - |X \cap C|$ over all $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ that coordinate A and B (and such an X exists);
- (4) the dimension in \mathcal{U}/S_2 of the space $([A]_{S_2} + [B]_{S_2}) \cap [C]_{S_2}$;
- (5) the dimension in \mathcal{U}/S_2 of the space $[(A + B) \cap C]_{S_2}$; and
- (6) (of course) any of (2)–(5) with A, B, C permuted in some fashion (since $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ does not depend on how we order A, B, C).

After proving this theorem, we will be able to write a number of important formulas involving A, B, C in terms of the discoordination. Let us first state the general principle.

Definition 3.7. Let $f = f(A_1, \dots, A_s)$ be a formula that is an \mathbb{Z} -linear combination of terms of the form $\dim^{\mathcal{U}/A''}([A']_{A''})$, where A', A'' are formulas in the operations $\cap, +$ and the variables A_1, \dots, A_s (and parenthesis) in an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} ; hence f is a function that takes arbitrary subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m of some \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and returns an integer. We say that f is a *balanced formula* if $f(A_1, \dots, A_s) = 0$ whenever A_1, \dots, A_s are coordinated.

Example 3.8. The following are examples of balanced functions $f = f(A, B, C)$:

- (1) $\dim((A + B) \cap C) - \dim(A \cap C) - \dim(B \cap C) + \dim(A \cap B \cap C)$;
- (2) $\dim(A \cap B) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}/C}([A]_C \cap [B]_C) - \dim(A \cap B \cap C)$;
- (3) $\dim(A \cap B) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}/C}([A \cap B]_C) - \dim(A \cap B \cap C)$; and
- (4) $\dim(I(A; B; C)) - \dim(A \cap B \cap C)$, with $I(A; B; C)$ as in (1) and (2).

To verify that these formulas are balanced, it suffices to take A, B, C to equal the coordinate subspaces e_I, e_J, e_K with I, J, K subsets of a finite set, (with notation as in Subsection 3.2), whereupon the dimensions of the subspaces in these formulas amount to the sizes of unions and intersections of I, J, K . See also the algorithm with Venn diagrams, e.g., Figure 1.

Corollary 3.9. *Let $f = f(A, B, C)$ be a balanced formula. Then for any subspaces A, B, C we have*

$$f(A, B, C) = k \text{ DisCoord}(A, B, C),$$

where

$$(30) \quad k = f(\text{Span}(e_1), \text{Span}(e_2), \text{Span}(e_1 + e_2)),$$

where e_1, e_2 are the standard basis vectors in \mathbb{F}^2 for any field \mathbb{F} .

The corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 2.10 and the paragraph just below it, since together they imply, with notation as in Theorem 3.6, that

$$f(A, B, C) = \sum_{i=1}^2 f(A \cap \mathcal{U}_i, B \cap \mathcal{U}_i, C \cap \mathcal{U}_i);$$

the $i = 1$ term above vanishes since this term involves coordinated subspaces, and the $i = 2$ term is isomorphic to the direct sum of m copies of \mathbb{F}^2 , in which f restricted to each copy equals k above.

FIGURE 1. Checking $f(A, B, C) = 0$ when $A = e_I, B = e_J, C = e_K$ in Item (6) of Corollary 3.10

Corollary 3.10. *Let A, B, C be three subspaces of an arbitrary \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . Then $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ also equals:*

(1) $\dim(A \cap B \cap C) - I(A; B; C)$, where

$$I(A; B; C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(A + B + C) - \dim(A + B) - \dim(A + C) - \dim(B + C) \\ + \dim(A) + \dim(B) + \dim(C).$$

(2) $\dim(C \cap (A + B)) - \dim(C \cap A) - \dim(C \cap B) + \dim(A \cap B \cap C)$;

(3) $\dim^{\mathcal{U}/C}([A]_C \cap [B]_C) + \dim(A \cap B \cap C) - \dim(A \cap B)$

(4) $\dim((A + C) \cap (B + C)) - \dim(C) + \dim(A \cap B \cap C) - \dim(A \cap B)$;

(5) $\dim((A + C) \cap (B + C)) - \dim((A \cap B) + C)$;

(6) $I(B; C|A) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}/A}([B \cap C]_A)$, where

$$I(B; C|A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(A + B) + \dim(A + C) - \dim(A) - \dim(A + B + C);$$

and

(7) (of course) the same expression as in (1)–(6) with A, B, C permuted in any order.

(Here \dim refers to $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}$ unless otherwise indicated.)

To prove the corollary, one easily checks that all the expressions $f(A, B, C)$ of items (1)–(6) are balanced equations, and have $k = 1$ in (30). In this above, the notation $I(B; C|A)$ is the information theory analog; see, e.g., [HRSV00], just below (13), page 456.

Remark 3.11. To check that an $f(A, B, C)$ is balanced, one can set $A = e_I$, $B = e_J$, $C = e_K$, draw Venn diagrams, and check that the coefficients in each piece adds to zero. An example is given in Figure 1 for item (6) in Corollary 3.10.

FIGURE 2. Size of Venn diagram pieces and $A = e_I$, $B = e_J$, $C = e_K$.

Remark 3.12. The reader may be put off by expressions such as $\dim^{\mathcal{U}/A}([B \cap C]_A)$. However, such expressions are the natural way on describes pieces of the “Venn diagram” of I, J, K when $A = e_I$, $B = e_J$, $C = e_K$. By our conventions, $\dim^{\mathcal{U}/A}([B \cap C]_A)$ can be written more briefly as $(B \cap C)/A$, but we usually prefer the longer notation for clarity, i.e., to emphasize the universe and quotienting involved. We illustrate this in Figure 2, which illustrates the size of the corresponding piece. Regarding piece 2 in this figure, we have

$$(31) \quad \text{DisCoord}(A, B, C) = 0 \Rightarrow (A \cap B)/C = ((A + C) \cap (B + C))/C,$$

although $(A \cap B)/C$ is a proper subset of $((A + C) \cap (B + C))/C$ when A, B, C are discoordinated; hence the coordinated case is simpler due to equalities such as (31). Note also that piece 5 is the only one that lives in \mathcal{U} itself; any other expression that lives in \mathcal{U} , e.g., $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(A \cap B)$, involves piece 5 plus and some other piece(s).

In our study of coded caching we will need the following theorem, which studies how the discoordination of A, B, C in an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} changes when considering the image of A, B, C in a quotient universe \mathcal{U}/D for some subspace $D \subset \mathcal{U}$. Before stating this theorem, we remark that without assumptions on D ,

$$\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/D}([A]_D, [B]_D, [C]_D)$$

can be larger or smaller than $\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A, B, C)$, as the following examples show:

- (1) if $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{F}^3$ and $A = \text{Span}(e_1)$, $B = \text{Span}(e_2)$, $C = \text{Span}(e_3)$, and $D = \text{Span}(e_1 + e_2 + e_3)$, then A, B, C have zero discoordination in \mathcal{U} , but \mathcal{U}/D is two dimensional and $[A]_D, [B]_D, [C]_D$ are three distinct one dimensional subspaces, hence are discoordinated in \mathcal{U}/D ; hence the discoordination can increase when passing from \mathcal{U} to \mathcal{U}/D ; and
- (2) if A, B, C have positive discoordination in \mathcal{U} and $D = \mathcal{U}$, then, of course, their discoordination in $\mathcal{U}/D = \{0\}$ is zero; hence the discoordination can decrease when passing from \mathcal{U} to \mathcal{U}/D .

Theorem 3.13. *Let A, B, C, D be four subspaces of an arbitrary \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , such that $D \subset A \cap B$. Then*

$$\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A, B, C) = \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/D}([A]_D, [B]_D, [C]_D),$$

i.e., the discoordination of A, B, C in \mathcal{U} is the same as that of the images of A, B, C in the quotient \mathcal{U}/D .

We will prove this result in Subsection 6.4.

In the next two subsections we give some important general results about discoordination and about decompositions and factorization; these results will be helpful in our proof of Theorem 3.6 and in our proof of Theorem 3.13.

3.5. The Discoordination Formula. Some of the results in this paper are based on a detailed description of how to build minimizers for subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m in a universe. This description gives an interesting “formula” for the discoordination which we will use to prove Theorem 3.13. Both results are stated as a single theorem, namely Theorem 5.10; however, in this section we will use only the second result, which we now state separately.

Theorem 3.14. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . For each $k = 1, \dots, m$, let S_k be the span of all intersections of any k of A_1, \dots, A_k , i.e.,*

$$S_k = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq m} A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k}$$

(see also Definition 5.7). Then

$$\text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(S_i).$$

When we study coded caching, we will see that it is usually difficult to determine S_2 , and often other of the S_i with $i \geq 3$; this generally requires detailed information on the way A_1, \dots, A_m are related to each other as subspaces of \mathcal{U} ; in our applications only $S_1 = A_1 + \dots + A_m$ will be easy to determine. Hence Theorem 3.14 gives only partial insight into the discoordination of three or more subspaces.

3.6. Factorization and Discoordination. Our discoordination formula, Theorem 3.14, has the following important consequence, in view of Theorem 2.10.

Theorem 3.15. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe \mathcal{U} that all factor through a decomposition $\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_r$ of \mathcal{U} . Then*

$$\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^r \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}_i}(A_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_i, \dots, A_m \cap \mathcal{U}_i).$$

Proof. Each of the S_i in Theorem 3.14 is a formula involving $+$, \cap and the subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m (and parenthesis); hence Theorem 2.10 implies that the dimensions of the subspaces S_1, \dots, S_m in Theorem 3.14 can be computed as the sum over i of the dimensions of the analogs of S_1, \dots, S_m of $A_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_i, \dots, A_m \cap \mathcal{U}_i$. \square

We can explain in rough terms how the above theorem is used in our proof of Theorem 3.13: if $A, B, C \subset \mathcal{U}$ are subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe \mathcal{U} , and $D \subset A \cap B$, then for the decomposition of \mathcal{U} as $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ given in Theorem 3.6 we have $D \subset \mathcal{U}_1$ (essentially since $\text{Span}(e_1) \cap \text{Span}(e_2) = 0$). It follows that \mathcal{U}/D is isomorphic to the direct sum of \mathcal{U}_1/D and \mathcal{U}_2 . It follows that the discoordination of the images of A, B, C in \mathcal{U}_2 is unchanged when passing from \mathcal{U} to \mathcal{U}/D ; one then has to prove that the discoordination of the images of A, B, C in \mathcal{U}_1/D remains equal to zero. After doing so, we apply Theorem 3.15.

3.7. Addition Results about Coordination. We finish this section by stating one more result on coordination, namely Theorem 4.1 and the resulting corollary. We found this theorem convenient in studying coded caching, although we have avoided its use in this article. The result is that if $A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_s$ and $B_1 \subset \dots \subset B_t$ are two increasing subsequences of subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, then all these subspaces are coordinated. In particular, the case $s = 1$ and $t = 2$ implies the sometimes convenient fact that if A, B, C are subspaces with $B \subset C$, then the discoordination of A, B, C vanishes. We also note that the case $s = 1$ and $t = 1$ of Corollary 4.2 is the key to proving the dimension formula.

4. QUASI-INCREASING SEQUENCES ARE COORDINATED, AND APPLICATIONS

The main goal of this section is to prove a number of theorems that state that certain sequences of subspaces of a universe are coordinated. The proofs can be given “from scratch,” but to simplify the proofs we will introduce a notion of *quasi-increasing sequences*.

This section begins by stating all the coordination theorems. We then discuss quasi-increasing sequences, and use this idea to prove all the coordination theorems. We finish this section by discussing the fact that all the *quasi-increasing sequences* in this section satisfy a stronger property, that we call *strongly quasi-increasing*.

4.1. Statement of Some Coordination Theorems.

Theorem 4.1. *Let \mathcal{U} be an \mathbb{F} -universe, and let*

$$A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_s, \quad B_1 \subset \dots \subset B_t$$

be two sequences of increasing subspaces of \mathcal{U} . Then the set of subspaces $\{A_i \cap B_j\}_{i,j}$ ranging over all $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [t]$ are coordinated.

This theorem has the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2. *Let \mathcal{U} be an \mathbb{F} -universe, and let*

$$A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_s, \quad B_1 \subset \dots \subset B_t$$

be two sequences of increasing subspaces of \mathcal{U} . Then the subspaces $A_1, \dots, A_s, B_1, \dots, B_t$ are coordinated.

The corollary is obtained from the theorem by extending the sequences of vector spaces by setting $A_{s+1} = B_{t+1} = \mathcal{U}$; then for all $i \in [s]$, $A_i \cap B_{t+1} = A_i \cap \mathcal{U} = A_i$ and similarly $A_{s+1} \cap B_j = B_j$ for all $j \in [t]$. The corollary is more succinct, since the intersection of any two subspaces coordinated by some basis X is again coordinated by X .

For our analysis of coded caching, we have found the result with $s = 2$ and $t = 1$ helpful. However in simplifying our results we have been able to forgo any use of the above theorem.

Note that if $s = t = 2$ and we $A_2 = B_2 = \mathcal{U}$, the above theorem implies that $A_1 \cap B_1, A_1, B_1$ are coordinated, which is how one proves the dimension formula. Hence Theorem 4.1 can be viewed as a generalization of the dimension formula.

The other main theorem in this section is the following.

Theorem 4.3. *Let A, B, C be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . Then the six spaces*

$$A \cap B \cap C, A \cap B, A \cap C, B \cap C, A, B$$

are coordinated.

Of course, by Proposition 3.2, in this theorem it suffices to state $A \cap C, B \cap C, A, B$ are coordinated; we include the other subspaces since they will also be used explicitly to prove Theorem 3.6. This theorem will be crucial to our theorem about the discoordination of three subspaces. One proof of Theorem 3.13 we will involve part of the following minor improvement of Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 4.4. *Let A, B, C be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and $D \subset A \cap B$ another subspace. Then the spaces*

$$A \cap B \cap C \cap D, A \cap B \cap C, D, A \cap B, A \cap C, B \cap C, A, B$$

are coordinated.

This theorem implies that there is always a minimizer of A, B, C that coordinates D , see the proof of Lemma 6.3 and the remark below it; in fact this remark shows that we can alternatively coordinate the same eight subspaces in Theorem 4.4 where the subspace B (or A) replaced with C .

Here is the last main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.5. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . For each $i \in [m]$ let*

$$(32) \quad A_{\hat{i}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{j \neq i} A_j = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_{i-1} \cap A_{i+1} \cap \dots \cap A_m,$$

and let $V_0 = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_m$. Then $V_0, A_{\hat{1}}, \dots, A_{\hat{m}}$ are coordinated.

In other words, the set of all $(m - 1)$ -fold intersections of A_1, \dots, A_m are coordinated (and therefore so is their intersection, namely $A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_m$).

It turns out that all the theorems stated above can be proven by a strategy that generalizes the proof of the dimension formula, which we now describe.

4.2. Quasi-Increasing Sequences. If $V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_m$ are a set of increasing subspaces of some universe, then one easily argues that this sequence is coordinated: one begins with a basis for V_1 , and successively increases this to a basis for V_2 and so on. In this subsection we give a more general situation where a similar strategy works.

Definition 4.6. Let V_1, \dots, V_m be a sequence of vector spaces in some universe. For $r = 2, \dots, m$, we say that this sequence is *quasi-increasing in position r* (or *at V_r*) if whenever

$$(33) \quad v_r = v_1 + \dots + v_{r-1} \quad \text{such that} \quad v_1 \in V_1, \dots, v_r \in V_r,$$

one also has

$$(34) \quad v_r = v'_1 + \dots + v'_{r-1} \quad \text{for some} \quad v'_1 \in V_1, \dots, v'_{r-1} \in V_{r-1},$$

where in addition

$$(35) \quad v'_i \neq 0 \Rightarrow V_i \subset V_r$$

(i.e., if $i < r$ and $V_i \not\subset V_r$ then $v'_i = 0$). Furthermore, if this condition holds for all $r = 2, \dots, m$, we say that V_1, \dots, V_m is *quasi-increasing*.

We easily see that to be quasi-increasing in position r is equivalent to

$$(36) \quad V_r \cap (V_1 + \dots + V_{r-1}) \subset \sum_{i < r \text{ and } V_i \subset V_r} V_i;$$

the reverse inclusion is clear, so we can replace \subset with $=$ if we like.

Of course, any sequence V_1, \dots, V_m is quasi-increasing in position r if $V_1, \dots, V_{r-1} \subset V_r$, and hence any increasing sequence $V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_m$ is also quasi-increasing,

Example 4.7. Let A, B be any vector spaces in some universe, and let $V_1 = A \cap B$, $V_2 = A$, $V_3 = B$. Then $V_1 \subset V_2$, but $V_2 \not\subset V_3$. However, if $v_1 \in V_1$, $v_2 \in V_2$, and $v_3 \in V_3$ with

$$v_3 = v_1 + v_2,$$

then in fact $v'_1 = v_1 + v_2$ also lies in V_1 (one sees this by first noting that $v_2 = v_3 - v_1$, and since $v_1, v_3 \in B$ then also $v_2 \in B$; since $v_2 \in A$ then $v_2 \in A \cap B = V_1$). Hence the above sequence is quasi-increasing, but not generally increasing.

The above example is the essential step in proving the dimension formula: namely, we let X_1 be a basis for $V_1 = A \cap B$, X_2 a minimal set such that $X_1 \cup X_2$ spans A , and X_3 a minimal set such that $X_1 \cup X_3$ spans B . We then see that $X_1 \cup X_2$ is a basis for $V_2 = A$; to show that $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3$ is a basis, we need to show that there is no nontrivial relation between the vectors of X_3 and those of X_1 and X_2 ; but if so then we have

$$v_1 + v_2 = v_3 \neq 0$$

where each v_i is a linear combination of vectors in X_i ; but then we have, as shown above, $v'_1 = v_1 + v_2$ actually lies in V_1 , which contradicts the fact that $X_1 \cup X_3$ are linearly independent.

Hence the theorem below strengthens the method used to prove the dimension formula.

Theorem 4.8. *Any quasi-increasing sequence is coordinated. In more detail, let V_1, \dots, V_m be a sequence of quasi-increasing subspaces in some universe. Let X_1 be any basis for V_1 , and inductively on $i = 2, \dots, m$, let X_i be a minimal size set of vectors such that if*

$$X' = \bigcup_{i' \text{ s.t. } V_{i'} \subset V_i} X_{i'},$$

then $X_i \cup X'$ spans V_i . Then X_1, \dots, X_m are pairwise disjoint and $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ coordinate V_1, \dots, V_m , and, more specifically, for each i we have

$$X \cap V_i = \bigcup_{V_{i'} \subset V_i} X_{i'}$$

is a basis for V_i .

Proof. We prove this by induction on m . The base case $m = 1$ is clear since X_1 is simply a basis for V_1 .

Now say that the theorem holds for some value of $m \geq 1$, let V_1, \dots, V_m, V_{m+1} be a quasi-increasing sequence, and X_1, \dots, X_m vectors as in the theorem. Let $I = \{i \in [m] \mid V_i \subset V_{m+1}\}$. By Proposition 3.2, $X' = \cup_{i \in I} X_i$ coordinates

$$(37) \quad U' = \sum_{i \in I} V_i;$$

since $V_i \subset V_{m+1}$ for all $i \in I$, we have $U' \subset V_{m+1}$. Let X_{m+1} be as specified in the theorem. Then the vectors $X' \cup X_{m+1}$ are linearly independent (and X_{m+1} is disjoint from X'). By assumption, $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ are (pairwise disjoint and) linearly independent. Hence if $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_{m+1}$ is not linearly independent (or if X_{m+1} is not distinct from X_1, \dots, X_m), we have

$$v_{m+1} = v_1 + \dots + v_m,$$

where each v_i is in the span of X_i and v_{m+1} is nonzero. But then we have

$$v_{m+1} = v'_1 + \dots + v'_m,$$

where $v'_i \neq 0$ only if $i \in I$; hence $v'_1 + \dots + v'_m \in U'$, which contradicts the fact that $X' \cup X_{m+1}$ are linearly independent. \square

The main subtlety in the above proof is to consider U' in (37) which is the sum of all subspaces that lie in V_{m+1} . The dimension formula works with V_1, V_2, V_3 as in Example 4.7, where V_1 is the sole subspace that lies in V_3 .

4.3. Quasi-Increasing Sequences and Maximal Elements. Say that we are trying to prove that a given sequence V_1, \dots, V_m of subspaces in a universe is quasi-increasing. Hence, given any r between 2 and m and any equation

$$v_r = v_{r-1} + \dots + v_1,$$

we wish to find v'_1, \dots, v'_{r-1} as in Definition 4.6, i.e., whose sum is also v_r , with $v'_i \in V_i$ for $i \in [r-1]$, but such that $v'_i = 0$ if $V_i \not\subset V_r$. In practice one can simplify this task by noting that if $i < j < r$ and $V_i \subset V_j$, then we can always assume that $v_i = 0$, by replacing v_j with $v_j + v_i$. We now make this precise; the reader may prefer to skip directly to Corollary 4.11, which is pretty clear without the formalities below.

Definition 4.9. Let V_1, \dots, V_m be a sequence of vector spaces in a universe, \mathcal{U} . For $r = [m]$ we define the r -maximal index set, denoted I_r , to be

$$(38) \quad I_r = \{i \in [r] \mid \text{if } j \neq i \text{ and } j \leq r, \text{ then } V_i \not\subset V_j\}$$

(equivalently $i \in I_r$ if V_i is a maximal subspace under inclusion among V_1, \dots, V_r).

Proposition 4.10. *Let V_1, \dots, V_r be a sequence of vector spaces in a universe, \mathcal{U} . Then*

$$(39) \quad V_1 + \dots + V_r = \sum_{i \in I_r} V_i,$$

i.e., any sum of elements in V_1, \dots, V_r can be written as a sum of those V_i that are maximal under inclusion. Similarly if I_r is replaced with any larger set in $[r]$, i.e., if I_r contains all i with V_i maximal under inclusion among V_1, \dots, V_r .

Proof. Clearly there is a map $f: [r] \rightarrow I_r$ such that for all $i \in [r]$, $V_i \subset V_{f(i)}$ (the reader can easily supply a formal proof by induction on r). Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^r V_i \subset \sum_{i=1}^r V_{f(i)} \subset \sum_{i \in I_r} V_i.$$

Clearly this also holds if I_r is replaced with any larger subset of $[r]$. \square

Corollary 4.11. *To show that a sequence V_1, \dots, V_r is quasi-increasing in position r (i.e., at V_r), we can assume that in (33) we have $v_i = 0$ if V_i is not maximal under inclusion among V_1, \dots, V_{r-1} .*

Proof. Apply Proposition 4.10 with r replaced with $r-1$. Then (39) shows that any vector $v_1 + \dots + v_{r-1}$ can be written as another such sum with $v_i = 0$ if $i \notin I_{r-1}$. \square

We will make constant use of the above corollary to simplify the task of verifying that a sequence is quasi-increasing.

4.4. Proof of Theorem 4.1. In this subsection we prove Theorem 4.1. According to Theorem 4.8, it suffices to prove the following stronger theorem.

$V_{s(t-1)+1} = A_1 \cap B_t$	$V_{s(t-1)+2} = A_2 \cap B_t$	\dots	$V_{st} = A_s \cap B_t$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$V_{s+1} = A_1 \cap B_2$	$V_{s+2} = A_2 \cap B_2$	\dots	$V_{2s} = A_s \cap B_2$
$V_1 = A_1 \cap B_1$	$V_2 = A_2 \cap B_1$	\dots	$V_s = A_s \cap B_1$

FIGURE 3. The sequence V_1, \dots, V_{st}

Theorem 4.12. *Let \mathcal{U} be an \mathbb{F} -universe, and let*

$$A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_s, \quad B_1 \subset \dots \subset B_t$$

be two sequences of increasing subspaces of \mathcal{U} . Let us order the st subspaces of the form $A_i \cap B_j$ as follows:

$$V_1 = A_1 \cap B_1, \dots, V_s = A_s \cap B_1, V_{s+1} = A_1 \cap B_2, \dots, V_{2s} = A_s \cap B_2, \dots, V_{st} = A_s \cap B_t.$$

(i.e., for all $i \in [s]$ and $j \in [t]$, we set $V_{i+s(j-1)} = A_i \cap B_j$). Then V_1, \dots, V_{st} is a quasi-increasing sequence of subspaces.

We depict the sequence V_1, \dots, V_{st} in Figure 3.

Proof. Let us prove the theorem by induction on t . For $t = 1$, the sequence V_1, \dots, V_s is increasing, and therefore quasi-increasing.

For the inductive step, say that the theorem holds whenever $t \leq T$, and consider the theorem in case $t = T+1$. We already know that V_1, \dots, V_{sT} is quasi-increasing. Let us verify that the condition of being quasi-increasing continues to hold at V_r (i.e., in position r) with $r = sT + 1, sT + 2, \dots, s(T + 1)$; hence we need to verify that whenever (33) holds, one can also write (34) such that (35) holds. It is simpler to determine the maximal subsets among V_1, \dots, V_{r-1} and to use Corollary 4.11.

\cdots	$\mathbf{V_{sT+i-1} = A_{i-1} \cap B_{T+1}}$	$V_r = V_{sT+i} = A_i \cap B_{T+1}$		
\cdots	$V_{s(T-1)+i-1} = A_{i-1} \cap B_T$	$V_{s(T-1)+i} = A_i \cap B_T$	\cdots	$\mathbf{V_{sT} = A_s \cap B_T}$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
\cdots	$V_{i-1} = A_{i-1} \cap B_1$	\cdots	\cdots	$V_s = A_s \cap B_1$

FIGURE 4. The two maximal subsets among V_1, \dots, V_{sT+i-1} in **bold face**.

For $r = sT + i$, with $2 \leq i \leq s$, each of V_1, \dots, V_{r-1} is contained in either A_{i-1} or B_T ; hence each of V_1, \dots, V_{r-1} is contained in at least one of (the two maximal subsets) $A_{i-1} \cap B_{T+1} = V_{sT+i-1}$ and $A_s \cap B_T = V_{sT}$ (see Figure 4, which indicates these two maximal subsets in **bold face**). Similarly, for $r = sT + 1$, $V_{sT+i-1} = V_{sT}$ is the unique maximal subset.

For any $i \in [s]$, let $r = sT + i$, and let us verify the condition in Definition 4.6. First consider the case $i \geq 2$ where there are two maximal subspaces. If $v_r = v_1 + \dots + v_{r-1}$, then also

$$(40) \quad v_r = w_1 + w_2$$

with $w_1 \in A_{i-1} \cap B_{T+1}$ and $w_2 \in A_s \cap B_T$. But then $w_2 = v_r - w_1$, and both v_r, w_1 lie in A_i ; hence $w_2 \in A_i$, and therefore $w_2 \in A_i \cap B_T$. But both $A_{i-1} \cap B_{T+1}$ and $A_1 \cap B_T$ are subsets of $A_i \cap B_{T+1} = V_r$ that occur in the list V_1, \dots, V_{r-1} . This establishes the condition of quasi-increasing for these values of r .

The remaining case is the case $r = sT + i$ with $i = 1$. In this case the only maximal subspace is $V_{r-1} = A_s \cap B_T$, and hence (40) is replaced with the equation $v_r = w_2$; hence the same argument as in the previous paragraph works (with $w_1 = 0$). \square

4.5. A Proof of Theorem 4.3 and a Partial Generalization. In this subsection we will prove Theorem 4.3. Again, it will suffice to prove this stronger result.

Theorem 4.13. *Let A, B, C be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . Then the sequence*

$$V_1 = A \cap B \cap C, \quad V_2 = A \cap B, \quad V_3 = A \cap C, \quad V_4 = B \cap C, \quad V_5 = A, \quad V_6 = B$$

is quasi-increasing.

Proof. We need to verify that the sequence is quasi-increasing in positions $r = 2, 3, \dots, 6$.

For $r = 2$ we have $V_1 \subset V_2$ so the condition holds. For $r = 3$, $V_2 \cap V_3 = V_1$, so the verification is the same as for the dimension formula.

For $r \geq 4$, since $V_1 \subset V_2$, we can omit v_1 from an equation (33).

For $r = 4$, $V_4 = B \cap C$, consider an equation $v_4 = v_2 + v_3$. Then since $v_4, v_2 \in B$, the equation $v_3 = v_4 - v_2 \in B$ shows that $v_3 \in V_3 \cap B = V_1$. The same argument with B and C exchanged shows that $v_2 \in V_1$. Hence we may take $v'_1 = v_2 + v_3 \in V_1$ and we have $v_4 = v'_1$.

For $r = 5$, we consider an equation

$$v_5 = v_2 + v_3 + v_4$$

Since $v_2, v_3, v_5 \in A$ also $v_4 \in A$ and hence $v_4 \in A \cap V_4 = V_1$. Furthermore $V_1, V_2, V_3 \subset A = V_5$, so the verification is complete.

For $r = 6$, since $V_1, V_2, V_3 \subset A = V_5$, it suffices to consider equations $v_6 = v_4 + v_5$. Since $v_4, v_6 \in B$ we have $v_5 \in B$ and hence $v_5 \in B \cap A = V_2 \subset B = V_6$. Since $V_2, V_4 \subset V_6$, the verification is complete there. \square

We remark that the same method for showing that V_1, \dots, V_4 are coordinated in the proof above can be used to show that for any V_1, \dots, V_m , the set of all intersections of any $m - 1$ of the V_1, \dots, V_m is coordinated. However, for $m \geq 4$, the set of all $(m - 2)$ -fold intersections can be discoordinated. For example, in \mathbb{F}^3 let

$$V_1 = \text{Span}(e_1, e_2), V_2 = \text{Span}(e_1, e_3), V_3 = \text{Span}(e_2, e_1 + e_3), V_4 = \text{Span}(e_3);$$

then the 2-fold intersections include the one dimensional spaces spanned by $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_1 + e_3$, which are therefore not coordinated. And if $m \geq 5$, we can set $V_i = \mathcal{U}$ for $i \geq 5$, and therefore, again, the $(m - 2)$ -fold intersections are not coordinated.

4.6. A Proof of Theorem 4.4. Similar to previous proofs, to prove Theorem 4.4, it clearly suffices to prove the following stronger theorem.

Theorem 4.14. *Let A, B, C, D be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . Then the sequence*

$$(41) \quad V_0, V_1, V'_1, V_2, V_3, V_4, V_5, V_6$$

where

$$(42) \quad \begin{aligned} V_0 &= A \cap B \cap C \cap D, V_1 = A \cap B \cap C, V'_1 = D, \\ V_2 &= A \cap B, V_3 = A \cap C, V_4 = B \cap C, V_5 = A, V_6 = B \end{aligned}$$

is quasi-increasing.

Proof. Since $V_0 \subset V_1$, (41) is quasi-increasing at V_1 .

If $u'_1 \in V'_1 = D$ equals a sum $u_0 + u_1$ with $u_i \in V_i$, then $u_1 = u'_1 - u_0 \in D$, and hence $u_1 \in A \cap B \cap C \cap D = V_0$. Since $V_0 \subset V'_1$, this proves $u_0 + u_1$ already lies in $V_0 \subset V'_1$; hence (41) is quasi-increasing at V'_1 .

Since V_2 contains V_0, V_1, V'_1 , (41) is quasi-increasing at V_2 .

From here we finish the proof as the proof of Theorem 4.13: since $V_0 \subset V_1$ and $V'_1 \subset V_2$, both V_0 and V'_1 are not maximal elements of the sequence $V_0, V_1, V'_1, V_2, \dots, V_{r-1}$ for all $r \geq 3$. Hence writing any element of V_r with $r \geq 3$ as the sum of elements of earlier members of the sequence (42) gives this element as a sum of elements in V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{r-1} ; and hence the verification for $r \geq 3$ in the proof of Theorem 4.13 holds here as well. \square

4.7. A Proof of Theorem 4.5. Similar to previous proofs, to prove Theorem 4.5 it clearly suffices to prove the following stronger theorem.

Theorem 4.15. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . For each $i \in [m]$ let*

$$V_i = A_{\hat{i}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{j \neq i} A_j = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_{i-1} \cap A_{i+1} \cap \dots \cap A_m,$$

and let $V_0 = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_m$. Then V_0, \dots, V_m is quasi-increasing.

Proof. We need to show that V_0, \dots, V_m is coordinated at V_j for any $j \in [m]$. So let

$$v_j = v_0 + \dots + v_{j-1}$$

with $v_i \in V_i$. Then

$$v_1 = v_j - v_2 - v_3 - \dots - v_{j-2} \in A_1,$$

and hence v_1 lies in both A_1 and $A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_m$, and therefore $v_1 \in V_0$. By the same argument, $v_2, \dots, v_{j-1} \in V_0$. Hence $v_j = v'_0$ with $v'_0 \in V_0 \subset V_j$. \square

4.8. Strongly Quasi-Increasing Sequences. We remark that the sequences in Theorems 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15 satisfy a stronger property than being quasi-increasing, which we now define.

Definition 4.16. Let V_1, \dots, V_m be a sequence of distinct vector spaces in some universe. For $r \in [m]$, we say that this sequence is *strongly quasi-increasing in position r* (or *at V_r*) if setting

$$J_r = \{i \in [m] \mid V_r \not\subset V_i\}, \quad K_r = \{i \in [m] \mid i \neq r \text{ and } V_i \subset V_r\},$$

then whenever

$$(43) \quad v_r = \sum_{i \in J_r} v_i \quad \text{such that} \quad \forall i \in J_r, v_i \in V_i,$$

one also has

$$(44) \quad v_r = \sum_{i \in K_r} v'_i \quad \text{such that} \quad \forall i \in K_r, v'_i \in V_i.$$

Furthermore, if this condition holds for all $r \in [m]$, we say that V_1, \dots, V_m is *strongly quasi-increasing*.

Notice that J_r, K_r above are defined independent of the order of the sequence V_1, \dots, V_m ; hence the notion of strongly quasi-increasing is independent of the order of the sequence.

We emphasize that in the above definition, the vector spaces V_1, \dots, V_m must be *distinct*; if not, the same definition would work for our results below, but we would need to add to the definition of K_r the condition that $V_i \neq V_r$.

We now claim that any strongly quasi-increasing sequence can be ordered so that it is quasi-increasing. Noticed that sequence of subspaces V_1, \dots, V_m is partially ordered, and hence has at least one compatible total order, i.e., we can arrange V_1, \dots, V_m so that $V_i \subset V_j$ implies $i \leq j$ (formally one can prove this by induction on r).

Proposition 4.17. *Let V_1, \dots, V_m be a strongly quasi-increasing sequence of distinct vector spaces in some universe. Say that V_1, \dots, V_m are arranged in any non-decreasing order, i.e., $V_i \subset V_j$ implies $i < j$, or, equivalently, $V_1 < \dots < V_m$ is a total order compatible with the partial order of inclusion. Then the sequence V_1, \dots, V_m is quasi-increasing.*

Proof. For any $i, r \in [m]$ with $i \neq r$, we have $i \in K_r$ implies $i < r$. Moreover if $i < r$ then $V_r \not\subset V_i$, so $i \in J_r$. Hence whenever (33) holds, then also (34) holds with (35). \square

Let us briefly show that in the quasi-increasing sequence used in Theorem 4.12 is actually strongly quasi-increasing. We leave it to the reader to verify the same for the sequences in Theorems 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15.

So consider the sets $A_i \cap B_j$ in Theorem 4.12: if $A_i \cap B_j \not\subset A_{i'} \cap B_{j'}$ (and the A_1, \dots, A_m are distinct, as well as the B_1, \dots, B_t), then either $i' < i$ or $j' < j$; hence $A_{i'} \cap B_{j'}$ is a subset of either $A_{i-1} \cap B_i$ (and $i \geq 2$) or a subset of $A_s \cap B_{j-1}$ (and $j \geq 2$). But if

$$v_r = w_1 + w_2$$

with $v_r \in A_i \cap B_j$, and $w_1 \in A_{i-1} \cap B_i$ (which does not exist if $i = 1$, so we can just take $w_1 = 0$) and $w_2 \in A_s \cap B_{j-1}$, then writing $w_2 = v_r - w_1$ shows that $w_2 \in A_i$, and hence $w_2 \in A_i \cap B_{j-1}$ which lies in $A_i \cap B_j$; similarly for w_1 .

Remark 4.18. We don't know if this strong quasi-increasing property is an accident in the four applications in this section, or holds whenever a sequence is quasi-increasing.

Remark 4.19. The following sequence of two-dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}^3 ,

$$V_1 = \text{Span}(e_1, e_2), \quad V_2 = \text{Span}(e_1, e_3), \quad V_3 = \text{Span}(e_2, e_3)$$

is not quasi-increasing (where e_i denotes the i -th standard basis vector). Hence a sequence can be coordinated even if it is not quasi-increasing. However, if we add to V_1, V_2, V_3 above all the intersections of these subspaces, then the resulting set of subspaces is (strongly) quasi-increasing. We do not presently know of a set of vector subspaces V_1, \dots, V_m that is coordinated but the set of all intersections of V_1, \dots, V_m cannot be ordered into a quasi-increasing sequence.

5. THE DISCOORDINATION FORMULA, MINIMIZERS, AND GREEDY ALGORITHMS

The point of this section is to prove theorems regarding the structure of discoordination minimizers and the “formula” in Theorem 3.14 for the discoordination of a collection A_1, \dots, A_m of subspaces of a universe. As mentioned just after we stated this theorem, our “formula” is stated in terms of certain subspaces S_1, \dots, S_m defined in terms of the A_i , and it is not generally easy to determine the S_i and their dimensions; without a good understanding of the S_i we get only partial information about the discoordination of A_1, \dots, A_m . Still, this discoordination formula, and related theorems we prove in this section will be crucial to later prove Theorem 3.6 in a fairly simple fashion.

5.1. Meet Numbers and Basic Greedy Considerations. There are a number of properties of discoordination minimizers, X , of subsets A_1, \dots, A_m that we now describe. Notice that since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DisCoord}_X(A_1, \dots, A_m) &= \sum_{i=1}^m (\dim(A_i) - |X \cap A_i|) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m |X \cap A_i|, \end{aligned}$$

$X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ is a discoordination minimizer iff $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ maximizes

$$\sum_{i=1}^m |X \cap A_i|.$$

Definition 5.1. Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . For a finite subset $X \subset \mathcal{U}$ we define the *meet of X (in A_1, \dots, A_m)* to be

$$\text{Meet}(X) = \text{Meet}(X; A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m |X \cap A_i|.$$

If $x \in \mathcal{U}$, we define the (*pointwise*) *meeting number of x (in A_1, \dots, A_m)* to be

$$\text{meet}(x) = \text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m) = \text{Meet}(\{x\}; A_1, \dots, A_m) = \{i \in [m] \mid x \in A_i\}.$$

If $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ is a finite subset of \mathcal{U} , we say that x_1, \dots, x_m is (*arranged in decreasing meeting order*) if

$$\text{meet}(x_1) \geq \text{meet}(x_2) \geq \dots \geq \text{meet}(x_m).$$

Usually A_1, \dots, A_m will be fixed, so we may simply write $\text{Meet}(X)$ and $\text{meet}(x)$ without confusion. Of course $\text{meet}(x)$ is the same as $\text{Meet}(\{x\})$, and we distinguish between “meet” and “Meet” for clarify (although confusion is unlikely to occur).

The next two propositions motivate some of the definitions above.

Proposition 5.2. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . For all $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ we have*

$$(45) \quad \text{DisCoord}_X(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m |X \cap A_i| = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - f(X),$$

where

$$(46) \quad f(X) = \sum_{i=1}^m |X \cap A_i|.$$

Furthermore,

$$(47) \quad f(X) = \text{Meet}(X; A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{x \in X} \text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m).$$

Hence $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ is a discoordination minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m iff X maximizes $f(X)$ above.

Proof. By definition,

$$\text{DisCoord}_X(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m (\dim(A_i) - |X \cap A_i|) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) \right) - f(X),$$

with $f(X)$ as in (46). Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^m |X \cap A_i| = \text{Meet}(X; A_1, \dots, A_m),$$

which clearly equals

$$\sum_{x \in X} \text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m),$$

we have (47). \square

Here is an important remark about minimizers that is related to the “greedy algorithm” we will discuss in the next subsection.

Proposition 5.3. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a basis of \mathcal{U} that is a discoordination minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m , such that the x_i 's are arranged in meeting decreasing order, i.e.,*

$$\text{meet}(x_1) \geq \text{meet}(x_2) \geq \dots \geq \text{meet}(x_n).$$

Let $X' = \{x'_1, \dots, x'_k\}$ be any other independent set in \mathcal{U} arranged in meet decreasing order, i.e.,

$$\text{meet}(x'_1) \geq \text{meet}(x'_2) \geq \dots \geq \text{meet}(x'_k).$$

Then $\text{meet}(x_k) \geq \text{meet}(x'_k)$.

Proof. Each $x'_{j'}$, with $j' \in [k]$ may be written uniquely as a linear combination

$$(48) \quad x'_{j'} = \gamma_{j'1}x_1 + \gamma_{j'2}x_2 + \dots + \gamma_{j'n}x_n$$

where $\gamma_{j'i} \in \mathbb{F}$. We claim that for some $j' \in [k]$ and $j \geq k$ we have $\gamma_{j'j} \neq 0$; otherwise $\gamma_{j'j} = 0$ for all j with $k \leq j \leq n$, and then

$$x'_{j'} \in S = \text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1});$$

but this is impossible, since S is of dimension $k-1$, and hence S cannot contain the k linearly independent vectors x'_1, \dots, x'_k . It follows that for some $j' \in [k]$ and $j \geq k$ we have $\gamma_{j'j} \neq 0$; fix any such j', j .

Since $\gamma_{j'j} \neq 0$ in (48), we may exchange $x'_{j'}$ for x_j in X and get a new basis X'' . Now assume that $\text{meet}(x_k) < \text{meet}(x'_k)$, and let us derive a contradiction: we have

$$\text{meet}(x_j) \leq \text{meet}(x_k) < \text{meet}(x'_k) \leq \text{meet}(x'_{j'}),$$

and hence

$$\text{Meet}(X'') = \text{Meet}(X) - \text{meet}(x_j) + \text{meet}(x'_{j'}) > \text{Meet}(X).$$

This contradicts the fact that X is a discoordination minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m . \square

The above proposition implies that if X, X' are two minimizers of A_1, \dots, A_m , both arranged in decreasing meeting order x_1, \dots, x_n and $x'_1, \dots, x'_{n'}$, then for all $i \leq \min(n, n')$ we have $\text{meet}(x_i) = \text{meet}(x'_i)$. Theorem 5.10 below is a more precise result, which gives a formula for the number of x_i 's that have a given meeting number for any minimizer, X , of A_1, \dots, A_m .

There are a few easy but useful corollaries of the above proposition that we wish to note.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ be a minimizer of subsets A_1, \dots, A_m of some \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let $X' = X \cap (A_1 + \dots + A_m)$. Then (1) we have*

$$|X'| = \dim(A_1 + \dots + A_m);$$

(2) if $x' \in X'$, then $\text{meet}(x') \geq 1$; and (3) if $x \in X \setminus X'$, then $\text{meet}(x) = 0$.

Proof. Since $S = A_1 + \dots + A_m$ is spanned by $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m$, one can write S as the span of $s = \dim(S)$ vectors, y_1, \dots, y_s , each of which lies in at least one A_i , i.e., $\text{meet}(y_i) \geq 1$ for $i \in [s]$. It follows from Proposition 5.3 that if the vectors of X are arranged in meet decreasing order, x_1, x_2, \dots , then $\text{meet}(x_s) \geq 1$. This gives s linearly independent vectors x_1, \dots, x_s for which $\text{meet}(x_i) \geq 1$ for all $i \in [s]$, and therefore all lie in X' . Since $\dim(S) = s$, X' is a basis for S , and the vectors in $X \setminus X'$ must lie outside of S . These facts imply (1)–(3) above. \square

The above theorem gives a small amount of structure regarding minimizers.

Definition 5.5. Let $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ be a minimizer of subsets A_1, \dots, A_m of some \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . We say that X is a *small minimizer* (with respect to A_1, \dots, A_m) if $X \subset A_1 + \dots + A_m$, and is a *large minimizer* if X is a basis for \mathcal{U} .

Proposition 5.6. *Let $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ be a minimizer of subsets A_1, \dots, A_m of some \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . Then $X' \subset X \subset X''$ where X' is a small minimizer and X'' is a large minimizer. Furthermore all small minimizers are of size $\dim(A_1 + \dots + A_m)$.*

Proof. We have $X' = X \cap (A_1 + \dots + A_m)$ is a small minimizer and $X' \subset X$. By the theorem above, X' is of size $\dim(A_1 + \dots + A_m)$ and spans all of $A_1 + \dots + A_m$. If X is not a basis for \mathcal{U} we can extend it to a basis X'' of \mathcal{U} . It follows that all elements of $X'' \setminus X'$ lie outside of $A_1 + \dots + A_m$, and hence each has meet zero with A_1, \dots, A_m . \square

5.2. The Greedy Algorithm for Minimizers. There is a simple “greedy algorithm” to build a minimizer, X , of subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m of a universe; the problem is that this algorithm is stated in terms of certain subspaces derived from the A_i —namely the S_i and U_i defined below—and so our greedy algorithm provides only partial information about the (dis)coordination of A_1, \dots, A_m and the structure of its minimizers. Nonetheless, aspects of this “greedy algorithm” will help us prove the main theorem regarding three subspaces of a universe.

Definition 5.7. Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . For any k between 1 and m , a *k-fold intersection of the A_1, \dots, A_m* refers to any subspace of the form

$$A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k} \quad \text{where } 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq m.$$

For each $k = 1, \dots, m$, we use $S_k = S_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ and $U_k = U_k(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ respectively to denote, respectively, the sum and union of all the k -fold intersections of the A_1, \dots, A_m , i.e.,

$$S_k = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq m} A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k}, \quad U_k = \bigcup_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq m} A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_k},$$

i.e.,

$$S_0 = \mathcal{U}, \quad S_1 = A_1 + \dots + A_m, \quad S_2 = \sum_{j_1 < j_2} A_{j_1} \cap A_{j_2},$$

$$S_3 = \sum_{j_1 < j_2 < j_3} A_{j_1} \cap A_{j_2} \cap A_{j_3}, \quad \dots, \quad S_m = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_m, \quad S_{m+1} = 0;$$

and

$$U_0 = \mathcal{U}, \quad U_1 = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_m, \quad U_2 = \bigcup_{j_1 < j_2} A_{j_1} \cap A_{j_2},$$

$$U_3 = \bigcup_{j_1 < j_2 < j_3} A_{j_1} \cap A_{j_2} \cap A_{j_3}, \quad \dots, \quad U_m = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_m, \quad U_{m+1} = 0.$$

(The values of $S_0, U_0, S_{m+1}, U_{m+1}$ are given as above either by convention or by a reasonable interpretation of an empty intersection, empty sum, and an empty union.)

We make the following remarks regarding the definitions and notation above. The U_i defined above are subsets of \mathcal{U} (not generally subspaces!), the S_i are subspaces of \mathcal{U} , and satisfy

- (1) for all $i = 0, \dots, m$ we have $U_i \subset S_i = \text{Span}(U_i)$ for all i ;
- (2) $0 = S_{m+1} \subset S_m \dots \subset S_1 \subset S_0 = \mathcal{U}$;
- (3) $\emptyset = U_{m+1} \subset U_m \dots \subset U_1 \subset U_0 = \mathcal{U}$;
- (4) for all $y \in \mathcal{U}$ and $i = 0, \dots, m$ we have $\text{meet}(y) = i$ iff $y \in U_i \setminus U_{i+1}$;
- (5) for all $i = 0, \dots, m$ we have S_i/S_{i+1} is spanned by the images of the elements of U_i in the quotient space \mathcal{U}/S_{i+1} ; said otherwise, $S_i = \text{Span}(S_{i+1}, U_i)$; hence
- (6) for all $i = 0, \dots, m$, the image of U_i in S_i/S_{i+1} spans this quotient space; hence there is a subset $Y_i \subset U_i$ whose image in S_i/S_{i+1} is a basis; since no such element of Y_i can lie in S_{i+1} (i.e., equal 0 in S_i/S_{i+1}), we have that any such Y_i consists entirely of elements $y \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\text{Meet}(y) = i$.

The Y_i described above turn out to be essential to our greedy algorithm, and merit a formal definition.

Definition 5.8. Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let notation be as in Definition 5.7. For any $i = 0, \dots, m$, we say that a set Y is a *purely i -th intersection basis* (for A_1, \dots, A_m) if

- (1) Y is a basis in S_i relative to S_{i+1} , and
- (2) for all $y \in Y$, $\text{meet}(y) = \text{meet}(y; A_1, \dots, A_m) = i$.

Note that (2) can also be replaced with $\text{meet}(y) \geq i$, since the fact that Y is a basis of S_i relative to S_{i+1} implies that $\text{meet}(y) \leq i$.

It is worth making the following easily proven remark.

Proposition 5.9. Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let notation be as in Definition 5.7. Then for each $i = 0, \dots, m$, there exists a *purely i -th intersection basis*.

Proof. The proof consists of unwinding the definitions. Setting $U'_i = U_i \setminus U_{i+1}$ we have

$$U'_i = U_i \setminus U_{i+1} = \{y \in \mathcal{U} \mid \text{Meet}(y; A_1, \dots, A_m) = i\}.$$

Since (1) $U_i = U'_i \cup U_{i+1}$, (2) $S_i = \text{Span}(U_i)$, and (3) $U_{i+1} \subset S_{i+1}$, it follows that S_i is spanned by S_{i+1} and the elements of U'_i . Hence (by Proposition 2.11, item (2)) there exists a Y_i consisting entirely of elements of U'_i such that Y_i is a basis of S_i relative to S_{i+1} . \square

Let us describe in rough terms our “greedy algorithm” to construct a discoordination minimizer, X , of subspaces A_1, \dots, A_m of a universe. Our approach is to equivalently choose an $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ that maximizes $f(X)$ in (47). Since $\text{meet}(x)$ takes values between 0 and m , our “greedy algorithm” first chooses the largest possible subset $X_m \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ consisting of elements in x with $\text{meet}(x) = m$; hence X_m can be as large as $\dim(S_m)$, and such a X_m is a basis for S_m . The second step is to choose the largest subset X_{m-1} possible consisting of x with $\text{meet}(x) = m - 1$ and such that $X_m \cup X_{m-1}$ remains linearly independent; it is not hard to see that (see below) that the largest possible X_{m-1} is of size $\dim(S_{m-1}/S_m)$ and must be a purely $(m - 1)$ -th intersection basis. The i -th step, for $i = 3, \dots, m$ is that given $X_m, X_{m-1}, \dots, X_{m-i+2}$, we choose X_{m-i+1} to consist of $x \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\text{meet}(x) = m - i + 1$ and as large as possible with $X_m \cup X_{m-1} \cup \dots \cup X_{m-i+1}$ linearly independent; by induction we easily see that X_{m-i+1} must be a pure $(m - i + 1)$ -th intersection basis.

Theorem 5.10 below proves that the above “greedy algorithm” always produces a minimizer, and each minimizer is constructed as such. A novel point is that each X_i is an arbitrary purely i -th intersection basis, and hence the choice of X_i is independent of the choice of X_m, \dots, X_{i+1} and X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1 . A consequence of this fact is that we get a simple formula for the discoordination in terms of the A_i 's and S_i 's. Let us state and prove this result formally (we state this theorem in a way that makes each subsequent claim easy to prove, although the overall statement is a bit long).

Theorem 5.10. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let notation be as in Definition 5.7. Let $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$, and for $i = 0, \dots, m$ set*

$$(49) \quad X_i = \{x \in X \mid \text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m) = i\}.$$

Then X_0, \dots, X_m are pairwise disjoint, and

$$(50) \quad \text{Meet}(X; A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m i|X_i| = \sum_{i=1}^m (|X_i| + \dots + |X_m|);$$

$$(51) \quad \forall i \in [m], \quad |X_i| + \dots + |X_m| \leq \dim(S_i);$$

and

$$(52) \quad \text{Meet}(X; A_1, \dots, A_m) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(S_i).$$

Furthermore, the following are equivalent:

- (1) equality holds in (52);
- (2) equality holds in (51) for all $i \in [m]$;
- (3) for all $i \in [m]$, $X_i \cup \dots \cup X_m$ is a basis of S_i (hence X_i is a basis of S_i relative to S_{i+1} and $|X_i| = \dim(S_i/S_{i+1})$); and
- (4) we have
 - (a) for each $i \in [m]$, X_i is a purely i -intersection basis, i.e., X_i is a basis of S_i relative to S_{i+1} and all elements of X_i lies in exactly i of A_1, \dots, A_m ; and
 - (b) $X_0 \subset \mathcal{U}$ is any set whose image in $\mathcal{U}/S_1 = S_0/S_1$ is a set of linearly independent vectors.

Hence for any $X \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ we have

$$(53) \quad \text{DisCoord}_X(A_1, \dots, A_m) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(S_i),$$

with equality holding for any X_0, \dots, X_m that satisfy (4a) and (4b) above, and hence

$$(54) \quad \text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(S_i).$$

In addition, for such a discoordination minimizer X we have

$$(55) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(S_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m i |X_i| = \sum_{i=1}^m i \dim(S_i/S_{i+1}),$$

and hence we may also write

$$(56) \quad \text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m i \dim(S_i/S_{i+1})$$

Proof. The X_i are pairwise disjoint in view of (49). The first equality in (50) follows since

$$\text{Meet}(X; A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{x \in X} \text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m),$$

and the second equality is clear. Since X_i, \dots, X_m are pairwise disjoint and their union is a linearly independent set in S_i , (51) follows. Summing (51) over all i we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (|X_i| + \dots + |X_m|) = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(S_i),$$

which combined with (50) yields (52). Moreover, the Inequality Summation Principle implies that condition (1) of the theorem holds iff (2) holds.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): X_0, \dots, X_m are pairwise disjoint; for each $i \in [m]$, $X_i \cup \dots \cup X_m$ lie in S_i , and hence if (51) holds with equality, then $X_i \cup \dots \cup X_m$ are a basis for S_i .

Clearly (3) \Rightarrow (2).

(3) \Rightarrow (4): for any $i \in [m]$, $X_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup X_m$ is a basis for S_{i+1} ; since $X_i \cup \dots \cup X_m$ is a basis for S_i , it follows that X_i is a basis for S_i relative to S_{i+1} (see the paragraph after Definition 2.3). Given (4a), (4b) follows since $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ is a basis for S_1 .

(4) \Rightarrow (3): we easily show this by descending induction for $i = m, m-1, \dots, 1$.

In view of Proposition 5.9, X_1, \dots, X_m satisfying (4a) exist, and hence (52) is attained with equality for any X that is the union of such X_1, \dots, X_m . Hence, by Proposition 5.2, (53) and (54) holds. In this case equality holds in (52), and by (50) we have the first equality in (55); the second equality there holds since X_i is a basis of S_i relative to S_{i+1} . Combining (55) and (54) yields (56). \square

5.3. An Equivalent Discoordination Formula and Interpretation of the Greedy Algorithm. In this subsection we use the greedy algorithm to give another interpretation of discoordination.

Theorem 5.11. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let $S_i = S_i(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ be as in Definition 5.7. Let X be any discoordination minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m .*

(1) We have

$$(57) \quad \text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = d_1 + \dots + d_m,$$

where

$$(58) \quad d_j = d_j(A_1, \dots, A_m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}) \right) - j \dim(S_j/S_{j+1}).$$

(2) We have

$$d_j = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}) \right) - j |X_j|$$

where $X_j = \{x \in X \mid \text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m) = j\}$.

(3) For all $j \in [m]$, $d_j \geq 0$.

(4) For all $j \in [m]$, $d_j = 0$ iff $[X_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ coordinates $[A_1 \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}, \dots, [A_m \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} .

(5) $d_j = 0$ iff $[A_1 \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}, \dots, [A_m \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ are coordinated in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} .

(6) We have $d_m = 0$.

Remark 5.12. Hence A_1, \dots, A_m are coordinated iff $d_1 = \dots = d_m = 0$. Beyond the fact that $d_m = 0$, with the help of Theorem 5.13 we will see that $d_{m-1} = d_m = 0$ (in Corollary 5.15). Theorem 5.13 addresses a more general phenomenon.

Proof. (1): For arbitrary

$$0 = S_{m+1} \subset S_m \subset \dots \subset S_1 \subset S_0 = \mathcal{U},$$

and any subspace $B \subset \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([B \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}) = \dim(B \cap S_j) - \dim(B \cap S_{j+1}),$$

which upon summing over all j allows us to write

$$\dim(B) = \sum_{j=0}^m \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([B \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}).$$

If $B \subset S_1 = A_1 + \dots + A_n$, then $B/S_1 = 0$, and hence the $j = 0$ term above vanishes; hence

$$(59) \quad B \subset S_1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \dim(B) = \sum_{j=1}^m \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([B \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}).$$

By (56) we have

$$\text{DisCoord}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m \dim(A_i) - \sum_{j=1}^m j \dim(S_j/S_{j+1}).$$

By (59) we have

$$\dim(A_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}),$$

and hence (57) follows.

(2): follows from (1) and the fact that $|X_j| = \dim(S_j/S_{j+1})$ for any minimizer X (by (3) of Theorem 5.10).

(3): in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , the image of X_j lies in exactly j of $[A_1 \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}, \dots, [A_m \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$, since X_j is a purely j -th intersection basis. Since X_j are linearly independent in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , we have

$$(60) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |[A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}} \cap [X_j]_{S_{j+1}}|^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}} = j|X_j|.$$

(4): $d_j = 0$ iff equality holds in (60) iff for each $i \in [m]$ we have

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}) = |[A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}} \cap [X_j]_{S_{j+1}}|^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}.$$

Hence $d_j = 0$ iff $[X_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ coordinates $[A_1 \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}, \dots, [A_m \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} .

(5): “if” is implied by (4), so it suffices to prove “only if.” So if $[A_1 \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}, \dots, [A_m \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ are coordinated in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , then they are coordinated by some basis X' in S_j/S_{j+1} . If $\tilde{X}_j \subset S_j$ are any representatives of X' (i.e., \tilde{X}_j is obtained by choosing some element of each S_{j+1} -coset in of X'), then \tilde{X}_j is a purely j -th intersection basis for A_1, \dots, A_m . Hence, by Theorem 5.10, (4a), in any minimizer X , we may replace $X_j \subset X$ with \tilde{X}_j and get another minimizer. But then

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}) = |[A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}} \cap [\tilde{X}_j]_{S_{j+1}}|^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}$$

for all i , and hence (by (2) above), $d_j = 0$.

(6): $S_{m+1} = 0$, and $S_m = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_m$; hence $A_i \cap S_m = S_m$, so any basis of S_m coordinates $[A_1 \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}, \dots, [A_m \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ for $j = m$. \square

5.4. Decomposing Discoordination into “ j -Fold Intersection” Parts. Theorem 4.5 shows that for any subspaces A_1, A_2, A_3 of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , the 2-fold intersections

$$A_1 \cap A_2, A_1 \cap A_3, A_2 \cap A_3$$

are coordinated. The theorems in this subsection will prove a few facts that are important in proving Theorem 3.6 and when we study coded-caching, such as

(1) we have

$$(61) \quad \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A_1, A_2, A_3) = \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/S_2}([A_1]_{S_2}, [A_2]_{S_2}, [A_3]_{S_2}),$$

(2) the images of $A_1 \cap A_2, A_1 \cap A_3, A_2 \cap A_3$ in \mathcal{U}/S_3 (with $S_3 = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3$) are linearly independent

(3) A_1, A_2, A_3 are coordinated iff

$$[A_1]_{S_2}, [A_2]_{S_2}, [A_3]_{S_2}$$

are linearly independent (in \mathcal{U}/S_2).

In this section we prove a number of stronger results that imply (1)–(3): in particular, Theorems 5.13 studies the situation in Theorem 5.11 where $d_m = \dots = d_k = 0$ for some k , and we will use this theorem to prove that this always holds with $k = m - 1$ (we already know this holds with $k = m$ from part (6) of Theorem 5.11); this therefore implies (2) and (3) above. Theorem 5.16 gives a general inequality of the form

$$(62) \quad \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/S_k}([A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}) \leq \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A_1, \dots, A_m),$$

and gives one set of conditions for the above to hold with equality. We will want to know that equality holds in the above when $m = 3$ and $k = 2$; one can prove this using (4) and (5) of Theorem 3.6. However, after proving Theorem 5.16, we will

show that (1) for any $m \geq 3$ and $1 \leq k \leq m - 2$, strict equality can hold in (62), and (2) for any $m \geq 3$ and $k = m - 1, m$, equality always holds.

Theorem 5.13. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} . For each $I \subset [m]$, let*

$$A_I = \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i.$$

Let $S_i = S_i(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ be as in Definition 5.7. Say that for some $k \in [m]$, the set $\{A_I\}_{|I|=k}$ is coordinated; let $Z \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ coordinate all A_I with $|I| = k$. For $j = 0, \dots, m$ let

$$Z_j = \{z \in Z \mid \text{meet}(z; A_1, \dots, A_m) = j\}$$

and

$$Z_{\geq j} = Z_j \cup Z_{j+1} \cup \dots \cup Z_m = \{z \in Z \mid \text{meet}(z; A_1, \dots, A_m) \geq j\}.$$

Then the following statements hold.

- (1) *For any $I \subset [m]$ with $|I| = j \geq k$, A_I is coordinated by Z .*
- (2) *For any $I \subset [m]$ with $|I| = j \geq k$, A_I is coordinated by $Z_{\geq j}$, i.e.,*

$$A_I \cap Z_{\geq j} \quad \text{is a basis of } A_I.$$

- (3) *For any $j \geq k$, S_j is coordinated by $Z_{\geq j}$, and $Z_{\geq j}$ is a basis for S_j .*
- (4) *For any $j \geq k$, Z_j is a basis for S_j relative to S_{j+1} .*
- (5) *For each $I \subset [m]$ with $|I| = j \geq k$, in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , the set $[A_I \cap Z_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ is a basis for $[A_I]_{S_{j+1}}$ of size $|A_I \cap Z_j|$.*
- (6) *For any $j \geq k$, each element of Z_j is in a unique element of A_I such that $I \subset [m]$ satisfies $|I| = j$, and so Z_j is partitioned into subsets $\{A_I \cap Z_j\}_I$ with I ranging over all $I \subset [m]$ with $|I| = j$.*
- (7) *For any $j \geq k$, the images of $\{A_I\}_{I \subset [m], |I|=j}$ in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , i.e., the subspaces*

$$\{[A_I]_{S_{j+1}}\}_{I \subset [m], |I|=j},$$

are linearly independent subspaces of S_j/S_{j+1} .

- (8) *With d_i as in (58), we have $d_m = \dots = d_k = 0$.*
- (9) *If X is any minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m , and X_j consists of those $x \in X$ with $\text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m) = j$, then for each $j \geq k$, $[X_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ coordinates $[A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} for all $i \in [m]$.*
- (10) *If X is any minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m , and X_j consists of those $x \in X$ with $\text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m) = j$, then for each $j \geq k$ and $|I| = j$ we have $|X_j \cap A_I| = \dim(A_I/S_{j+1})$.*

Remark 5.14. We do not presently know, regarding (9) and (10) above, if any minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m necessarily coordinates each A_I with $|I| \geq k$.⁴

Proof. Most of the implications easily result from the previous ones, often making use of Proposition 3.2; let us give some details.

(1): We prove (1) by induction on $j = k, k + 1, \dots, m$. The case $j = k$ holds by assumption. For the inductive step, assume that Z coordinates all A_I with $|I| = j$ for some j with $k \leq j \leq m - 1$, and let $I \subset [m]$ with $|I| = j + 1$. Then

⁴In other words, say that for some k , $\{A_I\}_{|I|=k}$ are coordinated; then the discoordination of $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ equals that of $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\} \cup \{A_I\}_{|I|=k}$ since we may take Z_j with $j \geq k$ as the purely j -th intersection basis of our minimizer; however, does the set of minimizers decrease?

$j + 1 \geq k + 1 \geq 2$, hence we can choose distinct elements i_1, i_2 of I and set $I_1 = I \setminus \{i_1\}$, $I_2 = I \setminus \{i_2\}$. Since $|I_1| = |I_2| = j$, Z coordinates A_{I_1}, A_{I_2} . Since

$$A_{I_1} \cap A_{I_2} = \bigcap_{i \in I_1 \cup I_2} A_i = A_I,$$

Proposition 3.2 implies that Z coordinates A_I .

(2): If $|I| = j \geq k$, any element $z \in Z \cap A_I$ meets all A_i with $i \in I$, and hence $\text{meet}(z) \geq j$. Hence $Z \cap A_I = Z_{\geq j} \cap A_I$. By (1), Z coordinates A_I , so $Z \cap A_I = Z_{\geq j} \cap A_I$ is a basis for A_I .

(3): S_j is the span of all A_I with $|I| = j$. Since $Z_{\geq j}$ coordinates each such A_I , Proposition 3.2 implies that $Z_{\geq j}$ coordinates S_j and that $S_j \cap Z_{\geq j}$ is a basis for S_j . However, each element of $Z_{\geq j}$ meets j of the A_1, \dots, A_m , and hence each element of $Z_{\geq j}$ lies in some A_I with $|I| = j$, and hence also lies in S_j . Hence $Z_{\geq j} \subset S_j$, and therefore $Z_{\geq j} \cap S_j = Z_{\geq j}$. Hence S_j has a basis consisting of $Z_{\geq j} \cap S_j = Z_{\geq j}$.

(4): By (3), we have $Z_{\geq j+1}, Z_{\geq j}$ are respective bases for S_{j+1}, S_j . It follows (by the discussion below Definition 2.3) that the set $Z_{\geq j} \setminus Z_{\geq j+1}$ is a basis for S_j relative to S_{j+1} . But $Z_{\geq j} \setminus Z_{\geq j+1}$ equals Z_j .

(5): According to (4), in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , the vectors in the set $[A_I \cap Z_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ are linearly independent and is a set of size $|A_I \cap Z_j|$. By (2) above,

$$A_I = \text{Span}(Z_{\geq j} \cap A_I),$$

and hence we have

$$[A_I]_{S_{j+1}} = A_I + S_{j+1} = \text{Span}(Z')$$

where

$$Z' = (Z_{\geq j} \cap A_I) \cup Z_{\geq j+1} = (Z_j \cap A_I) \cup Z_{\geq j+1}.$$

It follows that in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , $[Z_j \cap A_I]_{S_{j+1}}$ spans the image of $Z_j \cap A_I$ there. Hence, in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , $[Z_j \cap A_I]_{S_{j+1}}$ are linearly independent and span $[A_I]_{S_{j+1}}$, and hence are a basis for the span of $[A_I]_{S_{j+1}}$ in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , i.e., for $[S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} ; i.e., Z_j is a basis for S_j relative to S_{j+1} .

(6): is immediate from the definition of Z_j as those $z \in Z$ with $\text{meet}(z) = j$.

(7): We have

$$|Z_j| = \sum_{|I|=j} |Z_j \cap A_I|,$$

and so in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} we have

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([S_j]_{S_{j+1}}) = \sum_{|I|=j} \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_I]_{S_{j+1}}).$$

Since the A_I with $|I| = j$ span all of S_j , the $[A_I]_{S_{j+1}}$ span all of S_j/S_{j+1} in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} . Hence by (13) (in Definition 2.4), these subspaces are linearly independent in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , and hence in S_j/S_{j+1} .

(8): from (7) above, for any $j \geq k$, the A_I with $|I| = j$ are linearly independent in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , and therefore coordinated, and from (5) of Theorem 5.11 we have $d_j = 0$.

(9): by (8) above, $d_m = \dots = d_k = 0$, and hence for all $j \geq k$ we have that $[X_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ coordinates $[A_i \cap S_j]_{S_{j+1}}$ in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} .

(10): for any minimizer, X , of A_1, \dots, A_m , and any $j \in [m]$, X_j is a purely j -th intersection basis of A_1, \dots, A_m . Hence for any I with $|I| = j$, $|X_j \cap A_I| \leq \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_I]_{S_{j+1}})$. From (7) above we know that for all $j \geq k$, the $[A_I]_{S_{j+1}}$ are

linearly independent in \mathcal{U}/S_{j+1} , and hence, summing over all I with $|I| = j$ we have

$$|X_j| = \sum_{|I|=j} |X_j \cap A_I| \leq \sum_{|I|=j} \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_I]_{S_{j+1}}) = \dim(S_j/S_{j+1}).$$

But since $|X_j| = \dim(S_j/S_{j+1})$, the Inequality Summation Principle implies that $|X_j \cap A_I| \leq \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_{j+1}}([A_I]_{S_{j+1}})$ must hold with equality for all I . \square

Corollary 5.15. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , with $m \geq 2$, and let d_i be as in (58). Then $d_m = d_{m-1} = 0$.*

Proof. According to Theorem 4.5, A_I are coordinated for all $I \subset [m]$ with $|I| = m - 1$. So apply Theorem 5.13 with $k = m - 1$. \square

Theorem 5.16. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let $S_i = S_i(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ be as in Definition 5.7. Then for any $k \in [m]$ we have*

$$(63) \quad \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/S_k}([A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}) \leq \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A_1, \dots, A_m).$$

Furthermore, for any minimizer, X (or really any subset of \mathcal{U}), and $0 \leq j \leq m$ let

$$X_j = \{x \in X \mid \text{meet}(x; A_1, \dots, A_m) = j\}$$

(as usual, and)

$$X_{\geq k} = \bigcup_{j \geq k} X_j, \quad X_{< k} = \bigcup_{j < k} X_j.$$

Then (63) holds with equality if for some minimizer, X , the following conditions hold:

- (1) $X_{\geq k}$ coordinates $A_i \cap S_k$ for all i ,
- (2) for all $i \in [m]$, $|A_i \cap X_{< k}|$ equals the size of the number of S_k -cosets in $[A_i]_{S_k} \cap [X_{< k}]_{S_k}$, (our proof below shows that the first quantity is always bounded above by the second, but our proof doesn't address when equality holds), and
- (3) $X' = [X_{< k}]_{S_k}$ is a minimizer for $[A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}$.

Moreover, if (1)–(3) hold for some minimizer, X , then (1)–(3) hold for all minimizers, X , of A_1, \dots, A_m .

Proof. Let X be a minimizer of A_1, \dots, A_m . Then (3) of Theorem 5.10 implies that $X_{\geq k}$ is a basis for S_k , and hence the map from $X_{< k}$ to its image, X' , in \mathcal{U}/S_k is a bijection, and the X' are linearly independent in \mathcal{U}/S_k . Hence for any subspace $B \subset \mathcal{U}$ we have

$$(64) \quad |B \cap X_{\geq k}| \leq \dim(B \cap S_k);$$

since $X' \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U}/S_k)$ is a linearly independent set in bijection with $X_{< k}$,

$$(65) \quad |B \cap X_{< k}| \leq |[B]_{S_k} \cap X'|^{|\mathcal{U}/S_k|},$$

where the right-hand-side counts the number of S_k -cosets in $[B]_{S_k} \cap X'$ (note that strict inequality can hold, namely when $B + S_k$ contains an element of X' that doesn't lie in B). Adding (64) and (65) we get

$$(66) \quad |B \cap X| = |B \cap X_{\geq k}| + |B \cap X_{< k}| \leq \dim(B \cap S_k) + |[B]_{S_k} \cap X'|^{|\mathcal{U}/S_k|}.$$

Since X is a minimizer for A_1, \dots, A_m , we have

$$\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \sum_{i=1}^m (\dim(A_i) - |A_i \cap X|)$$

which, in view of (66) summed over all $B = A_i$,

$$(67) \quad \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\dim(A_i) - \dim(A_i \cap S_k) - |[A_i]_{S_k} \cap X'|^{U/S_k} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\dim^{U/S_k}([A_i]_{S_k}) - |[A_i]_{S_k} \cap X'|^{U/S_k} \right) = \text{DisCoord}_{X'}^{U/S_k}([A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k})$$

$$(68) \quad \geq \text{DisCoord}^{U/S_k}([A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}),$$

which implies (63).

Note that (68) holds with equality iff condition (3) of the theorem holds. Note also that (67) is equivalent to (66) for $B = A_i$ for all i , which is equivalent to both (64) and (65) for $B = A_i$ for all i , which are equivalent to (1) and (2). Hence if (1)–(3) hold for some minimizer, X , of A_1, \dots, A_m , then

$$\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A_1, \dots, A_m) = \text{DisCoord}^{U/S_k}([A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}),$$

and then (1)–(3) must hold for any other minimizer \tilde{X} , for otherwise replacing \tilde{X} by X in the above, strict inequality would hold for at least one of (67) or (68), and hence strict inequality would hold in (63), which is impossible. \square

Because conditions (2) and (3) of the above theorem look less direct to verify than condition (1), we make the following observation.

Proposition 5.17. *In Theorem 5.16, conditions (2) and (3) hold provided that for all $j \in [m]$ and $i_1 < \dots < i_j$ we have*

$$(69) \quad [A_{i_1}]_{S_k} \cap \dots \cap [A_{i_j}]_{S_k} = [A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_j}]_{S_k}.$$

Of course, the right-hand-side of (69) is always a subset of the left-hand-side.

Proof. To verify condition (2), say that $[A_1]_{S_k} = [x]_{S_k}$ for some $x \in X_j$ with $j < k$; we need to show that $x \in A_1$; if not, then since X_j is a pure j -th intersection basis of A_1, \dots, A_m , we have $x \in A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_j}$ for unique $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_j \leq m$; the fact that $x \notin A_1$ implies that $i_1 > 1$. But then

$$x \in [A_1]_{S_k} \cap [A_{i_1}]_{S_k} \cap \dots \cap [A_{i_j}]_{S_k} = [A_1 \cap A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_j}]_{S_k},$$

and hence $x \in [S_{j+1}]_{S_k} = S_{j+1}$; this is impossible, since $x \in X_j$ and X_j is a basis for S_j relative to S_{j+1} .

To verify condition (3), it suffices to show that for each $j < k$, X_j is a pure j -th intersection basis for $[A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}$. So fix $j < k$ and let

$$\tilde{S}_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S_j([A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}).$$

Summing (69) over all possible $i_1 < \dots < i_j$ we have

$$\tilde{S}_j = \left[S_j(A_1, \dots, A_m) \right]_{S_k},$$

and hence for $j < k$ we have that

$$(70) \quad \tilde{S}_j / \tilde{S}_{j+1} = [S_j / S_{j+1}]_{S_k} = S_j / S_{j+1}$$

since $S_k \subset S_{j+1}$. Since the image of X_j in S_j/S_{j+1} is a basis, (70) implies that the image of X_j in $\tilde{S}_j/\tilde{S}_{j+1}$ is a basis. Moreover, since each $x \in X_j$ lies in j of A_1, \dots, A_m , we have $[x]_{S_k}$ lies in at least j of $[A_1]_{S_k}, \dots, [A_m]_{S_k}$. \square

Remark 5.18. In (63) we have equality for $m = 3$ and $k = 2$, thanks to (4) and (5) of Theorem 3.6; For any $m = 3$ and $k = 1$, the left-hand-side of (63), and hence strict inequality can occur in this case.

Remark 5.19. Similarly, for $m \geq 4$ and any $1 \leq k \leq m - 2$, we note that strict inequality can occur in (63): indeed, if $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{F}^2 = A_4, \dots, A_m$, and A_1, A_2, A_3 are distinct one-dimensional spaces of $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{F}^2$, then $S_{m-2} = \mathcal{U}$, and hence $S_k = \mathcal{U}$. Hence $\mathcal{U}/S_k = 0$, and while A_1, \dots, A_m are not coordinated, the left-hand-side of (63) is 0.

We will now show that for $k = m - 1, m$, in contrast to the last remark, equality always holds in (63). To do so we need a subtle lemma.

Lemma 5.20. *Let A_1, \dots, A_m be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let $S_i = S_i(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ be as in Definition 5.7. For $k = m, m - 1$ we have that for all $j \in [m]$, (69) holds.*

Proof. By symmetry it suffices to show that for any $j \in [m]$

$$[A_1]_{S_k} \cap \dots \cap [A_j]_{S_k} = [A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_j]_{S_k}.$$

To do so it suffices to show that

$$(71) \quad [A_1]_{S_k} \cap \dots \cap [A_j]_{S_k} \subset [A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_j]_{S_k},$$

since the reverse inclusion is immediate. For $k = m$, (71) is immediate, since if

$$(72) \quad [a_1]_{S_k} = \dots = [a_j]_{S_k}$$

for some $a_i \in A_i$ for all $i \in [j]$, i.e.

$$(73) \quad b = a_1 + s_1 = \dots = a_j + s_j$$

for some $s_i \in S_m$ for all $i \in [j]$, then $b = a_i + s_i \in A_i$ for all $i \in [j]$, and hence $b \in A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_j$. Hence (71) holds.

Next say that $k = m - 1$ and (72) holds, i.e., (73) with $a_i \in A_i$ and $s_i \in S_{m-1}$. Then for all $i \in [j]$ we have

$$b = a_i + s_{i,1} + \dots + s_{i,m}$$

where $s_{i,\ell} \in A_{\hat{\ell}}$ with $A_{\hat{\ell}}$ as in (32). Then $b' = b - s_{1,1} - \dots - s_{j,j}$ lies in each A_i with $i \in [j]$, since b' equals a_i plus a sum of terms in $A_{\hat{\ell}}$ with $\ell \neq i$. Hence $b' \in A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_m$, and $[b']_{S_{m-1}} = [b]_{S_{m-1}} = [a_i]_{S_{m-1}}$ for all $i \in [j]$. Hence (71) holds. \square

Theorem 5.21. *In Theorem 5.16, (63) holds with equality for $k = m$ and $k = m - 1$.*

Proof. It suffices to verify conditions (1)–(3) of Theorem 5.16 holds with equality for any maximizer, X , of A_1, \dots, A_m . Conditions (2) and (3) follow from Lemma 5.20.

For $k = m$, Condition (1) follows since $A_i \cap S_m = S_m$ (since $S_m \subset A_i$), which X_m coordinates since X_m is a pure intersection basis.

For $k = m - 1$, let $A_{\hat{i}}$ be as in (32). Since $A_{\hat{1}}, \dots, A_{\hat{m}}$ are coordinated (by Theorem 4.5), we have (by (4) and (5) of Theorem 5.11) that $X_{\geq m-1}$ coordinates

each. Let us show that $A_1 \cap S_{m-1} = A_{\hat{2}} + \cdots + A_{\hat{m}}$: indeed, an element of $A_1 \cap S_{m-1}$ can be written as $a_1 = s_1 + \cdots + s_m$ with $s_i \in A_{\hat{i}}$, and then $s_1 = a_1 - s_2 - \cdots - s_m$ shows that $s_1 \in A_1$; hence $s_1 \in S_m \subset A_{\hat{2}}$. Hence $A_1 \cap S_{m-1} \subset A_{\hat{2}} + \cdots + A_{\hat{m}}$, and the reverse inclusion is clear. Hence $X_{\geq m-1}$ coordinates $A_1 \cap S_{m-1}$, and by symmetry also $A_i \cap S_{m-1}$ for any $i \in [m]$. Hence condition (1) holds for $k = m - 1$ as well. \square

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS REGARDING THREE SUBSPACES

The goal of this section is to prove Theorems 3.6 and 3.13. Theorem 3.6.

6.1. Theorem 3.6 in the Case When $S_2 = 0$. As a first step to proving Theorem 3.6, we address the case when $S_2(A, B, C) = 0$ with S_2 as in Theorem 5.10 and (54).

Theorem 6.1. *Let A, B, C be any subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe \mathcal{U} such that $A \cap B = A \cap C = B \cap C = 0$. Let $m = \text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$. Then:*

- (1) $\dim(A + B) = \dim(A) + \dim(B)$;
- (2) $m = \dim((A + B) \cap C)$; and
- (3) *there are bases a_1, \dots, a_{m_1} of A , b_1, \dots, b_{m_2} of B , and c_1, \dots, c_{m_3} of C , such that $m \leq m_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$,*

$$c_i = a_i + b_i \quad \text{for } i \in [m],$$

and

$$(74) \quad a_1, \dots, a_{m_1}, b_1, \dots, b_{m_2}, c_{m+1}, \dots, c_{m_3}$$

is a basis for $A + B + C$.

Proof. By the dimension formula, since $A \cap B = 0$, we have $\dim(A + B) = \dim(A) + \dim(B)$.

Let S_1, S_2, S_3 be as in Theorem 5.10. The hypothesis of this theorem implies that in the formula for discoordination (54), $S_2 = S_3 = 0$; since $S_1 = A + B + C$ we have

$$m = \dim(A) + \dim(B) + \dim(C) - \dim(A + B + C),$$

and since $\dim(A) + \dim(B) = \dim(A + B)$,

$$m = \dim(A + B) + \dim(C) - \dim(A + B + C).$$

Combining the dimension formula applied to $A + B$ and C then implies that $m = \dim((A + B) \cap C)$.

Let c_1, \dots, c_m be a basis for $(A + B) \cap C$; since each c_i also lies in $A + B$, we may write each c_i as $a_i + b_i$. We claim that a_1, \dots, a_m are linearly independent, for if not then for some $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in \mathbb{F}$ we have

$$\gamma_1 a_1 + \cdots + \gamma_m a_m = 0$$

where $\gamma_i \neq 0$ for at least one i ; hence

$$\gamma_1 c_1 + \cdots + \gamma_m c_m = \gamma_1 b_1 + \cdots + \gamma_m b_m;$$

but this is impossible, since the left-hand-side is a nonzero element of C , and the right-hand-side is an element of B , which would imply that $C \cap B$ contains a nonzero element, contrary to the hypothesis in the theorem.

Similarly the b_1, \dots, b_m are linearly independent. By basis extension, we may extend these vectors to a basis, b_1, \dots, b_{m_2} of B with $m_2 \geq m$. Similarly we extend

the a_1, \dots, a_m to get a basis a_1, \dots, a_{m_1} of A , with $m_1 \geq m$. Since $(A+B) \cap C$ is a subspace of dimension m in C , with a basis c_1, \dots, c_m , we may extend this to get a basis c_1, \dots, c_{m_3} of C with $m \geq m_3$. It follows that $A+B+C$ is spanned the vectors in (74) (since $c_i = a_i + b_i$); let us verify that these vectors are linearly independent (this can be done in a number of ways): notice that (74) has $m' = m_1 + m_2 + (m_3 - m)$ vectors; by construction m_1, m_2 are the dimensions of A, B and

$$\dim(C) = \dim(C \cap (A+B)) + m_3 - m;$$

by the dimension formula,

$$\dim(A+B+C) = \dim(A+B) + \dim(C) - \dim(C \cap (A+B))$$

$= \dim(A) + \dim(B) + \dim(C) - \dim((A+B) \cap C) = m_1 + m_2 + m_3 - m = m'$;
since the collection of m' vectors in (74) span $A+B+C$, and $\dim(A+B+C) = m'$, these vectors must be a basis for $A+B+C$. \square

6.2. The Lifting Lemma. Before we prove Theorem 4.3, it is helpful to extract a simple ingredient of the proof that is conceptually important.

Lemma 6.2 (The Lifting Lemma). *Let A, B, C be subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let*

$$S_2 = S_2(A, B, C) = A \cap B + A \cap C + B \cap C.$$

If for some $\tilde{a} \in A$, $\tilde{b} \in B$, and $\tilde{c} \in C$ we have

$$[\tilde{a} + \tilde{b}]_{S_2} = [\tilde{c}]_{S_2},$$

then there exist $a \in A$, $b \in B$, and $c \in C$ such that

$$a + b = c$$

and

$$(75) \quad [a]_{S_2} = [\tilde{a}]_{S_2}, [b]_{S_2} = [\tilde{b}]_{S_2}, [c]_{S_2} = [\tilde{c}]_{S_2}.$$

In particular we have

$$[A+B]_{S_2} \cap [C]_{S_2} = [(A+B) \cap C]_{S_2}.$$

Proof. Let us start with the first claim. We have

$$[\tilde{a} + \tilde{b} - \tilde{c}]_{S_2} = [0]_{S_2}$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{a} + \tilde{b} - \tilde{c} = v_1 + v_2 + v_3$$

for some $v_1 \in A \cap B$, $v_2 \in A \cap C$, and $v_3 \in B \cap C$. Then $v_2, v_3 \in C$ so $c = \tilde{c} + v_2 + v_3 \in C$ as well. Similarly $v_1 \in A$ so $a = \tilde{a} - v_1 \in A$ as well. Taking $b = \tilde{b}$ we then have $a + b = c$. Since each v_i lies in S_2 , we have (75).

To prove the second statement, it is immediate that

$$[(A+B) \cap C]_{S_2} \subset [A+B]_{S_2} \cap [C]_{S_2};$$

to prove the reverse inclusion we note that an element of the right-hand-side of the above equation is a class $[\tilde{c}]_{S_2}$ with $\tilde{c} \in C$ which is also a class of the form $[\tilde{a} + \tilde{b}]_{S_2}$; by the previous paragraph, there are $a \in A$, $b \in B$, and $c \in C$ with $c = a + b$ and that satisfy (75); hence $c \in C \cap (A+B)$ with $[c]_{S_2} = [\tilde{c}]_{S_2}$. Hence

$$[C]_{S_2} \subset [(A+B) \cap C]_{S_2},$$

and so the two sides are equal. \square

6.3. Proof of Theorem 3.6.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. According to Theorem 4.3, the subspaces

$$A \cap B \cap C, A \cap B, A \cap C, C \cap B$$

are coordinated; so let X be a minimum sized set that coordinates these three subspaces; hence

$$|X| = \dim(S_2) = \dim(A \cap B + A \cap C + B \cap C).$$

Consider in \mathcal{U}/S_2 the vector subspaces $A' = [A]_{S_2}$, $B' = [B]_{S_2}$, $C' = [C]_{S_2}$; apply Theorem 6.1 to these three subspaces (whose two-fold intersections clearly vanish)

$$a'_1, \dots, a'_{m_1}, b'_1, \dots, b'_{m_2}, c'_1, \dots, c'_{m_3}$$

be the respective bases for A', B', C' with $c'_i = a'_i + b'_i$ for $i \in [m]$; according to Theorem 6.1,

$$(76) \quad m = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_2} \left(([A]_{S_2} + [B]_{S_2}) \cap [C]_{S_2} \right)$$

and according to the lifting lemma

$$(77) \quad \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_2} \left(([A]_{S_2} + [B]_{S_2}) \cap [C]_{S_2} \right) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_2} \left([(A+B) \cap C]_{S_2} \right).$$

Each a'_i is an S_2 -coset, so for each $i \in [m_1]$ pick an arbitrary $\tilde{a}_i \in \mathcal{U}$ with $[\tilde{a}_i]_{S_2} = a'_i$, and similarly for \tilde{b}_i for all $i \in [m_2]$ and for \tilde{c}_i with $i \in [m_3]$. By the lifting lemma, for each $i \in [m]$ there exist a_i, b_i, c_i whose S_2 -coset is the same as $\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{b}_i, \tilde{c}_i$ respectively, and satisfy $a_i + b_i = c_i$.

For $i > m$, let $a_i = \tilde{a}_i$, and similarly for b_i and c_i . Setting

$$X' = \{a_1, \dots, a_{m_1}, b_1, \dots, b_{m_2}, c_{m+1}, \dots, c_{m_3}\}$$

we see that $X \cup X'$ is a basis for $A + B + C$, since X' is a basis of $A + B + C$ relative to S_2 and X is a basis of S_2 . Let Y be an arbitrary basis of \mathcal{U} relative to $A + B + C$; hence $X \cup Y \cup X'$ is a basis for \mathcal{U} . Set

$$X_2 = \{a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_m\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= (X \cup Y \cup X') \setminus X_2 \\ &= X \cup Y \{a_{m+1}, \dots, a_{m_1}\} \cup \{b_{m+1}, \dots, b_{m_2}\} \cup \{c_{m+1}, \dots, c_{m_3}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and set $\mathcal{U}_1 = \text{Span}(X_1)$ and $\mathcal{U}_2 = \text{Span}(X_2)$. Then X_1, X_2 are disjoint sets whose union is a basis of \mathcal{U} , and hence $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ form a decomposition of \mathcal{U} .

Let us prove that (1) A factors through the decomposition of \mathcal{U} into \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 , and that (2) X_1 coordinates $A \cap \mathcal{U}_1$: to prove both, it suffices to show that

$$(78) \quad \dim(A) \leq |A \cap X_1| + \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_2),$$

for if so then

$$\dim(A) \leq \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_1) + \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_2) \leq |A \cap X_1| + \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_2)$$

shows that both

$$\dim(A) = \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_1) + \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_1) = |A \cap X_1|$$

must hold. To prove (78), let us first prove that

$$(79) \quad A \cap S_2 = A \cap B + A \cap C :$$

if $v_1 + v_2 + v_3 = a \in A$ with v_1, v_2, v_3 in, respectively $A \cap B, A \cap C, B \cap C$, then $v_3 = a - v_1 - v_2 \in A$, and hence $v_3 \in A \cap B \cap C$ so $a = (v_1 + v_3) + v_2$ expresses a as a sum of elements of $A \cap B$ and $A \cap C$. Hence (79) holds; since X coordinates $A \cap B$ and $A \cap C$ it also coordinates their sum, i.e., $A \cap S_2$. Hence

$$\dim(A) = \dim(A \cap S_2) + \dim(A/S_2) = |A \cap X| + \dim(A/S_2);$$

but since a_1, \dots, a_{m_1} is a basis of A relative to S_2 , we have $\dim(A/S_2) = m_1$, and hence

$$\dim(A) = |A \cap X| + m_1 = |A \cap X| + m + (m_1 - m) \leq |A \cap X_1| + \dim(A \cap \mathcal{U}_2)$$

since $a_{m+1}, \dots, a_{m_1} \in X_1$, $X_1 \cap X = \emptyset$, and $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathcal{U}_2$ are linearly independent. This proves (78), and hence A factors through \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 and X_1 coordinates $A \cap \mathcal{U}_1$.

The same argument with A, B, C permuted shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(B) &\leq |B \cap X_1| + \dim(B \cap \mathcal{U}_2), \\ \dim(C) &\leq |C \cap X_1| + \dim(C \cap \mathcal{U}_2) \end{aligned}$$

(the only difference between C and A is that c_1, \dots, c_m do not lie in X_2 , but they do lie in \mathcal{U}_2). Hence A, B, C factor through the decomposition $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$, and $A \cap \mathcal{U}_1, B \cap \mathcal{U}_1, C \cap \mathcal{U}_1$ are coordinated (by X_1). This establishes claim (1) in Theorem 3.6 and the statement before it.

Next we have $\dim(\mathcal{U}_2) = 2m$ since it has X_2 for a basis; if $\mu: \mathcal{U}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^2 \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$ is the isomorphism taking a_i to $e_1 \otimes e_i$ and b_i to $e_2 \otimes e_i$, then μ takes c_i to $(e_1 + e_2) \otimes e_i$. Hence μ satisfies the required condition of claim (2) of Theorem 3.6.

Now we verify the second part of Theorem 3.6, i.e., that the quantities in (1)–(5) there are equal. According to (76) and (77),

$$m = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_2} \left(([A]_{S_2} + [B]_{S_2}) \cap [C]_{S_2} \right) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/S_2} \left([(A+B) \cap C]_{S_2} \right).$$

Hence (1), (4), and (5) are equal.

Let us show that m equals the discoordination of A, B, C . Since A, B, C factor through $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$, Theorem 3.15 implies that

$$(80) \quad \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(A, B, C) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}_i}(A \cap \mathcal{U}_i, B \cap \mathcal{U}_i, C \cap \mathcal{U}_i).$$

The $i = 1$ discoordination term above is zero, since $A \cap \mathcal{U}_1, B \cap \mathcal{U}_1, C \cap \mathcal{U}_1$ are coordinated; now we prove that the $i = 2$ discoordination term equals m . Since μ gives an isomorphism from $A \cap \mathcal{U}_2, B \cap \mathcal{U}_2, C \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ to

$$E_1 = \text{Span}(e_1) \otimes \mathbb{F}^m, \quad E_2 = \text{Span}(e_2) \otimes \mathbb{F}^m, \quad E_3 = \text{Span}(e_1 + e_2) \otimes \mathbb{F}^m,$$

the $i = 2$ discoordination term equals the discoordination of E_1, E_2, E_3 above. Visibly the intersection of any two of E_1, E_2, E_3 is zero, and hence Theorem 6.1 (with A, B, C there replaced with E_1, E_2, E_3) implies that

$$\text{DisCoord}(E_1, E_2, E_3) = \dim((E_1 + E_2) \cap E_3) = \dim(E_3) = m.$$

Hence the right-hand-side of (80) equals m . Hence (1), (2), (4), (5) of the second part of Theorem 3.6 are equal.

To see that (1), (2) (4), (5) in Theorem 3.6 also equals the quantity in (3), note that the basis $X_1 \cup X_2$ of \mathcal{U} contains all the a_i, b_i, c_i except for c_1, \dots, c_m , and that $X_1 \cup X_2$ coordinates A and B and satisfies

$$\text{DisCoord}_{X_1 \cup X_2}(A, B, C) = m = \text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$$

by the equality of (1) and (2). Hence $X_1 \cup X_2$ is a discoordination minimizer, and no other $Y \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$ can coordinate A and B and have $\dim(C) - |C \cap Y|$ be any smaller than m (for otherwise $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C) \leq \dim(C) - |C \cap Y| \leq m - 1$). Hence the quantity in (2) is minimized by the independent set $X_1 \cup X_2$ and equals m . \square

6.4. Proof of Theorem 3.13.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $A, B, C \subset \mathcal{U}$ be coordinated subspaces of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , and let $D \subset A \cap B$. Then A, B, C, D are coordinated, and hence the images of A, B, C in \mathcal{U}/D are coordinated.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.4,

$$A \cap B \cap C \cap D = C \cap D, A \cap B \cap C, D, A \cap B, A \cap C, B \cap C, A, B$$

are coordinated by some $\tilde{X} \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{U})$. Let $X = \tilde{X} \cap S_2$, which therefore coordinates

$$(81) \quad A \cap B \cap C \cap D = C \cap D, A \cap B \cap C, D, A \cap B, A \cap C, B \cap C.$$

Now let us repeat the proof of Theorem 3.6 in Subsection 6.3, with the above in mind. In the notation there, with

$$X_1 = X \cup \{a_{m+1}, \dots, a_{m_1}\} \cup \{b_{m+1}, \dots, b_{m_2}\} \cup \{c_{m+1}, \dots, c_{m_3}\},$$

and

$$X_2 = \{a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_m\},$$

we have that $X_1 \cup X_2$ is a basis for $A + B + C$. But since A, B, C are coordinated, $X_2 = \emptyset$ and $m = 0$. Hence X_1 coordinates A, B, C . Since X_1 contains X , X_1 also coordinates D , since X coordinates everything in (81). Hence X_1 coordinates A, B, C, D . Hence also $[X_1 \setminus D]_D$ coordinates $[A]_D, [B]_D, [C]_D$ in \mathcal{U}/D . \square

Proof of Theorem 3.13. Consider the decomposition of \mathcal{U} into $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ given by Theorem 3.6. Since $D \subset A \cap B$, and $A \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ and $B \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ do not intersect, and A, B both factor through the decomposition, we have $A \cap B \subset \mathcal{U}_1$ and hence $D \subset \mathcal{U}_1$. Hence D also factors through this decomposition.

Next we claim that

$$\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/D}([A]_D, [B]_D, [C]_D)$$

can be written as a formula involving \dim of expressions involving the operations $+, \cap$ (and parenthesis) applied to A, B, C, D : to see this, we write

$$\dim([A]_D) = \dim(A) - \dim(A \cap D),$$

and similarly for B, C replacing A ; for $i = 1, 2, 3$ we get similar formula for

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/D}(S_i([A]_D, [B]_D, [C]_D)) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(S_i(A + D, B + D, C + D)) - \dim(D).$$

In this way we can write the discoordination of the images of A, B, C in \mathcal{U}/D as a formula involving \dim and the $+, \cap$ applied to A, B, C, D . It then follows from Theorem 2.10 that

$$\text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/D}([A]_D, [B]_D, [C]_D)$$

$$(82) \quad = \sum_{i=1}^2 \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}_i/D}([A \cap \mathcal{U}_i]_{D \cap \mathcal{U}_i}, [B \cap \mathcal{U}_i]_{D \cap \mathcal{U}_i}, [C \cap \mathcal{U}_i]_{D \cap \mathcal{U}_i}).$$

Since $\mathcal{U}_2 \cap D = 0$, the \mathcal{U}_2 (i.e., $i = 2$) term of (82) is just

$$\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C).$$

Since $D \cap \mathcal{U}_1 \subset (A \cap \mathcal{U}_1) \cap (B \cap \mathcal{U}_1)$, and $A \cap \mathcal{U}_1, B \cap \mathcal{U}_1, C \cap \mathcal{U}_1$ are coordinated, Lemma 6.3 implies that the \mathcal{U}_1 (i.e., $i = 1$) term of (82) vanishes. \square

[We remark that one can give a slight variation of the above proof, using the fact that \mathcal{U}/D is isomorphic to the direct sum of \mathcal{U}_1/D and \mathcal{U}_2 ; this gives another way to arrive at the same calculation of the discoordination.]

7. CODED CACHING: INTRODUCTION AND THE CASE $N = K = 3$

Recall our discussion of information theory and our particular notions, including that of a *linear random variable* (Definition 2.16) in Subsection 2.9. We remind the reader that for our entire discussion of coded caching—which comprises most of the rest of this article—we will often use Notation 2.18; hence for linear random variables, $Y_1, \dots, Y_m \subset \mathcal{U}$ in an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , we often write (Y_1, \dots, Y_m) or simply $Y_1 \dots Y_m$ —notation common in information theory—for the subset $Y_1 + \dots + Y_m \subset \mathcal{U}$.

In this section we introduce the problem of *coded caching* and discuss one special case (of $N = K = 3$ in the standard notation) that is likely one of the “easiest” open special case of this problem.

There is an extensive literature on the many variations of the problem of *coded caching*, beginning with the seminal paper [MAN14]; see [YMAA19, Sab20] for a survey of the literature; we specifically use recent results from the impressive, computer-aided inequalities of the work of Tian [Tia18]. Let us give the basic definitions; most authors use the original notation of [MAN14].

7.1. Introduction to Coded Caching and Informal Description. We start by describing a mild simplification of Maddah-Ali and Niesen problem [MAN14]. We stick to their notation. In this subsection we begin with an informal description, before giving the formal (and less intuitive) description in the next subsection.

For $N, K, F \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and rationals $M, R \geq 0$ (and $M, R \leq N$ in practice), here is an informal description of an (N, K, F) -coded caching scheme that achieves the *memory-rate pair* (M, R) : a central server has access to $N \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ files or documents, W_1, \dots, W_N , each consisting of $F \in \mathbb{N}$ bits, i.e., each W_i is an element of $\{0, 1\}^F$. There are $K \in \mathbb{N}$ users, where each user has a “cache” (i.e., storage device, typically “small” in some sense) of size MF for some rational number M , and we are interested in the case where $0 < M < N$, so the caches can store some information regarding the documents, but not all N documents. The rough idea is that there are two phases in this process: in the first phase, each user can examine all NF bits of all the documents, but the user does not have enough storage to store all NF bits; in this phase each user knows that in the second phase they will need to obtain exactly one of the N documents, but the user does not know which document they will need until the first phase is over. The first phase is called the *placement phase*, during which the server broadcasts all NF bits in W_1, \dots, W_N , and for $i = 1, \dots, K$, user i can store up to MF bits of information, i.e., can store a function $Z_i = Z_i(W_1, \dots, W_N)$ of MF bits; we refer to Z_i as the

“cache” of user i ; the server knows the function Z_i (and hence knows the values $Z_i(W_1, \dots, W_N)$). Between the first in the second phase, the server and each user are given (by something external to this system) a vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_K)$ such that for each $i \in [K] = \{1, \dots, K\}$, $d_i \in [N]$, and user i requests to be able to reconstruct W_{d_i} ; we refer to $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_K)$ as the *demand vector*. In the second phase—the *delivery phase*—the central server broadcasts a message $X_{\mathbf{d}}$. By a *memory-rate pair* we mean a pair (M, R) of rational numbers, and we say that such a pair is *achievable* (for a given value of (N, K)) if for some $F \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a caching scheme as above, i.e., a choice of Z_1, \dots, Z_K , each of size MF bits, each $Z_i = Z_i(W_1, \dots, W_N)$, such that for all $\mathbf{d} \in [N]^K = \{1, \dots, N\}^K$ there exists a function $X_{\mathbf{d}} = X_{\mathbf{d}}(W_1, \dots, W_N)$ of at most RF bits, such that for all $i = 1, \dots, K$, the values of $X_{\mathbf{d}}$ and Z_i (and \mathbf{d}) determine the document W_{d_i} (needed by user i).

Remark 7.1. If an (N, K, F) -coded caching scheme achieves a memory-rate pair (M, R) , then one easily sees (see Subsection 7.1 below) that such a scheme exists with F replaced by any multiple of F . It easily follows that for any $F' \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an (N, K, F') with memory-rate pair $(M + o(1), R + o(1))$ for F' large. For this reason, much of the coded-caching literature studies which memory-rate pairs (M, R) are achievable, without regard to F . However, if F is very large (think of $F = 10^{100}$), then such a scheme may be wildly impractical for practical values of F' .

Example 7.2. Let $N = K = 2$; this case was solved in [MAN14] and illustrates the novelty of this problem; their solution was complete in the sense that for all rational $M \in [0, 2]$ they determined the smallest R with (M, R) achievable; we discuss this later. Here is one of their caching schemes: let $F = 2$, and let $W_1 = (A_1, A_2)$ and $W_2 = (B_1, B_2)$ where $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. We claim that the pair $(M, R) = (1/2, 1)$ is achievable: indeed, let $Z_1 = A_1 \oplus B_1$ and $Z_2 = A_2 \oplus B_2$, where \oplus denotes addition modulo 2. If $\mathbf{d} = (1, 1)$, i.e., both users want document 1, then we set $X_{(1,1)} = W_1$, i.e., in the delivery phase the server broadcasts $W_1 = (A_1, A_2)$. Similarly we may take $X_{(2,2)} = W_2$. If $\mathbf{d} = (1, 2)$, i.e., user 1 wants document 1 and user 2 wants document 2, we see that we may take $X_{(1,2)} = A_2 \oplus B_1$, so that (1) $X_{(1,2)}$ and $Z_1 = A_1 \oplus B_1$ allow user 1 to determine $W_1 = (A_1, A_2)$, and (2) $X_{(1,2)}$ and $Z_2 = A_2 \oplus B_2$ allow user 2 to determine $W_2 = (B_1, B_2)$. Similarly we can take $X_{(2,1)} = A_1 \oplus B_2$. Hence each cache Z_i stores $MF = 2$ bits, and each $X_{\mathbf{d}}$ can consist of only $RF = 2$ bits, which achieves $(M, R) = (1/2, 1)$.

Henceforth we will usually drop the parentheses and commas in writing the $X_{\mathbf{d}}$, e.g., writing X_{12} for $X_{(1,2)}$.

The motivation for coded caching comes from computer caches, where phase one is a time of high bandwidth on the communication network, and phase two is a one of low bandwidth. We note that there are many other ways to view the coded caching problem; for example, we may view the server as an online library, the N documents as books, and the K users as students. We may also view the server as a radio station, and the users as each having a radio. As such, we expect that this problem may have applications beyond the original motivation in [MAN14].

7.2. Formal Definition of a Classical and Linear Coded Caching Scheme.

In this subsection we define the usual (or *classical*) formal definition of a coded caching scheme, and then we introduce the version with \mathbb{F} -linear random variables

for an arbitrary field, \mathbb{F} ; the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ reduces to the linear case of the classical definition.

Definition 7.3 (Classical Coded Caching Scheme). Let $N, K, F \in \mathbb{N}$. By an *classical coded caching scheme with N documents of size F and K users*, or simply an (N, K, F) -*coded caching scheme*, we mean a collection of random variables

$$\left(\{W_i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{Z_j\}_{j \in [K]}, \{X_{\mathbf{d}}\}_{\mathbf{d} \in [N]^K} \right)$$

on a source (i.e., probability space) (S, P) , such that

- (1) W_1, \dots, W_N are independent uniformly distributed random variables $S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^F$;
 - (2) for each K -tuple $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_K) \in [N]^K$, i.e., with each $d_i \in [N]$, we have
- $$(83) \quad \forall j \in [K], \quad (Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}) \Rightarrow W_{d_j}.$$

We say that a scheme *achieves the memory-rate pair* (M, R) if

$$\begin{aligned} \forall j \in [N], \quad H(Z_j) &\leq MF \\ \forall \mathbf{d} \in [N]^K, \quad H(X_{\mathbf{d}}) &\leq RF. \end{aligned}$$

[One could generalize this setup by fixing a $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q \geq 3$, replacing $\{0, 1\}$ with $\{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$, and replace H with $H_q = (1/\log_2 q)H$. We have not seen this in the literature and will not address this in this article.]

We begin with a few remarks.

Remark 7.4. In the original definition of Maddah-Ali and Niesen (end of Section II of [MAN14]), there they add a parameter $\epsilon > 0$, and replace (83) by the condition that

$$(84) \quad \text{Prob}_{(S,P)}[(Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}) \Rightarrow W_{d_j}] \geq 1 - \epsilon;$$

then they define (M, R) to be achievable if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and F sufficiently large there is a scheme with parameters N, F, K, ϵ satisfying (84). This allows for a more general notation of a scheme, in which the Z_j and $X_{\mathbf{d}}$ are not necessarily functions of W_1, \dots, W_N . All the lower bounds in [MAN14] on R as a function of N, K, M are valid for this more general notion, by appealing to Fano's inequality. By contrast, all the caching schemes that we have seen in the literature that achieve an optimal (M, R) value have the $Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}$ being linear functions of W_1, \dots, W_N .

Remark 7.5. Some authors (e.g., Tian in [Tia18]) use Definition 7.3 with (83) rather than the original definition. This greatly simplifies matters: in this case we easily see that:

- (1) (83) remains valid if we replace the source (S, P) by the (possibly) coarser source that groups together all elements of S with the same value of (W_1, \dots, W_N) ; hence one can take the source to be the uniform distribution on $S = \{0, 1\}^{NF}$, whose elements are described by coordinates

$$(w_{1,1}, \dots, w_{1,F}, w_{2,1}, \dots, w_{2,F}, \dots, w_{N,F})$$

with $w_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ and where W_i is the random variable $(w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,F})$;

- (2) in doing so, Z_j 's and $X_{\mathbf{d}}$ become functions of the $w_{i,j}$'s, or equivalently of (W_1, \dots, W_N) .

For linear schemes it is simpler to work with linear random variables in the sense of Definition 2.16, Subsection 2.9.

Definition 7.6 (Linear Coded Caching Scheme). Let $N, K, F \in \mathbb{N}$, and \mathbb{F} be an arbitrary field. By an \mathbb{F} -linear coded caching scheme with N documents of size F and K users, or simply an \mathbb{F} -linear (N, K, F) -coded caching scheme, we mean a collection of subspaces

$$\left(\{W_i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{Z_j\}_{j \in [K]}, \{X_{\mathbf{d}}\}_{\mathbf{d} \in [N]^K} \right)$$

of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , such that

- (1) W_1, \dots, W_N are independent subspaces, each of dimension F ; and
- (2) $\forall j \in [K], \mathbf{d} \in [N]^K, W_{d_j} \subset Z_j + X_{\mathbf{d}}$.

We say that a scheme *achieves the memory-rate pair* (M, R) if

$$\begin{aligned} \forall j \in [N], \quad \dim(Z_j) &\leq MF \\ \forall \mathbf{d} \in [N]^K, \quad \dim(X_{\mathbf{d}}) &\leq RF \end{aligned}$$

We will generally limit our discussion to the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, although many of our results, including the lower bounds we prove, hold for arbitrary \mathbb{F} .

If in Definition 7.3, with notation as in Remark 7.5, the Z_j 's and $X_{\mathbf{d}}$'s are linear functions of the $w_{i,j}$'s, then all the random variables involved linear functions of the $w_{i,j}$'s, whose associated linear random variables reduce to Definition 7.6 in the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

7.3. Preliminary Remarks. Next we make some important observations about coded caching that mostly hold for either definitions we consider (and also the original definition, as in Remark 7.4).

7.3.1. Concatenation of Caching Schemes. A fundamental observation [MAN14] is that one can concatenate caching schemes. If for some N, K , and $\ell = 1, 2$ we have two caching schemes

$$\mathcal{S}^\ell = \left(\{W_i^\ell\}_{i \in [N]}, \{Z_j^\ell\}_{j \in [K]}, \{X_{\mathbf{d}}^\ell\}_{\mathbf{d} \in [N]^K} \right)$$

with document size are F^ℓ (not necessarily equal), on two sources, then we define their *concatenation* to be the set of random variables

$$W_i = (W_i^1, W_i^2), \quad Z_j = (Z_j^1, Z_j^2), \quad X_{\mathbf{d}} = (X_{\mathbf{d}}^1, X_{\mathbf{d}}^2),$$

defined on the source that is the product of the sources of \mathcal{S}^1 and \mathcal{S}^2 ; hence N, K are unchanged, but the document size is $F^1 + F^2$. Similarly for linear caching schemes, defined by taking direct sums, i.e.,

$$W_i = W_i^1 \oplus W_i^2, \quad Z_j = Z_j^1 \oplus Z_j^2, \quad X_{\mathbf{d}} = X_{\mathbf{d}}^1 \oplus X_{\mathbf{d}}^2,$$

as subspaces of the direct sum of the two universes. If—in either the classical or linear setting—the two schemes, respectively, achieve the memory-rate trade-offs (M^1, R^1) and (M^2, R^2) , then their concatenation achieves the memory-rate trade-off (M, R) where

$$(85) \quad M = \frac{M^1 F^1 + M^2 F^2}{F^1 + F^2}, \quad R = \frac{R^1 F^1 + R^2 F^2}{F^1 + F^2}$$

We can similarly concatenate a finite number of caching schemes. It follows that for any $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, we may concatenate n_1 concatenations of the first scheme with

n_2 of the second and achieve (M, R) with

$$(86) \quad M = \frac{M^1(F^1n_1) + M^2(F^2n_2)}{F^1n_1 + F^2n_2}, \quad R = \frac{R^1(F^1n_1) + R^2(F^2n_2)}{F^1n_1 + F^2n_2}.$$

It follows that we can achieve any rational convex combination of (M^1, R^1) and (M^2, R^2) .

7.3.2. Limit Achievable and Lower (or “Outer”) Bounds. It becomes convenient to say that for schemes with fixed N, K , and fixed \mathbb{F} for linear schemes, a pair of non-negative real numbers (M, R) is *limit achievable* if it is the limit point of achievable pairs.

The notion of limit achievable is mostly a convenience. We remark that if α, β, γ are positive reals for which we can prove $\alpha M + \beta R \geq \gamma$ for any scheme (classical or linear) that achieves trade-off (M, R) with fixed N, K (and \mathbb{F} for linear schemes), then this bound also holds for any limit point therefore.

The definition of “limit achievable” does raise some interesting questions: for example, is there a rational point (M, R) that is limit achievable (with N, K, \mathbb{F} fixed) that is not achievable (i.e., for some single scheme)?

7.3.3. Easy Lower Bounds. There are some obvious lower bounds on (M, R) in both the classical or linear case; for example, if $N = K$, then

$$R + KM \geq K, \quad KR + M \geq K,$$

which follow from the fact that $X_{(1,\dots,K)}, Z_1, \dots, Z_K$ determine W_1, \dots, W_K , and $X_{(1,\dots,1)}, \dots, X_{(K,\dots,K)}$ and Z_1 also determine W_1, \dots, W_K . These are easy to prove using information theory for classical schemes, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} RF + KMF &\geq H(X_{1\dots K}) + H(Z_1) + \dots + H(Z_K) \\ &\geq H(X_{1\dots K}, Z_1, \dots, Z_K) = H(W_1, \dots, W_K) = KF, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for linear schemes, with “dim” replacing “ H .”

7.3.4. Bounds on \mathbb{F} -Linear Caching Schemes. Of course, a lower bound for classical coded caching schemes immediately implies the same bound for \mathbb{F} -linear schemes with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

We remark that the lower bounds on R, M in the coded caching literature likely hold for \mathbb{F} -linear schemes for an arbitrary field, \mathbb{F} : indeed, all the bounds we have seen can be derived from “elemental inequalities” (e.g., [Tia18], equations (8) and (9) of Section 2.3), which presumably translate into inequalities on dimensions; e.g., $H(X|Y) \geq 0$ translates to $\dim^{U/Y}([X]_Y) \geq 0$, and $I(X_1; X_2|Y) \geq 0$ translates to $\dim^{U/Y}([X_1]_Y \cap [X_2]_Y) \geq 0$.

Whether bounds can translate the other way—at least in coded caching or some other “purely information theoretic” problem—is hardly clear. Certainly linear information theory is simpler and more expressive than traditional information theory: for example, the expression $\dim^{U/Y}([X_1 \cap X_2]_Y)$ doesn’t appear to have a non-linear analog (this expression is less than or equal to both $\dim^U(X_1 \cap X_2)$ and $\dim^{U/Y}([X_1]_Y \cap [X_2]_Y)$, and can be strictly less than both). Similarly for intersections of three or more subspaces, for discoordination, etc.

7.3.5. *The Case $N = K = 2$.* The case $N = K = 2$ case was entirely solved (i.e., for all M the minimum value of R was determined) in [MAN14]: namely, aside from the obvious lower bounds $M + 2R \geq 2$ and $2M + R \geq 2$, they show that $M + R \geq 3/2$ using the following clever argument: namely, they observe that

$$2M + 2R \geq H(X_{12}, Z_1) + H(X_{21}, Z_2),$$

and then use

$$H(X_{12}, Z_1) + H(X_{21}, Z_2) = H(X_{12}, Z_1, X_{21}, Z_2) + I(X_{12}, Z_1; X_{21}, Z_2) \geq 2 + 1 = 3.$$

The same bound applies for linear schemes over an arbitrary \mathbb{F} by replacing “ H ” with “ \dim ” and $I(X_{12}, Z_1; X_{21}, Z_2)$ with $\dim((X_{12} + Z_1) \cap (X_{21} + Z_2))$.

We will use a variation of this approach to get two lower (i.e., outer) bounds for $N = K = 3$ involving discoordination.

7.3.6. *Recent Literature and Currently Open Problems.* There are a large number of variants of the coded caching problem (see, for example, [Sab20, YMAA19]). Results in [YMAA19] determined lower bounds on R as a function of K, N, M for classical coded caching that is provably optimal to within a multiplicative factor of 2.00884. There are also many values of N, K where the optimal value is known for some values of M .

By contrast, there are relatively few values of (N, K) for which the optimal value of $R = R(M)$ is fully resolved, in the sense that it is known for all $M \in [0, N]$: the cases $K = 2$ and $N \geq 3$ was fully resolved by Tian in [Tia18], which also fully resolved the case $(N, K) = (2, 3)$. As of Tian’s work [Tia18], all other cases of $K \geq 3$ were open for some values of M .

Tian [Tia18] used an impressive computer-aided search to generate numerous new lower bounds for some small pairs (N, K) ; Tian’s search is based on a (generally large) collection “elemental inequalities” of Yeung [Yeu97], which exploit the non-negativity of entropy and of the two-variable mutual information (see equations (8) and (9) of [Tia18]); see Section 2 of [Tia18] for more details on the algorithms and previous results. Tian mentions that his computer-aided linear program for the case $(N, K) = (2, 4)$ would involve some 200 million inequalities, which he therefore reduces by exploiting symmetrization (which we discuss in Section 8) and other methods.

Our interest, like that in [Tia18], is to determine for small pairs (N, K) the exact optimal value of R for every M for linear schemes. Our motivation is to develop new tools in linear algebra and information theory that may arise to find these exact values, such as our theorems on coordination and discoordination that we developed in earlier sections. Our article deals only with the case $(N, K) = 3$.

7.4. **The Case $N = K = 3$ and The Methods of Tian.** In this paper we focus entirely on the case $N = K = 3$.

Prior to Tian’s work, the optimal value of R for a given M was known for all M except $1/3 \leq M \leq 1$: in more detail, the article [MAN14] showed that

$$3R + M \geq 3, \quad 3R + 2M \geq 5, \quad R + 3M \geq 3,$$

and that these lower bounds are tight for all $M \geq 1$, due to the achievability of $(M, R) = (1, 1), (2, 1/3), (3, 0)$ by the caching schemes given there. The achievability of $(M, R) = (1/3, 2)$ was shown by [CFL16], which settled the case $M \leq 1/3$ in view of the inequality $3R + M \geq 3$. This left the case of $1/3 < M < 1$ open.

In [Tia18], Tian gave the new lower bounds

$$(87) \quad M + R \geq 2, \quad 2M + R \geq 8/3,$$

with human readable proofs (tables A24–A27 there). Below we give a simpler derivation of Tian’s inequality $M + R \geq 2$. The intersection point of Tian’s inequalities (87), is the point $(M, R) = (2/3, 4/3)$, and Tian proves that this memory-rate trade-off is unlikely to be achieved by a linear scheme, which involves a rather ingenious technique to give a lower bound R ; we shall refer to this as *Tian’s method* (see Theorem 7.8 below), and refer to the type of caching scheme Tian studies regarding $(2/3, 4/3)$ as a *Tian scheme* (see Definition 9.1 below).

In more detail, Tian reports that his linear programs derive the following values for various joint entropies at the point $(2/3, 4/3)$, as scheme, see [Tia18], Table 4: namely setting with $m = 1/3$ (which equals $M/2$), Tian reports

$$(88) \quad \begin{aligned} H(Z_1|W_1) &= 2m, & H(Z_1|W_1W_2) &= m, \\ H(Z_1Z_2|W_1W_2) &= 2m, & H(Z_1Z_2Z_3|W_1W_2) &= 3m \end{aligned}$$

(Tian remarks that these results are reported by a floating point computation, without giving a human readable proof, and so there is a chance that what appears to be, say, $2m$, is actually $(2 \pm \epsilon)m$ where ϵ is a presumably small machine error; see the remarks in Section 5.4 of [Tia18]; Tian’s conclusions regarding $(2/3, 4/3)$ would still hold at this point to within a small additive multiple of ϵ .)

Assuming the values of (88) hold (exactly), Tian concludes (see discussion below Table 4 there) that if all random variables are linear functions of the bits of W_1, W_2, W_3 , then (1) F must be divisible by 3 (to achieve $(2/3, 4/3)$), and (2) based on (88) each W_i decomposes as a sum of three (linearly independent) subspaces,

$$(89) \quad W_1 = A_1 + A_2 + A_3, \quad W_2 = B_1 + B_2 + B_3, \quad W_3 = C_1 + C_2 + C_3,$$

each factor of dimension $F/3$, such that for $i = 1, 2, 3$ we have

$$(90) \quad Z_i = \mathcal{L}_i(A_i, B_i, C_i)$$

where \mathcal{L}_i is some linear function. Tian then gives an extremely clever argument to show that no such \mathcal{L}_i can achieve the $(2/3, 4/3)$ bound; a direct linear algebraic proof seems difficult, and Tian challenges the reader to find such a proof.

In fact, Tian’s argument (as is) can be used to show that any scheme with properties similar to those required to achieve $(2/3, 4/3)$ must satisfy $2R + 3M \geq 5$. Let us make this precise.

Definition 7.7. Consider an \mathbb{F} -linear coded caching for $N = K = 3$, where F is divisible by three, and each document W_i is decomposed into factors of dimension $F/3$ as in (89). We say that Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are *separated* if we have (90) for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, for some linear function \mathcal{L}_i .

We can similarly define a separated scheme for classical schemes, where each A_i, B_i, C_i has entropy $F/3$.

Recall the meaning of $A \oplus B$ (Subsection 2.2) when A, B are subspaces of the same dimension of a vector space: this means that we understand that we have an isomorphism $\nu: A \rightarrow B$, and we set

$$A \oplus B = A \oplus_\nu B = \{a + \nu(a) \mid a \in A\};$$

this is equivalent to choosing bases a_1, \dots, a_m of A , and b_1, \dots, b_m of B , and $A \oplus B$ to be the subspace spanned by $a_i + b_i$.

Tian shows that (88) implies that, with notation as in Definition 7.7, we must have Z_i that is spanned by $A_i \oplus B_i$ and $A_i \oplus C_i$ (i.e., $a_i + c_i$, where c_1, \dots, c_m is some basis for C_i). In this case X_{123}, Z_1 allows user 1 to infer

$$A_1, A_2, A_3, B_1, C_1,$$

and similarly for users 2 and 3.

Tian's argument in Section 5.4 of [Tia18] can prove the following more general theorem.

Theorem 7.8. *For $N = K = 3$ and F divisible by 3, let W_i be decomposed into subspaces of dimension $F/3$ as in (89). Let Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 be any linear scheme such that for $i = 1, 2, 3$,*

$$(X_{123}, Z_i) \Rightarrow W_i, A_i, B_i, C_i.$$

Then if such a scheme achieves the memory-rate trade-off (M, R) , we have

$$2R + 3M \geq 5.$$

Moreover, if $R' = \dim(X_{123})$, then $2R' + 3M \geq 5$, and similarly with the indices 1, 2, 3 permuted in any way.

Tian used this result to show that $(2/3, 4/3)$ cannot be achieved by a linear scheme, assuming (88). We remark that this result is quite strong, in that this implies that for each distinct $d_1, d_2, d_3 \in [3]$, $\dim(X_{\mathbf{d}}) \geq (5 - 3M)/2$; as we will show in the next section, other optimal bounds, such as the optimal bound $R \geq 1$ for $M = 1$, does not imply that $\dim(X_{\mathbf{d}}) \geq 1$ whenever $d_1, d_2, d_3 \in [3]$ are distinct, but only for the worst (or average) case of distinct d_1, d_2, d_3 .

Proof. The dimension of X_{123} is $R'F$ for some $R' \leq R$; we will show that

$$2R' + 3M \geq 5.$$

First, we wish to introduce coordinates on W so that each element of W —and therefore of X_{123} (and Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)—is associated to a vector of $3F$ scalars, i.e., an element of \mathbb{F}^{3F} . To do so, choose an arbitrary basis, \mathcal{A}_1 , of A_1 , and similarly bases $\mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_3$ of A_2, \dots, A_3 ; hence each basis contains $F/3$ elements of W , and we let \mathcal{W} be the union of these bases, $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_3$. If $u \in W$, we use $\iota_{\mathcal{W}}(u)$, or simply $\iota(u)$, to denote the element of \mathbb{F}^{3F} associated to u in the coordinates \mathcal{W} . Hence ι can be viewed as an isomorphism $W \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{3F}$. It will be useful to describe vectors in \mathbb{F}^{3F} as blocks of 9 vectors (and similarly for matrices each of whose rows are vectors in \mathbb{F}^{3F}); in this case we will understand that we have ordered \mathcal{W} as

$$\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3, \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{B}_3, \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3$$

(the order of the basis elements in each block $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_1$ is unimportant).

Let $\dim(X_{123}) = R'$, so $R' \leq R$. We therefore have $\iota(X_{123})$ is a subspace of \mathbb{F}^{3F} ; choose an arbitrary basis of X_{123} and let G be the matrix whose rows are ι of these basis vectors; hence

$$\iota(X_{123}) = \text{RowSpace}(G)$$

(the row space of G) where G is an $R' \times 3F$ matrix which we view as consisting of 9 blocks

$$(91) \quad G = [G_1 \ G_2 \ G_3 \ G_4 \ \dots \ G_9].$$

Similarly, choose a basis for Z_1 , which allows us to write

$$\iota(Z_1) = \text{RowSpace}(G')$$

where

$$G' = [G'_1 \ G'_2 \ G'_3 \ G'_4 \ \cdots \ G'_9].$$

It follows that $\iota(X_{123} + Z_1)$ equals the row space of the block matrix

$$\iota(X_{123} + Z_1) = \text{RowSpace} \left(\begin{bmatrix} G' \\ G \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix} G' \\ G \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} G'_1 & G'_2 & G'_3 & G'_4 & G'_5 & G'_6 & G'_7 & G'_8 & G'_9 \\ G_1 & G_2 & G_3 & G_4 & G_5 & G_6 & G_7 & G_8 & G_9 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Consider this matrix with its columns rearranged into two blocks:

$$\tilde{G} = \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|cccc} G'_1 & G'_2 & G'_3 & G'_4 & G'_7 & G'_5 & G'_6 & G'_8 & G'_9 \\ G_1 & G_2 & G_3 & G_4 & G_7 & G_5 & G_6 & G_8 & G_9 \end{array} \right];$$

clearly G and \tilde{G} have the same rank. Since X_{123} and Z_1 determine A_1, A_2, A_3, B_1, C_1 , $X_{123} + Z_1$ contains each of these subspaces of W , and hence contains each vector of the bases $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3, \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{C}_1$. Hence $\iota(X_{123} + Z_1)$ contains each standard basis vector associated the these five bases. By the basis exchange theorem⁵, we can apply elementary (i.e., invertible) row operations on \tilde{G} to get a matrix

$$\hat{G} = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ L_1 & L_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where I is the $5F/3 \times 5F/3$ identity matrix, and 0 is the $5F/3$ by $4F/3$ zero matrix, and L_1, L_2 are some matrices; since the total number of rows of \tilde{G} is at most $MF + R'F$, the number of rows in the L_1, L_2 block matrix is at most $(M + R' - 5/3)F$. Hence the column space of the two rightmost blocks,

$$\text{ColumnSpace} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ L_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

is at most $(M + R' - 5/3)F$. But since the row operations bringing \tilde{G} to \hat{G} do not change the dimension of the column space of any subset of columns of these matrices, it follows that the span of the column vectors of

$$(92) \quad \begin{bmatrix} G'_5 & G'_6 & G'_8 & G'_9 \\ G_5 & G_6 & G_8 & G_9 \end{bmatrix}$$

is of dimension at most $(M + R' - 5/3)F$. In particular, the same bound holds for the span of the columns of

$$(93) \quad [G_5 \ G_6 \ G_8 \ G_9].$$

The same argument with Z_2 replacing Z_1 shows that the column space of

$$[G_1 \ G_3 \ G_7 \ G_9]$$

has dimension at most $(M + R' - 5/3)F$; using Z_3 , the same holds for

$$[G_1 \ G_2 \ G_4 \ G_5]$$

⁵We remark that the rows of G' and of G are not necessarily independent, namely if Z_1 and X_{123} have a non-trivial intersection. Still, we can choose a subset of the rows of the matrix formed by the rows of G' and G and apply the basis exchange theorem there. (Alternatively, one can do this proof by repeatedly discarding rows of G' that create a linear dependence between the rows of G' and G , leaving G' to be a subset of rows of the original G' such that the rows of G and the new G' are linearly independent but still span $\iota(X_{123} + Z_1)$.)

Since each column of G appears once or twice in the above block matrices, the entire column space of G is at most

$$3(M + R' - 5/3)F.$$

But the dimension of the column space of G is the rank of G , which equals $R'F$, by assumption; and hence

$$R' = \text{Rank}(G) \leq 3(M + R' - 5/3)F$$

It follows that $3M + 2R' \geq 5$. \square

Table 4 in [Tia18] implies that if $(2/3, 4/3)$ is achievable, then the Z_i must be as in Theorem 7.8.

We remark that the above theorem does not analyze X_{123} directly, rather it draws conclusions based on the particular nature of the Z_i and the fact that X_{123} and Z_i imply certain information. Similarly our discoordination lower bounds on $2R + 3M$ do not directly analyze the $X_{\mathbf{d}}$.

We also remark that Theorem 7.8 is tight for $(M, R) = (1, 1)$ which is achievable. The proof above gives a little more: namely, the dimension formula implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Rank} [G_5 \ G_6 \ G_8 \ G_9] + \text{Rank} [G_1 \ G_3 \ G_7 \ G_9] \\ &= \text{Rank} [G_1 \ G_3 \ G_7 \ G_5 \ G_6 \ G_8 \ G_9] + \text{Rank} [G_9]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the dimension theorem to the column spaces of

$$[G_1 \ G_3 \ G_7 \ G_5 \ G_6 \ G_8 \ G_9], \quad [G_1 \ G_2 \ G_4 \ G_5]$$

whose intersection is the column space of $[G_1 \ G_5]$, we can get a more precise bound of

$$3M + 2R' \geq 5 + \text{Rank} [G_9] + \text{Rank} [G_1 \ G_5].$$

It follows if $3M + 2R \geq 5$ holds with equality, then the ranks of G_9, G_5, G_1 are zero. In other words, X_{123} cannot involve nonzero coefficients in $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{C}_3$. Indeed, for $(M, R) = (1, 1)$ it turns out that we can take $Z_i = A_i B_i C_i$ and $X_{123} = A_2 \oplus B_1, A_3 \oplus C_1, B_3 \oplus C_2$, which avoids $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{C}_3$, and similarly for other $X_{\mathbf{d}}$.

8. SYMMETRIZATION AND AVERAGING

Let us review the well-known idea of averaging and symmetrization, which simplify certain expressions that arise in proving lower bounds (i.e., “outer bounds”) in coded caching.

8.1. Symmetry and Averaging. Consider either a classical or \mathbb{F} -linear (N, K, F) -coded caching scheme

$$(94) \quad \mathcal{S} = \left(\{W_i\}_{i \in [N]}, \{Z_j\}_{j \in [K]}, \{X_{\mathbf{d}}\}_{\mathbf{d} \in [N]^K} \right).$$

The symmetric group S_K of permutations on $\{1, \dots, K\}$ acts on the K users of a coded caching problem, and similarly S_N acts on the N documents. Since these two actions are independent of each other (i.e., can be performed in either order), this gives us an action of $S_K \times S_N$ on all random variables in the scheme, \mathcal{S} , and therefore the expressions involving the indices of $W_i, Z_i, X_{\mathbf{d}}$: namely for $\kappa \in S_K$ and $\nu \in S_N$, we set

$$(95) \quad (\kappa, \nu)W_i = W_{\nu i}, \quad (\kappa, \nu)Z_i = Z_{\kappa i},$$

and

$$(96) \quad (\kappa, \nu)X_{\mathbf{d}} = X_{(\kappa, \nu)\mathbf{d}}, \quad \text{where} \quad (\kappa, \nu)(d_1, \dots, d_K) = (\nu(d_{\kappa(1)}), \dots, \nu(d_{\kappa(K)}))$$

(since each d_i represents a value in $\{1, \dots, N\}$ of a document requested by user $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$).

Definition 8.1. Let \mathcal{S} be either a classical or \mathbb{F} -linear (N, K, F) -coded caching scheme as in (94). For $(\kappa, \nu) \in S_K \times S_N$, we define *the action of (κ, ν) on \mathcal{S}* denoted $(\kappa, \nu)\mathcal{S}$, to be the (N, K, F) -coded caching scheme where (κ, ν) applied to the $W_i, Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}$ is given as in (95) and (96). We write $S_K \times S_N \mathcal{S}$ for the concatenation of the $(\kappa, \nu)\mathcal{S}$ ranging over all $(\kappa, \nu) \in S_K \times S_N$ (whose document size is therefore $K!N!F$), and refer to it as the *symmetrization of \mathcal{S}* .

We remark that if \mathcal{S} achieves the memory-rate tradeoff (M, R) , then so does the symmetrization of \mathcal{S} . It follows that for the sake of proving lower bounds, it suffices to consider the case where the coded caching scheme is the symmetrized version of a smaller scheme. We also easily see that if for $N = K = 3$, the Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are separated, then the same holds for the symmetrization of this scheme.

For schemes that are the symmetrization of some scheme, the dimension of all expressions in the $W_i, Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}$ (involving $\cap, +$ and parenthesis) are invariant under this $S_K \times S_N$ action. This will greatly simplify the proofs of the lower bounds we give in this article.

Definition 8.2. Let \mathcal{S} be an \mathbb{F} -linear classical (N, K, F) -coded caching scheme as in (94). For any formula involving $+, \cap$, the variables $W_i, Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}$ (and parenthesis), we use \dim^{avg} to denote the average dimension of this formula under the action of $S_K \times S_N$. Similarly if F_1, F_2 are such formulas, we define $\dim^{U/F_1, \text{avg}}([F_2]_{F_1})$ to be the average dimension of the action of $S_K \times S_N$ on the two expressions.

We can similarly define H^{avg} of any join of random variables of a classical coded caching scheme. Clearly \dim^{avg} applied to a formula of random variables of a scheme equals the dimension of the same formula applied to the symmetrization of the scheme, divided by $K!N!$.

For example, for $K = N = 3$,

$$\dim^{\text{avg}}(Z_1, W_1, W_3, X_{122}) = \frac{1}{K!N!} \sum_{(\kappa, \nu) \in S_K \times S_N} \dim(Z_{\kappa(1)}W_{\nu(1)}W_{\nu(3)}X_{\nu(\kappa(1,2,2))}).$$

Hence this average dimension is also equal to that of

$$(\kappa, \nu)(Z_1, W_1, W_3, X_{122})$$

for any $\kappa \in S_K$ and $\nu \in S_N$, so that, for example,

$$(97) \quad \dim^{\text{avg}}(Z_1, W_1, W_3, X_{122}) = \dim^{\text{avg}}(Z_1, W_1, W_2, X_{133}).$$

This averaging technique is convenient in proving lower bounds on achievable memory-rate pairs (M, R) (i.e., “outer bounds”); see, for example, equation (27) of [YMAA19], where H^* denotes the average value of H , and is used in a number of places in this article thereafter. [We do not know where this technique first arose in the literature.] We will use averaging in our bounds, as well, for the same reasons as in [YMAA19]: namely to cancel the difference terms related by a symmetry, and therefore of the same average dimension (such as the difference of the left-hand-side and right-hand-side of (97) above).

We also note that any lower bound for fixed (N, K) of the form $\alpha M + \beta R \geq \gamma$ (for positive $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$) also applies the same lower bound with M, R replaced by $\dim^{\text{avg}}(Z_i)$ and $\dim^{\text{avg}}(X_{\mathbf{d}})$, by applying the lower bound to the symmetrization of the scheme. Hence, although $\alpha M + \beta R \geq \gamma$ is a priori a lower bound on the maximum values of $\dim(Z_i)$ and $\dim(X_{\mathbf{d}})$, the same bound must hold for the average values.

8.2. Symmetric Coded Caching Schemes. Tian ([Tia18], equation (16)) defines a classical scheme to be *symmetric* if the entropy, H , of the join of any subset of the variables $W_i, Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}$ is invariant under the action of $S_K \times S_N$ of the scheme. In [Tia18], Tian prefers to symmetrize the coded caching schemes beforehand—which yield symmetric schemes—in order to simplify computations and proofs. See Proposition 3 of Section 3.3 of [Tia18].

We need a similar definition, although we require the invariance of \dim applied to the richer set of expressions in linear information theory which involve $+, \cap$ (and therefore include invariants such as the discoordination of any family of subspaces formed by such expressions).

Definition 8.3. We say that an \mathbb{F} -linear coded caching scheme \mathcal{S} as in (94) in an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} is *symmetric* if for each $(\kappa, \nu) \in S_K \times S_N$ there is an isomorphism $\iota = \iota_{\kappa, \nu}: \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $i \in [N]$,

$$(\kappa, \nu)W_i = \iota_{\kappa, \nu}W_i,$$

and similarly for all the Z_j 's and $X_{\mathbf{d}}$'s.

It follows that if an \mathbb{F} -linear scheme \mathcal{S} is symmetric, then expressions involving the dimension of formulas with $+, \cap$ and the $W_i, Z_j, X_{\mathbf{d}}$ are invariant under the $S_K \times S_N$ action.

We easily see that if \mathcal{S} is any \mathbb{F} -linear scheme (94) in an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , then $S_K \times S_N \mathcal{S}$ is symmetric, via the natural action of $S_K \times S_N$ on the universe that has one copy of \mathcal{U} for each element of $S_K \times S_N$.

By contrast, a symmetric scheme need not arise as the symmetrization of a smaller scheme: for example, the $N = K = 2$ and $M = 1/2$ scheme of Maddah-Ali and Niesen in Example 7.2 is symmetric; more explicitly, the action on $S_K \times S_N = S_2 \times S_2$ described above is given by: (1) the non-identity element of S_K exchanges A_1, B_1 with, respectively, A_2, B_2 , and, (2) the non-identity element of S_N exchanges A_1, A_2 with, respectively, B_1, B_2 . However, in the symmetrization of a scheme, the dimension of each Z_j (and the other random variables) must be divisible by $K!N!$, which here equals 4, and yet in this example $\dim(Z_j) = 1$.

8.3. A Lopsided Example: Average and Worst Case. As a concrete illustration of the need to use symmetrization, we give the following example of a “highly non-symmetric” scheme with $N = K = 3$ where X_{123} can be taken to be 0.

We remark that we will later (Definition 9.1) refer to this scheme as an example of a *pure individual scheme*, although Tian’s method (Theorem 7.8) does not apply since this scheme is not separated.

Consider the case $M = 1$ where we set $Z_i = W_i$ for all i . In this case we can take $X_{123} = 0$. While Theorem 7.8 shows that X_{123} has dimension $R'F$ with $2R' + 3M \geq 5$, i.e., $R' \geq (5 - 3M)/2$, the same cannot be said of this particular scheme. Of course, to prove $2R + 3M \geq 5$, we need to prove that some X_{ijk} must have dimension at least $(5 - 3M)/2$. We remark that if we use symmetrization

and we can prove that some X_{ijk} has this dimension, then we are actually proving something stronger, namely that the average dimension of X_{ijk} with i, j, k distinct is at least X_{ijk} .

It is instructive to compare the average versus worst case here: we may take $X_{213} = W_1 \oplus W_2$, so that X_{213} can be of dimension F , and similarly (the two other single transpositions) X_{321} and X_{132} can be taken to have dimension F . However, we claim that X_{312} must be of dimension at least $2F$ under this scheme: indeed, for X_{312} and Z_1 to determine W_3 , X_{312} must contain $W_3 + \mathcal{L}_3(W_1)$ for some linear map \mathcal{L}_3 , and similarly must contain $W_1 + \mathcal{L}_2(W_2)$ and $W_2 + \mathcal{L}_1(W_1)$. Hence X_{123} has the same row space as a matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_1 & 0 & I \\ I & L_2 & 0 \\ 0 & I & L_3 \end{bmatrix};$$

by dropping the first row and last column, we see that X_{123} has rank at least that of

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & L_2 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix},$$

from which we can eliminate the L_2 with row operations, leaving an identity matrix of size $2F$ by $2F$. Hence the dimension of X_{312} must be at least $2F$ (and this suffices, since we easily verify that setting X_{312} to be $W_1 \oplus W_2, W_1 \oplus W_3$ satisfies the conditions of each user). A similar calculation holds for the other full-cycle permutation, i.e., X_{231} .

Hence, under the lopsided scheme $Z_i = W_i$, the maximum dimension of an X_{ijk} is $2F$, and the average over all i, j, k distinct is $(3F + 2 \cdot 2F)/6 = 7F/6$.

9. THE Z -DECOMPOSITION LEMMA

In this section, motivated by coded caching in the case $N = K = 3$, we consider for any linear function Z of a vector space W that decomposes as W_1, W_2, W_3 , and show that we can decompose Z into some subspaces, each of a particularly simple form with respect to the decomposition W_1, W_2, W_3 .

Our intention is to apply this theorem to study linear coded caching schemes with $N = K = 3$; however, this theorem is a really a statement in linear algebra that holds in a fairly general setting.

9.1. Definitions and Statement of the Decomposition Lemma.

Definition 9.1. Let Z be linear subspace of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , that has a decomposition W_1, W_2, W_3 .

- (1) We say that Z is a *pure individual scheme* if Z is spanned by $A = Z \cap W_1$, $B = Z \cap W_2$, and $C = Z \cap W_3$, in which case $Z = A + B + C$ (typically written (A, B, C) or just ABC in information theory; see Notation 2.18).
- (2) We say that Z is a *pure Tian scheme* if there exist $A \subset W_1$, $B \subset W_2$, and $C \subset W_3$ such that A, B, C are of the same dimension, d , and there are bases a_1, \dots, a_d of A , b_1, \dots, b_d of B , and c_1, \dots, c_d of C such that Z is spanned by $a_i + b_i, b_i + c_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$; hence, in the notation of Subsection 2.2, we have Z is the span of $A \oplus_{\nu_1} B$ and $B \oplus_{\nu_2} C$ where ν_1 is the isomorphism $A \rightarrow B$ taking a_i to b_i for all i , and similarly for $\nu_2: B \rightarrow C$ taking b_i to c_i .

- (3) We say that Z is a *pure AB scheme* if there exist $A \subset W_1$, $B \subset W_2$ such that A, B are of the same dimension, and there are bases a_1, \dots, a_d of A , b_1, \dots, b_d of B such that Z is spanned by $a_i \oplus b_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$; hence $Z = A \oplus_\nu B$ where ν takes a_i to b_i for all i .
- (4) We similarly define when Z is a *pure AC scheme* and a *pure BC scheme*.
- (5) We say that Z is a *pure symmetric two-way scheme* when Z decomposes as a sum of AB -, AC -, and BC -schemes, each of the same dimension.
- (6) We say that Z is a *pure triple sum scheme* if there exist $A \subset W_1$, $B \subset W_2$, and $C \subset W_3$ such that A, B, C are of the same dimension, d , and there are bases a_1, \dots, a_d of A , b_1, \dots, b_d of B , and c_1, \dots, c_d of C such that Z is spanned by $a_i + b_i + c_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$; in this case $Z = A \oplus_{\nu_1} B \oplus_{\nu_2} C$, where ν_1, ν_2 are, respectively, the isomorphisms $A \rightarrow B$ and $A \rightarrow C$ taking a_i to, respectively, b_i and c_i .

Lemma 9.2. *Let Z be linear subspace of an \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , that has a decomposition A, B, C . Then there exist subspaces A^j, B^j, C^j indexed on integers $1 \leq j \leq 5$ such that*

- (1) A^1, \dots, A^5 are linearly independent subspaces of W_1 , as are $B^1, \dots, B^5 \subset W_2$ and $C^1, \dots, C^5 \subset W_3$;
- (2) Z is spanned by:
 - (a) $A^1 + B^1 + C^1$ (i.e., an individual scheme);
 - (b) $A^2 \oplus B^2, B^2 \oplus C^2$ (i.e., a Tian scheme);
 - (c) $A^3 \oplus B^3, A^4 \oplus C^3, B^4 \oplus C^4$ (i.e., an AB -, AC -, and a BC -scheme);
 - and
 - (d) $A^5 \oplus B^5 \oplus C^5$ (i.e., a triple scheme).

Of course, our intended application is to caches Z_i . This lemma says that any cache is really some combination of the schemes in Definition 9.1. Of course, in a symmetrized scheme, the dimensions of all subspaces with superscripts 3 and 4 are of the same dimension, which together comprise a pure symmetric two-way scheme.

9.2. Proof of the Decomposition Lemma. Our proof is quite straightforward, although a bit tedious. The strategy is, roughly speaking to define, in the following stages: the spaces A^1, B^1, C^1 , then A^2, B^2, C^2 , then $A^3, B^3, A^4, C^3, B^4, C^4$, and then A^5, B^5, C^5 . In each stage we make the necessary definitions and then show a number of properties of these spaces. Ultimately we need to show that the A^1, \dots, A^5 are linearly independent, and similarly for the B^i 's and C^i 's, and then we need to decompose any $a + b + c \in Z$ with $a \in A$, $b \in B$, and $c \in C$ as a sum of the above schemes in a unique way; the uniqueness is immediate from the linear independence of these subspaces.

Proof of Lemma 9.2. Set $A^1 = Z \cap A$, $B^1 = Z \cap B$, and $C^1 = Z \cap C$.

Say that an $u \in \mathcal{U}$ is *B-pairable (with b)* if for some $b \in B$ we have $u + b \in Z$. We easily see that set of B -pairable elements of \mathcal{U} are a subspace. Let us show that

if u is B -pairable with b , then

$$(98) \quad u \text{ is } B\text{-pairable with } b' \in B \quad \text{iff} \quad b = b' + b^1 \text{ for some } b^1 \in B^1 = Z \cap B;$$

“if” follows from the fact that if $b' = b + z$ with $z \in B^1$, then b' lies in B , and since $u + b' = (u + b) + (b' - b)$, we have that $u + b' \in Z$. The “only if” follows from the

fact that if $u + b$ and $u + b'$ both lie in Z , and then so does their difference $b - b'$; hence $b - b' \in Z$; since $b, b' \in B$, we have $b - b' \in Z \cap B$.

We similarly define A -pairable (with a) and the analogs of the remarks in the previous paragraph hold for A -pairable elements of \mathcal{U} ; similarly for C -pairable (with c).

The set of B -pairable elements in A (i.e., that also lie in A) is therefore a subspace $A' \subset A$, and it clearly contains all $a \in A^1$ (all paired with $b = 0$). Similarly the C -pairable elements of A forms a subspace $A'' \subset A$ containing A^1 . Hence $A' \cap A''$ contains A^1 ; let a_1^2, \dots, a_d^2 be a basis of $A' \cap A''$ relative to A^1 , and for each $i = 1, \dots, d$, choose a $b_i^2 \in B$ and a $c_i^2 \in C$ such that $a_i^2 + b_i^2$ and $a_i^2 + c_i^2$ lie in Z . Let us prove that the images of b_1^2, \dots, b_d^2 in B/B^1 are linearly independent: if not then some non-trivial linear combination, $\sum_i \beta_i b_i^2$, of the b_i^2 lies B^1 , and hence the corresponding (non-trivial) linear combination, $a = \sum_i \beta_i a_i^2$, of the a_i^2 satisfies $a = a + 0 \in Z$ in view of the fact that

$$a = a + 0 = \sum_i \beta_i (a_i^2 + b_i^2) \in Z.$$

But then $a \in Z$, and so $a \in A^1$, contradicting the fact that a_1^2, \dots, a_d^2 is a basis relative to A^1 . Similarly the c_1^2, \dots, c_d^2 are linearly independent in C/C^1 . Let A^2 be the span of the a_i^2 , and similarly for B^2 and C^2 . Then B^2 is linearly independent from B^1 , by the above argument, and similarly for C^2 and C^1 ; by definition A^2 is linearly independent from A^1 .

By the definition of A', A'' and of A^1 , an element $a \in A$ is both B - and C -pairable iff $a \in A' \cap A'' = A^1 + A^2$. Let us prove analogous statement holds with A, B, C exchanged: to start, let us prove that if $b \in B$ is both A - and C -pairable, then $b \in B^1 + B^2$: for any such b there are $a \in A$ and $c \in C$ such that $a + b, b + c \in Z$, and hence $a - c \in Z$; hence a is both B - and C -pairable, and hence $a \in A' \cap A'' = A_1 + A_2$, so we may write $a = a^1 + a^2$ with $a^i \in A^i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then there exists $b^2 \in B^2$ such that a^2 is paired with $b^2 \in B^2$ (by expressing a^2 as a linear combination of the a_i^2 and taking the corresponding linear combination of the b_i^2); hence $a + b^2 = (a^2 + b^2) + a^1 \in Z$. Hence a is B -paired with $b^2 \in B$; since a is also B -paired with b , by (98) we have $b = b^2 + b^1$ for some $b^1 \in B^1$. Hence $b \in B^1 + B^2$.

Conversely, if $b \in B^1 + B^2$, then $b = b^1 + b^2$ with $b^i \in B^i$ and b^1 is both A - and C -pairable (paired with 0 in both cases). An argument similar to that in the previous paragraph (i.e., writing b^2 as a linear combination of b_i^2 and considering the analogous combination of the a_i^2 and c_i^2) shows that b^2 is both A - and C -pairable. This establishes that $b \in B$ is both A - and C -pairable iff $b \in B^1 + B^2$.

Similarly, $c \in C$ is both A - and B -pairable iff $c \in C^1 + C^2$.

To summarize the above, we have shown the existence of A^2, B^2, C^2 with $A^1, A^2 \subset A$ independent, as well as $B^1 + B^2 \subset B$ and $C^1, C^2 \subset C$, such that an element of A is both B - and C -pairable iff it lies in $A^1 + A^2$, and similarly with A, B, C exchanged. Let us now construct $A^3, A^4, B^3, B^4, C^3, C^4$ with the desired properties.

Pick a basis, a_1^3, \dots, a_s^3 of A' relative to $A' \cap A'' = A^1 + A^2$, and let A^3 be the span of this relative basis; similarly for a_1^4, \dots, a_t^4 , of A'' relative to $A' \cap A''$ and for A^4 ; by the dimension formula $A^1 + A^2, A^3, A^4$ are linearly independent. For each a_i^3 , choose a b_i^3 such that $a_i^3 + b_i^3 \in Z$, and similarly for each a_i^4 and c_i^3 . We claim that the images of the b_i^3 in $B/(B^1 + B^2)$ are linearly independent: for otherwise

some non-trivial linear combination of the b_i^3 would vanish, and the corresponding linear combination of the a_i^3 , say a , would then satisfy $a = a + 0 \in Z$; but this contradicts the definition of the relative basis a_1^3, \dots, a_s^3 . The symmetric argument shows that the images of the c_i^3 are linearly independent in $C/(C^1 + C^2)$. Let B^3 be the span of the b_i^3 , and C^3 that of the c_i^3 .

Next consider the subspace, \tilde{B} , of all C -pairable elements of B , which clearly contains B^1, B^2 ; let b_1^4, \dots, b_p^4 be a basis of \tilde{B} relative to $B^1 + B^2$. For each i , choose an element c_i^4 such that $b_i^4 + c_i^4 \in Z$; let B^4 be the span of all b_i^4 , and C^4 those of the c_i^4 .

Due to the asymmetry in our definition, we have a lot of knowledge about A^1, \dots, A^4 , namely:

- (1) $A^1, \dots, A^4 \subset A$ are linearly independent;
- (2) the subspace of A of elements that are B -pairable equals $A^1 + A^2 + A^3$;
- (3) the subspace of A of elements that are C -pairable equals $A^1 + A^2 + A^4$.

We now wish to prove the analogous claims about the B^j and B , and the C^j 's and C .

Let us start by giving proofs of analogous statements with the B^j and B .

- (1) B^1, B^2 are linearly independent: shown above.
- (2) B^1, B^2, B^3 are linearly independent: if not, then we have $b^3 = b^2 + b^1$ for some nonzero $b^3 \in B^3$ and $b^1 \in B^1, b^2 \in B^2$ (since B^1, B^2 are linearly independent). But then we have $a^2 \in A^2$ and $c^2 \in C^2$ such that $a^2 + b^2, b^2 + c^2 \in Z$, and hence $a^2 - c^2 \in Z$; also there exists a nonzero a^3 such that $b^3 + a^3 \in Z$ (obtained by writing b^3 as a linear combination of the b_i^3 and forming the analogous linear combination of the a_i^3). But then $a = a^3$ is both B -pairable (with b^3), and we now check that it is C -pairable with $-c^2$, since:

$$a - c^2 = a - c^2 + (b^3 - b^2 - b^1) = (a + b^3) - (c^2 + b^2) - (b^1)$$

and $a + b^3, c^2 + b^2$, and b^1 all lie in Z . But the fact that $a = a^3$ is nonzero, both B - and C -pairable, but not in $A^1 + A^2 = A' \cap A''$ contradicts the definition of A' and A'' .

- (3) B^1, B^2, B^3, B^4 are linearly independent: if not, then we have $b^4 = b^3 + b^2 + b^1$ for some $b^i \in B^i$ with b^4 nonzero (since B^1, B^2, B^3 are linearly independent). Since the b_i^4 is a basis relative to B^1, B^2 of B' , we have $b^3 \neq 0$. To b^4 there is a corresponding linear combination, c^4 , of the c_i^4 , such that $b^4 + c^4 \in Z$, and similarly for b^3 and a^3 with $b^3 + a^3 \in Z$; since $b^3 \neq 0$ also $a^3 \neq 0$; similarly b^2 has a corresponding a^2 and c^2 such that both $b^2 + a^2$ and $b^2 + c^2$ lie in Z . Since

$$b^4 + c^4, b^3 + a^3, b^2 + a^2, b^2 + c^2, b^1$$

all lie in Z , we have that b^3 is a B element that is A -pairable (since $b^3 + a^3 \in Z$), and also

$$b^3 + (c^4 - c^2) = b^4 - b^2 - b^1 + c^4 - c^2 = (b^4 + c^4) - (b^2 + c^2) - b^1 \in Z.$$

Hence if $a = a^3, b = b^3$, and $c = c^4 - c^2$, then $a + b \in Z$ and $b + c \in Z$ and hence $a - c \in Z$. Hence a is both B - and C -pairable. But $a = a^3 \notin A^1 + A^2$, since a^3 is a nonzero element of A^3 , which is a contradiction.

- (4) If $b \in B$ is A -pairable, then $b \in B^1 + B^2 + B^3$ (clearly the converse holds): if b is A -pairable with a , then a is B -pairable and hence $a = a^3 + a^2 + a^1$, and there exist b^3, b^2 in B^3, B^2 respectively such that $a^i + b^i \in Z$ for $i = 2, 3$. But then a is B -pairable by $b^3 + b^2$, and since it is B -pairable by b as well, (98) implies that b equals some element of B^1 plus $b^3 + b^2$, and hence $b \in B^1 + B^2 + B^3$.
- (5) If b is C -pairable, then $b \in B^1 + B^2 + B^4$ (the converse clearly holds): this follows from the definition of B^4 .

Next we address the same issues with the C^j and C .

- (1) C^1, C^2 are linearly independent: proven above.
- (2) C^1, C^2, C^3 are linearly independent: one argues just as for B^1, B^2, B^3 .
- (3) c_1^4, \dots, c_p^4 are linearly independent: if not, then some nontrivial linear combination of them is zero, and, b , the corresponding linear combination of b_i^4 , has $b + 0 \in Z$. Then $B^4 \cap B^1$ is nonzero, contradicting the independence of B^1 and B^4 .
- (4) C^1, C^2, C^3, C^4 are linearly independent: any nonzero element $c^4 \in C^4$ has a corresponding nonzero $b^4 \in B^4$ with $c^4 + b^4 \in Z$. Since c^4, c^2, c^1 can be B -paired, so can $c^3 = c^4 - c^2 - c^1$; hence c^3 can be B -paired, say with b' , and by definition any $c^3 \in C^3$ can be A -paired, say with a' ; hence

$$c^3 + b', c^3 + a', a' - b'$$

all lie in Z , and hence a' can be both B - and C -paired and hence $a' = a^2 + a^1$ for a^1, a^2 respectively in A^1, A^2 ; since a^2 can be C -paired with some $\tilde{c}^2 \in C^2$, we have $(a^2 + \tilde{c}^2) + a_1 \in Z$, and hence $c^3 + \tilde{c}^2 \in Z$, and so $c^3 + \tilde{c}^2 \in Z \cap C = C^1$. Since C^1, C^2, C^3 are linearly independent, it follows that $c^3 = 0$ (and $\tilde{c}^2 = 0$). Hence $c^4 = c^2 + c^1$. To the nonzero linear combination of the c_i^4 that give c^4 , there corresponds a linear combination of the b_i^4 , $b^4 \in B^4$, such that $b^4 \neq 0$ (since $c^4 \neq 0$) and $c^4 + b^4 \in Z$; but since c^2, c^1 are both A - and B -pairable, so is c^4 , and hence for some b'', a'' we have $c^4 + b'', c^4 + a'', b'' - a''$ lie in Z , and hence—subtracting $b^4 + c^4 \in Z$, also $-b^4 + a'' \in Z$. Hence b^4 is A - and C -pairable, and hence, $b^4 \in B^1 + B^2$ (shown in the last paragraphs). But this contradicts that $b^4 \neq 0$ and $b^4 \in B^4$.

- (5) If $c \in C$ is A -pairable, then $c \in C^1 + C^2 + C^3$ (the converse clearly holds): same proof as for $b \in B^1 + B^2 + B^3$.
- (6) If $c \in C$ is B -pairable, then $c \in C^1 + C^2 + C^4$ (the converse clearly holds): say that $b + c \in Z$ with $b \in B$. Then b is C -pairable, as shown above; hence $b = b^4 + b^2 + b^1$ with $b^i \in B^i$ for $i = 1, 2, 4$, and to b^4 and b^2 correspond c^4 and c^2 with $b^i + c^i \in Z$ for $i = 2, 4$. Hence b is pairable with $c^4 + c^2$, and applying (98) with all occurrences of b, B replaced with c, C , we see that c equals $c^4 + c^2$ plus some element of C^1 . Hence $c \in C^1 + C^2 + C^4$.

Finally we construct A^5, B^5, C^5 : to do so, consider the subset \tilde{A} of $a \in A$ such that $a + b + c \in Z$ for some $b \in B$ and $c \in C$. Clearly \tilde{A} is a subspace, and clearly it contains A^1, \dots, A^4 ; let a_1^5, \dots, a_q^5 be a basis of \tilde{A} relative to $A^1 + A^2 + A^3 + A^4$, and for each $i = 1, \dots, q$ choose b_i^5 and c_i^5 such that $a_i^5 + b_i^5 + c_i^5 \in Z$. Let A^5, B^5, C^5 , respectively, be the spans of the a_i^5 , the b_i^5 , and the c_i^5 . We prove the following claims, all with ideas similar to the ideas above.

- (1) A^1, \dots, A^5 are linearly independent: immediate from the definition of a_i^5 .

- (2) If $a + b + c \in Z$ for some $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$, then $a \in A^1 + \dots + A^5$: clear from the definition of A' and A^5 above.
- (3) If $a + b + c \in Z$ for some $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$, and $a = a^1 + \dots + a^5$ with $a^i \in A^i$ and $a^5 \neq 0$, then $b \notin B^1 + B^2 + B^3 + B^4$: otherwise $b = b^1 + \dots + b^4$ with $b^i \in B^i$; in this case we have $c^4 \in C^4$ such that $b^4 + c^4 \in Z$ and $\tilde{a}^i \in A^i$ for $i = 2, 3$ with $\tilde{a}^i + b^i \in Z$. It follows that

$$(a^1 + \dots + a^5 + \tilde{a}^2 + \tilde{a}^3) + (b^2 + b^3 + b^4) + c^4 \in Z,$$

and hence

$$(a^1 + \dots + a^5 + \tilde{a}^2 + \tilde{a}^3) + (b^2 + b^3) \in Z,$$

and hence

$$a^1 + \dots + a^5 + \tilde{a}^2 + \tilde{a}^3$$

is B -pairable and therefore lies in $A^1 + A^2 + A^3$. But this is impossible since $a^5 \neq 0$ and A^5 is linearly independent from A^1, \dots, A^4 .

- (4) If $a + b + c \in Z$ for some $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$, and $a = a^1 + \dots + a^5$ with $a^i \in A^i$ and $a^5 \neq 0$, then $c \notin C^1 + C^2 + C^3 + C^4$: the same argument as above with b, B 's and c, C 's exchanged.
- (5) The b_i^5 are linearly independent: if not, then some linear combination of the b_i^5 equals zero, and the corresponding linear combination, a^5 , of the a_i^5 , and c^5 , that of the c_i^5 , have $a^5, c^5 \neq 0$ and $a^5 + c^5 \in Z$. But then a^5 is C -pairable and must lie in $A^1 + A^2 + A^4$, which contradicts the independence of A^1, \dots, A^5 proven above.
- (6) B^1, \dots, B^5 are linearly independent: if they are dependent, then we have $b^5 = b^1 + \dots + b^4$ with $b^i \in B^i$ and not all b^i being zero; since B^1, \dots, B^4 are linearly independent, we have $b^5 \neq 0$. But then for all $i \neq 4$, there are corresponding linear combinations $a^i \in A^i$ to b^i such that $a^5 \neq 0$ and $a^i + b^i \in Z$; also there is a $c^4 \in C^4$ with b^4 with $c^4 + b^4 \in Z$. Hence setting $a = a^5 + a^3 + a^2$ we have

$$(a^5 + a^3 + a^2) + (b^2 + b^3 + b^4) + c^4 = (a^2 + b^2) + (a^3 + b^3) + (b^4 + c^4) \in Z.$$

But since $a^5 \neq 0$, this contradicts (4) above, since $c^4 \in C^4 \subset C^1 + C^2 + C^3 + C^4$.

- (7) The c_i^5 are linearly independent, and C^1, \dots, C^5 are linearly independent: the same argument as above with b, B 's and c, C 's exchanged.
- (8) If $a + b + c \in Z$ for some $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$, then $b \in B^1 + \dots + B^5$: we have $a \in A^1 + \dots + A^5$, by definition of the A^i , and hence for some $a^i \in A^i$ we have $a = a^1 + \dots + a^5$. It follows that $a^5 + b^5 + c^5 \in Z$ for the corresponding b^5, c^5 to a^5 , and $a^2 + b^2 \in Z$ for some $b^2 \in B^2$, and similarly for $a^3 + b^3$ and $a^4 + c^3$. It follows that

$$(-a - b - c) + a^1 + (a^2 + b^2) + (a^3 + b^3) + (a^4 + c^3) + (a^5 + b^5 + c^5) \in Z,$$

and hence

$$(-b + b^3 + b^5) + (-c + c^3 + c^5) \in Z.$$

It follows that $-b + b^3 + b^5$ is C -pairable, and hence $-b + b^3 + b^5 \in B^1 + B^2 + B^4$. Hence $b \in B^1 + \dots + B^5$.

- (9) If $a + b + c \in Z$ for some $a \in A, b \in B, c \in C$, then $c \in C^1 + \dots + C^5$: the same argument as above with b, B 's and c, C 's exchanged.

At this point we claim that Z consists precisely of the sums given in the above theorem. Namely, say that $a + b + c \in Z$ with $a \in A$, $b \in B$, $c \in C$. Then write a as $a^1 + \dots + a^5$. Corresponding to $a^5 \in A^5$ there are $b^5 \in B^5$ and $c^5 \in C^5$ with $a^5 + b^5 + c^5 \in Z$, c^3 corresponding to a^4 with $a^4 + c^3 \in Z$, b^3 corresponding to a^3 with $a^3 + b^3 \in Z$, and a^2 corresponding to b^2 with $a^2 + b^2 \in Z$. Hence, setting $\tilde{b} = -b + b^5 + b^3$ and $\tilde{c} = -c + c^5 + c^3$ we have

$$-a^1 + \tilde{b} + \tilde{c} \in Z,$$

and hence $\tilde{b} + \tilde{c} \in Z$. It follows \tilde{b} is C -pairable and hence $\tilde{b} = \tilde{b}^1 + \tilde{b}^2 + \tilde{b}^4$ with $\tilde{b}^i \in B^i$, and hence

$$-a^1 + (\tilde{b}^1 + \tilde{b}^2 + \tilde{b}^4) + \tilde{c} \in Z.$$

Corresponding to \tilde{b}^2, \tilde{b}^4 there are $\tilde{c}^2 \in C^2$ and $\tilde{c}^4 \in C^4$ with $\tilde{b}^i + \tilde{c}^i \in Z$, and hence

$$-a^1 + \tilde{b}^1 - \tilde{c}^2 - \tilde{c}^4 + \tilde{c} \in Z,$$

and hence

$$-\tilde{c}^2 - \tilde{c}^4 + \tilde{c} \in Z,$$

and hence

$$-\tilde{c}^2 - \tilde{c}^4 + \tilde{c} \in Z \cap C = C^1$$

and hence

$$-\tilde{c}^2 - \tilde{c}^4 + \tilde{c} = c^1$$

for some $c^1 \in C^1$. Similarly

$$-\tilde{b}^2 - \tilde{b}^4 + \tilde{b} = b^1$$

for some $b^1 \in B^1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a^1 + \dots + a^5, \\ b &= b^5 + b^3 - \tilde{b} = b^5 + b^3 - \tilde{b}^2 - \tilde{b}^4 - b^1, \\ c &= c^5 + c^3 - \tilde{c} = c^5 + c^3 - \tilde{c}^2 - \tilde{c}^4 - c^1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence any triple $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{U}$ with $a + b + c \in Z$ satisfies $a \in \sum_i A^i$, and similarly for b and c . Since the A^1, \dots, A^5 are linearly independent, and similarly for the B^i 's and C^i 's, the decomposition of any such triple (a, b, c) as such is unique. \square

9.3. The Decomposition Lemma for Two and Four or More Subspaces.

Taking $C = 0$ in the decomposition lemma, we see that if Z is a linear subspace of a universe that has a decomposition into subspaces A, B , then Z is spanned by a sum of A^1, B^1 , and $A^2 \oplus B^2$ with A^1, B^1, A^2, B^2 independent.

To study linear coded caching schemes with $N \geq 4$ it could be useful to generalize the decomposition lemma when the universe has a decomposition into $N \geq 4$ parts. At present, it is not clear to us what is the correct statement of such a lemma, even for $N = 4$.

10. A NEW CODED CACHING SCHEME WITH $N = K = 3$: $(1/2, 5/3)$ IS ACHIEVABLE

For the case of $N = K = 3$, one can use pure symmetric two-way schemes in Definition 9.1 to achieve the memory-rate trade-off $(1/2, 5/3)$, which is an \mathbb{F} -linear scheme with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. In this section we describe the scheme: the Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 are chosen to be pure symmetric two-way schemes, separated, and otherwise as large as

possibly; this determines them. We found it a bit more difficult to find appropriate values of $X_{\mathbf{d}}$; we will describe how we found their values.

We emphasize that for a given N, K, F, \mathbb{F} and values of Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 , we do not know of a good algorithm for finding the smallest possible values of $\dim(X_{\mathbf{d}})$ for an arbitrary \mathbf{d} .

We let $F = 6$, we take $W_1 = \mathbb{F}^6$ with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and decompose W_1 into three two dimensional subspaces A_1, A_2, A_3 ; we let a'_j, a''_j be an arbitrary basis for A_j . We do similarly for $W_2 = B_1 + B_2 + B_3$ and b'_j, b''_j , and similarly for $W_3 = C_1 + C_2 + C_3$ and c'_j, c''_j . Then for $j = 1, 2, 3$ we set

$$Z_1 = \text{Span}(a'_j \oplus b'_j, a''_j \oplus c'_j, b''_j \oplus c''_j).$$

Hence each Z_i is of dimension $3 = F/2 = FM$ with $M = 1/2$;

First we claim that there exists an X_{123} of size $5F/3$ such that for $j = 1, 2, 3$, X_{123} and Z_j determines W_j . To prove this, it is easiest to discuss our method for building X_{123} . Since Z_1 along with X_{123} needs to learn A_1, A_2, A_3 for a total of $6(F/6)$ bits of information, and similarly for Z_2 and Z_3 , it is simplest to build X_{123} by first adding all unencoded bits that are useful to at least two of Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 . We easily see that each bit of

$$(99) \quad a'_2, a''_3, b'_1, b''_3, c'_1, c''_2$$

is useful to two of Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 , and after adding these bits each of Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 has two bits of information it needs. Next, we know that Z_1 will need to make use of $b''_1 \oplus c''_1$, since if it does not then we can discard $b''_1 \oplus c''_1$ from Z_1 , in which case it only needs $FM = F/3$ of its information, in which case $R \geq 2$ and hence we cannot hope to achieve $R = 5/3$; hence our strategy is to add $b''_1 \oplus c''_1$ to each missing part of the information Z_1 needs in $W_1 = A_1, A_2, A_3$, namely a'_2 and a'_3 , each added to $b''_1 \oplus c''_1$; this process suggests that we add to X_{123} the vectors

$$a''_2 \oplus b''_1 \oplus c''_1, \quad a'_3 \oplus b''_1 \oplus c''_1,$$

and similarly for Z_2 the vectors

$$a''_2 \oplus b''_1 \oplus c'_2, \quad a''_2 \oplus b'_3 \oplus c'_2$$

and for Z_3

$$a'_3 \oplus b'_3 \oplus c''_1, \quad a'_3 \oplus b'_3 \oplus c'_2.$$

But the six vectors displayed above come in pairs whose sum is the sum of the six bits not used in (99), namely

$$a''_2 \oplus a'_3 \oplus b''_1 \oplus b'_3 \oplus c''_1 \oplus c'_2.$$

Hence the dimension of the span of these six vectors is 4-dimensional. Adding to this 4-dimensional vector space the span of the vectors in (99) gives a 10-dimensional subspace, therefore giving an X_{123} with dimension $10 = (5/3)F$.

By symmetry, there is an X_{d_1, d_2, d_3} of $5F/3$ bits for any d_1, d_2, d_3 distinct that for each j allows Z_j to infer W_{d_j} .

Furthermore, by symmetry it suffices to describe values for X_{111} and X_{112} of at most $5F/3 = 10$ bits. Of course, for X_{111} it suffices to broadcast W_1 , which requires $F \leq 5F/3$ bits. Next we describe X_{112} : we use only the fact that Z_j knows $a'_j \oplus b'_j$, and first put into X_{112} all the " bits, namely

$$a''_1, a''_2, a''_3, b''_1, b''_2, b''_3,$$

so the Z_i only need infer the correct $'$ bits; then add to X_{112} the bits

$$b'_1, b'_2, a'_3;$$

at this point we see that Z_3 can infer all of B , and that Z_1 has a'_1, a'_3 and Z_2 has a'_2, a'_3 ; hence we add the 10th bit

$$a'_1 \oplus a'_2$$

to X_{112} , which allows both Z_1, Z_2 to infer their last $'$ bit of $W_1 = A$ that each needs.

It follows that the $X_{\mathbf{d}}$ given above all have dimension at most $5F/3$, which shows that the memory-rate trade-off $(M, R) = (1/2, 5/3)$ can be achieved.

11. CODED CACHING WITH $N = K = 3$: TWO DISCOORDINATION BOUNDS

The point of this section is to prove some lower bounds (i.e., “outer bounds”) on linear coded caching schemes that attain a memory-rate pair (M, R) in the case $N = K = 3$. We will get two bounds that are interesting and involve the discoordination of certain random variables. We will use the second bound to prove $6M + 5R \geq 11$ for separated linear schemes in Section 12, and general linear schemes in Section 13.

11.1. The Main Bounds for Linear Codes for $N = K = 3$. In this subsection we formally describe the two main bounds involving linear schemes for $N = K = 3$ for coded caching, plus a lemma that seems interesting in its own right. In all cases, the inequalities can be turned into equalities by going through the proofs and keeping certain non-negative terms that we discard along the way.

Theorem 11.1. *Consider a coded caching scheme with notation as in Subsection 7.1 for $N = K = 3$ and where F is arbitrary. Let*

$$P_1 = X_{123} + Z_1, \quad P_2 = X_{213} + Z_2.$$

Then

$$(100) \quad 2R + 3M \geq 5 + \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1W_2}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]_{W_1W_2}) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(W_2 \cap Z_3) + s_1 + s_2 - \delta,$$

where δ is the discoordination

$$(101) \quad \delta = \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1}, [P_2]_{W_1}, [Z_3]_{W_1})$$

and s_1, s_2 are terms that vanish under symmetrization or for symmetric schemes, namely

$$(102) \quad s_1 = \dim(W_1W_3Z_3) - \dim(W_1W_2Z_3), \quad s_2 = \dim(W_1 \cap Z_3) - \dim(W_2 \cap Z_3).$$

We warn the reader that the above term $\dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1W_2}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3)$, we first calculate the intersection $(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3$ in \mathcal{U} , and then consider the image of this intersection in \mathcal{U}/W_1W_2 ; in the optimal scheme for $M = 1/3$, this dimension is 0, whereas the dimension of $[P_1 + P_2] \cap [Z_3]$ in \mathcal{U}/W_1W_2 equals $1/3$.

To prove this bound, we will first prove Lemma 11.4 below, which seems interesting in its own right.

The second main theorem is a bound that involves the discoordination of W_1, W_2, Z_3 ; since W_1 and W_2 are independent, we have $W_1 \cap W_2 = 0$, and hence

$$S_2(W_1, W_2, Z_3) = W_1 \cap Z_3 + W_2 \cap Z_3$$

and hence the discoordination of W_1, W_2, Z_3 equals

$$\delta' = \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(W_1, W_2, Z_3) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/(W_1 \cap Z + W_2 \cap Z)}((W_1 + W_2) \cap Z_3)$$

and since $S_2 = W_1 \cap Z + W_2 \cap Z$ lies in both $W_1 + W_2$ and Z , this equals

$$= \dim((W_1 + W_2) \cap Z_3) - \dim(W_1 \cap Z_3 + W_2 \cap Z_3),$$

$$= \dim((W_1 + W_2) \cap Z_3) - \dim(W_1 \cap Z_3) - \dim(W_2 \cap Z_3) + \dim((W_1 \cap Z_3) \cap (W_2 \cap Z_3))$$

and since $W_1 \cap W_2 = 0$, the rightmost term equals zero. Hence

$$\delta' = \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}}(W_1, W_2, Z_3) = \dim((W_1 + W_2) \cap Z_3) - \dim(W_1 \cap Z_3) - \dim(W_2 \cap Z_3).$$

Theorem 11.2. *Consider a coded caching scheme with notation as in Subsection 7.1 for $N = K = 3$ and where F is arbitrary. Then*

$$(103) \quad 2R + 3M \geq 5 - s - \delta',$$

where s is a term that vanishes after symmetrization, and δ' is the average discoordination of W_1, W_2, Z_3 in \mathcal{U} ,

$$\delta' = \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}, \text{avg}}(W_1, W_2, Z_3).$$

After we prove Theorem 11.2, we remark that (103) remains valid if we add the following non-negative term to the right-hand-side of (103):

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(Z_3 \cap S_2) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(Z_3 \cap W_1).$$

We suspect that by better understanding this term we could improve upon Theorem 11.2.

11.2. Proof of the First Discoordination Bound. We organize the proof of the discoordination bounds into a few lemmas.

Lemma 11.3. *Consider a coded caching scheme with notation as in Subsection 7.1 for $N = K = 3$ and where F is arbitrary. Then setting*

$$P_1 = X_{123} + Z_1, \quad P_2 = X_{213} + Z_2$$

we have

$$(104) \quad 2R + 3M \geq \dim(P_1) + \dim(P_2) + \dim(Z_3).$$

Proof. We have

$$2R + 3M \geq \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(X_{123}) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(Z_1) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(X_{213}) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(Z_2) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(Z_3).$$

By the dimension formula

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(X_{123}) + \dim(Z_1) \geq \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(X_{123} + Z_1) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_1);$$

similarly

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(X_{213}) + \dim(Z_2) \geq \dim(P_2).$$

Combining the three equations displayed above yields the lemma. \square

We remark that (104) would hold with equality if we add $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(X_{123} \cap Z_1)$ and $\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(X_{213} \cap Z_2)$ to the right-hand-side.

Lemma 11.4. *Consider the hypothesis and notation of Lemma 11.3. Then*

$$(105) \quad 2R + 3M \geq 4 + \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1} \cap [P_2]_{W_1}) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3).$$

Proof. By the dimension formula,

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_1) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_2) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_1 + P_2) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_1 \cap P_2),$$

and hence the right-hand-side of (104) can be written as

$$2R + 3M \geq \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_1 + P_2 + Z_3) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_1 \cap P_2).$$

But $P_1 + P_2 + Z_3$ implies X_{123}, Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 whose sum is all of \mathcal{U} . Hence

$$2R + 3M \geq 3 + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(P_1 \cap P_2).$$

Also P_1 and P_2 both imply W_1 , and (105) follows. \square

Next we study the first term on the right-hand-side of (105).

Lemma 11.5. *Consider the hypothesis and notation of Lemma 11.3. Then*

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1} \cap [P_2]_{W_1}) \geq \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([W_3]_{W_1 Z_3}) + t_1 + t_2 - \delta,$$

where

$$(106) \quad \delta = \text{DisCoord}^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1}, [P_2]_{W_1}, [Z_3]_{W_1})$$

and t_1, t_2 are the non-negative terms

$$t_1 = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1} \cap [P_2]_{W_1} \cap [Z_3]_{W_1}), \quad t_2 = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([P_1]_{W_1 Z_3} \cap [P_2]_{W_1 Z_3}).$$

In particular,

$$(107) \quad \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1} \cap [P_2]_{W_1}) \geq \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([W_3]_{W_1 Z_3}) - \delta.$$

Note that since P_1 and P_2 both imply W_1 , P_i already equals all of $[P_i]_{W_1} = P_i + W_1$.

Proof. Consider the universe \mathcal{U}/W_1 and its three linear subspaces $[P_1], [P_2], [Z_3]$; Corollary 3.10 (with $C = [Z_3]$ there) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1} \cap [P_2]_{W_1}) \\ &= \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([P_1]_{W_1 Z_3} \cap [P_2]_{W_1 Z_3}) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1} \cap [P_2]_{W_1} \cap [Z_3]_{W_1}) - \delta \\ &= \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([P_1]_{W_1 Z_3} \cap [P_2]_{W_1 Z_3}) + t_1 - \delta; \end{aligned}$$

since $P_i + Z_3$ implies W_3 (and W_1) we have

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([P_1]_{W_1 Z_3} \cap [P_2]_{W_1 Z_3}) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([W_3]_{W_1 Z_3}) + t_2.$$

Hence

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1}([P_1]_{W_1} \cap [P_2]_{W_1}) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([W_3]_{W_1 Z_3}) + t_1 + t_2 - \delta. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 11.1. Consider the second term on the right-hand-side of (105): since W_1, W_2 are both implied by $P_1 + P_2$ (since this contains X_{123}, Z_1, Z_2), we have

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3) = \dim^{\mathcal{U}}((W_1 W_2) \cap Z_3) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 W_2}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]_{W_1 W_2}).$$

Using this formula and Lemma 11.5, and applying these to the right-hand-side of (105), we get

$$(108) \quad \begin{aligned} 2R + 3M &\geq 4 + \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 Z_3}([W_3]_{W_1 Z_3}) + \dim^{\mathcal{U}}((W_1 W_2) \cap Z_3) \\ &\quad + \dim^{\mathcal{U}/W_1 W_2}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]_{W_1 W_2}) - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Now we take two of the terms above and notice the following simplification (modulo the term s_1 , which drops out upon symmetrization):

$$\dim^{U/W_1 Z_3}([W_3]_{W_1 Z_3}) = \dim^U(W_1 Z_3 W_3) - \dim^U(W_1 Z_3),$$

and

$$\dim^U((W_1 W_2) \cap Z_3) = \dim^U(W_1 W_2) + \dim^U(Z_3) - \dim^U(W_1 W_2 Z_3),$$

and upon adding these equalities we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim^{U/W_1 Z_3}([W_3]_{W_1 Z_3}) + \dim^U((W_1 W_2) \cap Z_3) \\ &= s_1 - \dim^U(W_1 Z_3) + \dim^U(W_1 W_2) + \dim^U(Z_3) \\ &= 1 + s_1 + \dim^U(W_1 \cap Z_3) = 1 + s_1 + s_2 + \dim^U(W_2 \cap Z_3). \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to (108) yields (100). \square

11.3. Proof of the Second Discoordination Bound.

Proof of Theorem 11.2. Our strategy is to use Theorem 11.1 and a seemingly crude bound on the discoordination. First, according to Theorem 3.13, since $W_1 \subset P_1 \cap P_2$ with notation as in Theorem 11.1, we have

$$\delta = \text{DisCoord}^{U/W_1}([P_1], [P_2], [Z_3]) = \text{DisCoord}^U(P_1, P_2, Z_3),$$

which in turn equals

$$\dim^{U/S_2}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]_{S_2}),$$

where

$$S_2 = S_2(P_1, P_2, Z_3) = P_1 \cap P_2 + P_1 \cap Z_3 + P_2 \cap Z_3.$$

Since $W_1 \subset S_2$ we have

$$(109) \quad \delta = \dim^{U/S_2}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]_{S_2}) \leq \dim^{U/W_1}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]_{W_1}).$$

Since $P_1 + P_2$ implies W_1, W_2 ,

$$\dim^{U/W_1}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]) = \dim^{U/W_1}([(W_1 W_2) \cap Z_3]) + \dim^{U/W_1 W_2}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3])$$

Applying this to (109) we have

$$\delta \leq \dim^{U/W_1}([W_1 W_2 \cap Z_3]_{W_1}) + \dim^{U/W_1 W_2}([(P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3]_{W_1 W_2});$$

equivalently

$$\dim^{U/W_1 W_2}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3) - \delta \geq -\dim^{U/W_1}(W_1 W_2 \cap Z_3).$$

Putting this into (100) we have

$$2R + 3M \geq 5 + \dim^U(W_2 \cap Z_3) - \dim^{U/W_1}([W_1 W_2 \cap Z_3]_{W_1}) + s,$$

where s is a term that vanishes upon symmetrization. Since

$$\dim^{U/W_1}([W_1 W_2 \cap Z_3]_{W_1}) = \dim^U((W_1 W_2) \cap Z_3) - \dim^U(W_1 \cap Z_3),$$

we have

$$2R + 3M \geq 5 + \dim^U(W_2 \cap Z_3) + \dim^U(W_1 \cap Z_3) - \dim^U((W_1 W_2) \cap Z_3) + s = 5 - \delta' + s.$$

Symmetrizing yields (103). \square

We remark that we can turn the inequality in (109) into an equality by subtracting from the right-hand-side the non-negative term

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3 \cap S_2) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}}((P_1 + P_2) \cap Z_3 \cap W_1),$$

which, since $P_1 + P_2$ contains both W_1 and S_2 , simplifies to

$$\dim^{\mathcal{U}}(Z_3 \cap S_2) - \dim^{\mathcal{U}}(Z_3 \cap W_1).$$

12. A HYBRID LOWER BOUND INVOLVING TIAN'S METHOD

The point of this section is to prove that for $N = K = 3$, any separated scheme must satisfy

$$6M + 5R \geq 11.$$

The proof given in this section will introduce some helpful concepts to give the same bound for any general linear schemes in Section 13. Along the way we will give some useful notation that we will use in both sections. We will also discuss our conjecture that $4M + 3R \geq 7$ for all linear schemes for $N = K = 3$. We begin with some useful notation.

12.1. Notation for Linear Schemes for $N = 3$. In this subsection we introduce some useful notation for linear schemes for $N = 3$; our interest is the case $K = 3$, but the notation is valid for any K .

We will introduce the following notation for linear schemes with $K = 3$; for simplicity we work with symmetric schemes. We recall that scheme becomes symmetric after taking the concatenation of the $N!K!$ symmetric forms of the scheme (see Section 8), and if the original scheme is linear or separated, then the same is true of the concatenation.

Definition 12.1. Consider a symmetric linear scheme for $N = 3$ and some value of K . For all $j \in [K]$, Lemma 9.2 implies that Z_j decomposes as a sum consisting of

- (1) a pure individual scheme A_j^1, B_j^1, C_j^1 ;
- (2) a pure Tian scheme, i.e., $A_j^2 \oplus B_j^2, B_i^2 \oplus C_j^2$;
- (3) a pure *symmetric two-way scheme*, meaning an AB -scheme $A_j'^3 \oplus B_j'^3$, an AC -scheme $A_j''^3 \oplus C_j''^3$, and a BC -scheme $B_j''^3 \oplus C_j''^3$, where all the $A_j'^3, A_j''^3, B_j'^3, B_j''^3, C_j'^3, C_j''^3$ have the same dimension; and
- (4) a three-way-scheme $A_j^4 \oplus B_j^4 \oplus C_j^4$.

By symmetry, the dimensions of

$$A_j'^3, A_j''^3, B_j'^3, B_j''^3, C_j'^3, C_j''^3$$

are independent of j and are all of the same dimension. We set $A_j^3 = A_j'^3 + A_j''^3$,

$$A_j = A_j^1 + \cdots + A_j^4,$$

and similarly for B_j and C_j . We then let r_1, \dots, r_4 be given by

$$Fr_i = \dim(A_j^i) = \dim(B_j^i) = \dim(C_j^i),$$

and we let r_5 be given by

$$3Fr_5 = F - \dim(A_1 + A_2 + A_3)$$

(which therefore represents the “information” of W_1 that is “unused” by the caches). we call $(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5)$ the *ratios* of the scheme. It will also be convenient to set for $1 \leq i \leq 4$

$$W^i = \sum_{j=1}^K (A_j^i + B_j^i + C_j^i),$$

which therefore gives linearly independent subspaces W^1, \dots, W^4 of $W = W_1 + W_2 + W_3$.

Next we make a few remarks about symmetric linear schemes in the above notation. First, for all $j \in [K]$ we have

$$\dim(A_j) = \dim(B_j) = \dim(C_j) = F(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4)$$

since for fixed j , the subspaces A_j^i with $1 \leq i \leq 4$ are independent in Lemma 9.2, and similarly for B or C replacing A . Second, we have

$$(110) \quad M = 3r_1 + 2r_2 + (3/2)r_3 + r_4.$$

Third, the second discoordination bound (103) implies that

$$(111) \quad 2R + 3M \geq 5 - r_2 - r_3/2.$$

Fourth, if $K = 3$ and the scheme is separated (Definition 7.7), then A_1, A_2, A_3 are linearly independent, and hence

$$3Fr_5 = F - 3F(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4),$$

and hence

$$(112) \quad r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 = 1/3.$$

12.2. Lower Bounds on Pure Schemes. By a *pure scheme* we mean a separated, linear scheme for $N = K = 3$ with some $r_i = 0$ for all but one value of i , and hence, by (112), equivalently $r_i = 1/3$ for a unique i . In this section we discuss pure schemes and their implication for linear schemes in the (currently open) range of $1/2 < M < 1$.

We remark that for the pure schemes we have the following bounds (recall results from Subsection 7.4):

- (1) If $r_i = 1/3$ for $i = 1, 3, 4$, then (111) gives us tight bounds: the value $r_1 = 1/3$ corresponds to the caching scheme that achieves $(M, R) = (1, 1)$ (due to [MAN14]), the $r_3 = 1$ to our new point $(M, R) = (1/2, 3/5)$ of Section 10, and $r_4 = 1/3$ the scheme of [CFL16] that achieves $(1/3, 2)$.
- (2) If $r_5 = 1/3$, then we have $M = 0$ and then $R = 3$ is clearly achievable and is optimal due to $3R + M \geq 3$ of [MAN14].
- (3) If $r_2 = 1/3$, then $M = 2/3$ and Theorem 7.8 applies here and gives $3M + 2R \geq 5$ and gives $R \geq 3/2$, which is *worse* than a convex combination of $(1/2, 5/3)$ of $(1, 1)$ which achieves $(2/3, 13/9)$. At present we do not know of the best lower bound for R for this particular scheme, i.e., the pure Tian scheme; however, it may be useful to get some bounds to see if one can show $4M + 3R \geq 7$, since the main weakness of (103) is its r_2 term.

Hence, assuming that we use one of the above pure schemes, we have lower bounds that match what is achievable, except for $r_2 = 1/3$, the pure Tian scheme, where the lower bound for R rules out this scheme as optimal.

Notice that when we create a scheme from a convex combination of the two schemes that achieve the (M, R) values of $(1/2, 5/3)$ and $(1, 1)$, so that the caches involve only nonzero \mathcal{W}^3 and \mathcal{W}^1 parts, then X_{123} can be written as a sum of two subspaces, one that involves only \mathcal{W}^3 , the other only \mathcal{W}^1 . It follows that if a scheme achieves an (M, R) value with $1/2 < M < 1$ and $4M + 3R < 7$, i.e., below the convex hull of $(1/2, 5/3)$ and $(1, 1)$, then the corresponding X_{123} cannot decompose in this way, i.e., the X_{123} does not factor through the decomposition of W^1, \dots, W^4 of $W^1 + \dots + W^4$. (This observation may be useful in trying to find a scheme with $1/2 < M < 1$ and $4M + 3R < 7$ or in refuting its existence.)

12.3. Tian’s Method for Separated Schemes without Other Considerations. In this subsection we motivate our hybrid approach to proving Theorem 12.2 and sketch our hybrid approach in rough terms; this subsection provides intuition but is not essential to the rest of this paper.

Our hybrid approach applies Tian’s method to X_{123} after we prove that we can separate X_{123} into a part that deals with information it needs to due an $r_5 > 0$ and an $r_4 > 0$ part of the Z_i ’s, and a part that deals with the $r_1, r_2, r_3 > 0$ parts. We deal with any r_5, r_4 parts by a “direct” linear algebra argument, and then apply Tian’s method to the remaining $r_1, r_2, r_3 > 0$ parts.

In more detail, consider applying the proof of Theorem 7.8 to a separated linear scheme with notation as in Definition 12.1. In this case Z_1, X_{123} implies W_1 and

$$B_1^1, C_1^1, B_1^2, C_1^2, B_1^3, C_1^3, B_1^{\prime 3}, C_1^{\prime 3}, B_1^{\prime\prime 3}, C_1^{\prime\prime 3}, B_1^4 \oplus C_1^4,$$

and hence, with notation as in (91) and (93), it follows that

$$(113) \quad \text{Rank} \begin{bmatrix} G_5 & G_6 & G_8 & G_9 \end{bmatrix} \leq F(M + R'' - 1 - 2r_1 - 2r_2 - (3/2)r_3 - r_4).$$

Therefore the same reasoning applied to Z_2, X_{123} and Z_3, X_{123} yields, with the same reasoning there, the bound

$$(114) \quad 3M + 2R'' \geq 3(1 - 2r_1 - 2r_2 - (3/2)r_3 - r_4).$$

combining this with (112) we may write (114) as

$$(115) \quad 3M + 2R \geq 5 - (3/2)r_3 - 6r_4 - 9r_5.$$

Notice that r_5 is conspicuously absent from (113) and (114), although if $r_5 > 0$ we certainly expect that this places a further condition on X_{123} that should be reflected in these equations. In fact, if $r_5 > 0$ it is easy to see by “direct linear algebra” that X_{123} must contain Fr_5 bits of information for Z_1 to reconstruct the information about W_1 that is missing from $A_1 + \dots + A_4$, and similarly for W_2 and the B_i ’s, and W_3 and the C_i ’s; furthermore this information is independent (in the sense of independent subspaces) from the part of X_{123} needed to deal with the r_1, \dots, r_4 parts of the scheme. Hence we are led to consider a hybrid approach: before applying Tian’s method, we first prove that X_{123} is a sum of the above $3Fr_5$ bits of missing information, plus information leftover for the part of the scheme represented by any positive values of r_1, \dots, r_4 . One can take this approach further, reasoning “directly” about the part of the scheme represented by r_4 ; this gives an improved result for separated schemes; however, we do not know how to reason directly about the r_4 part for general linear schemes, due to the possibly complicated way that the r_4 parts of the Z_i may intersect with the r_1, r_2, r_3 parts of the Z_i (without the assumption of separability). Hence in Section 13 we apply direct linear algebra only to the r_5 part, and Tian’s method to the r_1, \dots, r_4 parts; the resulting bound is

weaker, but still suffices—when combined with the second discoordination bound—to prove $6M + 5R \geq 11$.

12.4. The Result $6M + 5R \geq 11$ for Separated Linear Schemes. The main computation we do in this section is the following.

Theorem 12.2. *In any linear separated scheme as above for coded caching with $N = K = 3$, we have*

$$(116) \quad 2R + 3M \geq 5 - (3/2)r_3 + 3r_5.$$

Notice that the lower bound in the above theorem is not tight for $r_3 = 1/3$, which is the $(1/2, 5/3)$ achievable point described in Section 10. The above theorem easily gives the following corollary.

Corollary 12.3. *In any linear separated scheme above for coded caching as in Theorem 12.2, we have*

$$6M + 5R \geq 11.$$

Proof. Adding the following equalities and inequalities:

- (1) 1 times (116),
- (2) $-9/2$ times (112)
- (3) $-3/2$ times (110), and
- (4) $3/2$ times (111),

yields

$$(117) \quad 6M + 5R \geq 11 + 3r_4 + (15/2)r_5.$$

□

Note that this shows that $5R + 6M > 11$ unless $r_4 = r_5 = 0$.

The bound in this corollary gives a slight improvement to Tian's bound $R + M \geq 2$, as both pass through the achievable point $(M, R) = (1, 1)$; however, the bound in the corollary requires the assumption that the scheme is linear separated schemes; in the next section we remove the separability assumption, but obtain the weaker inequality

$$6M + 5R \geq 11 + 5r_5,$$

which still gives $6M + 5R \geq 11$; by contrast, Tian's bound $M + R \geq 2$ is valid for any scheme, including non-linear schemes.

[We remark that Tian's bound $R + M \geq 2$ has a short proof: for linear schemes, Tian's bound $R + M \geq 2$ follows from the fact that $(2R + 2M)F \geq \dim(X_{123} + Z_1) + \dim(X_{312} + Z_2)$, which by the dimension formula equals

$$\dim(X_{123} + Z_1 + X_{312} + Z_2) + \dim((X_{123} + Z_1) \cap (X_{312} + Z_2)),$$

and the first dimension above equals $3F$, and the second dimension is at least that of W_1 , namely F . For non-linear schemes this proof still holds, since the above lower bound on $2R + 2M$ becomes

$$H(X_{123}, Z_1, X_{312}, Z_2) + I((X_{123} + Z_1); (X_{312} + Z_2)),$$

which again are bounded above by $3F + F$, using the fact that the two-way mutual information $I(X; Y)$ of random variables X and Y is bounded from below by $H(Z)$ for any Z that is implied by both X and Y .]

Next we make some conjectures and further remarks.

First, we conjecture that one can improve the bound in Theorem 12.2 to

$$2R + 3M \geq 5 - (1/2)r_3 + 3r_5.$$

If so then adding to this inequality the following

- (1) $-3/2$ times (112)
- (2) $-1/2$ times (110), and
- (3) $1/2$ times (111),

we get $4M + 3R \geq 7$. This would then imply that no separated linear scheme can improve upon a convex combination of $(1/2, 5/3)$ and $(1, 1)$.

Second, we conjecture that any optimal linear scheme is separated. Our difficulty in attacking either conjecture is the possible way in which the X_{ijk} can involve XOR's of the bits A_i^j, B_i^j, C_i^j over different values of j ; furthermore, if a scheme is not separated, the relationships between the Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 could conceivably be quite complicated.

Third, the line connecting $(1/2, 5/3)$ and $(1, 1)$ is $4M + 3R = 7$, and we conjecture than

$$4M + 3R \geq 7$$

holds for all $1/2 \leq M \leq 1$ and any linear scheme; if this holds, then $4M + 3R \geq 7$ holds for all schemes unless there is a non-linear scheme which improves upon this (we do not particularly conjecture one way or another on the existence of such a non-linear scheme).

12.5. Proof of Theorem 12.2. We follow the hybrid approach of first making some “direct linear algebra” remarks regarding the information that X_{123} must contain due to parts of the scheme with $r_5 > 0$ and $r_4 > 0$; then we apply Tian’s method to the rest.

Proof of Theorem 12.2. As in the proof of Theorem 7.8, let us specify a basis for $W = W_1 + W_2 + W_3$. Consider the basis for W consisting of five parts:

- (1) for each $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$, let \mathcal{A}_j^i be a basis A_j^i , and similarly for \mathcal{B}_j^i and \mathcal{C}_j^i . Let \mathcal{A}^i be the union of $\mathcal{A}_1^i, \mathcal{A}_2^i, \mathcal{A}_3^i$, and similarly for $\mathcal{B}^i, \mathcal{C}^i$, \mathcal{W}^i be the union of $\mathcal{A}^i, \mathcal{B}^i, \mathcal{C}^i$.
- (2) Similarly, let $\mathcal{A}_j^{\prime 3}$ be an arbitrary basis of $A_j^{\prime 3}$, and similarly for $\mathcal{A}_j^{\prime\prime 3}$, and let \mathcal{A}^3 be the union of $\mathcal{A}^{\prime 3}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{\prime\prime 3}$. Similarly for \mathcal{B} or \mathcal{C} replacing everywhere \mathcal{A} , and let \mathcal{W}^3 be the union of $\mathcal{A}^3, \mathcal{B}^3, \mathcal{C}^3$.
- (3) For $i = 4$ we take a different approach: for $j = 1, 2, 3$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_j^4$ be an arbitrary basis for $A_j^4 \oplus B_j^4 \oplus C_j^4$ (recall the mildly abusive meaning of $A_j^4 \oplus B_j^4 \oplus C_j^4$ in Definition 9.1, which is first introduced in Subsection 2.2), let $\mathcal{A}_j^4, \mathcal{B}_j^4$ respectively be arbitrary bases for A_j^4, B_j^4 ; let \mathcal{A}^4 be the union of the \mathcal{A}_j^4 , and similarly for \mathcal{B}^4 and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^4$, and let \mathcal{W}^4 be the union of these sets.
- (4) For $1 \leq j \leq 3$, let A_j be the span of \mathcal{A}_j^i over all $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Let \mathcal{A}^5 be a basis of W_1 relative to $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$; hence $|\mathcal{A}^5| = 3Fr_5$ which represents the amount of information in W_1 that does not occur in the A_j^i ranging over all $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $1 \leq j \leq 3$. Introduce similar notation for \mathcal{B}^5 and \mathcal{C}^5 , and $\mathcal{W}^5 = \mathcal{A}^5 \cup \mathcal{B}^5 \cup \mathcal{C}^5$.

Finally, let \mathcal{W} be the union of the \mathcal{W}^i , which for block purposes we arrange in the order $\mathcal{W}^1, \dots, \mathcal{W}^5$. As in the proof of Theorem 7.8, the basis \mathcal{W} of W gives an isomorphism $\iota = \iota_{\mathcal{W}}: W \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{3F}$ with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

It will be crucial to note that for each $j = 1, 2, 3$, the vectors in $\iota(Z_j)$ have zeros in all their components corresponding to the basis elements in all \mathcal{W}^5 , and of those in \mathcal{A}^4 and \mathcal{B}^4 . [We actually know more: for example, $\iota(Z_1)$ has zeros in its components corresponding to the \mathcal{A}_j^i with $i \leq 3$ and $j \neq 1$, but we won't need such observations here.]

Now we will describe a set of vectors in X_{123} that are linearly independent; their span will be a subspace of X_{123} , namely X'_{123} . Our goal is to describe vectors so that $\iota(X'_{123})$ has a convenient form to which we can employ a hybrid strategy, first making direct observations about part of $\iota(X'_{123})$, and afterward we will apply Tian's method (in Theorem 7.8) to a matrix involving of the remaining upper left part of $\iota(X'_{123})$.

Consider any basis vector $a \in \mathcal{A}^5$. Since user 1 must be able to infer a from X_{123} and Z_1 , we have $a = x + z$ where $x \in X_{123}$ and $z \in Z_1$. It follows that $-x = a - z$, and hence $\iota(-x)$ —viewed as a block vector that breaks the basis \mathcal{W} into its $\mathcal{W}^1, \dots, \mathcal{W}^5$ blocks—is of the form:

$$[\ell^1 \quad \ell^2 \quad \ell^3 \quad \ell^4 \quad e_r],$$

where e_r is one of the standard basis vectors in the \mathcal{W}^5 block (in particular, in the \mathcal{A}^5 part of \mathcal{W}^5), and where the $-\ell^i$ corresponds to the part of $\iota(z)$ in the \mathcal{W}^i block of the basis \mathcal{W} ; furthermore, as remarked above, ℓ^4 has zeros in the components corresponding to vectors in \mathcal{A}^4 and \mathcal{B}^4 .

Doing this for each basis vector in \mathcal{A}^5 , and similarly for the rest of the basis vectors in \mathcal{W}^5 we get a set of vectors in X_{123} whose image under ι , when arranged as row vectors, yields a block matrix of the form:

$$(118) \quad [L^1 \quad L^2 \quad L^3 \quad L^4 \quad I],$$

where I is a $9r_5F \times 9r_5F$ identity matrix, and for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, L^i is a block matrix with $9r_5F$ rows. These rows are linearly independent because of the I in the block form above.

Next, user 1 can infer each element, $a \in \mathcal{A}_j^4$ with $j = 1, 2, 3$ from Z_1 and X_{123} , and again $a = z + x$ with $z \in Z_1$ and $x \in X_{123}$, so $\iota(x) = \iota(a) - \iota(z)$ gives us vectors of the form

$$[\ell^1 \quad \ell^2 \quad \ell^3 \quad e_r + \ell^4 \quad 0],$$

where e_r is the standard basis vector corresponding to $a \in \mathcal{A}^4$, and the ℓ^i result from $-\iota(z)$, and we observe that ℓ^4 has zero components in the positions corresponding to \mathcal{A}^4 and \mathcal{B}^4 , only possibly nonzero in those components corresponding to $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^4$. Doing the same for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_j^4$ with $j = 1, 2, 3$, we get elements of X_{123} such that ι of these elements, arranged as row vectors, is of the form

$$(119) \quad [P^1 \quad P^2 \quad P^3 \quad [Q \ I] \quad 0]$$

where the I in $[Q \ I]$ is an $6r_4F$ by $6r_4F$ identity matrix, and Q is the matrix of components corresponding to elements of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^4$.

Now we observe that all the rows of the matrices in (119) and (118) are linearly independent with the following argument: when we combine these matrices we get a matrix

$$(120) \quad \begin{bmatrix} P^1 & P^2 & P^3 & [Q \ I] & 0 \\ L^1 & L^2 & L^3 & [Q' \ 0] & I \end{bmatrix}$$

(here L^4 becomes $[Q' \ 0]$ since the Z_i have zero components in elements of \mathcal{A}^4 and \mathcal{B}^4), and separating the $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^4$ block part from the $\mathcal{A}^4, \mathcal{B}^4$ part we get a block matrix

$$(121) \quad \begin{bmatrix} P^1 & P^2 & P^3 & Q & I & 0 \\ L^1 & L^2 & L^3 & Q' & 0 & I \end{bmatrix},$$

whose two right-most columns give a $6r_4F + 9r_5F$ identity matrix.

At this point we have identified a subspace X'_{123} of X_{123} , and a basis of X'_{123} , whose image under ι , viewed as row vectors, equals the block matrix in (121). Now list all of the vectors in $\mathcal{W}^1 \cup \mathcal{W}^2 \cup \mathcal{W}^3$ as a sequence in any order

$$v_1, \dots, v_m$$

(note that here the subscript does not refer to which scheme or user is involved). Each $v_i = x_i + z_i$ for some $x_i \in X_{123}$ and $z_i \in Z_1 \cup Z_2 \cup Z_3$. We let

$$\hat{X}_{123} = X'_{123} + \text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_m).$$

Now we create a matrix whose rowspace equals $\iota(\hat{X}_{123})$ as follows: we begin with the matrix in (121) and for $i = 1, \dots, m$ we add a row for each x_i such that

$$x_i \notin X'_{123} + \text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$$

using the same idea as before: since $-x_i = v_i - z_i$ we add the row $\iota(-x_i) = \iota(v_i) - \iota(z_i)$ which has the form

$$[\ell^1 \ \ell^2 \ \ell^3 \ \ell^4 \ 0_{\mathcal{A}^4, \mathcal{B}^4} \ 0_{\mathcal{W}^5}],$$

where ℓ^4 corresponds to the $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^4$ part, and the subscripts on the 0 indicates the corresponding components. Adding all such vectors x_i to obtain \hat{X}_{123} we have that $\iota(\hat{X}_{123})$, viewed as row vectors, is the row space of a matrix

$$(122) \quad G = \begin{bmatrix} G''^1 & G''^2 & G''^3 & Q'' & 0 & 0 \\ P^1 & P^2 & P^3 & Q & I & 0 \\ L^1 & L^2 & L^3 & Q' & 0 & I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Setting

$$G'' = [G''^1 \ G''^2 \ G''^3],$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} FR &\geq \dim(X_{123}) \geq \dim(\hat{X}_{123}) \geq \text{Rank}(G) \\ &= \text{Rank}([G'' \ Q'']) + 6r_4F + 9r_5F \geq \text{Rank}(G'') + 6r_4F + 9r_5F, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$(123) \quad FR \geq R''F + 6r_4F + 9r_5F, \quad \text{where } R'' = \text{Rank}(G'')/F$$

Now let's reason about G'' . First, we prove that

$$\iota(\text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_m))$$

lies entirely in the rowspace of $[G'' \ Q'' \ 0 \ 0]$: indeed, surely each x_i with

$$x_i \notin X'_{123} + \text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$$

has $\iota(x_i)$ as one of the rows of $[G'' \ Q'' \ 0 \ 0]$, by our construction above. However, if

$$x_i \in X'_{123} + \text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$$

then $\iota(x_i)$ lies in some combination of the row space of G in (122). But since $x_i = v_i - z_i$, then x_i has zero components in positions corresponding to $\mathcal{A}^4, \mathcal{B}^4$ and \mathcal{W}^5 ; but since the two last columns of G are

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix},$$

and v_i corresponds to a vector in one of $\mathcal{W}^1, \mathcal{W}^2, \mathcal{W}^3$, we have that $\iota(x_i) = \iota(v_i) - \iota(z_i)$ has zero component in the positions corresponding to $\mathcal{A}^4, \mathcal{B}^4$ and \mathcal{W}^5 ; hence $\iota(x_i)$, which is a linear combination of rows in G , cannot involve the bottom two rows blocks, which correspond to $\iota(X'_{123})$.

Hence we know

$$\iota(\text{Span}(x_1, \dots, x_m)) = \text{Rowspace}\left(\begin{bmatrix} G'' & Q'' & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

Next consider the special case where all the vectors in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^4 = 0$, i.e., $A_j^4 \oplus B_j^4 \oplus C_j^4 = 0$ for all j ; in this special case, user 1 can reconstruct A_j^i for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and $1 \leq j \leq 3$, since each vector in A_j^i occurs in the sequence v_1, \dots, v_m , and we may set $Q'' = 0$ and compute the same values of v_1, \dots, v_m . Hence we may replace x_1, \dots, x_m with the vectors x''_1, \dots, x''_m obtained by discarding the $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^4$ components of x_1, \dots, x_m giving an $X''_{123} = \text{Span}(x''_1, \dots, x''_m)$ that allows users to reconstruct their $\mathcal{W}^1, \mathcal{W}^2, \mathcal{W}^3$ parts of their files. So the total memory user j needs to do this is $M''F$ where

$$M'' = M - r_4,$$

and the dimension of

$$X''_{123} = \text{Span}(x''_1, \dots, x''_m)$$

equals $R''F = \text{Rank}(G'')$.

Now we apply Tian's argument to show that in view of what user 1 knows with Z''_1 and X''_{123} (see proof of Theorem 7.8), the columns of G'' corresponding to $\mathcal{B}_2^i, \mathcal{B}_3^i, \mathcal{C}_2^i, \mathcal{C}_3^i$ ranging over all $1 \leq i \leq 3$ has dimension at most

$$(124) \quad M''F + R''F - (5r_1 + 5r_2 + (9/2)r_3)F.$$

Proceeding similarly for users 2 and 3 we have that the dimension of the entire column space of G'' , which equals $R''F$ (see (123)), is bounded above by three times (124), and hence

$$R''F \leq 3\left(M''F + R''F - (5r_1 + 5r_2 + (9/2)r_3)F\right).$$

and hence

$$3M'' + 2R'' \geq 15r_1 + 15r_2 + (27/2)r_3.$$

Using (123) and the fact that $M = M'' + r_4$ we get

$$3M + 2R \geq 3(M'' + r_4) + 2(R'' + 6r_4 + 9r_5)$$

$$\geq 15r_1 + 15r_2 + (27/2)r_3 + 15r_4 + 18r_5 = 5 - (3/2)r_3 + 3r_5$$

using $\sum_i r_i = 1/3$. □

13. A HYBRID BOUND WITHOUT ASSUMING SEPARABILITY

The point of this section is to prove a slightly weaker hybrid bound without the assumption of separability. It is based on a weaker form of Theorem 12.2.

Theorem 13.1. *Consider a symmetric linear coded caching for $N = K = 3$, and let notation be as in Definition 12.1 (which defines A_j^i, B_j^i, C_j^i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $1 \leq j \leq 3$, and the ratios (r_1, \dots, r_5)). Then we have (without the assumption of separability)*

$$(125) \quad 2R + 3M \geq 5 - (3/2)r_3 - 3r_4 + 3r_5,$$

and

$$(126) \quad 0 \leq r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - 1/3.$$

Furthermore both these inequalities are strict unless the scheme is separated.

Notice that the above theorem has a $-3r_4$ term in (125) that Theorem 12.2 does not. Fortunately, we still get the same $6M + 5R \geq 11$ bound: the $-3r_4$ here means that (117) becomes (127) below, which is worse by $-3r_4$, but still implies $6M + 5R \geq 11$.

Corollary 13.2. *Consider a symmetric linear coded caching for $N = K = 3$, and let notation be as in Definition 12.1. Then we have (without the assumption of separability)*

$$6M + 5R \geq 11.$$

Proof. (Similar to the proof of Corollary 12.3,) we add

- (1) 1 times (125),
- (2) $-9/2$ times (126)
- (3) $-3/2$ times (110), and
- (4) $3/2$ times (111),

which yields

$$(127) \quad 6M + 5R \geq 11 + (15/2)r_5.$$

□

13.1. Proof of Theorem 13.1. The proof below attempts to keep most of the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 12.2.

Proof of Theorem 13.1. Let notation be as in Definition 13.1, (which defines A_j^i, B_j^i, C_j^i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and $1 \leq j \leq 3$, and the ratios (r_1, \dots, r_5) .) (We will use a mostly different choice of basis elements of W than we did in Section 12). For $j = 1, 2, 3$, let

$$A_j = A_j^1 + \dots + A_j^4.$$

Hence $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subset W_1$, but we do not assume that they are independent. Let \mathcal{A}^5 be a basis of W_1 relative to $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$. Similarly define B_i, C_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $\mathcal{B}^5, \mathcal{C}^5$.

Before defining the rest of the bases we use for W , let us describe the rough idea behind our proof: the idea is to use our hybrid bound by first considering the $\mathcal{A}^5, \mathcal{B}^5, \mathcal{C}^5$ part that X_{123} must contain, and then applying a form of Tian's method to what is left. It follows that we use Tian's method on the three-way part of the scheme, which means that (125) will have a $-3r_4$ coefficient that is not present in

(116). Our approach to dealing with the fact that $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subset W_1$ may not be independent is to apply Theorem 3.6 and to use a discoordination minimizer, X , of A_1, A_2, A_3 to us to write down a convenient basis of $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$ to apply Tian's method. What then happens, roughly speaking, is that any dependence between A_1, A_2, A_3 will force the dimension of $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$ to be smaller than the sum of $\dim(A_i)$, and hence force the values of r_1, \dots, r_5 to be larger (which can only improve our lower bound) than what would be if A_1, A_2, A_3 are independent. (And similarly with A replaced everywhere by B , or by C .)

The above rough ideas motivate our need to introduce notation and a different type of basis than in Section 12: namely, the bases we introduce here express how any dependence between A_1, A_2, A_3 arises, and for that we apply Theorem 3.6 to A_1, A_2, A_3 (and similarly for B_1, B_2, B_3 and C_1, C_2, C_3). Here are the precise bases; we start with A_1, A_2, A_3 .

So apply to Theorem 3.6 with $A = A_2$, $B = A_3$, and $C = A_1$ (it is important to take $C = A_1$) and $\mathcal{U} = A_1 + A_2 + A_3$; this yields a decomposition of $\mathcal{U} \subset W_1$ into subspaces $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ with the properties stated in the theorem. In particular, there exists a basis \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{U}_1 that coordinates $A_i \cap \mathcal{U}_1$, and there exists a basis y_1, \dots, y_m of $A_2 \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ and y'_1, \dots, y'_m of $A_3 \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ such that the $y_i + y'_i$ are a basis of $A_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2$ (where m is the discoordination of A_1, A_2, A_3).

Given these bases, introduce the following notation:

- (1) $\mathcal{A}' = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \cup \{y'_1, \dots, y'_m\}$ (hence $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}'$ is a basis of $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$, and $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}' \cup \mathcal{A}^5$ a basis of W_1);
- (2) $\mathcal{A}_{123} = \mathcal{A} \cap A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3$;
- (3) $\mathcal{A}_{12 \text{ only}} = (\mathcal{A} \cap A_1 \cap A_2) \setminus \mathcal{A}_{123}$, and similarly for $\mathcal{A}_{13 \text{ only}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}$;
- (4) $\mathcal{A}_{1 \text{ only}} = (\mathcal{A} \cap A_1) \setminus (\mathcal{A}_{12 \text{ only}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{13 \text{ only}})$, and similarly for $\mathcal{A}_{2 \text{ only}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{3 \text{ only}}$.

Since \mathcal{A} coordinates the $A_i \cap \mathcal{U}_1$, and \mathcal{A} spans only their sum, it follows (from Theorem 5.4) that each element of \mathcal{A} lies in at least one of the $A_i \cap \mathcal{U}_1$. Hence the sets

$$(128) \quad \mathcal{A}_{123}, \mathcal{A}_{12 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{13 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{1 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{2 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{3 \text{ only}}$$

form a partition of \mathcal{A} . \mathcal{A}' can be partitioned into its subsets

$$(129) \quad \mathcal{A}'_2 = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}, \quad \mathcal{A}'_3 = \{y'_1, \dots, y'_m\}.$$

Since \mathcal{A}^5 is a basis of W_1 relative to $\mathcal{U} = A_1 + A_2 + A_3$, \mathcal{A}^5 and the union of (129) and (128) form a basis for W_1 .

Now form a similar basis for W_2 with B 's replacing the A 's, making sure that $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B}'_1 \cup \mathcal{B}'_3$ (the subscripts 1 and 3 are important), so on the discoordinated part of $B_1 + B_2 + B_3$ we take \mathcal{B}' to consist of basis elements of B_1 and B_3 . Then form a similarly basis for W_3 with C 's, similarly with $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}'_1 \cup \mathcal{C}'_2$.

We will exploit any dependence between A_1, A_2, A_3 in the following equation:

$$(130) \quad |\mathcal{A}^5| = 3Fr_5 = F - \dim(A_1 + A_2 + A_3).$$

Note that

$$\dim(A_1) = m + |\mathcal{A}_{1 \text{ only}}| + |\mathcal{A}_{12 \text{ only}}| + |\mathcal{A}_{13 \text{ only}}| + |\mathcal{A}_{123}|,$$

and similarly for $\dim(A_2)$ and $\dim(A_3)$; since $\dim(A_1 + A_2 + A_3)$ is the sum of the size of the sets in (128) and (129), it follows that

$$\dim(A_1 + A_2 + A_3) = \dim(A_1) + \dim(A_2) + \dim(A_3) - m - \sum_{i < j} |\mathcal{A}_{ij \text{ only}}| - 2|\mathcal{A}_{123}|$$

$$= 3F(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4) - m - \sum_{i < j} |\mathcal{A}_{ij \text{ only}}| - 2|\mathcal{A}_{123}|$$

Applying (130) we get

$$3F(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5) - F = m + \sum_{i < j} |\mathcal{A}_{ij \text{ only}}| + 2|\mathcal{A}_{123}|.$$

By the symmetry of the scheme, we have $|\mathcal{A}_{ij \text{ only}}| = |\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}|$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, and we may rewrite the above equation as

$$(131) \quad 3F(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - 1/3) = m + \sum_{i < j} |\mathcal{A}_{ij \text{ only}}| + 2|\mathcal{A}_{123}| = m + 3|\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}| + 2|\mathcal{A}_{123}|.$$

So if A_1, A_2, A_3 are not independent, then some of the quantities on the right-hand-side above must be nonzero, which forces $r_1 + \dots + r_5$ to be larger than $1/3$. Since clearly

$$|\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}| + |\mathcal{A}_{123}| \leq (m + 3|\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}| + 2|\mathcal{A}_{123}|)/2,$$

considering the right-hand-side of (131) yields

$$(132) \quad |\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}| + |\mathcal{A}_{123}| \leq 3F(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - 1/3)/2,$$

which is weaker than (131) but sufficient for our needs.

Now we proceed similarly to the proof of Theorem 12.2. So let $\iota: W \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{3F}$ be the isomorphism expressing an element of W in terms of its coefficients in $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{C}$. We similarly let $\mathcal{W}^5 = \mathcal{A}^5 \cup \mathcal{B}^5 \cup \mathcal{C}^5$, which allows us to infer that X_{123} contains vectors whose image under ι whose span is the row space of a block matrix $[L \ I]$, where I is an identity matrix of size $\dim(\mathcal{W}^5)$; here L plays the role of $[L_1 \ \dots \ L_4]$ in (118).

Now we go straight to the Tian style argument: we take the vectors in X_{123} corresponding to $[L \ I]$ above, and add independent vectors of X_{123} each of which is needed by some Z_i to infer W_i from X_{123} . This gives us a basis for a subspace X'_{123} such that X'_{123} and Z_i implies W_i , and ι of the basis vectors forms a matrix of the form

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} G'' & 0 \\ L & I \end{bmatrix}$$

with L, I as above (the only crucial observation is that there is a 0 above the I , which occurs since each new row corresponding to a X'_{123} vector is needed by some Z_i and therefore cannot include any \mathcal{W}^5 component. In particular, similar to (123) (but looking only at \mathcal{W}^5 rather than both \mathcal{W}^5 and \mathcal{W}^4) we have

$$FR \geq R''F + 9r_5F, \quad \text{where } R'' = \text{Rank}(G'')/F.$$

Now we consider Z_1, X'_{123} . First we note that Z_1 contains no \mathcal{W}^5 component. Second we note that the Z_1 contains all vectors in the following parts:

$$\mathcal{B}_{123}, \mathcal{B}_{12 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{B}_{13 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{B}_1 \text{ only}, \mathcal{B}'_1$$

and the case with \mathcal{C} replacing \mathcal{B} everywhere. Since Z_1 and X'_{123} allows us to deduce all vectors in \mathcal{W}^1 , Tian's argument shows that setting

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \{\mathcal{B}_2 \text{ only}, \mathcal{B}_3 \text{ only}, \mathcal{B}_{23 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{B}'_3, \mathcal{C}_2 \text{ only}, \mathcal{C}_3 \text{ only}, \mathcal{C}_{23 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{C}'_2\},$$

we have that the columns of G'' corresponding to the columns in \mathcal{D}_1 have the dimension of their column space to be at most

$$\text{Rank}(G''|_{\mathcal{D}_1}) \leq M + R - F(1 + 2r_1 + 2r_2 + (3/2)r_3 + r_4).$$

Considering Z_2 and X'_{123} , the same remark holds with \mathcal{D}_1 replaced by

$$\mathcal{D}_2 = \{\mathcal{A}_{1 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{3 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{13 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}'_3, \mathcal{C}_{1 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{C}_{3 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{C}_{13 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{C}'_1\}$$

and similarly with

$$\mathcal{D}_3 = \{\mathcal{A}_{1 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{2 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{12 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}'_2, \mathcal{B}_{1 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{B}_{2 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{B}_{12 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{B}'_1\}$$

Setting $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2 \cup \mathcal{D}_3$, we have

$$\text{Rank}(G''|_{\mathcal{D}}) \leq 3\left(M + R - F(1 + 2r_1 + 2r_2 + (3/2)r_3 + r_4)\right).$$

Now we notice that the only basis elements of $\mathcal{W} \setminus \mathcal{W}^5$ that do not appear in \mathcal{D} are

$$\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{A}_{123}, \mathcal{B}_{13 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{B}_{123}, \mathcal{C}_{12 \text{ only}}, \mathcal{C}_{123}\},$$

and note that, by symmetry

$$|\mathcal{E}| = 3|\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}| + 3|\mathcal{A}_{123}|,$$

and hence (132) implies that

$$(133) \quad |\mathcal{E}| \leq (9/2)F(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - 1/3).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} FR'' &= \text{Rank}(G'') \leq \text{Rank}(G''|_{\mathcal{D}}) + \text{Rank}(G''|_{\mathcal{E}}) \\ &\leq 3\left(MF + R''F - F(1 + 2r_1 + 2r_2 + (3/2)r_3 + r_4)\right) + |\mathcal{E}|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$3M + 2R'' \geq 3\left(F(1 + 2r_1 + 2r_2 + (3/2)r_3 + r_4) - |\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}| - |\mathcal{A}_{123}|\right).$$

Since $R \geq R'' + 9r_5$ we get, using (132) we get

$$(134) \quad 3M + 2R \geq 3(1 + 2r_1 + 2r_2 + (3/2)r_3 + r_4) + 9r_5 - (9/2)(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - 1/3).$$

In view of (133) or (132) we have

$$(135) \quad r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - 1/3 \geq 0,$$

we may replace the factor of 9/2 in (134) by anything larger, and setting it to 6 we get

$$\begin{aligned} 3M + 2R &\geq 3(1 + 2r_1 + 2r_2 + (3/2)r_3 + r_4) + 9r_5 - 6(r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - 1/3) \\ &= 5 - (3/2)r_3 - 3r_4 + 3r_5. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that in view of (132), the inequality (135) is strict unless $m, |\mathcal{A}_{23 \text{ only}}|, |\mathcal{A}_{123}|$ are all 0. This only happens if $A_j = \mathcal{A}_{j \text{ only}}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, which implies that A_1, A_2, A_3 are independent. \square

14. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Let us indicate some directions for future research.

The first direction involves whether or not one can generalize our main theorem, Theorem 3.6, to four or more subspaces, A_1, \dots, A_m with $m \geq 4$, to obtain some sort of decomposition of the ambient \mathbb{F} -universe, \mathcal{U} , into a part where the subspaces are coordinated and other parts that have a sort of canonical form. Perhaps there are also non-trivial relationships between the discoordination of different collections of subspaces, either all in the original universe or some in quotient universes. Let us state a related question for $m \geq 4$ subspaces that seems very interesting.

Given a set subspaces $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ of an \mathbb{F} -universe, define the *closure* of \mathcal{A} to be the set of all subspaces that can be expressed by a formula involving $+$, \cap and elements of \mathcal{A} (and parenthesis). We remark that if $A_1, \dots, A_m \subset \mathbb{F}^n$ are coordinate subspaces, so $A_j = \mathbb{F}^{I_j}$ with $I_j \subset [n]$, then the closure of these subspaces are all subspaces of the form \mathbb{F}^I where $I \subset [n]$ and I can be expressed as a formula involving \cap, \cup and the I_1, \dots, I_m (and parenthesis). Considering the Venn diagram of the I_1, \dots, I_m , we see that the size of this closure is bounded as a function of m . Hence the same holds if A_1, \dots, A_m are coordinated subspaces of some \mathbb{F} -universe. Theorem 3.6 implies that the closure of a set $\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$ is also bounded by universal constant, since applying $+$, \cap to

$$e_1 \otimes \mathbb{F}^m, e_2 \otimes \mathbb{F}^m, (e_1 + e_2) \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$$

yields either 0 or all of $\mathbb{F}^2 \otimes \mathbb{F}^m$. Hence, we wonder if one can give a bound on the closure of $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ for $m \geq 4$ that depends only on m ; at present we do not even know if this closure is necessarily finite for $m = 4$.

As mentioned before, another linear algebra question would be to generalize the decomposition lemma, Lemma 9.2, when the universe has a decomposition into $N \geq 4$ subspaces. We remark that we discovered the achievability of $(M, R) = (1/2, 5/3)$ after proving Lemma 9.2, so we believe that a generalization of this lemma may give new achievable memory-rate pairs. We also mention that our proof of Lemma 9.2 seems long and tedious, so we hope that future work, either for $N = 3$ or $N \geq 4$, would eventually come with simpler proofs based on some new concepts.

As mentioned in Section 10, even if we take the Z_i to be a fairly simple scheme, such as a separated scheme consisting entirely of one of the pure schemes in Definition 9.1, we don't know of any reasonable algorithm to determine the corresponding $X_{\mathbf{d}}$ of minimum dimension.

Regarding coded caching for $N = K = 3$, our new achievable point $(M, R) = (1/2, 5/3)$ shows that Tian's bound $2M + R \geq 8/3$ is tight for $1/3 \leq M \leq 1/2$, but leaves open $1/2 < M < 1$. We wonder if one can add discoordination bounds to Tian's type of computer-aided search and get improved results.

We are, of course, interested to know if the equation

$$I(A; B; C) = \dim(A \cap B \cap C) - \text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$$

and the many other equalities involving the $\text{DisCoord}(A, B, C)$ could have new applications in information theory under the assumption that the random variables involved are linear.

Finally we wonder if there are analogs of the above formula for $I(A; B; C)$ when A, B, C are not assumed to be linear, and of the mutual information of more than three random variables.

REFERENCES

- [Ax15] Sheldon Axler, *Linear algebra done right*, third ed., Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2015. MR 3308468
- [BT82] Raoul Bott and Loring W. Tu, *Differential forms in algebraic topology*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 82, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982. MR 83i:57016
- [CFL16] Zhi Chen, Pingyi Fan, and Khaled Letaief, *Fundamental limits of caching: Improved bounds for users with small buffers*, IET Communications **10** (2016), Preprint available at: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1407.1935.pdf>.
- [CT06] Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*, second ed., Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], Hoboken, NJ, 2006. MR 2239987
- [CX20] Daming Cao and Yinfei Xu, *Characterizing linear memory-rate tradeoff of coded caching: The $(N,K)=(3,3)$ case*, CoRR **abs/2005.05548** (2020), Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.05548>.
- [DFZ10] Randall Dougherty, Chris Freiling, and Kenneth Zeger, *Linear rank inequalities on five or more variables*, 2010, Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/0910.0284>.
- [Dou14] Randall Dougherty, *Computations of linear rank inequalities on six variables*, 2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, 2014, pp. 2819–2823.
- [GV18] Jesus Gomez-Vilardebo, *Fundamental limits of caching: Improved rate-memory trade-off with coded prefetching*, 2018 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC), 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [HRSV00] Daniel Hammer, Andrei Romashchenko, Alexander Shen, and Nikolai Vereshchagin, *Inequalities for Shannon entropy and Kolmogorov complexity*, vol. 60, 2000, Twelfth Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (Ulm, 1997), pp. 442–464. MR 1785025
- [Ing71] A. W. Ingleton, *Representation of matroids*, Combinatorial Mathematics and its Applications (Proc. Conf., Oxford, 1969), Academic Press, London, 1971, pp. 149–167. MR 0278974
- [Izs15] Alice Izsak, *Abelian girth and gapped sheaves*, Doctoral thesis, Available as <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0223486>.
- [J94] Klaus Jänich, *Linear algebra*, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. MR 1307382
- [Kin11] Ryan Kinser, *New inequalities for subspace arrangements*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **118** (2011), no. 1, 152–161. MR 2737190
- [Laf99] L. Lafforgue, *Pavages des simplexes, schémas de graphes recollés et compactification des $\mathrm{PGL}_r^{n+1}/\mathrm{PGL}_r$* , Invent. Math. **136** (1999), no. 1, 233–271. MR 1681089
- [Laf01] ———, *Erratum: “Pavings of simplices, schemes of graphs that are ‘pasted together’ and compactification of $\mathrm{PGL}_r^{n+1}/\mathrm{PGL}_r$ ” [Invent. Math. **136** (1999), no. 1, 233–271; MR1681089 (2000i:14071)]*, Invent. Math. **145** (2001), no. 3, 619–620. MR 1856403
- [MAN14] Mohammad Ali Maddah-Ali and Urs Niesen, *Fundamental limits of caching*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **60** (2014), no. 5, 2856–2867.
- [Mat99] F. Matúš, *Conditional independences among four random variables. III. Final conclusion*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **8** (1999), no. 3, 269–276. MR 1702569
- [NvdP18] Peter Nelson and Jorn van der Pol, *Doubly exponentially many Ingleton matroids*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **32** (2018), no. 2, 1145–1153. MR 3807942
- [Sab20] Seyed Ali Saberali, *Coded caching : convex optimization and graph theoretical perspectives*, Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, 2020.
- [Tia18] Chao Tian, *Symmetry, outer bounds, and code constructions: A computer-aided investigation on the fundamental limits of caching*, Entropy **20** (2018), no. 8.
- [TM22] Amirhossein Tootooni Mofrad, *Linear information theory and its application to the coded caching problem*, Master’s thesis, University of British Columbia, 2022, Available at: <https://open.library.ubc.ca/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0412871>.
- [Yeu97] Raymond W. Yeung, *A framework for linear information inequalities*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **43** (1997), no. 6, 1924–1934.
- [Yeu02] Raymond W. Yeung, *A first course in information theory*, Information Technology: Transmission, Processing and Storage, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 2002, With a foreword by Toby Berger, With 1 CD-ROM. MR 2042182

- [YMAA19] Qian Yu, Mohammad Ali Maddah-Ali, and A. Salman Avestimehr, *Characterizing the rate-memory tradeoff in cache networks within a factor of 2*, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor. **65** (2019), no. 1, 647–663.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC
V6T 1Z4, CANADA
Email address: `jf@cs.ubc.ca`

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC
V6T 1Z4, CANADA
Email address: `tootooniamirhossein@gmail.com`