

Optimally Decoding Two-Dimensional Reed- Solomon Codes up to the Half-Singleton Bound

Shubhransh Singhvi*

Abstract

Constructing Reed-Solomon (RS) codes capable of correcting insertion and deletion errors (ins-del errors) has been the focus of numerous recent studies. However, the development of efficient decoding algorithms for such RS codes has not garnered significant attention and remains an important and intriguing open problem. In this work, we take a first step toward addressing this problem by designing an optimal-time decoding algorithm for the special case of two-dimensional RS codes, capable of decoding up to the half-Singleton bound.

1 Introduction

In the last decade, channels that introduce insertion and deletion errors have attracted significant attention due to their relevance to DNA storage systems [3, 27, 51, 52, 69, 78], where deletions and insertions are among the most dominant error types [35, 55]. An insertion error occurs when a new symbol is added between two symbols of the transmitted word. Conversely, a deletion error occurs when a symbol is removed from the transmitted word. These errors affect the length of the received word. For example, over the binary alphabet, if 100110 is transmitted, the received word might be 11011000, which can result from three insertions (a 1 at the beginning and two 0s at the end) and one deletion (one of the 0s at the beginning of the transmitted word). The study of communication channels with insertion and deletion errors is also relevant to various other applications, such as the synchronization of files and data streams [19], and scenarios involving over-sampling or under-sampling at the receiver side [58]. VT codes, introduced by Varshamov and Tenengolts [72], represent the first family of codes capable of correcting a single deletion or a single insertion [40]. Subsequent research extended these schemes to handle multiple deletion errors, as well as substitution and edit errors; see, e.g., [7, 23, 22, 30, 59, 12, 60, 61, 64, 65, 68].

In some applications, such as DNA storage systems, the problem of list decoding has also been studied. For example, works such as [2, 29, 33, 32, 47, 73] examine scenarios where the decoder receives a channel output and returns a (short) list of possible codewords, including the transmitted codeword.

Even though significant progress has been made in recent years toward understanding the ins-del error model—both in identifying its limitations and constructing efficient codes—our understanding of this model still lags far behind that of codes designed to correct erasures and substitution errors. For further details, we refer the reader to the following excellent surveys: [50, 49, 13, 31].

Linear codes provide a compact representation, efficient encoding algorithms, and, in many cases, efficient decoding algorithms. The rate R of a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is defined as $\frac{\log_q(|\mathcal{C}|)}{n}$, which, for a linear code, is $\frac{k}{n}$, where k is the dimension of the code.

*International Institute of Information Technology, Hyderabad, India; shubhranshsinghvi2001@gmail.com

While linear codes are predominantly used for correcting Hamming errors, most constructions for handling ins-del errors are non-linear. This disparity can be attributed to findings in works such as [1, 10], which demonstrate that the maximal rate of a linear code capable of correcting ins-del errors is significantly lower than that of a non-linear code correcting the same number of such errors.

Consequently, exploring the performance of linear codes against the ins-del error model remains an important open problem and has been the focus of recent studies [10, 9, 15, 16, 36, 11, 45, 17, 14]. The works [10, 9, 36] have shown that the best one can hope for while designing linear codes capable of decoding ins-del errors is to achieve the *half-Singleton bound*, given next.

Theorem 1. *Half-Singleton bound [10, Corollary 5.2]. Every linear ins-del code which is capable of correcting a δ fraction of deletions has rate at most $\frac{1-\delta}{2} + \mathcal{O}(1)$.*

Remark 1. *The following non-asymptotic version of the half-Singleton bound can be derived from the proof of [10, Corollary 5.2]: An $[n, k]$ -linear code can correct at most $n - 2k + 1$ ins-del errors.*

Reed-Solomon (RS) codes [54] are among the most widely used families of codes in both theory and practice, with numerous applications, including QR codes, secret sharing schemes, space transmission, data storage, and more. Their ubiquity is largely due to their simplicity and the availability of efficient encoding and decoding algorithms. Consequently, understanding how RS codes perform against ins-del errors is a significant problem, one that has garnered considerable attention in recent years [56, 75, 71, 18, 46, 8, 16, 17, 45, 14]. We next formally define RS Codes.

Definition 1 (Reed-Solomon codes). *Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$ be distinct points in a finite field \mathbb{F}_q of order $q \geq n$. For $k \leq n$ the $[n, k]_q$ RS-code defined by the evaluation vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is the set of codewords*

$$\{c_f = (f(\alpha_1), \dots, f(\alpha_n)) \mid f \in \mathbb{F}_q[x], \deg f < k\} .$$

Namely, a codeword of an $[n, k]_q$ RS-code is the evaluation vector of some polynomial of degree less than k at n predetermined distinct points. It is well known that the rate of $[n, k]_q$ RS-code is k/n and the minimal distance, w.r.t. the Hamming metric, is $n - k + 1$, the maximum possible by the *Singleton bound* [63]. As such, RS codes are maximum distance separable (MDS) w.r.t. the Hamming metric.

Notably, Con et al. in [15] have demonstrated that certain RS codes can achieve the half-Singleton bound. However, the problem of efficiently handling the ins-del errors remains largely open. While RS codes, like other linear codes, benefit from efficient encoding algorithms, efficient decoding algorithms are not a direct consequence of linearity. Instead, they require a careful analysis of the code's algebraic structure.

Informally, the goal of this work is to design efficient decoding algorithms for RS codes against ins-del errors, achieving a decoding radius as close as possible to the half-Singleton bound (ideally achieving the bound itself). For $k = 2$, by carefully analyzing the structure of the 2-dimensional RS code constructed by Roni et al. [17], we design an *optimal-time* decoding algorithm capable of correcting up to $n - 3$ deletions, the maximum number of deletion errors that can be corrected.

In Section 2, we review related work. In Section 3, we establish the notation and present some preliminary results. The main contributions of this work, which include two decoding algorithms—Algorithm A, for RS codes satisfying a specific algebraic condition with complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$, and Algorithm B, an optimized $\mathcal{O}(n)$ algorithm for a specific RS code construction—are presented in Section 4.

2 Related Works

2.1 Decoding RS Codes against Substitution Errors

Designing efficient algorithms for decoding RS against substitution(Hamming) errors has been of immense importance and has received significant attention.

An $[n, k]_q$ -RS code is uniquely decodable up to the optimal radius $\rho = \frac{1-R}{2}$ given by Singleton-bound. This means that for every received word $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, there is at most one codeword within Hamming distance ρn of \mathbf{y} . Over the years, numerous unique-decoding algorithms have been developed that are capable of efficiently decoding up to this optimal radius [53, 26, 6, 48, 67, 76, 24, 38, 5, 20, 44, 25, 77, 43, 21].

Berlekamp-Massey [6, 48] and Euclidean algorithms [67] generate syndromes from the received codeword, which are then used to generate key-equations. Then, by solving the key-equations, the algorithms locate the erroneous positions and error magnitudes. For an $[n, k]$ -RS code, the computational complexity of syndrome-based decoding is $\mathcal{O}(n(n-k) + (n-k)^2)$.

Welch and Berlekamp in [76] presented a new key-equation and solving algorithm for decoding RS codes without computing the syndromes. However, the computational complexity of Welch-Berlekamp algorithm is also $\mathcal{O}(n(n-k) + (n-k)^2)$.

Over the years, faster approaches based on fast Fourier transforms or fast polynomial arithmetic techniques [24, 38, 5, 20, 44, 25, 77, 43, 21] have led to a unique-decoding algorithm by Tang et al. [70] with computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}((n-k)\log^2(n-k))$.

A code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is (ρ, L) -list decodable if, for every received word $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, there are at most L codewords of \mathcal{C} within the Hamming distance ρn of \mathbf{y} . Due to Johnson-bound [37], Reed-Solomon codes are (ρ, L) -list-decodable for error parameter $\rho = 1 - \sqrt{R} - \epsilon$ and list size $L = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

Sudan[66] developed an efficient algorithm to list-decode RS codes up to the radius $\rho = 1 - \sqrt{2R}$, which was later improved by Sudan and Guruswami [28] to efficiently list-decode RS codes up to the Johnson radius $1 - \sqrt{R}$. Koetter and Vardy [39] further modified the Guruswami-Sudan algorithm to incorporate soft-decoding.

For $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, let $B_t(\mathbf{v})$ be the radius- t ball centered at \mathbf{v} . A code \mathcal{C} is $(\rho n, N)$ -sequence reconstructable [42, 41] if, for every codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$, it can be uniquely reconstructed from the N distinct channel outputs of \mathbf{c} , denoted by $Y \triangleq \{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N\} \subseteq B_{\rho n}(\mathbf{c})$. To uniquely reconstruct \mathbf{c} , it must hold that, for all the other codewords $\mathbf{c}' \in \mathcal{C}/\{\mathbf{c}\}$, $\mathbf{c}' \notin \bigcap_{i=1}^N B_{\rho n}(\mathbf{y}_i)$.

Recently, Singhvi et al. [62] explored RS codes in the context of sequence reconstruction and proposed an efficient algorithm capable of decoding beyond the Johnson radius.

2.2 RS codes against ins-del errors

The performance of RS codes against ins-del errors was first considered in [56] in the context of traitor tracing. In [75], the authors constructed a $[5, 2]$ -RS code capable of correcting a single deletion. Subsequently, in [71], an $[n, k]$ -generalized RS code capable of correcting $\log_{k+1}(n) - 1$ deletions was constructed. In [18, 46], the authors provided constructions of two-dimensional RS codes capable of correcting $n - 3$ ins-del errors. A breakthrough was achieved in [16], where the authors constructed the first linear codes that achieve the half-Singleton bound. Specifically, they demonstrated that certain $[n, k]$ RS codes achieve this bound with a field size of $n^{O(k)}$. This then led to the following open problem:

Problem 1. *What is the minimal field size for which there exists an $[n, k]_q$ RS code that achieves the half-Singleton bound?*

Recently, this question was partially addressed in [17] for RS codes with dimension $k = 2$. The authors showed that the minimal field size required is $q = \Theta(n^3)$. Furthermore, in a more recent study [14], the authors demonstrated that, with high probability, random Reed-Solomon codes approach the half-Singleton bound over a linear-sized alphabet.

3 Notations and Preliminaries

Let $[k] \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For a set \mathcal{S} and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we denote the set of all possible subsets of \mathcal{S} of size k by $\binom{\mathcal{S}}{k}$. Throughout this paper, $\log(x)$ refers to the base-2 logarithm.

For a prime power q , we denote with \mathbb{F}_q the field of size q . Let $\mathbb{F}_q^* \triangleq \mathbb{F}_q / \{0\}$. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$, then by the abuse of notation, we use $\frac{a}{b}$ to refer to $a \cdot b^{-1}$.

Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a linear code of dimension k , then it can be described as the image of a linear map, which, abusing notation, we also denote with \mathcal{C} , i.e., $\mathcal{C} : \mathbb{F}_q^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$. When $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ has dimension k we say that it is an $[n, k]_q$ code (or an $[n, k]$ code defined over \mathbb{F}_q). The minimal distance of a code \mathcal{C} with respect to a metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined as $\min_{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{v}} d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})$. In this work, we focus on codes against insertions and deletions.

Definition 2. Let \mathbf{s} be a string over the alphabet Σ . The operation in which we remove a symbol from \mathbf{s} is called a deletion and the operation in which we place a new symbol from Σ between two consecutive symbols in \mathbf{s} , in the beginning, or at the end of \mathbf{s} , is called an insertion.

Let \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' be n -length strings over the alphabet Σ . The relevant metric for codes against insertions and deletions is the fixed-length Levenshtein (FLL) distance that we define next.

Definition 3. The FLL distance between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}' , denoted by $\text{FLL}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$, is the smallest integer t such that \mathbf{x} can be transformed to \mathbf{x}' by t insertions and t deletions.

One of the most fundamental parameters in any metric is the size of a ball with a given radius t centered at a word \mathbf{x} . In the case of the FLL metric, the size of the ball depends on the word \mathbf{x} [57, 4, 74, 34], contrary to the Hamming metric.

Definition 4. We denote the shortest common supersequence between \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' by $\text{SCS}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$ and the longest common subsequence by $\text{LCS}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$.

The following lemma, due to Levenshtein [40], characterizes the ins-del error capability of a code by the maximal LCS of all pairs of distinct codewords.

Lemma 1 ([40]). A code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ can correct any combination of t insertions and deletions if and only if, for any two distinct codewords $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \in \mathcal{C}$, it holds that $|\text{LCS}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}')| < n - t$. Furthermore, it holds that $\text{FLL}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}') = n - |\text{LCS}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}')|$.

We use $d_F(\mathcal{C})$ to denote the minimal distance of a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ w.r.t the FLL distance. The following corollary is a direct consequence of Lemma 1.

Corollary 1. A code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ can correct t deletions (but not $t + 1$) if and only if $d_F(\mathcal{C}) = t + 1$.

Remark 2. Note that a decoding algorithm capable of correcting any t deletions does not automatically lead to a decoding algorithm that can correct any combination of t insertions and deletions.

Throughout this paper, we shall move freely between representations of vectors as strings and vice versa. Namely, we shall view each vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ also as a string by concatenating all the symbols of the vector into one string, i.e., $(v_1, \dots, v_n) \leftrightarrow v_1 \circ v_2 \circ \dots \circ v_n$. Thus, if we say that \mathbf{s} is a subsequence of some vector \mathbf{v} , we mean that we view \mathbf{v} as a string and \mathbf{s} is a subsequence of that string.

3.1 An Algebraic Condition

In this section, we recall the algebraic condition presented in [16], which was used to characterize the ins-del error correcting capability of RS codes.

We first make the following definitions: We say that a vector of indices $I \in [n]^s$ is an *increasing* vector if its coordinates are monotonically increasing, i.e., for any $1 \leq i < j \leq s$, $I_i < I_j$, where I_i is the i th coordinate of I . For two vectors $I, J \in [n]^{2k-1}$ with distinct coordinates, we define a (variant of) Vandermonde matrix of order $(2k-1) \times (2k-1)$ denoted by $V_{I,J}(\mathbf{X})$ in the formal variables $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & X_{I_1} & \dots & X_{I_1}^{k-1} & X_{J_1} & \dots & X_{J_1}^{k-1} \\ 1 & X_{I_2} & \dots & X_{I_2}^{k-1} & X_{J_2} & \dots & X_{J_2}^{k-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 1 & X_{I_{2k-1}} & \dots & X_{I_{2k-1}}^{k-1} & X_{J_{2k-1}} & \dots & X_{J_{2k-1}}^{k-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Proposition 1. [16, Proposition 2.1] *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k]_q$ RS-code defined by an evaluation vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$. If for every two increasing vectors $I, J \in [n]^{2k-1}$ that agree on at most $k-1$ coordinates, it holds that $\det(V_{I,J}(\alpha)) \neq 0$, then $d_F(\mathcal{C}) = n - 2k + 2$, i.e., \mathcal{C} achieves the half-Singleton bound.*

For the ease of exposition, we say that an $[n, k]_q$ RS-code defined by an evaluation vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ satisfies the *algebraic condition* if the evaluation vector α satisfies the condition stated in Proposition 1.

Lemma 2. *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, 2]_q$ -RS code with evaluation vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ satisfying the algebraic condition. Let $g : \binom{\alpha}{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ be a mapping that assigns the triplet $(\alpha_{I_1}, \alpha_{I_2}, \alpha_{I_3})$ to*

$$\frac{\alpha_{I_1} - \alpha_{I_2}}{\alpha_{I_2} - \alpha_{I_3}},$$

where $I \in [n]^3$ is an increasing vector. Then, the mapping g is one-to-one over the domain $\binom{\alpha}{3}$.

Proof. Since \mathcal{C} satisfies the algebraic condition, it follows from Proposition 1 that for any two increasing vectors $I, J \in [n]^3$ that agree on at most one coordinate, the following holds:

$$\left| \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha_{I_1} & \alpha_{J_1} \\ 1 & \alpha_{I_2} & \alpha_{J_2} \\ 1 & \alpha_{I_3} & \alpha_{J_3} \end{pmatrix} \right| \neq 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{\alpha_{I_1} - \alpha_{I_2}}{\alpha_{I_2} - \alpha_{I_3}} \neq \frac{\alpha_{J_1} - \alpha_{J_2}}{\alpha_{J_2} - \alpha_{J_3}}.$$

Therefore, the mapping g is one-to-one over the domain $\binom{\alpha}{3}$. □

4 Our Decoding Algorithm

In [17], the authors designed explicit $[n, 2]_q$ -RS Codes, over a field size of $q = \mathcal{O}(n^3)$, which can correct up to $n - 3$ deletions. We describe one of the constructions presented in [17] below.

Construction 1. [17, Proposition 2.3] Let \mathbb{F}_q be a finite field of characteristic $p > 2$ and let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^*$ be a subset of size n . Let γ be a root of a degree 3 irreducible polynomial over \mathbb{F}_q , and let the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ be some ordering of the n elements $\delta + \delta^2 \cdot \gamma, \delta \in \mathcal{A}$. Then, the $[n, 2]$ RS-code defined over \mathbb{F}_{q^3} with the evaluation vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ can correct any $n - 3$ ins-del errors. Furthermore, the blocklength can be as large as $q - 1$.

We consider the worst-case scenario in which $n - 3$ symbols are deleted from the transmitted codeword \mathbf{c} . Let $\mathbf{K}_1, \mathbf{K}_2, \mathbf{K}_3$ be variables corresponding to the indices of the received symbols. Consequently, the received vector is given by $(c_{\mathbf{K}_1}, c_{\mathbf{K}_2}, c_{\mathbf{K}_3})$.

We first present a decoding algorithm that can recover from $n - 3$ deletions in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time for any $[n, 2]_q$ -RS code that satisfies the algebraic condition. Then specifically for Construction 1, we use the algebraic structure of the set of evaluation points to design an improved decoding algorithm that can recover from $n - 3$ deletions in *linear*-time.

Algorithm 1: Decoding Algorithm A

```

input : Received Vector;  $(c_{\mathbf{K}_1}, c_{\mathbf{K}_2}, c_{\mathbf{K}_3})$ 
output: Transmitted codeword;  $\mathbf{c}$ 
1 Set  $\beta = \frac{c_{\mathbf{K}_1} - c_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - c_{\mathbf{K}_3}}$ 
2 for  $J \in [n]^3$  do
3   | Set  $\eta = \frac{\alpha_{J_1} - \alpha_{J_2}}{\alpha_{J_2} - \alpha_{J_3}}$ 
4   | if  $\eta = \beta$  then
5   |   |  $\mathbf{K}_i = J_i$ , where  $i \in [3]$ 
6   |   | Break
7   | end
8 end
9 Interpolate  $(c_{J_1}, c_{J_2}, c_{J_3})$  to find  $\mathbf{c}$ 
10 Return  $\mathbf{c}$ 

```

Theorem 2. Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, 2]_q$ -RS code with evaluation vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ satisfying the algebraic condition. Then, Algorithm 1 can recover the transmitted codeword in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^2$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ be the codeword corresponding to the message vector \mathbf{m} . Therefore, we have that

$$c_i = m_1 + \alpha_i m_2,$$

where $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_1}, \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2}, \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_3}) &= \frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_1} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_3}} \\
&= \frac{((c_{\mathbf{K}_1} - m_1)m_2^{-1}) - ((c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - m_1)m_2^{-1})}{((c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - m_1)m_2^{-1}) - ((c_{\mathbf{K}_3} - m_1)m_2^{-1})} \\
&= \frac{c_{\mathbf{K}_1} - c_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - c_{\mathbf{K}_3}} \triangleq \beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get that

$$\frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_1} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_3}} = \beta. \quad (2)$$

As shown in Lemma 2, the mapping g is one-to-one over the domain $\binom{\alpha}{3}$. Therefore, there is a unique solution to Equation (2). Furthermore, the values of the index variables $\{\mathbf{K}_i\}_{i=1}^3$ can be found by an exhaustive search in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time. Once the evaluation points are known, the interpolation step to find the transmitted codeword can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time as the dimension of the code is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. \square

Algorithm 2: Decoding Algorithm B

input : Received Vector; $(c_{\mathbf{K}_1}, c_{\mathbf{K}_2}, c_{\mathbf{K}_3})$
output: Transmitted codeword; \mathbf{c}

- 1 Set $\beta = \frac{c_{\mathbf{K}_1} - c_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - c_{\mathbf{K}_3}}$
- 2 Let $\beta = a\gamma^2 + b\gamma + c$
- 3 Let $\beta\gamma = r\gamma^2 + s\gamma + t$
- 4 Let $\theta = \frac{a}{r}$
- 5 Compute $\delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} = \frac{(b - \theta(c^2 + s - 2ct\theta + t^2(\theta)^2))}{(2(c + c^2 - 2ct\theta + t\theta(-1 + t\theta)))}$
- 6 Compute $\delta_{\mathbf{K}_1} = \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}(1 + 2c - 2t\theta) + \theta(c - t\theta)$
- 7 Compute $\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} = -\delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} - \theta$
- 8 Set $\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_i} = \delta_{\mathbf{K}_i} + \delta_{\mathbf{K}_i}^2\gamma$, where $i \in [3]$
- 9 **for** $i \in [3]$ **do**
- 10 **for** $j \in [n]$ **do**
- 11 **if** $\alpha_j = \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_i}$ **then**
- 12 $\mathbf{K}_i = j \triangleq J_i$
- 13 **end**
- 14 **end**
- 15 **end**
- 16 Interpolate $(c_{J_1}, c_{J_2}, c_{J_3})$ to find \mathbf{c}
- 17 **Return** \mathbf{c}

Theorem 3. Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, 2]_{q^3}$ -RS code defined over \mathbb{F}_{q^3} with evaluation vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ as specified in Construction 1. Then, Algorithm 2 can recover the transmitted codeword in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^2$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ be the codeword corresponding to the message vector \mathbf{m} . Therefore, we have that

$$c_i = m_1 + \alpha_i m_2,$$

where $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} g(\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_1}, \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2}, \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_3}) &= \frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_1} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_3}} \\ &= \frac{((c_{\mathbf{K}_1} - m_1)m_2^{-1}) - ((c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - m_1)m_2^{-1})}{((c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - m_1)m_2^{-1}) - ((c_{\mathbf{K}_3} - m_1)m_2^{-1})} \\ &= \frac{c_{\mathbf{K}_1} - c_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{c_{\mathbf{K}_2} - c_{\mathbf{K}_3}} \triangleq \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get that

$$\frac{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_1} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2}}{\alpha_{\mathbf{K}_2} - \alpha_{\mathbf{K}_3}} = \beta. \quad (3)$$

As shown in Lemma 2, the mapping g is one-to-one over the domain $\binom{\alpha}{3}$. Therefore, there is a unique solution to Equation (3).

Next, from Construction 1, for $i \in [n]$, we have $\alpha_i = \delta_i + \delta_i^2\gamma$, where recall that $\delta_i \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$. Upon making this substitution in (3), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta_{\mathbf{K}_1} - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} + (\delta_{\mathbf{K}_1}^2 - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}^2)\gamma \\ & + \beta(\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} + (\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3}^2 - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}^2)\gamma) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Write $\beta = a\gamma^2 + b\gamma + c$ and $\beta\gamma = r\gamma^2 + s\gamma + t$, where $a, b, c, r, s, t \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Observe that the LHS is a polynomial in γ of degree less than 3 over \mathbb{F}_q . Namely, $p_0(\delta) + p_1(\delta) \cdot \gamma + p_2(\delta) \cdot \gamma^2 = 0$, where,

$$\begin{aligned} p_0(\delta) &= \delta_{\mathbf{K}_1} - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} + c(\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}) + t(\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3}^2 - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}^2), \\ p_1(\delta) &= \delta_{\mathbf{K}_1}^2 - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}^2 + b(\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}) + s(\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3}^2 - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}^2), \\ p_2(\delta) &= a(\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}) + r(\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3}^2 - \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by the definition of γ , $p_i(\delta) = 0$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. We first solve the system of equations for the case of $a = 0$ to serve as a sanity check for the general case. For $a = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} &= -\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3}, \\ \delta_{\mathbf{K}_1} &= -(2c + 1)\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3}, \\ \delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} &= \frac{-b}{2c^2 + 2c} \text{ or } 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta_{\mathbf{K}_1}, \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}, \delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$, we must have that

$$\delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} = \frac{-b}{2c^2 + 2c}.$$

Let $\theta = \frac{a}{r}$. For the general case, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbf{K}_3} &= -\delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} - \theta, \\ \delta_{\mathbf{K}_1} &= \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2}(1 + 2c - 2t\theta) + \theta(c - t\theta), \\ \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} &= \frac{(b - \theta(c^2 + s - 2ct\theta + t^2(\theta)^2))}{(2(c + c^2 - 2ct\theta + t\theta(-1 + t\theta)))} \text{ or } \frac{-a}{2r}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta_{\mathbf{K}_1} \neq \delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} \neq \delta_{\mathbf{K}_3}$, we must have that

$$\delta_{\mathbf{K}_2} = \frac{(b - \theta(c^2 + s - 2ct\theta + t^2(\theta)^2))}{(2(c + c^2 - 2ct\theta + t\theta(-1 + t\theta)))}.$$

Hence, the decoding algorithm can find the evaluation points in $\mathcal{O}(\log(q)) = \mathcal{O}(\log(n))$ time. Once the evaluation points are known, the interpolation step to find the transmitted codeword can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time as the dimension of the code is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. \square

Hence, the RS code construction by Roni et al. [17] is not only optimal in terms of field size, but it can also be decoded with optimal time complexity.

5 Acknowledgment

The author of this paper would like to acknowledge Roni Con and Lalitha Vadlamani for fruitful discussions on the problem.

References

- [1] Khaled AS Abdel-Ghaffar, Hendrik C Ferreira, and Ling Cheng. On linear and cyclic codes for correcting deletions. In *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 851–855. IEEE, 2007.
- [2] Maria Abu-Sini and Eitan Yaakobi. On list decoding of insertions and deletions under the reconstruction model. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1706–1711. IEEE, 2021.
- [3] Leon Anavy, Inbal Vaknin, Orna Atar, Roei Amit, and Zohar Yakhini. Data storage in dna with fewer synthesis cycles using composite dna letters. *Nature biotechnology*, 37(10):1229–1236, 2019.
- [4] Daniella Bar-Lev, Tuvi Etzion, and Eitan Yaakobi. On the size of balls and anticodes of small diameter under the fixed-length levenshtein metric. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(4):2324–2340, 2022.
- [5] Sandro Bellini, Marco Ferrari, and Alessandro Tomasoni. On the structure of cyclotomic fourier transforms and their applications to reed-solomon codes. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 59(8):2110–2118, 2011.
- [6] E. R. Berlekamp. *Algebraic Coding Theory*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968.
- [7] Joshua Brakensiek, Venkatesan Guruswami, and Samuel Zbarsky. Efficient low-redundancy codes for correcting multiple deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(5):3403–3410, 2017.
- [8] Bocong Chen and Guanghui Zhang. Improved singleton bound on insertion-deletion codes and optimal constructions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(5):3028–3033, 2022.
- [9] Hao Chen. Coordinate-ordering-free upper bounds for linear insertion-deletion codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(8):5126–5132, 2022.
- [10] Kuan Cheng, Venkatesan Guruswami, Bernhard Haeupler, and Xin Li. Efficient linear and affine codes for correcting insertions/deletions. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 37(2):748–778, 2023.
- [11] Kuan Cheng, Zhengzhong Jin, Xin Li, Zhide Wei, and Yu Zheng. Linear insertion deletion codes in the high-noise and high-rate regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17370*, 2023.
- [12] Kuan Cheng, Zhengzhong Jin, Xin Li, and Ke Wu. Deterministic document exchange protocols, and almost optimal binary codes for edit errors. In *2018 IEEE 59th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 200–211. IEEE, 2018.
- [13] Mahdi Cheraghchi and João Ribeiro. An overview of capacity results for synchronization channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(6):3207–3232, 2020.

- [14] Roni Con, Zeyu Guo, Ray Li, and Zihan Zhang. Random reed-solomon codes achieve the half-singleton bound for insertions and deletions over linear-sized alphabets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07299*, 2024.
- [15] Roni Con, Amir Shpilka, and Itzhak Tamo. Explicit and efficient constructions of linear codes against adversarial insertions and deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(10):6516–6526, 2022.
- [16] Roni Con, Amir Shpilka, and Itzhak Tamo. Reed solomon codes against adversarial insertions and deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(5):2991–3000, 2023.
- [17] Roni Con, Amir Shpilka, and Itzhak Tamo. Optimal two-dimensional reed–solomon codes correcting insertions and deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2024.
- [18] Tai Do Duc, Shu Liu, Ivan Tjuawinata, and Chaoping Xing. Explicit constructions of two-dimensional reed-solomon codes in high insertion and deletion noise regime. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(5):2808–2820, 2021.
- [19] Lara Dolecek and Venkat Anantharam. Using reed–muller $RM(1, m)$ codes over channels with synchronization and substitution errors. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 53(4):1430–1443, 2007.
- [20] Sergei V Fedorenko and Peter V Trifonov. Finding roots of polynomials over finite fields. *IEEE Transactions on communications*, 50(11):1709–1711, 2002.
- [21] Sergei Valentinovich Fedorenko. Efficient syndrome calculation via the inverse cyclotomic discrete fourier transform. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 26(9):1320–1324, 2019.
- [22] Ryan Gabrys, Venkatesan Guruswami, João Ribeiro, and Ke Wu. Beyond single-deletion correcting codes: Substitutions and transpositions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(1):169–186, 2022.
- [23] Ryan Gabrys and Frederic Sala. Codes correcting two deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 65(2):965–974, 2018.
- [24] Shuhong Gao. A new algorithm for decoding reed-solomon codes. In *Communications, information and network security*, pages 55–68. Springer, 2003.
- [25] Shuhong Gao and Todd Mateer. Additive fast fourier transforms over finite fields. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(12):6265–6272, 2010.
- [26] D. Gorenstein and N. Zierler. A class of error-correcting codes in p^m symbols. *Journal of The Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 9:207–214, 1961.
- [27] Robert N Grass, Reinhard Heckel, Michela Puddu, Daniela Paunescu, and Wendelin J Stark. Robust chemical preservation of digital information on dna in silica with error-correcting codes. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 54(8):2552–2555, 2015.
- [28] V. Guruswami and M. Sudan. Improved decoding of reed-solomon and algebraic-geometry codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(6):1757–1767, 1999.
- [29] Venkatesan Guruswami, Bernhard Haeupler, and Amirbehshad Shahrashbi. Optimally resilient codes for list-decoding from insertions and deletions. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 524–537, 2020.

- [30] Venkatesan Guruswami and Johan Håstad. Explicit two-deletion codes with redundancy matching the existential bound. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(10):6384–6394, 2021.
- [31] Bernhard Haeupler and Amirbehshad Shahrashbi. Synchronization strings and codes for insertions and deletions—a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(6):3190–3206, 2021.
- [32] Serge Kas Hanna and Salim El Rouayheb. List decoding of deletions using guess & check codes. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2374–2378. IEEE, 2019.
- [33] Tomohiro Hayashi and Kenji Yasunaga. On the list decodability of insertions and deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(9):5335–5343, 2020.
- [34] Lang He and Min Ye. The size of levenshtein ball with radius 2: Expectation and concentration bound. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 850–855. IEEE, 2023.
- [35] Reinhard Heckel, Gediminas Mikutis, and Robert N Grass. A characterization of the dna data storage channel. *Scientific reports*, 9(1):9663, 2019.
- [36] Qinqin Ji, Dabin Zheng, Hao Chen, and Xiaoqiang Wang. Strict half-singleton bound, strict direct upper bound for linear insertion-deletion codes and optimal codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(5):2900–2910, 2023.
- [37] Selmer Johnson. A new upper bound for error-correcting codes. *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, 8(3):203–207, 1962.
- [38] Jørn Justesen. On the complexity of decoding reed-solomon codes (corresp.). *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 22(2):237–238, 2006.
- [39] Ralf Koetter and Alexander Vardy. Algebraic soft-decision decoding of reed-solomon codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(11):2809–2825, 2003.
- [40] V. I. Levenshtein. Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals. *Soviet Physics Doklady*, 10(8):707–710, 1966.
- [41] Vladimir I Levenshtein. Efficient reconstruction of sequences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(1):2–22, 2001.
- [42] Vladimir I Levenshtein. Efficient reconstruction of sequences from their subsequences or supersequences. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 93(2):310–332, 2001.
- [43] Sian-Jheng Lin, Tareq Y Al-Naffouri, and Yunghsiang S Han. Fft algorithm for binary extension finite fields and its application to reed–solomon codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(10):5343–5358, 2016.
- [44] Tsung-Ching Lin, Trieu-Kien Truong, and Pei-Ding Chen. A fast algorithm for the syndrome calculation in algebraic decoding of reed–solomon codes. *IEEE transactions on communications*, 55(12):2240–2244, 2007.
- [45] Jingge Liu. Optimal rs codes and grs codes against adversarial insertions and deletions and optimal constructions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2024.

- [46] Shu Liu and Ivan Tjuawinata. On 2-dimensional insertion-deletion reed-solomon codes with optimal asymptotic error-correcting capability. *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, 73:101841, 2021.
- [47] Shu Liu, Ivan Tjuawinata, and Chaoping Xing. On list decoding of insertion and deletion errors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.09705*, 2019.
- [48] J. L. Massey. Shift-register synthesis and bch decoding. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, IT-15:122–127, 1969.
- [49] Hugues Mercier, Vijay K Bhargava, and Vahid Tarokh. A survey of error-correcting codes for channels with symbol synchronization errors. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 12(1):87–96, 2010.
- [50] Michael Mitzenmacher. A survey of results for deletion channels and related synchronization channels. *Probability Surveys*, 6:1–33, 2009.
- [51] Lee Organick, Siena Dumas Ang, Yuan-Jyue Chen, Randolph Lopez, Sergey Yekhanin, Konstantin Makarychev, Miklos Z Racz, Govinda Kamath, Parikshit Gopalan, Bichlien Nguyen, et al. Random access in large-scale dna data storage. *Nature biotechnology*, 36(3):242–248, 2018.
- [52] Chao Pan, S Kasra Tabatabaei, SM Hossein Tabatabaei Yazdi, Alvaro G Hernandez, Charles M Schroeder, and Olgica Milenkovic. Rewritable two-dimensional dna-based data storage with machine learning reconstruction. *Nature communications*, 13(1):2984, 2022.
- [53] W. Peterson. Encoding and error-correction procedures for the bose-chaudhuri codes. *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, 6(4):459–470, 1960.
- [54] Irving S Reed and Gustave Solomon. Polynomial codes over certain finite fields. *Journal of the society for industrial and applied mathematics*, 8(2):300–304, 1960.
- [55] Omer Sabary, Yoav Orlev, Roy Shafir, Leon Anavy, Eitan Yaakobi, and Zohar Yakhini. Solqc: Synthetic oligo library quality control tool. *Bioinformatics*, 37(5):720–722, 2021.
- [56] Reihaneh Safavi-Naini and Yejing Wang. Traitor tracing for shortened and corrupted fingerprints. In *ACM workshop on Digital Rights Management*, pages 81–100. Springer, 2002.
- [57] Frederic Sala and Lara Dolecek. Counting sequences obtained from the synchronization channel. In *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 2925–2929. IEEE, 2013.
- [58] Frederic Sala, Clayton Schoeny, Nicolas Bitouzé, and Lara Dolecek. Synchronizing files from a large number of insertions and deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 64(6):2258–2273, 2016.
- [59] Clayton Schoeny, Antonia Wachter-Zeh, Ryan Gabrys, and Eitan Yaakobi. Codes correcting a burst of deletions or insertions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(4):1971–1985, 2017.
- [60] Jin Sima and Jehoshua Bruck. On optimal k-deletion correcting codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(6):3360–3375, 2020.

- [61] Jin Sima, Netanel Raviv, and Jehoshua Bruck. On coding over sliced information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 67(5):2793–2807, 2021.
- [62] Shubhransh Singhvi, Roni Con, Han Mao Kiah, and Eitan Yaakobi. An optimal sequence reconstruction algorithm for reed-solomon codes. In *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2832–2837, 2024.
- [63] R. Singleton. Maximum distance q-nary codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 1964.
- [64] Ilia Smagloy, Lorenz Welter, Antonia Wachter-Zeh, and Eitan Yaakobi. Single-deletion single-substitution correcting codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2023.
- [65] Wentu Song, Nikita Polyanskii, Kui Cai, and Xuan He. Systematic codes correcting multiple-deletion and multiple-substitution errors. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(10):6402–6416, 2022.
- [66] Madhu Sudan. Decoding of reed solomon codes beyond the error-correction bound. *Journal of complexity*, 13(1):180–193, 1997.
- [67] Y. Sugiyama, M. Kasahara, S. Hirasawa, and T. N. Namekawa. A method for solving key equation for decoding goppa codes. *Information and Control*, 21:87–99, 1975.
- [68] Yubo Sun, Yuanxiao Xi, and Gennian Ge. Sequence reconstruction under single-burst-insertion/deletion/edit channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(7):4466–4483, 2023.
- [69] S Kasra Tabatabaei, Boya Wang, Nagendra Bala Murali Athreya, Behnam Enghiad, Alvaro Gonzalo Hernandez, Christopher J Fields, Jean-Pierre Leburton, David Soloveichik, Huimin Zhao, and Olgica Milenkovic. Dna punch cards for storing data on native dna sequences via enzymatic nicking. *Nature communications*, 11(1):1742, 2020.
- [70] Nianqi Tang and Yunghsiang S Han. A new decoding method for reed–solomon codes based on fft and modular approach. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 70(12):7790–7801, 2022.
- [71] Dongvu Tonien and Reihaneh Safavi-Naini. Construction of deletion correcting codes using generalized reed–solomon codes and their subcodes. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 42:227–237, 2007.
- [72] Rom R Varshamov and GM Tenenholz. A code for correcting a single asymmetric error. *Automatica i Telemekhanika*, 26(2):288–292, 1965.
- [73] Antonia Wachter-Zeh. List decoding of insertions and deletions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(9):6297–6304, 2017.
- [74] Geyang Wang and Qi Wang. On the size distribution of the fixed-length levenshtein balls with radius one. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, pages 1–13, 2024.
- [75] Yejing Wang, Luke McAven, and Reihaneh Safavi-Naini. Deletion correcting using generalized reed-solomon codes. In *Coding, Cryptography and Combinatorics*, pages 345–358. Springer, 2004.
- [76] L. Welch and E. R. Berlekamp. Error correction for algebraic block code. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, St. Jovite, 1983.

- [77] Xuebin Wu, Zhiyuan Yan, and Jun Lin. Reduced-complexity decoders of long reed-solomon codes based on composite cyclotomic fourier transforms. *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, 60(7):3920–3925, 2012.
- [78] SM Hossein Tabatabaei Yazdi, Ryan Gabrys, and Olgica Milenkovic. Portable and error-free dna-based data storage. *Scientific reports*, 7(1):5011, 2017.