



Syndrome-Based Error-Erasure Decoding of Interleaved Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes

Felicitas Hörmann , *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Hannes Bartz , *Member, IEEE*

Abstract

Linearized Reed–Solomon (LRS) codes are sum-rank-metric codes that generalize both Reed–Solomon and Gabidulin codes. We study vertically and horizontally *interleaved* LRS (VILRS and HILRS) codes whose codewords consist of a fixed number of stacked or concatenated codewords of a chosen LRS code, respectively. Our unified presentation of results for horizontal *and* vertical interleaving is novel and simplifies the recognition of resembling patterns.

This paper’s main results are syndrome-based decoders for both VILRS and HILRS codes. We first consider an error-only setting and then present more general error-erasure decoders, which can handle full errors, row erasures, and column erasures simultaneously. Here, an erasure means that parts of either the row space or the column space of the error are already known before decoding. We incorporate this knowledge directly into Berlekamp–Massey-like key equations and thus decode all error types jointly. The presented error-only and error-erasure decoders have an average complexity in $O(sn^2)$ and $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ in most scenarios, respectively, where s is the interleaving order and n denotes the length of the component code.

Errors of sum-rank weight $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ consist of $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ full errors, $t_{\mathcal{R}}$ row erasures, and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ column erasures. Their successful decoding can be guaranteed for $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k - t_{\mathcal{R}} - t_{\mathcal{C}})$, where n and k represent the length and the dimension of the component LRS code. Moreover, probabilistic decoding beyond the unique-decoding radius is possible with high probability when $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{s}{s+1}(n - k - t_{\mathcal{R}} - t_{\mathcal{C}})$ holds for interleaving order s . We give an upper bound on the failure probability for probabilistic unique decoding and showcase its tightness via Monte Carlo simulations.

Index Terms

linearized Reed–Solomon codes, interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon codes, vertical interleaving, horizontal interleaving, sum-rank metric, error-only decoding, error-erasure decoding, syndrome-based decoding, row erasures, column erasures

I. INTRODUCTION

The sum-rank metric is a rather modern alternative metric in coding theory and covers the Hamming metric as well as the rank metric as special cases. A prominent family of sum-rank-metric codes are linearized Reed–Solomon (LRS) codes [1] which generalize Reed–Solomon codes in the Hamming metric and Gabidulin codes in the rank metric, respectively. LRS codes attain the Singleton-like bound in the sum-rank metric with equality and have been studied from many different perspectives. While the sum-rank metric was first proposed in the context of space-time coding [2, Sec. III], it now has a variety of applications in e.g. coherent and non-coherent multishot network coding [3]–[6], private information retrieval [7], and distributed storage [8]. Another emerging use case for the sum-rank metric is post-quantum cryptography (PQC), which deals with the design and analysis of cryptosystems that remain secure in the realm of powerful quantum computers. First results for PQC include the study of generic decoding in the sum-rank metric [9] as well as a work on distinguishers for disguised LRS codes [10].

Code-based cryptography mostly uses channels with an additive error of fixed weight in a certain metric. When side channels are accessible on top of the encrypted data, additional information about the secret error might be leaked and facilitate attacks. For example, the knowledge of an entry of the error, of an erroneous position, or of an error-free position in the Hamming metric decreases the complexity of information-set decoding [11]. Note that the knowledge of an erroneous position is precisely what is classically called an *erasure* in the Hamming metric. As each erasure influences exactly one position of the error vector, it can be thought of as a weight-one error with side information. The notion of erasures in the rank metric has to be adapted to the different way of measuring the gravity of errors. For erasures in the rank metric, the focus is on an error decomposition whose two parts share the column space and the row space with the error, respectively. A rank error is called a *column erasure*, if only the first part is unknown, and a *row erasure*, if only the second part is unknown [12]–[15]. The same strategy can be applied blockwise to the sum-rank metric and Figure 1 shows how an error is composed of full errors, row erasures, and column erasures. Moreover, it is highlighted which parts of the respective decompositions are known to the receiver.

The simultaneous decoding of errors and erasures for Gabidulin codes in the rank metric was e.g. considered in [15] and the signature scheme RankSign is based on error-erasure decoding of low-rank parity-check (LRPC) codes [16]. Further, a series of work deals with the natural occurrence of error-erasure decoding of rank-metric codes in linear network coding, where some packets are erroneous and others are lost [14], [17], [18]. There is also a syndrome-based error-erasure decoder for LRS codes

F. Hörmann and H. Bartz are with the Institute of Communications and Navigation, German Aerospace Center (DLR), Germany (e-mail: {felicitas.hoermann, hannes.bartz}@dlr.de). Moreover, F. Hörmann is affiliated with the School of Computer Science, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland. F. Hörmann and H. Bartz acknowledge the financial support by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany in the programme of “Souverän. Digital. Vernetzt.” Joint project 6G-RIC, project identification number: 16KISK022.

$$e = \underbrace{a_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot B_{\mathcal{F}}}_{\text{full errors}} + \underbrace{a_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot B_{\mathcal{R}}}_{\text{row erasures}} + \underbrace{a_{\mathcal{C}} \cdot B_{\mathcal{C}}}_{\text{column erasures}}$$

Fig. 1. Visualization of the sum-rank error decomposition into parts containing full errors, row erasures, and column erasures, respectively. The filled green parts are known to the receiver, the unknown parts are hatched in red.

in the sum-rank metric [19] which generalizes the error-only decoder from [20] and can be applied to randomized decoding of LRS codes [21], [22], for example.

A typical coding-theoretical approach to handle burst errors is *code interleaving*. When a code is interleaved *vertically* with an interleaving order s , each codeword of the new code is a matrix consisting of s stacked codewords of the original code. In contrast, any codeword of a *horizontally* s -interleaved code is a concatenation of s codewords of the original code. While communication channels endowed with the Hamming metric mostly benefit from vertical interleaving and the horizontal analog was barely considered, both notions occur quite naturally in the rank metric. In fact, interleaved rank-error channels lead to a common row space for the component errors in the vertical case and to a shared column space in the horizontal setting. The decoding of Gabidulin codes was studied for vertical interleaving [13], [23]–[25] as well as for horizontal interleaving [26]–[30]. Moreover, interleaving of rank-metric codes and similar ideas were used in cryptographic proposals such as Durandal [31], LIGA [32], LowMS [33], and a variant of Loidreau’s system [34].

In the sum-rank-metric regime, the decoding of vertically interleaved LRS codes and its applications were studied in [6], [35], [36]. Further, a Metzner–Kapturowski-like decoder was presented in [37], [38] and allows to probabilistically decode *any* vertically interleaved linear code with high interleaving order, regardless of the structure of the underlying component code. In an earlier version of this work, the authors derived a definition of horizontally interleaved LRS codes and based their proposal of a Gao-like decoding algorithm in [39] on it. Note that the Gao-like decoder can correct only errors and a generalization to the error-erasure setting in the spirit of [24, Sec. 3.2.3] will likely introduce restrictions on the block sizes and thus only apply to a smaller family of codes. We use Figure 2 to give an overview on how the definition of the sum-rank weight differs for the vertical and the horizontal setting. The notions themselves will be discussed in more detail later.

(a) Vertical interleaving.

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{vert}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_s \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{vert}}) = \text{rk}_q \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{x}_2^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_s^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} + \text{rk}_q \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{x}_2^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_s^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} + \dots + \text{rk}_q \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(\ell)} \\ \mathbf{x}_2^{(\ell)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_s^{(\ell)} \end{pmatrix}$$

(b) Horizontal interleaving.

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{hor}} = (\mathbf{x}_1 | \mathbf{x}_2 | \dots | \mathbf{x}_s) = \left(\begin{matrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(1)} & \mathbf{x}_1^{(2)} & \dots & \mathbf{x}_1^{(\ell)} \\ \mathbf{x}_2^{(1)} & \mathbf{x}_2^{(2)} & \dots & \mathbf{x}_2^{(\ell)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_s^{(1)} & \mathbf{x}_s^{(2)} & \dots & \mathbf{x}_s^{(\ell)} \end{matrix} \right)$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{hor}}) = \text{rk}_q \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(1)} & \mathbf{x}_2^{(1)} & \dots & \mathbf{x}_s^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} + \text{rk}_q \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(2)} & \mathbf{x}_2^{(2)} & \dots & \mathbf{x}_s^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} + \dots + \text{rk}_q \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(\ell)} & \mathbf{x}_2^{(\ell)} & \dots & \mathbf{x}_s^{(\ell)} \end{pmatrix}$$

Fig. 2. Illustration of the sum-rank weight for vertically and horizontally interleaved vectors.

Contributions: We present syndrome-based error-only and error-erasure decoders for vertically interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (VILRS) codes as well as for horizontally interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (HILRS) codes. Up to our knowledge, this is the first publication giving a unified presentation of *both* types of interleaving, which allows us to highlight the similarities and differences between the two concepts.

The presented decoders are syndrome-based, i.e., they follow a Berlekamp–Massey-like approach and rely on the recovery of the error-locator polynomial (ELP) or the error-span polynomial (ESP), respectively. While both approaches are equivalent for non-interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (LRS) codes [19], each of the two approaches is tailored to one interleaving type. More precisely, the decoding of VILRS codes relies on an ELP key equation and HILRS codes are decoded by means of an ESP key equation.

Our decoding algorithms are the first syndrome-based *and* the first error-erasure decoders for HILRS and VILRS codes. Since we provide fast subroutines for certain steps in the decoding process, the algorithms require on average only $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ operations in the ambient field \mathbb{F}_{q^m} for errors and erasures, and $O(sn^2)$ operations in the error-only setting given that the interleaving order s grows at most linearly in m and n denotes the length of the component code.

The error-only decoders for VILRS and HILRS codes guarantee successful decoding up to the unique-decoding radius $\frac{1}{2}(n-k)$ and probabilistic unique decoding succeeds with high probability for errors of weight at most $\frac{s}{s+1}(n-k)$. Here, n and k denote the length and the dimension of the component code, respectively, and s is the interleaving order.

In the error-erasure setting, we focus on errors of sum-rank weight $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ that can be decomposed into $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ full errors, $t_{\mathcal{R}}$ row erasures, and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ column erasures. Our decoders guarantee unique decoding for both code classes when the error satisfies $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-k-t_{\mathcal{R}}-t_{\mathcal{C}})$. Further, errors of larger weight can be decoded with high probability when $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{s}{s+1}(n-k-t_{\mathcal{R}}-t_{\mathcal{C}})$ applies. In fact, the exact decoding radii for guaranteed and probabilistic decoding in the error-erasure regime are slightly better but differ for VILRS and HILRS codes.

Outline: After the preliminaries, this paper contains two main parts: Section III and Section IV are devoted to *vertically* and *horizontally* interleaved LRS codes and their syndrome-based decoding, respectively. We start each of these sections with describing the corresponding concept and the considered error and channel models in the sum-rank metric, and then present an error-only decoder as well as its generalization to the error-erasure setting.

In Section V, we then showcase experimental results to verify the tightness of the obtained upper bounds on the decoding-failure probabilities. Section VI contains short descriptions of fast subroutines that we use to speed up the derived decoders. Finally, we conclude in Section VII and give an outlook on future work and applications of the presented material.

II. PRELIMINARIES

We fix a prime power q and denote the finite field of order q by \mathbb{F}_q . Like [35], we use the following constant depending on the field size q in some expressions:

$$\kappa_q := \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1-q^{-i}} \quad \text{for any } q \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } q \geq 2. \quad (1)$$

As a sequence, κ_q is monotonically decreasing for growing q and converges to 1 quickly. In fact, the first values are $\kappa_2 \approx 3.463$, $\kappa_3 \approx 1.785$, and $\kappa_4 \approx 1.452$. The bound $\kappa_q < 3.5$ is conservative and even $\kappa_q < 2$ applies for non-binary fields with $q > 2$.

We further let \mathbb{F}_{q^m} be an extension field of \mathbb{F}_q and choose a field automorphism θ on \mathbb{F}_{q^m} whose fixed field is precisely \mathbb{F}_q . We write e.g. $\theta(\mathbf{a})$ to denote the elementwise application of θ to a vector \mathbf{a} . More generally, we use this notation to evaluate unary functions and operators on vectors and matrices elementwise.

We work with *row* vectors and usually denote vectors and matrices by bold lowercase and uppercase letters, respectively. Moreover, we often divide length- n vectors into ℓ blocks and call the vector $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_{\ell})$ of the block lengths a *length partition* of n . A length partition contains only positive integers and satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} n_i = n$. We denote the corresponding block representation of a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ by $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{x}^{(\ell)})$ with $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and extend this notation to matrices.

At some points, it will be useful to represent elements of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} over \mathbb{F}_q . Let us therefore fix an arbitrary ordered \mathbb{F}_q -basis $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m)$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and consider the induced vectorspace isomorphism $\text{ext} : \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$ which *extends* an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -element to its \mathbb{F}_q -representation. Namely, an element $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ is mapped to its coefficient vector $\text{ext}_q(x) := (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$ with respect to the basis γ , which means that $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{F}_q$ are chosen such that $x = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \gamma_i$ holds. When we consider a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, we represent its entries over \mathbb{F}_q and collect the \mathbb{F}_q -representations $\text{ext}_q(x_1), \dots, \text{ext}_q(x_n)$ as columns in the matrix $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$. Similarly, the notation $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{sm \times n}$ for a matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ with rows $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ denotes the \mathbb{F}_q -matrix obtained by stacking the \mathbb{F}_q -representations $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}_s)$ of its rows.

We use the common $O(\cdot)$ -notation to state the asymptotic time complexity of discussed algorithms. Moreover, we adopt $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to indicate that we neglect logarithmic factors. We usually consider operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and assume that an operation in an extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} can be executed in $\tilde{O}(s)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} as explained in [25, Sec. II.A]. This is reasonable because a suitable \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ can be chosen in all cases according to [40].

A. Sum-Rank-Metric Codes

The *sum-rank weight* of a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ with respect to the length partition $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell}$ is

$$\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{rk}_q(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}),$$

where $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ denotes the number of \mathbb{F}_q -linearly independent entries of $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ [1, Def. 25]. Equivalently, $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ with $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ can be interpreted as the \mathbb{F}_q -rank of the matrix $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n_i}$. We further define the *rank partition* of \mathbf{x} as the vector $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau^{(1)}, \dots, \tau^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell}$ with $\tau^{(i)} := \text{rk}_q(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ to emphasize how the

sum-rank weight $\tau = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \tau^{(i)}$ of \mathbf{x} splits across the ℓ blocks. The sum-rank weight induces the *sum-rank metric* on $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$, which is explicitly given as $d_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$. When n is clear from the context, we simply write $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}$ and $d_{\Sigma R}$, respectively. Note that the sum-rank metric covers the Hamming metric and the rank metric as special cases for $\ell = n$ and $\ell = 1$, respectively.

This paper considers \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear sum-rank-metric codes, that is, \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ endowed with the sum-rank metric. A *linear code* $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ has dimension $k := \dim_{q^m}(\mathcal{C})$ and length n . It can be represented as the \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -row space of a full-rank *generator matrix* $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{k \times n}$ or, equivalently, as the kernel of a full-rank *parity-check matrix* $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$. Its *minimum sum-rank distance* is

$$d_{\Sigma R} := \min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}} \{d_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\} = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \{\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x})\}.$$

The sum-rank analog of the Singleton bound reads $d_{\Sigma R}(\mathcal{C}) \leq n - k + 1$ [1, Prop. 34] and codes attaining it with equality are called *maximum sum-rank distance (MSRD) codes*.

B. Skew Polynomials

The non-commutative *skew-polynomial ring* $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ was first studied by Ore [41], [42] and contains all formal polynomials $\sum_i f_i x^{i-1}$ with finitely many nonzero coefficients $f_i \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. It is equipped with ordinary polynomial addition and a non-commutative multiplication determined by the rule $xf_i = \theta(f_i)x$ for all $f_i \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. The notion of *degree* naturally carries over from classical polynomials and we denote the set of all skew polynomials of degree at most $k - 1$ by $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]_{<k} := \{f \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta] : \deg(f) < k\}$.

$\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ is a right Euclidean ring which ensures for every pair $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ the existence of skew polynomials q_r and r_r such that $f(x) = q_r(x)g(x) + r_r(x)$ and $\deg(r_r) < \deg(g)$ holds [42]. We write $(f \bmod_r g)(x) := r_r(x)$ and if $(f \bmod_r g)(x) = 0$ applies, we call g a *right divisor* of f and write $\text{rdiv}(f, g)(x) := q_r(x)$. Since $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ is also a *left* Euclidean ring, we similarly obtain skew polynomials q_l and r_l for every $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ with $f(x) = g(x)q_l(x) + r_l(x)$ and $\deg(r_l) < \deg(g)$ [42]. Again, we use the notation $(f \bmod_l g)(x) := r_l(x)$ and call g a *left divisor* of f if $(f \bmod_l g)(x) = 0$ holds. In the latter case, we write $\text{ldiv}(f, g)(x) := q_l(x)$. The *greatest common right divisor (gcdr)* and the *least common left multiple (lclm)* of two skew polynomials $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ are denoted by $\text{gcdr}(f, g)$ and $\text{lclm}(f, g)$, respectively. We assume that both gcdr and lclm are monic to ensure their uniqueness.

The product $p = f \cdot g \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ of two skew polynomials $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ with $d_f := \deg(f)$ and $d_g := \deg(g)$ has degree $d_f + d_g$. The coefficients p_l of p with $l = \min(d_f, d_g) + 1, \dots, \max(d_f, d_g) + 1$ can be computed as follows [26]:

$$p_l = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{d_f+1} f_i \theta^{i-1}(g_{l-i+1}) & \text{if } d_f \leq d_g \\ \sum_{i=1}^{d_g+1} f_{l-i+1} \theta^{l-i}(g_i) & \text{if } d_f > d_g. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Another useful transformation for skew polynomials is the *skew reverse*. The θ -reverse of an $f \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ with respect to a fixed integer $t \geq \deg(f)$ is defined as $\overline{f}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{t+1} \overline{f}_i x^{i-1} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ with coefficients $\overline{f}_i = \theta^{i-t-1}(f_{t-i+2})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t+1$ [26, p. 574], [18, Sec. 2.4].

Next, we define the generalized operator evaluation for skew polynomials, which requires the definition of $\mathcal{N}_{\theta}^i(a)$ for $i \geq 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. We set $\mathcal{N}_{\theta}^0(a) = 1$ and proceed iteratively with $\mathcal{N}_{\theta}^i(a) = \theta^{i-1}(a) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{i-1}(a) = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \theta^j(a)$ for all $i > 0$ [43]. Since certain expressions containing this function will appear in later proofs, we anticipate technical auxiliary results in the next lemma:

Lemma 1: The following equalities hold for two integers $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ and an element $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$:

$$1) \quad \theta^{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x))) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta-\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\alpha}(x) & \text{if } \beta \geq \alpha \\ \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\alpha-\beta+2}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})) & \text{if } \beta < \alpha \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

$$2) \quad \theta^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x))) = \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha+\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})) \quad (4)$$

$$3) \quad \theta^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\beta}(x)) = \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha-\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})) \quad (5)$$

Proof: We start with the proof of 1) and 2) by assuming that $\alpha \geq 1$ holds since the case $\alpha = 0$ is straightforward to check. We obtain

$$\theta^{\pm\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x))) = \theta^{\pm\alpha}(\theta^{-(\beta-1)}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \dots \theta^{-1}(x)) = \theta^{-(\beta \mp \alpha)}(x) \dots \theta^{\pm\alpha-1}(x)$$

by definition and the first statement follows for $\beta \geq \alpha$ from

$$\theta^{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x))) = \theta^{-(\beta-\alpha-1)}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \dots \theta^{-1}(x) \cdot x \dots \theta^{\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x)) = \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta-\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\alpha}(x)$$

and for $\beta < \alpha$ from

$$\theta^{\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x))) = \theta^{\alpha-\beta+1}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \dots \theta^{-1}(x) \cdot \theta^{\alpha-1}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})) \dots \theta^{-1}(x^{-1}) = \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\alpha-\beta+2}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})).$$

As $\alpha + \beta \geq 0$ is always satisfied, there is no need for a case distinction for the second statement and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x))) &= \theta^{-(\alpha+\beta-1)}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \dots \theta^{-1}(x) \cdot \theta^{-(\alpha-1)}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})) \dots (\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})) \\ &= \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha+\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})).\end{aligned}$$

We now prove 3) and focus on the nontrivial case $\beta \geq 1$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^{-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{\beta}(x)) &= \theta^{-(\alpha-\beta)}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \dots \theta^{-(\alpha-1)}(\theta^{-1}(x)) = \theta^{-(\alpha-1)}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \dots \theta^{-1}(x) \cdot \theta^{-(\alpha-\beta-1)}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})) \dots \theta^{-1}(x^{-1}) \\ &= \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha}(\theta^{-1}(x)) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\alpha-\beta}(\theta^{-1}(x^{-1})).\end{aligned}$$

Let us define the operator $\mathcal{D}_{\theta}(b)_a := \theta(b)a$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ and set $\mathcal{D}_{\theta}^0(b)_a := b$. Further, consider its powers $\mathcal{D}_{\theta}^i(b)_a := \mathcal{D}_{\theta}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{i-1}(b)_a)_a = \theta^i(b) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^i(a)$ for all $i > 0$ and any $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ [1, Prop. 32]. The *generalized operator evaluation* of a skew polynomial $f(x) = \sum_i f_i x^{i-1} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ at an element $b \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ with respect to an evaluation parameter $a \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ was studied in e.g. [1], [44] and is defined as

$$f(b)_a := \sum_i f_i \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{i-1}(b)_a.$$

Note that there is another meaningful way to evaluate skew polynomials which is called *remainder evaluation* [1], [43]. We do not consider remainder evaluation in this paper but it has interesting connections to the generalized operator evaluation.

Remark 1: Generalized operator evaluation collapses to the usual evaluation of classical polynomials for the identity automorphism $\theta = \text{Id}$ and evaluation parameter $a = 1$ and to the evaluation of linearized polynomials [41] for the Frobenius automorphism $\theta = \cdot^q$ and evaluation parameter $a = 1$.

When the product of two skew polynomials $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ is evaluated at $b \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ with respect to $a \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, the generalized operator evaluation follows the product rule $(f \cdot g)(b)_a = f(g(b)_a)_a$ [7]. Moreover, it is useful to note that generalized operator evaluation $f(\cdot)_a$ with a fixed evaluation parameter a is an \mathbb{F}_q -linear map because θ fixes \mathbb{F}_q [44]. We write $f(\mathbf{b})_a$ to denote the vector of the evaluations of f at all entries of a vector \mathbf{b} and use the same notation also for matrices. When we consider a vector \mathbf{b} with respect to a length partition \mathbf{n} and we choose ℓ evaluation parameters $a_1, \dots, a_{\ell} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, we use

$$f(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}} := (f(\mathbf{b}^{(1)})_{a_1} \mid \dots \mid f(\mathbf{b}^{(\ell)})_{a_{\ell}}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\mathbf{n}}$$

to denote the elementwise evaluation of f at the entries of \mathbf{b} , where the i -th evaluation parameter a_i is used for the entries of the i -th block $\mathbf{b}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. We use the notation $\mathcal{D}_{\theta}(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}}$ for the operator $\mathcal{D}_{\theta}(\cdot)$ and its powers in a similar fashion.

The generalized operator evaluation of a skew polynomial $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^d f_i x^{i-1}$ can also be expressed as a vector-vector product. In particular, the evaluation vector $f(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\mathbf{n}}$ for evaluation points $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\mathbf{n}}$ and evaluation parameters $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\ell}$ is the product of the coefficient vector (f_1, \dots, f_d) of f and the *generalized Moore matrix* $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^d(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}}$ which was studied in e.g. [43] and is given by

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^d(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\theta}(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{d-1}(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{d \times \mathbf{n}}.$$

We further use the notation

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^d(\mathbf{B})_{\mathbf{a}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^d(\mathbf{b}_1)_{\mathbf{a}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^d(\mathbf{b}_s)_{\mathbf{a}} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sd \times \mathbf{n}} \quad \text{for matrices } \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{b}_s \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times \mathbf{n}}.$$

We will see that generalized Moore matrices can be used to generate linearized Reed–Solomon codes and we are thus naturally interested in their \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank. In fact, [1, Thm. 2] and [43, Thm. 4.5] imply that $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^d(\mathbf{b})_{\mathbf{a}}) = \min(d, \mathbf{n})$ holds if each block $\mathbf{b}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{(\ell)}$ contains \mathbb{F}_q -linearly independent entries and if the entries of \mathbf{a} belong to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Here, the *conjugacy class* of an element $a \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ is the set $\mathcal{C}(a) := \{\theta(c)ac^{-1} : c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*\}$ and this notion depends on the choice of θ [43]. The set of all conjugacy classes with respect to a fixed \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -automorphism θ is a partition of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and since we picked an automorphism with fixed field precisely \mathbb{F}_q , there are $q - 1$ nontrivial conjugacy classes next to the trivial one $\mathcal{C}(0)$. In particular, one choice of representatives for all nontrivial conjugacy classes are the powers $1, \gamma, \dots, \gamma^{q-2}$ of a primitive element $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, i.e., of an element that generates the multiplicative group $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*$.

The roots of a skew polynomial $f \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ with respect to the generalized operator evaluation $f(\cdot)_a$ with fixed evaluation parameter $a \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ form an \mathbb{F}_q -linear subspace of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The dimension of this subspace is upper-bounded by $\deg(f)$ and equality holds if and only if f divides $p(x) = x^m - \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^m(a)$, i.e., the polynomial for which $p(x)_a = 0$ holds for all elements $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ [45, Prop. 1.3.4]. When we consider root spaces of f with respect to different evaluation parameters a_1, \dots, a_{ℓ} and

these parameters belong to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , the dimensions of the ℓ root spaces sum up to at most $\deg(f)$ [45, Prop. 1.3.7]. In this setting, equality holds when f divides $\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x^m - \mathcal{N}_{\theta^m}(a_i))$ [45, Prop. 1.3.7].

The monic skew polynomial $\text{mpol}_{(b)_a}$ characterized by $\text{mpol}_{(b)_a}(b)_a = \mathbf{0}$ is called the *minimal skew polynomial* of the vector $b \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ with respect to generalized operator evaluation and evaluation parameters $a \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\ell}$. Recall that every entry of the i -th block $b^{(i)}$ is evaluated with respect to the i -th evaluation parameter a_i for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. The degree of $\text{mpol}_{(b)_a}$ is at most n and equality holds if and only if the entries of each block $b^{(1)}, \dots, b^{(\ell)}$ are \mathbb{F}_q -linearly independent and a_1, \dots, a_{ℓ} belong to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} [45, Sec. 1.3.1]. When all entries of b are nonzero, the minimal skew polynomial can be computed as follows [45, Rem. 1.3.6]:

$$\text{mpol}_{(b)_a}(x) = \text{lcm} \left(x - \frac{\theta(b_{\kappa}^{(i)})a_i}{b_{\kappa}^{(i)}} \right)_{1 \leq \kappa \leq n_i, 1 \leq i \leq \ell}. \quad (6)$$

C. Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes

Linearized Reed–Solomon (LRS) codes are a prominent family of sum-rank-metric codes and can be described as evaluation codes with respect to the generalized operator evaluation of skew polynomials. We make use of the concepts and notations from the previous section for their definition.

Definition 1 (Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes [1, Def. 31]): Let $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ be a vector whose blocks $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(\ell)}$ contain \mathbb{F}_q -linearly independent elements and choose $\xi \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\ell}$ with entries belonging to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Then, the code

$$\text{LRS}_{\theta}[\beta, \xi; n, k] := \{f(\beta)_{\xi} : f \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]_{<k}\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$$

is a *linearized Reed–Solomon (LRS) code* of length n and dimension k .

Note that the definition of an LRS code depends on the choice of the \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -automorphism θ . If θ is clear from the context, we often omit the index and write $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; n, k]$ to refer to the respective code. We further introduce the following shorthand notations for vectors of evaluation parameters because they will recur throughout the remainder of this paper:

$$\xi, \quad \xi^{-1}, \quad \tilde{\xi} := \theta^{-1}(\xi), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\xi} := \theta^{-1}(\xi^{-1}). \quad (7)$$

Remark that each of these vectors contains elements of pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes.

LRS codes have minimum sum-rank distance $n - k + 1$ and are thus MSRD codes [1, Thm. 4]. Furthermore, the generalized Moore matrix $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^k(\beta)_{\xi}$ is a generator matrix of $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; n, k]$ [1, Sec. 3.3]. The dual code of $\text{LRS}_{\theta}[\beta, \xi; n, k]$ is $\text{LRS}_{\theta^{-1}}[\mathbf{h}, \tilde{\xi}; n, n - k]$, where $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ satisfies $\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{l-1}(\beta)_{\xi}^{\top} = \mathbf{0}$ for all $l = 1, \dots, n - 1$ and has sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{h}) = n$ [5], [46]. In other words, the matrix

$$\mathbf{H} := \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}} \quad (8)$$

is a parity-check matrix of $\text{LRS}_{\theta}[\beta, \xi; n, k]$.

III. VERTICALLY INTERLEAVED LINEARIZED REED–SOLOMON (VILRS) CODES AND THEIR DECODING

The vertical interleaving of LRS codes was first studied in [35], where the authors derived a Loidreau–Overbeck-like and an interpolation-based decoder. They are tailored to an error-only channel and are the only known decoding schemes for vertically interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (VILRS) codes so far. Both allow for decoding beyond the unique-decoding radius and can be used as probabilistic unique decoders, which return either the correct solution or a decoding failure. Further, the interpolation-based approach can be adapted to the list-decoding setting such that the decoder outputs a list of all codewords within a sum-rank ball of a certain radius around the received word.

We introduce a syndrome-based decoding algorithm for VILRS codes, which we first present in the error-only setting that was considered for the previously known decoders. Additionally, we generalize our approach to an error-erasure channel model that allows to correct full errors as well as row and column erasures jointly. This is an extension of the ELP-based error-erasure decoder for non-interleaved LRS codes from [19]. Observe that the presented approach has an advantage compared to a potential generalization of the faster interpolation-based error-erasure decoder for vertically interleaved Gabidulin codes from [13]. Namely, the interpolation-based approach requires the code length to equal the extension degree of the ambient finite field and this restriction will most likely carry over to the sum-rank metric in a blockwise manner. Our syndrome-based decoder, however, does not have these parameter restrictions and can thus decode a larger family of codes.

A. Vertical Interleaving in the Sum-Rank Metric

Consider an arbitrary \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear sum-rank-metric code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ with respect to a length partition $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_{\ell})$. We define the *vertically interleaved code* $\text{VInt}(\mathcal{C}, s)$ as

$$\text{VInt}(\mathcal{C}, s) := \left\{ \mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{c}_s \end{pmatrix} : \mathbf{c}_j \in \mathcal{C} \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, s \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$$

and call $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$ its *interleaving order*.

Remark 2: This form of interleaving is called *homogeneous*, as all component codewords \mathbf{c}_j belong to the same code \mathcal{C} . In contrast, *heterogeneous* interleaving allows the component codewords $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_s$ to belong to possibly different subcodes $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_s$ of \mathcal{C} .

The length partition \mathbf{n} naturally induces a block structure on every codeword \mathbf{C} of $\text{VInt}(\mathcal{C}, s)$. Namely,

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{c}_s \end{pmatrix} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \mathbf{c}_1^{(1)} & \mathbf{c}_1^{(2)} & \dots & \mathbf{c}_1^{(\ell)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \mathbf{c}_s^{(1)} & \mathbf{c}_s^{(2)} & \dots & \mathbf{c}_s^{(\ell)} \end{array} \right) =: (\mathbf{C}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{C}^{(\ell)})$$

with $\mathbf{C}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. In other words, the columns of \mathbf{C} are divided into the blocks $\mathbf{C}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{C}^{(\ell)}$ according to the same length partition \mathbf{n} . This suggests a straightforward generalization of the sum-rank weight to codewords of vertically interleaved sum-rank-metric codes and, more generally, to arbitrary matrices $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$.

We define the *sum-rank weight* of a vertically interleaved matrix $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{X}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ as

$$\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{X}) := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{rk}_q(\mathbf{X}^{(i)}), \quad (9)$$

where the \mathbb{F}_q -rank of an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -matrix is the maximum number of \mathbb{F}_q -linearly independent columns. Naturally, the corresponding metric is obtained as $d_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) := \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y})$ for any $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$. We simply write $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\cdot)$ and $d_{\Sigma R}(\cdot, \cdot)$ when the length partition \mathbf{n} is clear from the context.

An example of vertically interleaved codes in the sum-rank metric are *vertically interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (VILRS)* codes, which were first considered in [35]. Their component code is an LRS code and we use the notation

$$\text{VILRS}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, s; \mathbf{n}, k] := \text{VInt}(\text{LRS}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}; \mathbf{n}, k], s)$$

to highlight the corresponding code parameters, which have to fulfill the restrictions given in Definition 1. VILRS codes have minimum sum-rank distance $d = n - k + 1$ and are thus MSRD codes [35].

In the following, we discuss channel models that naturally arise in a vertical interleaving setting. We then propose a probabilistic unique syndrome-based decoder for VILRS codes under the error-only model. We further extend the decoder to the error-erasure channel model and thus describe the first error-erasure decoder for VILRS codes.

B. Channel and Error Models

We first describe the error-only channel for vertical interleaving in the sum-rank metric. Then, we explain how to generalize the model to the error-erasure setting.

Consider the transmission of a codeword $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ over an additive sum-rank error channel such that the received word $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ can be described as

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{E} \quad (10)$$

for an error matrix $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ of sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{E}) = \tau$. We assume that \mathbf{E} is chosen uniformly at random from the set of all matrices having sum-rank weight $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., from

$$\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \mathbf{n}; \tau) := \{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n} : \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{M}) = \tau\}. \quad (11)$$

Remark 3: Sampling uniformly at random from $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \mathbf{n}; \tau)$ is not straightforward, as the sum-rank weight depends on the rank partition and different rank partitions are not equally likely. This topic was studied for vectors of a given sum-rank weight in [9], [47] and an algorithm for uniform sampling from $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(1, \mathbf{n}; \tau)$ based on enumerative coding can be found in [47, Alg. 9]. It can be adapted to our case by using $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^s \cong \mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ and thus $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \mathbf{n}; \tau) \cong \mathcal{M}_{q^{ms}}(1, \mathbf{n}; \tau)$.

If we focus on the interleaved structure, we can express the channel observation in (10) as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}_s \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{c}_s \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{e}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{e}_s \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with } \mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{c}_j, \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, s. \quad (12)$$

We call $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_s \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ received component words, $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_s \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ component errors, and $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_s \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ component codewords, respectively. We will switch between the perspectives given in (10) and (12) depending on the context.

Let $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau^{(1)}, \dots, \tau^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell}$ denote the rank partition of \mathbf{E} with respect to \mathbf{n} . In other words, we write $\tau^{(i)} := \text{rk}_q(\mathbf{E}^{(i)})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. We can apply a full-rank decomposition [48, Thm. 1] to each block of the error matrix \mathbf{E} and thus obtain

a decomposition

$$\mathbf{E} = (\mathbf{E}^{(1)} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{E}^{(\ell)}) = \underbrace{(\mathbf{A}^{(1)} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{A}^{(\ell)})}_{=: \mathbf{A}} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}^{(1)} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathbf{B}^{(\ell)} \end{pmatrix}}_{=: \mathbf{B}} \quad (13)$$

with matrices $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{s \times \tau}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times n}$ satisfying $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\tau}(\mathbf{A}) = \tau$ and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{B}) = \tau$ as in [9, Lem. 5]. The decomposition naturally induces a block structure on \mathbf{A} and a block-diagonal structure on \mathbf{B} , which is shown in (13). Namely, the columns of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are divided into blocks according to the length partitions τ and n , respectively.

Remark 4: The sum-rank conditions $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\tau}(\mathbf{A}) = \tau$ and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{B}) = \tau$ on the matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} in the above error decomposition are equivalent to $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{A}^{(i)}) = \tau^{(i)}$ and $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{B}^{(i)}) = \tau^{(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Note that the decomposition in (13) is not unique. In fact, every block-diagonal matrix $\mathbf{M} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{M}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{M}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times \tau}$ with full-rank blocks $\mathbf{M}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau^{(i)} \times \tau^{(i)}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ gives rise to a decomposition

$$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A}' \cdot \mathbf{B}' = \underbrace{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{M}^{-1}}_{=: \mathbf{A}'} \cdot \underbrace{\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}}_{=: \mathbf{B}'},$$

which satisfies the same sum-rank conditions as (13). Even though different decompositions might yield different matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , they are always directly linked to the error \mathbf{E} . Namely, the columns of $\mathbf{A}^{(i)}$ span the \mathbb{F}_q -column space of $\mathbf{E}^{(i)}$ and are called *error values*. Similarly, the rows of $\mathbf{B}^{(i)}$ span the \mathbb{F}_q -row space of $\mathbf{E}^{(i)}$ and are called *error locations*. Observe that the error decomposition in (13) shows that all component errors e_1, \dots, e_s share the same row space due to the vertically interleaved structure. This is beneficial for decoding, as it allows to employ the synergies between the error components by working with only *one* set of error locations.

We now move towards the error-erasure channel model. The main idea behind generalizing the error-only model to the error-erasure case is that the channel provides the receiver with partial knowledge about the error. For the adapted error model, we divide the $\tau = \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E})$ occurred sum-rank errors into three categories according to the available information. We distinguish between

- a (*full*) *error* or an error of type \mathcal{F} , for which neither the row nor the column space is known,
- a *row erasure* or an error of type \mathcal{R} , for which the column space is known,
- and a *column erasure* or an error of type \mathcal{C} , for which the row space is known.

By grouping the errors according to their type $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$, we obtain the decomposition $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{C}}$ with $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{s \times n}$ and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}) = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{T}})$. In the following, we use the notation $t_{\mathcal{T}} := \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{T}})$ for every $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$ and denote the rank partition of $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{T}}$ by $\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{T}} = (t_{\mathcal{T}}^{(1)}, \dots, t_{\mathcal{T}}^{(\ell)})$.

The application of (13) to the components $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{C}}$ yields the error decomposition

$$\mathbf{E} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \underbrace{(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(1)} \mid \cdots \mid \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(\ell)})}_{=: \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{s \times t_{\mathcal{T}}}} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(1)} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(\ell)} \end{pmatrix}}_{=: \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{t_{\mathcal{T}} \times n}} \quad (14)$$

with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{t_{\mathcal{T}}}(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}}) = t_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}) = t_{\mathcal{T}}$ for each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$. As in the error-only setting, the columns of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}$ form a basis of the \mathbb{F}_q -column space of $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}$ and the rows of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}$ are a basis of its \mathbb{F}_q -row space for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$. We thus call the columns of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$ *error values* and the rows of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ *error locations*. Again, the error's row space is shared by all component errors due to the structure induced by vertical interleaving. Observe further that the additional information that is available for the different error types can be translated directly into the knowledge of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$. This is visualized in Figure 1 for the non-interleaved setting.

C. Error-Only Decoding

Assume that we have received a word $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{s \times n}$ after a codeword $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ was transmitted over the error-only channel described in (10). The error $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{C}$ is thus assumed to have a fixed sum-rank weight τ . Let $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{(n-k) \times n}$ be a parity-check matrix of the component code $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; \mathbf{n}, k]$. Then we can compute the *component syndromes*

$$\mathbf{s}_j := \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^{\top} = \mathbf{e}_j \mathbf{H}^{\top} \stackrel{(13)}{=} \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{B} \mathbf{H}^{\top} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s$$

with \mathbf{a}_j denoting the j -th row of the matrix \mathbf{A} from (13). Without loss of generality, we can assume that \mathbf{H} is a generalized Moore matrix with respect to a vector $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ as described in (8). We can thus express the l -th entry of the syndrome \mathbf{s}_j for $l = 1, \dots, n - k$ as

$$s_{j,l} = \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{B} \mathcal{D}_{\theta-1}^{l-1}(\mathbf{h})_{\xi}^{\top} = \mathbf{a}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta-1}^{l-1}(\underbrace{\mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}^{\top}}_{=: \mathbf{x}})_{\xi}^{\top} = \mathbf{a}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta-1}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x})_{\xi}^{\top} \quad (15)$$

with $\tilde{\xi} := \theta^{-1}(\xi)$ defined in (7). Observe that the vector $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{h}\mathbf{B}^\top \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ does not depend on the chosen component index $j = 1, \dots, s$. We call its entries *error locators* and divide them into blocks according to the rank partition τ of the error \mathbf{e} and the matrix \mathbf{B}^\top .

We define the *error-locator polynomial (ELP)* $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ as the minimal skew polynomial satisfying $\lambda(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$. In other words, λ vanishes on the error locators with respect to generalized operator evaluation with evaluation parameters $\tilde{\xi}$. Note that λ has degree τ because the blocks $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(\ell)}$ of the error locators have \mathbb{F}_q -linearly independent entries and the evaluation parameters $\tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_\ell$ belong to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Next, we define the reversed component-syndrome polynomials which we will shortly relate to the ELP by means of a key equation. For $j = 1, \dots, s$, the j -th *component-syndrome polynomial* $s_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ is the skew polynomial whose coefficients are the entries of the component syndrome $\mathbf{s}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k}$, that is, $s_j(x) := \sum_{l=1}^{n-k} s_{j,l} x^{l-1}$. We call its skew θ^{-1} -reverse with respect to $n-k-1$ the *reversed component-syndrome polynomial* $\bar{s}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$. It is given by

$$\bar{s}_j(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{n-k} \bar{s}_{j,l} x^{l-1} \quad \text{with } \bar{s}_{j,l} = \theta^{-(l-n+k)}(s_{j,n-k+1-l}) \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, n-k \quad \text{and } j = 1, \dots, s. \quad (16)$$

We can now move on to the ELP key equation which will allow to jointly recover the error locations from the component syndromes in our decoder.

Theorem 1 (ELP Key Equation): For each $j = 1, \dots, s$, there is a skew polynomial $\psi_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ with $\deg(\psi_j) < \tau$ that satisfies

$$\lambda(x) \cdot \bar{s}_j(x) \equiv \psi_j(x) \pmod{x^{n-k}}. \quad (17)$$

Proof: We prove (17) by showing that $\psi_{j,l} = 0$ holds for all $l = \tau + 1, \dots, n-k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{j,l} &= (\lambda \cdot \bar{s}_j)_l \stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \lambda_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (\bar{s}_{j,l-\nu+1}) \stackrel{(16)}{\stackrel{(15)}}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \lambda_\nu \theta^{-(l-n+k)} (\mathbf{a}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l+\nu-1}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}}^\top) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau^{(i)}} \theta^{-(l-n+k)} (\mathbf{a}_{j,r}^{(i)}) \sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \lambda_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (x_r^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{-(l-n+k)} (\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l+\nu-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(3)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_\theta^{n-k-l}(\xi_i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau^{(i)}} \theta^{-(l-n+k)} (\mathbf{a}_{j,r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_\theta^{n-k-l}(\xi_i) \underbrace{\sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \lambda_\nu \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(x_r^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i}}_{= \lambda(x_r^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i}} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

■

The above proof shows that the key equation (17) can be reformulated as an inhomogeneous system of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear equations. This is useful for the analysis of the decoding radius and the failure probability, and we obtain

$$\sum_{\nu=2}^{\tau+1} \lambda_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (\bar{s}_{j,l-\nu+1}) = -\bar{s}_{j,l} \quad \text{for all } l = \tau + 1, \dots, n-k \quad \text{and all } j = 1, \dots, s \quad (18)$$

by normalizing $\lambda_1 = 1$ without loss of generality. The systems for the component indices $j = 1, \dots, s$ can be joined into the larger system

$$\begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{S}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\mathbf{S}}_s \end{pmatrix} \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top = - \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{s}}_1^\top \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\mathbf{s}}_s^\top \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k-\tau) \times \tau}$ is the coefficient matrix

$$\bar{\mathbf{S}}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \theta^{-1}(\bar{s}_{j,\tau}) & \theta^{-2}(\bar{s}_{j,\tau-1}) & \dots & \theta^{-\tau}(\bar{s}_{j,1}) \\ \theta^{-1}(\bar{s}_{j,\tau+1}) & \theta^{-2}(\bar{s}_{j,\tau}) & \dots & \theta^{-\tau}(\bar{s}_{j,2}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \theta^{-1}(\bar{s}_{j,n-k-1}) & \theta^{-2}(\bar{s}_{j,n-k-2}) & \dots & \theta^{-\tau}(\bar{s}_{j,n-k-\tau}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

and $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_j = (\bar{s}_{j,\tau+1}, \dots, \bar{s}_{j,n-k})$ is the right-hand side of the respective system (18) for $j = 1, \dots, s$. The vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{\tau+1}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ contains the unknown coefficients of the ELP λ . We use the shorthand notation $\bar{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top = \bar{\mathbf{s}}^\top$ to refer to the whole system (19) without focusing on the stacked structure.

Remark 5: While it is possible to solve the key equation in its equivalent formulation (19) by e.g. Gaussian elimination, it is beneficial to exploit the particular structure of the system. In fact, multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis [28]

can solve it in at most $O(s(n-k)^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} .

The proof of Theorem 1 showed that the ELP is *one* valid solution of the key equation (17). But since we want to be sure to recover the actual error in the decoding process, we require that (17) is uniquely solvable up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples. We can use the equivalent formulation (19) of the key equation to characterize for which parameters this is possible. The inhomogeneous \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system (19) has $s(n-k-\tau)$ equations in τ unknowns and can hence only have a one-dimensional solution space if the number of equations is at least the number of unknowns. Therefore, we directly obtain the necessary condition $\tau \leq s(n-k-\tau)$ for decoding success. In other words, the error weight τ must adhere to

$$\tau \leq \tau_{\max} := \frac{s}{s+1}(n-k) \quad (21)$$

and τ_{\max} is the maximum decoding radius. Note that this bound is necessary but not sufficient for the decoder's success, that is, successful decoding is *possible* but not guaranteed.

A decoding failure occurs if the key equation (17) has a solution space of dimension at least two. This corresponds to the case where the coefficient matrix $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ of (19) has \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank less than τ . The next lemma investigates the probability for this event and derives an upper bound on the decoding-failure probability. Moreover, it shows that correct decoding can be guaranteed as long as the error lies within the unique-decoding radius of the VILRS code, i.e., if $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(d-1) = \frac{1}{2}(n-k)$ holds for $d = n-k+1$ being the minimum distance of the code.

Lemma 2: Let $\overline{\mathbf{S}}$ be the coefficient matrix of the system (19), which arose from a VILRS decoding instance $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{E}$ with error weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}) = \tau \leq \tau_{\max}$. Then, the bound

$$\Pr \{ \text{rk}_{q^m}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) < \tau \} \leq \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max}-\tau)+1)}$$

applies for $\kappa_q < 3.5$ being defined in (1). Moreover, $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) = \tau$ is guaranteed for any error of weight $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-k)$.

Proof: Observe from (20) that the entry in column $\nu-1$ and row $l+\nu-\tau-2$ of $\overline{\mathbf{S}}_j$ is $\theta^{-(\nu-1)}(\overline{s}_{j,l-\nu+1})$ for $\nu = 2, \dots, \tau+1$, $l = \tau+1, \dots, n-k$, and $j = 1, \dots, s$. We can thus use the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(\overline{s}_{j,l-\nu+1}) &\stackrel{(16)}{\stackrel{(15)}}{=} \theta^{n-k-l}(\mathbf{a}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l+\nu-1}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau^{(i)}} \theta^{n-k-l} (a_{j,r}^{(i)}) \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(x_r^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{n-k-l}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l+\nu-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(3)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{n-k-l}(\xi_i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau^{(i)}} \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{n-k-l} (a_{j,r}^{(i)})_{\xi_i} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1} (x_r^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i} = \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{n-k-l}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\nu = 2, \dots, \tau+1$, all $l = \tau+1, \dots, n-k$, and all $j = 1, \dots, s$ to decompose the matrix $\overline{\mathbf{S}}_j$ into a product. In particular, we obtain

$$\overline{\mathbf{S}}_j = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{n-k-\tau-1}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_{\theta}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi} \\ \mathbf{a}_j \end{pmatrix}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{A}}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k-\tau) \times \tau}} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top} \end{pmatrix}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau \times \tau}} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s.$$

Note that $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top}$ does not depend on j and has full \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank τ because $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}) = \tau$ holds according to the definition of the code locators. Since the matrix $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j$ contains precisely the rows of $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi}$ in reverse order, $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_j) = \text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi})$ holds for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Overall, we obtain

$$\overline{\mathbf{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \overline{\mathbf{S}}_s \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{A}}_s \end{pmatrix}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{A}}}$$

and $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) = \text{rk}_{q^m}(\hat{\mathbf{A}}) = \text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathbf{A})_{\xi})$ with \mathbf{A} being the matrix from the error decomposition (13) with the rows $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_s$. Since the error matrix \mathbf{E} is chosen uniformly at random from the set $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \mathbf{n}; \tau)$, it follows that \mathbf{A} is distributed uniformly over $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \tau; \tau)$. In this setting, the proof of [35, Lem. 7] yields the stated inequality

$$\Pr \{ \text{rk}_{q^m}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) < \tau \} = \Pr \{ \text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathbf{A})_{\xi}) < \tau \} \stackrel{[35]}{\leq} \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max}-\tau)+1)}.$$

Let us now consider an error of bounded sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}) = \tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-k)$. As shown above, it holds that $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\overline{\mathbf{S}}) = \text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathbf{A})_{\xi})$. The latter matrix has full \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank τ according to [35, Lem. 6] because no vector in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau}$ can have a sum-rank weight larger than $n-k-\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}(n-k) \geq \tau$. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Let us now focus on the steps of the decoder, which starts by setting up the reversed component-syndrome polynomials $\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_s$, i.e., the ingredients for the key equation. Then, it solves the key equation (17) for the ELP λ with multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis [28], which is briefly summarized in Section VI-A. If the solution of (17) is not unique up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples, the decoder returns a decoding failure. Otherwise, it proceeds as follows: According to the definition of the ELP, the equality $\lambda(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$ holds and the error locations $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ can thus be recovered by finding the roots of λ with respect to generalized operator evaluation and the evaluation parameters $\tilde{\xi} := \theta^{-1}(\xi)$ from (7). This can be done with the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm, whose main idea is described in Section VI-B.

For the recovery of the error values $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_s \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$, we first note that the application of θ^{l-1} to $s_{j,l}$ yields

$$\theta^{l-1}(s_{j,l}) \stackrel{(15)}{=} \theta^{l-1}(\mathbf{a}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x})_{\tilde{\xi}}^\top) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau^{(i)}} \theta^{l-1}(a_{j,r}^{(i)}) x_r^{(i)} \underbrace{\theta^{l-1}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(3)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\xi_i)} = \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}^\top \quad (22)$$

for all $l = 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Thus, we can recover \mathbf{a}_j by solving the linear system

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}^\top = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^\top \quad (23)$$

with $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j = (s_{j,1}, \theta(s_{j,2}), \dots, \theta^{n-k-1}(s_{j,n-k})) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. Since the systems in (23) have a particular shape, the Gabidulin-like algorithm from Section VI-C is applicable.

We now retrieve the error locations, i.e., the matrix $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau \times n}$, from the error locators $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ by applying the methods from [18] in a blockwise manner. We consider the first row $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ of the parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ of the component LRS code from (8) and represent it over \mathbb{F}_q as $\mathbf{H}_q := \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$. Next we compute for each block $\mathbf{H}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n_i}$ of \mathbf{H}_q a left inverse $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i \times m}$ which satisfies $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \cdot \mathbf{H}_q^{(i)} = \mathbf{I}_{n_i}$ for the identity matrix $\mathbf{I}_{n_i} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i \times n_i}$ and every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. We recover the error locations blockwise as

$$\mathbf{B}^{(i)\top} = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \mathbf{X}_q^{(i)} = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \mathbf{H}_q^{(i)} \mathbf{B}^{(i)\top} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell \quad (24)$$

with $\mathbf{X}_q := \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times \tau}$ being the \mathbb{F}_q -representation of the code locators.

As we found all rows $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_s$ of the error-value matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times \tau}$ and all blocks of the error-location matrix $\mathbf{B} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times n}$, we can compute the error \mathbf{E} as $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B}$ according to (13) and return the codeword $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{E}$.

Remark 6: Note that the computation of the left inverses $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(\ell)}$ used in (24) has a worst-case complexity of $O(\max(m, n)^3)$ and is thus computationally expensive. However, since the inverses only depend on the code and not on the particular decoding instance, they can be precomputed and saved in a lookup table.

Algorithm 1 and Theorem 2 summarize the steps and the properties of the syndrome-based decoder for VILRS codes, respectively.

Algorithm 1: ERROR-ONLY DECODING OF VILRS CODES

Input : A channel output $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ with $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}) = \tau \leq \tau_{\max}$,
a parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$ of the form $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ of $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; \mathbf{n}, k]$,
and a left inverse $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i \times m}$ of $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{h}^{(i)})$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.
Output: The transmitted codeword $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ or “decoding failure”.

```

1 for  $j = 1, \dots, s$  do
2   Compute the component syndrome  $\mathbf{s}_j \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^\top$  with  $\mathbf{y}_j$  being the  $j$ -th row of  $\mathbf{Y}$ .
3   Set up the reversed component-syndrome polynomial  $\bar{s}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$  according to (16).
4   Solve the key equation (17) to obtain the ELP  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ .
5   if the key equation (17) has a unique solution up to  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -multiples then
6     Find a basis  $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$  of the root space of  $\lambda(\cdot)_{\tilde{\xi}_i}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  and set  $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow (\mathbf{x}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{x}^{(\ell)})$ .
7     Set up  $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a}_j)_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}^\top = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^\top$  from (23) for each  $j = 1, \dots, s$  and solve it for  $\mathbf{a}_j$ .
8     Recover the error locations  $\mathbf{B}^{(i)\top} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \cdot \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}^{(i)})$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  as in (24).
9     Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be the matrix with rows  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_s$  and set  $\mathbf{B} \leftarrow \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}^{(\ell)})$ .
10    Recover the error matrix  $\mathbf{E} \leftarrow \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}$  as in (13).
11    return  $\mathbf{C} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{E}$ .
12 return “decoding failure”.

```

Theorem 2 (Error-Only Decoding of VILRS Codes): Consider the transmission of a codeword $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ over the additive error-only channel (10). The error $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ of sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}) = \tau$ is chosen uniformly at random

from the set $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \mathbf{n}; \tau)$ defined in (11) and determines the received word $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$. The presented syndrome-based decoder can always recover \mathbf{C} from \mathbf{Y} if $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k)$ holds. Moreover, the decoder can be used probabilistically for larger error weights and decoding succeeds with a probability of at least

$$1 - \kappa_q^\ell q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max} - \tau) + 1)}$$

as long as the error weight satisfies

$$\tau \leq \tau_{\max} := \frac{s}{s+1}(n - k).$$

The decoder requires on average $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} if $m \in O(s)$ applies.

Proof: The correctness of Algorithm 1 follows from the arguments given in this section and in particular from the proof of the key equation in Theorem 1. The only potential point of failure is the key equation having a solution space of dimension at least two, and Algorithm 1 correctly returns “*decoding failure*” in this case.

The stated decoding radius and the bound on the success probability directly follow from the reasoning above, where we transformed the key equation into an equivalent system of linear equations. The corresponding results are stated in equation (21) and Lemma 2, respectively. Note that Lemma 2 also shows that successful decoding can be guaranteed as long as the error lies within the unique-decoding radius, that is, as long as $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k)$ holds.

Let us now consider the computational complexity of the decoding algorithm with respect to operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Note that the fast subroutines we use, i.e., multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis, a Skachek–Roth-like algorithm, and a Gabidulin-like algorithm, are discussed in Section VI. The computation of the reversed component-syndrome polynomials in lines 1–3 can be achieved in at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Lines 4 and 5 solve the key equation and check the uniqueness of the solution up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples. When multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis is applied, this takes at most $O(s(n - k)^2)$ operations. Next, line 6 computes the roots of λ and a Skachek–Roth-like approach has an average complexity in $O(\ell m \deg(\lambda)) = O(\ell m(n - k))$. If $m \in O(s)$ applies, this is in $O(sn^2)$. The system of linear equations in line 7 has a particular form and can be solved with a Gabidulin-like algorithm in at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Since the left inverses in line 8 were precomputed, the remaining basic operations in lines 8 and 9 can be done in $O(n^2)$. Overall, this yields an average decoding complexity in $O(sn^2)$. Note that the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm is the only probabilistic ingredient of the decoder and therefore the only part where we consider the average complexity and not the worst-case complexity. ■

D. Error-Erasure Decoding

Let us now move forward and consider the error-erasure channel for which the sent codeword $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ is not only corrupted by $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ full errors but also by $t_{\mathcal{R}}$ row erasures and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ column erasures. More precisely, the additive error matrix $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ has sum-rank weight $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ and (14) shows the error decomposition per error type.

Our overall decoding strategy is similar to the error-only case but we incorporate and exploit the information the receiver has about the erasures. We start by computing the *component syndromes*

$$\mathbf{s}_j := \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^\top = (e_{\mathcal{F},j} + e_{\mathcal{R},j} + e_{\mathcal{C},j}) \mathbf{H}^\top \stackrel{(14)}{=} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F},j} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{H}^\top + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{H}^\top + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C},j} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{H}^\top \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s.$$

Note that the vector $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T},j}$ with $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$ and $j = 1, \dots, s$ denotes the j -th row of the matrix $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{T}}$ from the error decomposition (14). When we follow (15) for every error type separately, we can write the l -th coefficient of \mathbf{s}_j with $l = 1, \dots, n - k$ and $j = 1, \dots, s$ as

$$s_{j,l} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T},j} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1} (\underbrace{\mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^\top}_{=: \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}})_{\tilde{\xi}}^\top = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T},j} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1} (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}})_{\tilde{\xi}}^\top, \quad (25)$$

where $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ denotes the first row of the parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ of the component LRS code and $\tilde{\xi} = \theta^{-1}(\xi)$ was defined in (7). This allows us to define the *error locators* $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}} := \mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^\top \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\ell_{\mathcal{T}}}$ with respect to each error type $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$. Note that the vector $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}$ with $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$ has a block structure with respect to the rank partition $\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^\top$ and that $\mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{t}_{\mathcal{C}} = \boldsymbol{\tau}$ holds by definition.

Recall that $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ was defined as the minimal skew polynomial of the error locators in the error-only setting. We keep the notion of the *error-locator polynomial (ELP)* and let λ be the minimal skew polynomial satisfying $\lambda(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$. It will prove beneficial to express λ as a product of skew polynomials related to the different error types. This allows to incorporate the knowledge about the column erasures into our decoder because their row space translates to the respective error locators and the resulting partial ELP. We write

$$\lambda(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x), \quad (26)$$

where the *partial ELPs* $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}, \lambda_{\mathcal{R}}, \lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ are the minimal skew polynomials satisfying

$$(\lambda_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}})(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}})(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (27)$$

respectively. Observe that the degree of $\lambda_{\mathcal{T}}$ is $t_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\deg(\lambda) = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}} = \tau$ holds.

Since the column spaces of the row erasures are known for every component error, we capture them in the *partial component error-span polynomials (ESPs)* $\sigma_{\mathcal{R},1}, \dots, \sigma_{\mathcal{R},s}$. They are defined as the minimal skew polynomials satisfying

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{R},j}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s. \quad (28)$$

Here, $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j}$ with $j = 1, \dots, s$ denotes the j -th row of the matrix $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ from the error decomposition (14) and we denote its sum-rank weight by $t_{\mathcal{R},j} := \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j}) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(e_{\mathcal{R},j})$ in the following. Observe that $t_{\mathcal{R},j} \leq t_{\mathcal{R}}$ holds for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ because the error decomposition imposes $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}) = t_{\mathcal{R}}$. It is also worth noting that $\sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{R},j} \geq t_{\mathcal{R}}$ applies, while there is no need for equality.

Recall that minimal skew polynomials can be computed efficiently, e.g. via the equality given in (6). Thus, the knowledge of \mathbf{B}_C and $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},s}$ directly translates to the knowledge of λ_C and $\sigma_{\mathcal{R},1}, \dots, \sigma_{\mathcal{R},s}$. We define the *auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials* $s_{CR,j} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ as

$$s_{CR,j}(x) = \lambda_C(x) \cdot \bar{s}_j(x) \cdot \Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}(x)),$$

where $\Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}(x)) := \theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}(\theta^{-(n-k-1)}(x)))$ denotes the skew polynomial obtained from $\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}$ by applying θ^{n-k-1} to all its coefficients. More precisely, it holds

$$\Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}(x)) = \sum_{l=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}+1} (\Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}))_l x^{l-1} \quad \text{with } (\Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}))_l = \theta^{n-k+t_{\mathcal{R}}-l}(\sigma_{\mathcal{R},j,l}) \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, t_{\mathcal{R}}+1. \quad (29)$$

Further, \bar{s}_j denotes the θ^{-1} -reverse of the component-syndrome polynomial s_j with respect to $n - k - 1$ as given in (16) for each $j = 1, \dots, s$.

We can now derive an ELP key equation that embodies the knowledge about the row and column erasures. The following theorem relates the ELP corresponding to the full errors with the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials and generalizes the ELP key equation from Theorem 1 in the error-only setting.

Theorem 3 (ELP Key Equation for Errors and Erasures): For each $j = 1, \dots, s$, there is a skew polynomial $\psi_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ with $\deg(\psi_j) < t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R},j} + t_C$ that satisfies

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot s_{CR,j}(x) \equiv \psi_j(x) \pmod{x^{n-k}}. \quad (30)$$

Proof: We prove the statement by showing that $\psi_{j,l} = 0$ holds for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R},j} + t_C + 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Therefore, we compute the respective coefficients $\psi_{j,l}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ by using the equality

$$\psi_j(x) = \underbrace{\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \lambda_C(x)}_{=: \lambda_{\mathcal{FC}}(x)} \cdot \bar{s}_j(x) \cdot \Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}(x))$$

and applying (2) first to the product $\lambda_{\mathcal{FC}}(x) \cdot \bar{s}_j(x)$ and then again to the product of the result and $\Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}(x))$. In the first step, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda_{\mathcal{FC}} \cdot \bar{s}_j)_l &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_C+1} \lambda_{\mathcal{FC},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (\bar{s}_{j,l-\nu+1}) \stackrel{(16)}{(25)} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_C+1} \lambda_{\mathcal{FC},\nu} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \theta^{n-k-l} (\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T},j} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l+\nu-1} (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}} \theta^{n-k-l} (a_{\mathcal{T},j,r}^{(i)}) \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_C+1} \lambda_{\mathcal{FC},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (x_{\mathcal{T},r}^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{n-k-l} (\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l+\nu-1} (\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(3)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1} (\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l} (\xi_i)} \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}} \theta^{n-k-l} (a_{\mathcal{T},j,r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l} (\xi_i) \underbrace{\sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_C+1} \lambda_{\mathcal{FC},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (x_{\mathcal{T},r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1} (\tilde{\xi}_i)}_{=: \lambda_{\mathcal{FC}}(x_{\mathcal{T},r}^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i}} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l} (\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\xi} \cdot \underbrace{\lambda_{\mathcal{FC}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top}} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_C + 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Note that the last equality follows because $\lambda_{\mathcal{FC}}$ satisfies $\lambda_{\mathcal{FC}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\lambda_{\mathcal{FC}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$ according to (27) and the product rule of the generalized operator evaluation.

In the second step, we get

$$\psi_{j,l} \stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R},j}+1} (\lambda_{\mathcal{FC}} \cdot \bar{s}_j)_{l-\nu+1} \theta^{-(l-\nu)} ((\Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j}))_{\nu}) \stackrel{(31)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R},j}+1} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-l+\nu-1} (\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\xi} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top} \theta^{n-k-l+t_{\mathcal{R},j}} (\sigma_{\mathcal{R},j,t_{\mathcal{R},j}-\nu+2})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}} \hat{x}_{\mathcal{R},r}^{(i)} \theta^{n-k-l+t_{\mathcal{R},j}} \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R},j}+1} \theta^{-(t_{\mathcal{R},j}-\nu+1)} (a_{\mathcal{R},j,r}^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{-(n-k-l+t_{\mathcal{R},j})} (\mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{n-k-l+\nu-1}(\xi_i))}_{\stackrel{(5)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta-1}^{n-k-l+t_{\mathcal{R},j}}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta-1}^{t_{\mathcal{R},j}-\nu+1}(\hat{\xi}_i)} \right) \sigma_{\mathcal{R},j,t_{\mathcal{R},j}-\nu+2} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}} \hat{x}_{\mathcal{R},r}^{(i)} \theta^{n-k-l+t_{\mathcal{R},j}} \underbrace{\left(\mathcal{N}_{\theta-1}^{n-k-l+t_{\mathcal{R},j}}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R},j}+1} \sigma_{\mathcal{R},j,t_{\mathcal{R},j}-\nu+2} \theta^{-(t_{\mathcal{R},j}-\nu+1)} (a_{\mathcal{R},j,r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta-1}^{t_{\mathcal{R},j}-\nu+1}(\hat{\xi}_i) \right)}_{= \sigma_{\mathcal{R},j}(a_{\mathcal{R},j,r}^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i=0}} = 0
\end{aligned}$$

for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{C}} + t_{\mathcal{R},j} + 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. The last step above follows from the definition of the partial component ESPs $\sigma_{\mathcal{R},1}, \dots, \sigma_{\mathcal{R},s}$ in (28) and this concludes the proof. \blacksquare

As the decoder needs to recover the correct ELP $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples, successful decoding requires that the error-erasure key equation (30) has a one-dimensional solution space. Let us fix $\lambda_1 = 1$ without loss of generality and express (30) equivalently as

$$\sum_{\nu=2}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+1} \lambda_{\mathcal{F},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (s_{CR,j,l-\nu+1}) = -s_{CR,j,l} \quad \text{for all } l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R},j} + t_{\mathcal{C}} + 1, \dots, n - k \quad \text{and all } j = 1, \dots, s. \quad (32)$$

This is an inhomogeneous \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system with $s(n - k - t_{\mathcal{F}} - t_{\mathcal{C}} - \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{R},j})$ equations in $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ unknowns and the system can only have a one-dimensional solution space if the number of equations is at least the number of unknowns, i.e., if

$$t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{s}{s+1} \left(n - k - t_{\mathcal{C}} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{R},j}}_{=: \bar{t}_{\mathcal{R}}} \right). \quad (33)$$

This characterizes the maximal decoding region of the error-erasure decoder. It is worth noting that (33) depends on the *average* number of row erasures per component error, which we denote by $\bar{t}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Similar to the error-only setting, errors satisfying (33) do not always yield a decoding success but the condition is necessary to render it possible.

Let us now summarize how our syndrome-based decoder recovers all errors and erasures step by step. We first set up all ingredients for the key equation (30) and then solve (30) via multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis [28] as discussed in Section VI-A. If the key equation has multiple \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linearly independent solutions, a decoding failure is recorded. Otherwise, we can use the obtained partial ELP $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ to determine the product $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \bar{s}_j(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \bar{s}_j(x)$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ and set up the systems

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta-1}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{C}}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j}^{\top} = \mathbf{v}_j^{\top} \quad (34)$$

with $\mathbf{v}_j := ((\lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}} \cdot \bar{s}_j)_{n-k}, \theta^{-1}((\lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}} \cdot \bar{s}_j)_{n-k-1}), \dots, \theta^{-(n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{C}}-1)}((\lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}} \cdot \bar{s}_j)_{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{C}}+1}))$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. This is equivalent to the system (31) from the proof of Theorem 1, which follows from applying $\theta^{-(n-k-l)}$ to the l -th equation to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta^{-(n-k-l)} (\lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}} \cdot \bar{s}_j)_l &= \theta^{-(n-k-l)} (\mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{n-k-l}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\xi} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}} a_{\mathcal{R},j,r}^{(i)} \underbrace{\theta^{-(n-k-l)} (\mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{n-k-l}(\xi_i))}_{\stackrel{(5)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta-1}^{n-k-l}(\tilde{\xi}_i)} \theta^{-(n-k-l)} (\hat{x}_{\mathcal{R},r}^{(i)}) \\
&= \mathcal{D}_{\theta-1}^{n-k-l}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j}^{\top}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{C}} + 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$ and reversing the order of the equations. Now we merge the s systems from (34) into one system over the extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . We fix an ordered \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -basis $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}^s$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , define the vectors

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}} := \gamma \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},s} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v} := \gamma \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_s \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{C}}},$$

and set up the $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ -linear system

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta-1}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{C}}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top} = \mathbf{v}^{\top} \quad (35)$$

which indeed combines all systems from (34). We can apply the Gabidulin-like algorithm from Section VI-C over $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ to solve (35) and obtain a solution $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}}$ with sum-rank weight $t_{\mathcal{R}}$. In fact, we can guarantee that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}}$ has only entries from \mathbb{F}_{q^m} because we know that there is a solution in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}}$ and the solution is unique. The latter follows since the fact $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}) = \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$ implies $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}) = t_{\mathcal{R}}$.

After we have recovered $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}}$, we can reconstruct the partial ELP $\lambda_{\mathcal{R}}$ for the row erasures and set up the overall ELP $\lambda(x) = \lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$ as defined in (26). Now the missing code locators $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}$ can be recovered via the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm from Section VI-B according to (27). More precisely, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is recovered first by initializing the algorithm with $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and applying it to $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$. Then, the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm is initialized with $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and run on $\lambda(x)$. This yields the missing vector $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

A system similar to (23) allows to recover $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Namely, equation (22) can be applied to (25), i.e., to each error type separately, and we obtain

$$\theta^{l-1}(s_{j,l}) - \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{l-1}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}\}} \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{l-1}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T},j})_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\top} = \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{l-1}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F},j} | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\xi} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}})^{\top} \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, n-k.$$

This yields the systems

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F},j} | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\xi} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}})^{\top} = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^{\top} \quad (36)$$

with $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j = (s_{j,1} - \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top}, \theta(s_{j,2}) - \mathcal{D}_{\theta}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top}, \dots, \theta^{n-k-1}(s_{j,n-k}) - \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{n-k-1}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k}$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$ and we can solve them efficiently with the Gabidulin-like algorithm.

We can follow the approach (24) in the error-only case for every error type to recover the error locations $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}}$ from $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}}$ from $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ from $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}$, respectively. Finally, we assemble the error matrix \mathbf{E} as $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{F}}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ according to (14) and recover the codeword $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{E}$.

Algorithm 2 and Theorem 4 summarize the syndrome-based error-erasure decoder for VILRS codes and its properties.

Algorithm 2: ERROR-ERASURE DECODING OF VILRS CODES

Input : A channel output $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ with $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$, $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{C}}$, and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}) = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ satisfying $\tau_{\text{vert}}^* \leq \tau_{\text{max}}$,
a matrix $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times t_{\mathcal{R}}}$ of the form in (14) such that $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}$ has the same column space as $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$,
a matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{t_{\mathcal{C}} \times n}$ of the form in (14) such that $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}$ has the same row space as $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$,
a parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$ of the form $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\xi}$ of LRS $[\beta, \xi; \mathbf{n}, k]$,
and a left inverse $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i \times m}$ of $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{h}^{(i)})$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Output: The transmitted codeword $\mathbf{C} \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ or “decoding failure”.

- 1 Set $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}} \leftarrow \mathbf{h}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top}$ and compute the partial ELP $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \leftarrow \text{mpol}_{(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\xi}}(x)$.
 - 2 **for** $j = 1, \dots, s$ **do**
 - 3 Compute the component syndrome $\mathbf{s}_j \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^{\top}$ with \mathbf{y}_j being the j -th row of \mathbf{Y} .
 - 4 Set up the reversed component-syndrome polynomial $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ according to (16).
 - 5 Compute the partial component ESP $\sigma_{\mathcal{R},j}(x) \leftarrow \text{mpol}_{(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\xi}}(x)$ with $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},j}$ being the j -th row of $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}$.
 - 6 Set up $\Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j})$ according to (29).
 - 7 Set up the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomial $s_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{R},j}(x) \leftarrow \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j(x) \cdot \Theta^{n-k-1}(\bar{\sigma}_{\mathcal{R},j})(x)$.
 - 8 Solve the key equation (30) to obtain the partial ELP $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$.
 - 9 **if** the key equation (30) has a unique solution up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples **then**
 - 10 Set up $(\lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}} \cdot \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j)(x) \leftarrow \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j(x)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$.
 - 11 Set up $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{C}}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\top} = \mathbf{v}^{\top}$ from (35) and solve it for $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}}$.
 - 12 Compute $\lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \leftarrow \text{mpol}_{(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\xi}}(x)$.
 - 13 Set up $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}}(x) \leftarrow \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$.
 - 14 Find $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)}$ whose entries extend $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}$ to a basis of the root space of $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}}(\cdot)_{\xi_i}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.
 - 15 Set up $\lambda(x) \leftarrow \lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \cdot \lambda_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{C}}(x)$.
 - 16 Find $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}$ whose entries extend $(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)})$ to a basis of the root space of $\lambda(\cdot)_{\xi_i}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.
 - 17 Set $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}} \leftarrow (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)} | \dots | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\ell)})$.
 - 18 Set up $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F},j} | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\xi} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}})^{\top} = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^{\top}$ from (36) and solve it for $(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F},j} | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C},j})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$.
 - 19 Recover the error locations $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)\top} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \cdot \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}\}$ as in (24).
 - 20 Let $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$ be the matrices with rows $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F},1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F},s}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C},1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C},s}$, respectively.
 - 21 Set $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}} \leftarrow \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(\ell)})$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}} \leftarrow \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(\ell)})$.
 - 22 Recover the error matrix $\mathbf{E} \leftarrow \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{F}}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{R}}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{C}}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ as in (14).
 - 23 **return** $\mathbf{C} \leftarrow \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{E}$.
 - 24 **return** “decoding failure”.
-

Theorem 4 (Error-Erasure Decoding of VILRS Codes): Consider the transmission of a codeword $C \in \text{VILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \mathbf{n}, k]$ over the additive error-erasure channel (10). The error $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$ of sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{E}) = \tau$ is chosen uniformly at random from the set $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \mathbf{n}; \tau)$ defined in (11) and determines the received word $\mathbf{Y} = C + \mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n}$. The channel provides partial knowledge of the error which gives rise to a decomposition into $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ full errors, $t_{\mathcal{R}}$ row erasures, and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ column erasures such that $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ holds, as explained in Section III-B. The presented syndrome-based decoder can always recover C from \mathbf{Y} if $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k - \max_j \{t_{\mathcal{R},j}\} - t_{\mathcal{C}})$ holds with $t_{\mathcal{R},j} := \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(e_{\mathcal{R},j}) \leq t_{\mathcal{R}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Moreover, the decoder can be used probabilistically for larger error weights and decoding succeeds with a probability of at least

$$1 - \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max} - \tau_{\text{vert}}^*) + 1)}$$

as long as the error weight satisfies

$$\tau_{\text{vert}}^* := t_{\mathcal{F}} + \frac{s}{s+1}(t_{\mathcal{C}} + \bar{t}_{\mathcal{R}}) \leq \tau_{\max} := \frac{s}{s+1}(n - k) \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{t}_{\mathcal{R}} := \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{R},j}.$$

The decoder requires on average $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} if $m \in O(s)$ applies.

Proof: The reasoning in this section and especially the proof of the key equation in Theorem 3 already showed that Algorithm 2 is correct. In particular, a decoding failure is returned correctly in case the key equation (30) admits multiple \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linearly independent solutions. This is the only potential problem during decoding since all other steps are guaranteed to succeed. The claimed maximum decoding radius was derived in (33).

The failure probability and the decoding radius for guaranteed success are closely connected to the key equation (30) and, in particular, to the dimension of its solution space. We observed that the coefficient vectors of the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials $s_{CR,1}, \dots, s_{CR,s}$ in the key equation can be interpreted as modified component syndromes corresponding to an error-only transmission. The precise relation can be seen when the ideas of the error-erasure decoder for Gabidulin codes from [12] are suitably generalized. However, this is a nontrivial endeavor and we will present the details in follow-up work. The stated observation justifies to apply the upper bound $\text{Pr}_{\text{fail}} \leq \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max} - \tau_{\text{vert}}^*) + 1)}$ on the failure probability Pr_{fail} , which we derived for the error-only case in Lemma 2. Further, a resulting representation of the coefficients of the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials gives rise to a simple proof that errors satisfying $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k - t_{\mathcal{C}} - \max_j \{t_{\mathcal{R},j}\})$ ensure a successful decoding.

Let us now move on to the complexity analysis of the decoder and focus on the different types of tasks in the algorithm. First observe that operations like taking skew reverses and setting up vectors and matrices according to simple rules are essentially for free and we thus do not mention all of them explicitly. The vector-matrix and matrix-matrix products in lines 1, 3, 19, and 22 take at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Equation (6) shows how a minimal skew polynomial of degree at most n is computed in at most $O(n^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and this yields an upper bound of $O(sn^2)$ for the respective steps in lines 1, 5, and 12. Two skew polynomials of degree at most n can be multiplied in $O(n^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , which lets us summarize the respective tasks in lines 7, 10, 13, and 15 in $O(sn^2)$.

We deal with the remaining nontrivial tasks with fast subroutines that we describe in Section VI. For example, multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis solves the key equation (30) in line 8 in at most $O(s(n - k)^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The linear systems in lines 11 and 18 have a special structure and can be tackled with the Gabidulin-like algorithm. While the instance in line 18 is over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and can be solved in at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , the one in line 11 is over $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ and requires $O(sn^2)$ operations in the extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$. When we choose a suitable \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$, this complexity can be upper-bounded by $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The Skachek–Roth-like algorithm allows to find a basis of the root space of a skew polynomial of degree at most n with respect to generalized operator evaluation with ℓ distinct evaluation parameters and takes on average $O(\ell mn)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} to do so. If we assume $m \in O(s)$, the occurring instances of this problem in lines 14 and 16 need on average $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . It is worth noting that the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm is the only piece in this complexity analysis where we deal with an average and not a worst-case complexity. All in all, we obtain an asymptotic average complexity of $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} for the syndrome-based error-erasure decoder. ■

Remark 7: As the observant reader might have noticed, the stated asymptotic complexity of the error-erasure decoder is $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$, whereas the error-only decoder is in $O(sn^2)$ over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Note that this only stems from solving (35) via the Gabidulin-like algorithm in $O(t_{\mathcal{R}}^2)$ operations in $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ and assuming a suitable \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ which allows to upper-bound the necessary $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ -operations by $\tilde{O}(st_{\mathcal{R}}^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} .

In practice, it is quite likely that at least one of the vectors $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R},s}$ has full sum-rank weight $t_{\mathcal{R}}$. In this case, one can restrict to the corresponding \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system in (34) and solve it over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} to recover $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Then, the Gabidulin-like algorithm takes at most $O(t_{\mathcal{R}}^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and this reduces the overall asymptotic complexity of the decoder to $O(sn^2)$ in these cases.

IV. HORIZONTALLY INTERLEAVED LINEARIZED REED–SOLOMON (HILRS) CODES AND THEIR DECODING

We now introduce horizontally interleaved codes in the sum-rank metric and then give a syndrome-based decoder for the family of horizontally interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (HILRS) codes. Horizontal interleaving has been studied in the

rank metric with a focus on the case of Gabidulin codes [26]–[30] and low-rank parity-check (LRPC) codes [49]. Moreover, a Gao-like decoder for the decoding of HILRS codes in the sum-rank metric is available [39]. The Gao-like approach was only investigated in the error-only setting so far and allows probabilistic unique decoding for large-weight errors.

This section has an analog structure as Section III to make the two different interleaving approaches easily comparable. More precisely, we first introduce the concept of horizontal interleaving for the sum-rank metric, we then give the channel and error models of interest, and we finally present syndrome-based decoders for the error-only setting and for the error-erasure setting. Note that the latter decoder extends the ESP-based error-erasure decoder for non-interleaved LRS codes from [19].

A. Horizontal Interleaving in the Sum-Rank Metric

Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ be an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear sum-rank-metric code for the length partition $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ and choose an interleaving order $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$. In the same spirit as for vertical interleaving, we define the *horizontally interleaved code*

$$\text{HInt}(\mathcal{C}, s) := \{\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{c}_s) : \mathbf{c}_j \in \mathcal{C} \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, s\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$$

whose codewords are the concatenation of s codewords of the component code \mathcal{C} .

Remark 8: Our above definition of horizontal interleaving is called *homogeneous*, as we only allow one component code \mathcal{C} to which all component codewords need to belong. It is also possible to consider *heterogeneous* interleaving with s different component codes $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_s \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, similar to Remark 2 for the vertical setting. In fact, we can generalize horizontal interleaving even further and choose component codes $\mathcal{C}_j \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n_j}$ with different lengths n_j and length partitions $\mathbf{n}_j \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$. The component codes only need to share the number of blocks ℓ to not interfere with the sum-rank weight for horizontally interleaved vectors which we will introduce shortly.

While vertical interleaving still preserves the block structure of codewords and thus suggests a straightforward definition of the sum-rank weight with respect to the length partition of \mathcal{C} , the horizontal case needs a more careful treatment. Observe that every codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HInt}(\mathcal{C}, s)$ has the form

$$\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{c}_s) = \left(\mathbf{c}_1^{(1)} | \dots | \mathbf{c}_1^{(\ell)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{c}_s^{(1)} | \dots | \mathbf{c}_s^{(\ell)} \right) \quad (37)$$

and therefore follows the naturally induced length partition $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} := (\mathbf{n}, \dots, \mathbf{n}) \in \mathbb{N}^{s\ell}$ consisting of s copies of the length partition \mathbf{n} of \mathcal{C} . However, if the sum-rank weight was defined with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$, it would add up the \mathbb{F}_q -ranks of the $s\ell$ blocks and thus equal the sum $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{c}_1) + \dots + \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{c}_s)$ of the sum-rank weights of the component codewords. This corresponds to independently sending the s component codewords of \mathcal{C} over a non-interleaved sum-rank channel and does not capture horizontal interleaving in the rank metric as a special case.

We regroup the blocks of the interleaved codewords and define the sum-rank weight with respect to the reordering. This incorporates the rank-metric case and lets us obtain a gain for the joint decoding of the s concatenated codewords. We divide \mathbf{c} into ℓ blocks $\mathbf{c}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{c}^{(\ell)}$ and choose the i -th block to be the concatenation $(\mathbf{c}_1^{(i)} | \dots | \mathbf{c}_s^{(i)})$ of the i -th block of every component codeword. This reordering is illustrated in Figure 2 and leads to the length partition $s\mathbf{n} := (sn_1, \dots, sn_\ell)$ which we will use for the definition of the sum-rank weight. Note that this reordering process is not limited to codewords but can be applied to arbitrary vectors in $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$.

We define the *sum-rank weight* of a horizontally interleaved vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ of the form (37) as

$$\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{s\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{rk}_q((\mathbf{x}_1^{(i)} | \dots | \mathbf{x}_s^{(i)})) \quad (38)$$

using the reordered length partition $s\mathbf{n} := (sn_1, \dots, sn_\ell)$ of sn . The corresponding sum-rank metric is given by $d_{\Sigma R}^{s\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{s\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ for arbitrary $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$. If the length partition $s\mathbf{n}$ is clear from the context, we will omit it for readability and use the notations $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\cdot)$ and $d_{\Sigma R}(\cdot, \cdot)$. We further use the shorthand $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} := (\mathbf{x}_1^{(i)} | \dots | \mathbf{x}_s^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn_i}$ to denote the i -th block of \mathbf{x} with respect to $s\mathbf{n}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ in the following. Remark that this does not collide with the notation $\mathbf{x}_j^{(i)}$ for the blocks arising from the length partition $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ with $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $j = 1, \dots, s$.

If we choose an LRS code as defined in Definition 1 as the component code \mathcal{C} in the construction of a horizontally interleaved code, we arrive at a *horizontally interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (HILRS)* code

$$\text{HILRS}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k] := \text{HInt}(\text{LRS}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}; \mathbf{n}, k], s).$$

This code has interleaving order $s \in \mathbb{N}^*$, length sn , induced length partition $\tilde{\mathbf{n}} = (\mathbf{n}, \dots, \mathbf{n}) \in \mathbb{N}^{s\ell}$, and dimension sk . However, recall that we measure the sum-rank weight of its codewords with respect to the length partition $s\mathbf{n}$, i.e., after reordering the blocks as displayed in Figure 2. We can explicitly compute the minimum sum-rank distance of HILRS codes in the next lemma:

Lemma 3 (Minimum Distance of HILRS Codes): The HILRS code $\text{HILRS}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ has minimum sum-rank distance

$$d = n - k + 1.$$

Proof: Since HILRS codes are \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear, their minimum sum-rank distance equals the minimum weight of a nonzero codeword. As the weight of any codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ is computed according to (38), the i -th summand is bounded by

$$0 \leq \text{rk}_q((\mathbf{x}_1^{(i)} | \cdots | \mathbf{x}_s^{(i)})) \leq \sum_{j=1}^s \text{rk}_q(\mathbf{x}_j^{(i)}) \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell.$$

Hence, the lowest sum-rank weight can be achieved by choosing the all-zero codeword for all component codewords except for one. The optimal choice for the latter is a minimum-weight codeword in the component code $\mathcal{C} = \text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; \mathbf{n}, k]$ and thus has sum-rank weight $n - k + 1$. This shows that an interleaved codeword of minimum weight has weight $d := n - k + 1$ and thus $\text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ has minimum sum-rank distance d . \blacksquare

Note that HILRS codes are *not* MSRD for $s > 1$, as the Singleton-like bound reads $d \leq s(n - k) + 1$ in this setting. This behavior is different from VILRS codes which are MSRD codes for *all* interleaving orders.

B. Channel and Error Models

Let us first describe the error-only scenario and then move to the error-erasure setting, which incorporates three different error types. In any case, we consider the transmission of a codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ over a sum-rank channel that returns the received word

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e}, \quad (39)$$

where $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ is an additive error of sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{sn}(\mathbf{e}) = \tau$. Recall once more that the weight of \mathbf{e} is measured according to the reordered length partition $s\mathbf{n}$ as described in (38). We assume that the error \mathbf{e} is drawn uniformly at random from the set

$$\mathcal{V}_{q^m}(s\mathbf{n}; \tau) := \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn} : \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{sn}(\mathbf{v}) = \tau\} \quad (40)$$

and denote its rank partition by $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau^{(1)}, \dots, \tau^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ with $\tau^{(i)} := \text{rk}_q(\mathbf{e}^{(i)}) = \text{rk}_q((\mathbf{e}_1^{(i)} | \cdots | \mathbf{e}_s^{(i)}))$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Remark 9: Note that the error sets $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \mathbf{n}; \tau)$ and $\mathcal{V}_{q^m}(s\mathbf{n}; \tau)$ for vertical and horizontal interleaving are not isomorphic even though $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s \times n} \simeq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ holds. The definitions of the sets look similar but the respective notions of sum-rank weight given in (9) and (38) make the difference. Since a horizontally interleaved error \mathbf{e} can be reordered into $\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{e}^{(1)} | \cdots | \mathbf{e}^{(\ell)})$ and the sum-rank condition translates to $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{e}^{(i)}) = \tau^{(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, the uniform sampling of errors from $\mathcal{V}_{q^m}(s\mathbf{n}; \tau)$ boils down to sampling vectors from $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{(sn_1, \dots, sn_\ell)}(\mathbf{e}) = \tau$ uniformly at random.

Another perspective on the channel in (39) is

$$(\mathbf{y}_1 | \cdots | \mathbf{y}_s) = (\mathbf{c}_1 | \cdots | \mathbf{c}_s) + (\mathbf{e}_1 | \cdots | \mathbf{e}_s) \quad \text{with } \mathbf{y}_j, \mathbf{c}_j, \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n_j} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s.$$

It focuses on the components induced by the interleaving structure. In the following, we switch between this representation and the one given in (39) depending on the context.

The condition $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e}) = \tau$ on the sum-rank weight of the error is equivalent to requiring $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{e}^{(i)}) = \tau^{(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Thus, a full-rank decomposition [48, Thm. 1] of each block $\mathbf{e}^{(i)}$ yields a vector $\mathbf{a}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau^{(i)}}$ with $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{a}^{(i)}) = \tau^{(i)}$ and matrices $\mathbf{B}_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau^{(i)} \times n_j}$ with $\text{rk}_q((\mathbf{B}_1^{(i)} | \cdots | \mathbf{B}_s^{(i)})) = \tau^{(i)}$ such that

$$\mathbf{e}^{(i)} = (\mathbf{e}_1^{(i)} | \cdots | \mathbf{e}_s^{(i)}) = \mathbf{a}^{(i)} \cdot (\mathbf{B}_1^{(i)} | \cdots | \mathbf{B}_s^{(i)})$$

holds for every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. We will use the shorthand notation $\mathbf{B}^{(i)} := (\mathbf{B}_1^{(i)} | \cdots | \mathbf{B}_s^{(i)})$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ in the following to highlight the correspondence to the error block $\mathbf{e}^{(i)}$. When we now reorder the blocks of \mathbf{e} according to its natural length partition $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$, we obtain the error decomposition

$$\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{e}_1 | \cdots | \mathbf{e}_s) = \underbrace{(\mathbf{a}^{(1)} | \cdots | \mathbf{a}^{(\ell)})}_{=: \mathbf{a}} \cdot \underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \mathbf{B}_1^{(1)} & & \mathbf{B}_s^{(1)} \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \mathbf{B}_s^{(\ell)} \end{array} \right)}_{=: (\mathbf{B}_1 | \cdots | \mathbf{B}_s) =: \mathbf{B}} \quad (41)$$

with $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ having sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{sn}(\mathbf{a}) = \tau$. Further, $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{sn}(\mathbf{B}) = \tau$ holds and is equivalent to the equality $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{B}^{(i)}) = \tau^{(i)}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Note that the decomposition in (41) is only unique up to a change of \mathbb{F}_q -basis for each block $\mathbf{B}_j^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $j = 1, \dots, s$. Namely, any matrix $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{M}_1 | \cdots | \mathbf{M}_s) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times s\tau}$ with block-diagonal blocks $\mathbf{M}_j = \text{diag}(\mathbf{M}_j^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{M}_j^{(\ell)})$ and full-rank $\mathbf{M}_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau^{(i)} \times \tau^{(i)}}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$ yields another valid error decomposition

$$\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{a}' \cdot \mathbf{B}' = \underbrace{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{M}^{-1}}_{=: \mathbf{a}'} \cdot \underbrace{\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}}_{=: \mathbf{B}'}$$

Since the entries of $\mathbf{a}^{(i)}$ span the \mathbb{F}_q -column space of the error block $\mathbf{e}^{(i)}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, we call them *error values*. Similarly, the rows of $\mathbf{B}^{(i)}$ form an \mathbb{F}_q -basis of the row space of $\mathbf{e}^{(i)}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and are referred to as *error locations*. The above decomposition (41) shows that the error values represented by the vector \mathbf{a} are common for all received component errors e_1, \dots, e_s . In contrast, the error locations differ for the components and we use the notation $\mathbf{B}_j := \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_j^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_j^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times n}$ to denote the part of the matrix \mathbf{B} corresponding to the j -th component error e_j for $j = 1, \dots, s$.

Remark 10: The error decomposition in (41) corresponds to the one in (13) for vertical interleaving. They are both obtained by applying full-rank decompositions to the blocks for which the \mathbb{F}_q -rank is known. However, vertical and horizontal interleaving establish different structures in the error and result in a somewhat complementary representation. Namely, the component errors share their row space for vertical interleaving and their column space for horizontal interleaving, respectively. The component errors thus share the matrix \mathbf{B} in (13), whereas they share the vector \mathbf{a} in (41).

Let us now discuss the error-erasure setting, in which we incorporate partial knowledge about the error. The three considered error types are the same as in the case of vertical interleaving and they are illustrated in Figure 1. Namely, we categorize each of the $\tau = \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e})$ occurred sum-rank errors

- as a (*full*) *error* or an error of type \mathcal{F} , if neither the row space nor the column space is known,
- as a *row erasure* or an error of type \mathcal{R} , if its column space is known,
- or as a *column erasure* or an error of type \mathcal{C} , if its row space is known.

We denote the number of full errors, row erasures, and column erasures by $t_{\mathcal{F}}$, $t_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$, respectively. The equality $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ holds, as every sum-rank error belongs to precisely one error type. We write $\tau^{(i)} = t_{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)} + t_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)} + t_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ to highlight which errors occurred in the i -th error block $\mathbf{e}^{(i)}$.

The error \mathbf{e} has an additive decomposition $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{C}}$ into vectors $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s n}$ that contain the errors of the respective error type $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$ and satisfy $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{T}}) = t_{\mathcal{T}}$. We can decompose all three parts as described in (41) and obtain

$$\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (42)$$

with $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t_{\mathcal{T}}}$ having sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}}) = t_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$ of the form given in (41) with $\text{rk}_q(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}) = t_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and every $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$. As in the error-only setting above, the entries of $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}$ are a basis of the column space of $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}$ and the rows of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}$ span its row space for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and every error type $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$. Therefore, we call the entries of $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}$ *error values* and the rows of $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ *error locations*. Figure 1 depicts the decomposition in (42) for the non-interleaved setup and highlights the parts that the receiver knows before decoding. Recall that $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ are known for horizontal interleaving according to the definition of row and column erasures.

C. Error-Only Decoding

We now present a syndrome-based decoder for the error-only setting and the channel (39) over which a codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ was transmitted. Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{s n}$ denote the received word and assume that the sum-rank weight of the error $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{c}$ is τ . Further, let $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$ be a parity-check matrix of the component code $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; \mathbf{n}, k]$ and assume without loss of generality that \mathbf{H} is a generalized Moore matrix with respect to the vector $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ as described in (8).

Compute the *component syndromes* $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_s$ as

$$\mathbf{s}_j = \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^\top = \mathbf{e}_j \mathbf{H}^\top \stackrel{(41)}{=} \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{B}_j \mathbf{H}^\top \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s.$$

Now the l -th entry $s_{j,l}$ of \mathbf{s}_j for $l = 1, \dots, n - k$ and $j = 1, \dots, s$ is

$$s_{j,l} = \mathbf{a}_j \mathbf{B}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{h})_{\hat{\xi}}^\top = \mathbf{a}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\underbrace{\mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}_j^\top}_{=: \mathbf{x}_j})_{\hat{\xi}}^\top = \mathbf{a}_j \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\hat{\xi}}^\top, \quad (43)$$

where $\hat{\xi} = \theta^{-1}(\xi)$ according to (7). We define the *error locators* of the j -th component as $\mathbf{x}_j := \mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}_j^\top \in \mathbb{F}_q^\tau$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$ and denote the vector's block structure with respect to the rank partition τ of the error and the matrix \mathbf{B}_j^\top by $\mathbf{x}_j = (\mathbf{x}_j^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{x}_j^{(\ell)})$. This is in the same spirit as in the vertical case but now the error locators depend on the component index $j = 1, \dots, s$ and the vector \mathbf{a} containing the error values is independent of it. Therefore, the HILRS decoder starts by recovering the common error values, in contrast to first recovering the error locators in the vertical setting.

We will shortly derive a key equation that is focused on the error-span polynomial and allows to recover it by exploiting its relations with the component syndromes $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_s$. The *error-span polynomial (ESP)* is the minimal skew polynomial $\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ vanishing on the error values \mathbf{a} with respect to generalized operator evaluation and the evaluation parameters $\hat{\xi} = \theta^{-1}(\xi^{-1})$ defined in (7). In other words, σ is the skew polynomial of minimal degree satisfying $\sigma(\mathbf{a})_{\hat{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$. Because the evaluation parameters in $\hat{\xi}$ belong to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and the blocks $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(\ell)}$ of the error values are \mathbb{F}_q -linearly independent, the ESP has degree τ . We further associate to each component syndrome $\mathbf{s}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k}$

the corresponding *component-syndrome polynomial* $s_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ given by $s_j(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{n-k} s_{j,l} x^{l-1}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Now we can state the ESP key equation which is the key ingredient for the syndrome-based decoding of HILRS codes:

Theorem 5 (ESP Key Equation): For each $j = 1, \dots, s$, there is a skew polynomial $\omega_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ with $\deg(\omega_j) < \tau$ that satisfies

$$\sigma(x) \cdot s_j(x) \equiv \omega_j(x) \pmod{x^{n-k}}. \quad (44)$$

Proof: We show (44) by proving that $\omega_{j,l} = 0$ holds for all $l = \tau + 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{j,l} &= (\sigma \cdot s_j)_l \stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \sigma_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (s_{j,l-\nu+1}) \stackrel{(43)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \sigma_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (\mathbf{a} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}}^\top) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau(i)} \theta^{-(l-1)} (x_{j,r}^{(i)}) \sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \sigma_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (a_r^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{-(\nu-1)} (\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(4)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau(i)} \theta^{-(l-1)} (x_{j,r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \underbrace{\sum_{\nu=1}^{\tau+1} \sigma_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (a_r^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i)}_{=\sigma(a_r^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i} = 0} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

■

The above proof shows that the key equation in (44) is equivalent to a set of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear equations. Namely, we get

$$\sum_{\nu=2}^{\tau+1} \sigma_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)} (s_{j,l-\nu+1}) = -s_{j,l} \quad \text{for all } l = \tau + 1, \dots, n - k \quad \text{and all } j = 1, \dots, s \quad (45)$$

when the normalization $\sigma_1 = 1$ is assumed without loss of generality. This can be expressed as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{S}_s \end{pmatrix} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top = - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{s}'_1{}^\top \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{s}'_s{}^\top \end{pmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

where the matrix

$$\mathbf{S}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \theta^{-1}(s_{j,\tau}) & \theta^{-2}(s_{j,\tau-1}) & \dots & \theta^{-\tau}(s_{j,1}) \\ \theta^{-1}(s_{j,\tau+1}) & \theta^{-2}(s_{j,\tau}) & \dots & \theta^{-\tau}(s_{j,2}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \theta^{-1}(s_{j,n-k-1}) & \theta^{-2}(s_{j,n-k-2}) & \dots & \theta^{-\tau}(s_{j,n-k-\tau}) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k-\tau) \times \tau} \quad (47)$$

and the vector $\mathbf{s}'_j = (s_{j,\tau+1}, \dots, s_{j,n-k})$ are defined for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ and the vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{\tau+1}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ captures the unknown coefficients of the ESP. For brevity, we often write $\mathbf{S} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^\top = \mathbf{s}'^\top$ to represent the system (46) in the following.

Remark 11: The reformulation (46) can be used to solve the key equation (44) by Gaussian elimination. However, multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis [28] is a tool that is more tailored to this problem and has less computational complexity. We discuss it briefly in Section VI-A.

The inhomogeneous linear system (46) consists of $s(n-k-\tau)$ equations in τ unknowns and can only have a one-dimensional solution space if the number of equations is at least the number of unknowns, i.e., if $\tau \leq s(n-k-\tau)$ applies. Since (46) is equivalent to the ESP key equation (44), this directly yields the necessary condition

$$\tau \leq \tau_{\max} := \frac{s}{s+1}(n-k) \quad (48)$$

on the error weight τ for potentially successful decoding.

A decoding failure occurs if the key equation (44) has multiple solutions, which corresponds to the case that the matrix \mathbf{S} on the left-hand side of (46) has \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank less than τ . The following lemma gives an upper bound on the probability for this scenario and also shows when \mathbf{S} is guaranteed to have full rank and unique decoding is possible.

Lemma 4: Let \mathbf{S} be the coefficient matrix of the system (46), which arose from an HILRS decoding instance $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e}$ with error weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e}) = \tau \leq \tau_{\max}$. Then, the bound

$$\Pr \{ \text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathbf{S}) < \tau \} \leq \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max}-\tau)+1)}$$

applies for $\kappa_q < 3.5$ being defined in (1). Moreover, $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathbf{S}) = \tau$ is guaranteed for any error \mathbf{e} of weight $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-k)$.

Proof: The definition of \mathbf{S}_j in (47) shows that its entry in column $\nu - 1$ and row $l + \nu - \tau - 2$ is $\theta^{-(\nu-1)} (s_{j,l-\nu+1})$ for

$\nu = 2, \dots, t_{\mathcal{F}} + 1$, $l = \tau + 1, \dots, n - k$, and $j = 1, \dots, s$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(s_{j,l-\nu+1}) &\stackrel{(43)}{=} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(\mathbf{a} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(a_r^{(i)}) \theta^{-(l-1)}(x_{j,r}^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{-(\nu-1)}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(4)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(x_{j,r}^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(a_r^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i} = \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\mathbf{a})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top} \end{aligned}$$

holds for all $\nu = 2, \dots, \tau + 1$, all $l = \tau + 1, \dots, n - k$, and all $j = 1, \dots, s$, we obtain the decomposition

$$\mathbf{S}_j = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-1}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}} \end{pmatrix}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{X}}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k-\tau) \times \tau}} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}(\mathbf{a})_{\tilde{\xi}} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{a})_{\tilde{\xi}} \end{pmatrix}^{\top}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau \times \tau}} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s.$$

Observe that $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}(\mathbf{a})_{\tilde{\xi}})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top}$ is independent of j and has full \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank τ because the sum-rank weight of \mathbf{a} equals τ by definition. When we now combine $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_s$ into \mathbf{S} , we get

$$\mathbf{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{S}_s \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{X}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{X}}_s \end{pmatrix}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{X}}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}$$

and hence $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathbf{S}) = \text{rk}_{q^m}(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$. Note that $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_j = \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ applies for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. This yields $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{X})_{\tilde{\xi}})_{\tilde{\xi}}$, where the rows of the matrix \mathbf{X} are precisely $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s$. In fact, \mathbf{X} contains all error locators and can be computed as $\mathbf{X} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{h}, \dots, \mathbf{h}) \cdot \mathbf{B}^{\top}$ with \mathbf{h} being the first row of the parity-check matrix \mathbf{H} of the component LRS code given in (8) and \mathbf{B} arising from the error decomposition (41). Recall that $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ only depends on the considered code and not on the particular decoding instance. We can thus consider \mathbf{h} as a fixed given part and since \mathbf{e} is chosen uniformly at random from $\mathcal{V}_{q^m}(sn; \tau)$, the matrix \mathbf{X} is distributed uniformly over the set $\mathcal{M}_{q^m}(s, \tau; \tau)$. The proof of [35, Lem. 7] then yields the desired bound

$$\Pr\{\text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathbf{S}) < \tau\} = \Pr\{\text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{X})_{\tilde{\xi}})_{\tilde{\xi}}) < \tau\} \stackrel{[35]}{\leq} \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max}-\tau)+1)}.$$

Let us focus on errors with sum-rank weight at most $\frac{1}{2}(n-k)$ and use the equality $\text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathbf{S}) = \text{rk}_{q^m}(\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{X})_{\tilde{\xi}})_{\tilde{\xi}})$ from above to see that \mathbf{S} has always full \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank τ in this case. Since $\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{X})_{\tilde{\xi}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau \times \tau}$ has sum-rank weight τ , [35, Lem. 6] states that $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-\tau}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\tau}(\mathbf{X})_{\tilde{\xi}})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ cannot be rank-deficient. This follows because a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau}$ with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{b}) > n - k - \tau \geq \frac{1}{2}(n - k) \geq \tau$ cannot exist. \blacksquare

We now describe step by step how the syndrome-based decoder for HILRS codes proceeds. First, the component-syndrome polynomials s_1, \dots, s_s and the key equation (44) are set up. The in Section VI-A described multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis [28] is used to recover the ESP from (44) and to decide whether the solution space of the key equation has dimension one or more. In case it has dimension at least two, a decoding failure is returned. Otherwise, the ESP σ was successfully recovered and the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm from Section VI-B allows to retrieve the error values $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau}$ from σ by finding bases $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(\ell)}$ of the root spaces of σ with respect to generalized operator evaluation and evaluation parameter $\tilde{\xi}_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Next, the error locators $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_s \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{\tau}$ are recovered by making use of the equivalent formulation

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\top} = \mathbf{s}_j^{\top} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s \quad (49)$$

of (43). Since the above systems have a particular form, we can solve them with the generalized version of Gabidulin's algorithm from Section VI-C. We recover the matrices $\mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_s \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times n}$ containing the error locations by applying the techniques from [18] blockwise. More precisely, we consider the matrix $\mathbf{H}_q := \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n}$ with $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ being the first row of the parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ of the component code given in (8). We compute for each block $\mathbf{H}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times n_i}$ with $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ a left inverse $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i \times m}$ satisfying $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \cdot \mathbf{H}_q^{(i)} = \mathbf{I}_{n_i}$ for the identity matrix $\mathbf{I}_{n_i} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i \times n_i}$. Then, we can recover the i -th block of \mathbf{B}_j as

$$\mathbf{B}_j^{(i)\top} = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \mathbf{X}_{j,q}^{(i)} = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \mathbf{H}_q^{(i)} \mathbf{B}_j^{(i)\top} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell \quad \text{and all } j = 1, \dots, s. \quad (50)$$

Here, $\mathbf{X}_{j,q} := \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}_j) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{m \times \tau}$ denotes the \mathbb{F}_q -representation of the vector $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$. We set $\mathbf{B}_j = \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_j^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_j^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times n}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ and finally obtain \mathbf{B} as $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{B}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{B}_s) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\tau \times sn}$. Ultimately, we can compute the error \mathbf{e} as $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{B}$ according to (41) and return the correct codeword $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{e}$.

It is worth noting that the left inverses $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(1)}, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(\ell)}$ can be precomputed as described in Remark 6. Algorithm 3 and Theorem 6 summarize the syndrome-based decoder for HILRS codes in the error-only setting.

Algorithm 3: ERROR-ONLY DECODING OF HILRS CODES

Input : A channel output $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ with $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e}) = \tau \leq \tau_{\max}$,
a parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$ of the form $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ of $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; \mathbf{n}, k]$,
and a left inverse $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n_i \times m}$ of $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{h}^{(i)})$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.
Output: The transmitted codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ or “decoding failure”.

```

1 for  $j = 1, \dots, s$  do
2   Compute the component syndrome  $\mathbf{s}_j \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^\top$  with  $\mathbf{y}_j$  being the  $j$ -th component of  $\mathbf{y}$ .
3   Set up the component-syndrome polynomial  $s_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ .
4   Solve the key equation (44) to obtain the ESP  $\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ .
5   if the key equation (44) has a unique solution up to  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -multiples then
6     Find a basis  $\mathbf{a}^{(i)}$  of the root space of  $\sigma(\cdot)_{\tilde{\xi}_i}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  and set  $\mathbf{a} \leftarrow (\mathbf{a}^{(1)} | \dots | \mathbf{a}^{(\ell)})$ .
7     Set up  $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{x}_j)_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}^\top = \mathbf{s}_j^\top$  from (49) for each  $j = 1, \dots, s$  and solve it for  $\mathbf{x}_j$ .
8     Recover the error locations  $\mathbf{B}_j^{(i)\top} = \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \cdot \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}_j^{(i)})$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  and all  $j = 1, \dots, s$  as in (50).
9     Set up  $\mathbf{B} \leftarrow (\mathbf{B}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{B}_s)$  with  $\mathbf{B}_j \leftarrow \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_j^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_j^{(\ell)})$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, s$ .
10    Recover the error vector  $\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{a} \mathbf{B}$  as in (41).
11    return  $\mathbf{c} \leftarrow \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{e}$ .
12 return “decoding failure”.

```

Theorem 6 (Error-Only Decoding of HILRS Codes): Consider the transmission of a codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ over the additive error-only channel (39). The error $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ of sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e}) = \tau$ is chosen uniformly at random from the set $\mathcal{V}_{q^m}(sn; \tau)$ defined in (40) and determines the received word $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$. The presented syndrome-based decoder can always recover \mathbf{c} from \mathbf{y} if $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k)$ holds. Moreover, the decoder can be used probabilistically for larger error weights and decoding succeeds with a probability of at least

$$1 - \kappa_q^\ell q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max} - \tau) + 1)}$$

as long as the error weight satisfies

$$\tau \leq \tau_{\max} := \frac{s}{s+1}(n - k).$$

The decoder requires on average $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} if $m \in O(s)$ applies.

Proof: The reasoning above and the proof of the key equation (44) ensure the correctness of Algorithm 3, as a decoding failure is returned if and only if the key equation has a solution space of dimension greater than one and this is the only potential point of failure.

The maximum decoding radius was established in (48) and Lemma 4 showed that successful decoding is guaranteed as long as the error weight is at most $\frac{1}{2}(n - k)$. For larger error weights that are still within the decoding radius (48), the claimed upper bound on the failure probability was proved in Lemma 4 as well.

We now focus on the asymptotic complexity of Algorithm 3 and make use of the fast subroutines outlined in Section VI for computational gains. The computation of the component syndromes $\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_s$ in line 2 and the setup of the corresponding component-syndrome polynomials in line 3 need at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Next, multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis can be applied to lines 4 and 5 to solve the key equation (44) and test the uniqueness of its solution up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples in at most $O(s(n - k)^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Line 6 derives the error values $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ from the ESP σ and the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm can achieve this on average in $O(\ell m \deg(\sigma)) = O(\ell m(n - k))$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The average complexity of this step is in $O(sn^2)$ for $m \in O(s)$. The system (49) in line 7 is solved with the Gabidulin-like algorithm in at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Line 8 makes use of the precomputed left inverses $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ which allows to solve (50) in at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The remaining lines consist of basic operations that require at most $O(n^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . In the end, we obtain an average complexity in $O(sn^2)$ if $m \in O(s)$ applies. It is worth noting that we accounted for the worst-case complexity in most steps and only the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm is probabilistic and was thus assessed in terms of average complexity. \blacksquare

D. Error-Erasure Decoding

In this section, we generalize the presented syndrome-based decoder to work with the error-erasure channel model. Hence, we consider an error vector $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ which can be additively decomposed into three parts containing $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ full errors, $t_{\mathcal{R}}$ row erasures, and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ column erasures, respectively, and has sum-rank weight $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$. With a parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$ of the component code $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; n, k]$ and the error decomposition shown in (42), we can compute the *component syndromes*

$$s_j := \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^\top = (\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{F},j} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{R},j} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{C},j}) \mathbf{H}^\top \stackrel{(42)}{=} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F},j} \mathbf{H}^\top + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R},j} \mathbf{H}^\top + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C},j} \mathbf{H}^\top \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s,$$

where each matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T},j}$ with $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$ and $j = 1, \dots, s$ has a block-diagonal structure as shown in (41). Since there is a suitable vector $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ of sum-rank weight n for which the generalized Moore matrix $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$ is a parity-check matrix of $\text{LRS}[\beta, \xi; n, k]$ according to (8), we can express the l -th entry of the component syndrome s_j as

$$s_{j,l} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1} \underbrace{(\mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T},j}^\top)^\top}_{=: \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T},j}} \tilde{\xi} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1} (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T},j})^\top \tilde{\xi} \quad (51)$$

for all $l = 1, \dots, n - k$ and every $j = 1, \dots, s$. This motivates to define the *error locators* per component and error type, i.e., as $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T},j} := \mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T},j}^\top \tilde{\xi} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^n$ for each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$.

Since the receiver already knows $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},s}$, we encode this knowledge in the *partial component error-locator polynomials (ELPs)* which we define as the minimal skew polynomials satisfying

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{C},j}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s.$$

As the evaluation parameters in $\tilde{\xi}$ belong to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , the skew polynomial $\lambda_{\mathcal{C},j}$ with $j = 1, \dots, s$ has degree $t_{\mathcal{C},j} := \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{t_{\mathcal{C}}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j}) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{C},j})$. Observe that $t_{\mathcal{C},j}$ is upper-bounded by $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ since $t_{\mathcal{C},j} = \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C},j})$ applies and the error decomposition enforces $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^n(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{rk}_q(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C},1}^{(i)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C},s}^{(i)}) = t_{\mathcal{C}}$. We also get the bound $\sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{C},j} \geq t_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Further, we keep using the *error-span polynomial (ESP)* $\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ which is the minimal skew polynomial vanishing on all error values, that is, $\sigma(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$ holds for all $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$. We express σ as a product of partial ESPs related to the different error types to make the knowledge about the row erasures more accessible to the decoder. Namely, we write

$$\sigma(x) = \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x), \quad (52)$$

where the *partial error-span polynomials (ESPs)* $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}, \sigma_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ are defined as the minimal skew polynomials satisfying

$$(\sigma_{\mathcal{C}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}})(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (\sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}})(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (53)$$

respectively. Recall again that since $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ are known, we can compute $\sigma_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\lambda_{\mathcal{C},1}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{C},s}$ efficiently using (6). We use them to compute the *auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials* which we define as

$$s_{RC,j}(x) := \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \cdot s_j(x) \cdot \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j}(x) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}] \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, s.$$

Here, $\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j}$ denotes the θ^{-1} -reverse of $\lambda_{\mathcal{C},j}$ with respect to $t_{\mathcal{C},j}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ and is explicitly given as

$$\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j}(x) = \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{C},j}+1} \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j,\nu} x^{\nu-1} \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j,\nu} = \theta^{-(\nu-t_{\mathcal{C},j}-1)} (\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j,t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+2}) \quad \text{for all } \nu = 1, \dots, t_{\mathcal{C},j} + 1. \quad (54)$$

We are now ready to derive a key equation that relates the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials with the partial ESP corresponding to the full errors.

Theorem 7 (ESP Key Equation for Errors and Erasures): For each $j = 1, \dots, s$, there is a skew polynomial $\omega_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$ with $\deg(\omega_j) < t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C},j}$ that satisfies

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot s_{RC,j}(x) \equiv \omega_j(x) \pmod{x^{n-k}}. \quad (55)$$

Proof: Instead of showing (55) directly, we prove the equivalent statement that $\omega_{j,l} = 0$ holds for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C},j} + 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Therefore, we compute the coefficients of ω_j for each $j = 1, \dots, s$ via the equality

$$\omega_j(x) = \underbrace{\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x)}_{=: \sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}(x)} \cdot s_j(x) \cdot \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j}(x)$$

by applying (2) first to $\sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}(x) \cdot s_j(x)$ and then to the product of the obtained result and $\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j}(x)$. The first part yields

$$\begin{aligned}
(\sigma_{\mathcal{FR}} \cdot s_j)_l &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}+1} \sigma_{\mathcal{FR},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(s_{j,l-\nu+1}) \stackrel{(51)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}+1} \sigma_{\mathcal{FR},\nu} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T},j})_{\xi}^{\top}) \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}} \theta^{-(l-1)}(x_{\mathcal{T},j,r}^{(i)}) \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}+1} \sigma_{\mathcal{FR},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(a_{\mathcal{T},r}^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{-(\nu-1)}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(4)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\hat{\xi}_i)} \\
&= \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{T}}^{(i)}} \theta^{-(l-1)}(x_{\mathcal{T},j,r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \underbrace{\sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}+1} \sigma_{\mathcal{FR},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(a_{\mathcal{T},r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{\nu-1}(\hat{\xi}_i)}_{= \sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}(a_{\mathcal{T},r}^{(i)})_{\hat{\xi}_i}} \\
&= \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \underbrace{\sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\tilde{\xi}}^{\top}}_{=: \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top}} \tag{56}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + 1, \dots, n - k$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$. Here, the last equality follows from the fact that $\sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}$ vanishes at the error values corresponding to full errors and row erasures, i.e., $\sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}$ apply according to (53). The second step yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{j,l} &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{C},j}+1} (\sigma_{\mathcal{FR}} \cdot s_j)_{l-\nu+1} \theta^{-(l-\nu)}(\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j,\nu}) \stackrel{(54)}{\stackrel{(56)}}{=} \sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{C},j}+1} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top} \cdot \theta^{-(l-t_{\mathcal{C},j}-1)}(\lambda_{\mathcal{C},j,t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+2}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}} \hat{a}_{\mathcal{C},r}^{(i)} \theta^{-(l-t_{\mathcal{C},j}-1)} \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{C},j}+1} \theta^{-(t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+1)}(x_{\mathcal{C},j,r}^{(i)}) \underbrace{\theta^{l-t_{\mathcal{C},j}-1}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-\nu}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(4)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+1}(\tilde{\xi}_i) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-t_{\mathcal{C},j}-1}(\xi_i)} \lambda_{\mathcal{C},j,t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+2} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}} \hat{a}_{\mathcal{C},r}^{(i)} \theta^{-(l-t_{\mathcal{C},j}-1)} \left(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-t_{\mathcal{C},j}-1}(\xi_i) \underbrace{\sum_{\nu=1}^{t_{\mathcal{C},j}+1} \lambda_{\mathcal{C},j,t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+2} \theta^{-(t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+1)}(x_{\mathcal{C},j,r}^{(i)}) \mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{t_{\mathcal{C},j}-\nu+1}(\tilde{\xi}_i)}_{= \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(x_{\mathcal{C},j,r}^{(i)})_{\tilde{\xi}_i} = 0} \right) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C},j} + 1, \dots, n - k$ and every $j = 1, \dots, s$. ■

We can formulate the key equation (55) equivalently as

$$\sum_{\nu=2}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+1} \sigma_{\mathcal{F},\nu} \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(s_{RC,j,l-\nu+1}) = -s_{RC,j,l} \quad \text{for all } l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C},j} + 1, \dots, n - k \quad \text{and all } j = 1, \dots, s \tag{57}$$

when we normalize $\sigma_{\mathcal{F},1} = 1$ without loss of generality. Hence, the key equation (55) corresponds to an inhomogeneous \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system of $s(n - k - t_{\mathcal{F}} - t_{\mathcal{R}} - \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{C},j})$ equations in $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ unknowns. This system can have a unique solution up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples only if the number of equations is at least the number of unknowns, i.e., if

$$t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{s}{s+1} \left(n - k - t_{\mathcal{R}} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{C},j}}_{=: \bar{t}_{\mathcal{C}}} \right). \tag{58}$$

However, this condition is not sufficient to ensure a one-dimensional solution space and decoding failures can occur. Remark that the maximal decoding region defined by (58) depends on $\bar{t}_{\mathcal{C}}$, that is, on the *average* number of column erasures per component error.

Overall, we can summarize the steps of the syndrome-based error-erasure decoder as follows: The partial ESP $\sigma_{\mathcal{R}}$ as well as the the partial component ELPs $\lambda_{\mathcal{C},1}, \dots, \lambda_{\mathcal{C},s}$ and the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials $s_{RC,1}, \dots, s_{RC,s}$ are determined to set up the key equation (55). We can solve (55) by means of multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis [28] which is briefly explained in Section VI-A. In case the solution space of the key equation has dimension at least two, the decoder returns a decoding failure. Otherwise, the obtained partial ESP $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}$ corresponds to the actual error and can be used to set up the skew polynomials $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \cdot s_j(x) = \sigma_{\mathcal{FR}}(x) \cdot s_j(x)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. We then make use

of equality (56) from the proof of Theorem 7 and apply θ^{l-1} to it to obtain

$$\theta^{l-1}((\sigma_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \cdot s_j)_l) \stackrel{(56)}{=} \theta^{l-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{r=1}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)}} x_{\mathcal{C},j,r}^{(i)} \underbrace{\theta^{l-1}(\mathcal{N}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\tilde{\xi}_i))}_{\stackrel{(3)}{=} \mathcal{N}_{\theta}^{l-1}(\xi_i)} \theta^{l-1}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C},r}^{(i)}) = \mathcal{D}^{l-1}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\xi} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j}^{\top}$$

for all $l = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + 1, \dots, n - k$. Now we can set up the system

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{R}}}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\xi}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j}^{\top} = \mathbf{v}_j^{\top} \quad (59)$$

with $\mathbf{v}_j := ((\sigma_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \cdot s_j)_{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}+1}, \dots, (\sigma_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \cdot s_j)_{n-k}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{R}}}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, s$. Then we combine the s systems from (59) into one $\mathbb{F}_{q^m s}$ -linear system. Therefore, fix an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -basis $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m s}^s$ of $\mathbb{F}_{q^m s}$ and set

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}} := \gamma \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},s} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m s}^{t_{\mathcal{C}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v} := \gamma \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_s \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m s}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{R}}}.$$

This yields the combined system

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{R}}}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\xi}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top} = \mathbf{v}^{\top}. \quad (60)$$

We can use the Gabidulin-like algorithm over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m s}$ to solve (60) and refer to Section VI-C for a detailed description of the method. Further note that $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}) = t_{\mathcal{C}}$ implies the uniqueness of the solution of (60) and since the decoding problem makes sure that there is a valid solution $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}}$ over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , we will recover the correct one.

After we have found $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}}$, we can reconstruct the partial ESP $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ for the column erasures as the minimal skew polynomial $\text{mpol}_{(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\tilde{\xi}}}$ of $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}}$. We can also finally set up the overall ESP $\sigma(x) = \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x)$ as defined in (52). The characterization of the partial ESPs in (53) allows us to recover the missing error values $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Namely, we first initialize the Skachek–Roth-like algorithm from Section VI-B with $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and run it on $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x)$ to obtain $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}}$. Then we initialize the algorithm with $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}}$ to recover $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}$ from the full ESP σ . The missing code locators $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}$ can be recovered in a similar fashion as described in (49) for the error-only case. Rephrasing (51) yields

$$s_{j,l} - \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}\}} \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\top} = \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{l-1}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F},j} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}} | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}})^{\top} \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, n - k$$

and we obtain the Gabidulin-like systems

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F},j} | \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}} | \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}})^{\top} = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^{\top} \quad (61)$$

with $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j = (s_{j,1} - \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top}, \theta(s_{j,2}) - \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top}, \dots, \theta^{n-k-1}(s_{j,n-k}) - \mathcal{D}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-1}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$. They can be solved with the Gabidulin-like algorithm which is explained in Section VI-C.

The error locations $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ can be obtained from the respective error locators $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F}}$, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}$ by applying the approach from the error-only setting given in (50) to each error type. The overall error \mathbf{e} is then the sum of the vectors $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{T}} = \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{C}\}$ and the decoder returns $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{e}$.

Algorithm 4 summarizes the steps of the decoder compactly and Theorem 8 states the main attributes of the syndrome-based error-erasure decoder for HILRS codes.

Theorem 8 (Error-Erasure Decoding of HILRS Codes): Consider the transmission of a codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ over the additive error-erasure channel (39). The error $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ of sum-rank weight $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e}) = \tau$ is chosen uniformly at random from the set $\mathcal{V}_{q^m}(sn; \tau)$ defined in (40) and determines the received word $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$. The channel provides partial knowledge of the error which gives rise to a decomposition into $t_{\mathcal{F}}$ full errors, $t_{\mathcal{R}}$ row erasures, and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ column erasures such that $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ holds, as explained in Section IV-B. The presented syndrome-based decoder can always recover \mathbf{c} from \mathbf{y} if $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k - t_{\mathcal{R}} - \max_j \{t_{\mathcal{C},j}\})$ holds with $t_{\mathcal{C},j} = \text{wt}_{\Sigma R}^{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{C},j}) \leq t_{\mathcal{C}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Moreover, the decoder can be used probabilistically for larger error weights and decoding succeeds with a probability of at least

$$1 - \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max} - \tau_{\text{hor}}^*) + 1)}$$

as long as the error weight satisfies

$$\tau_{\text{hor}}^* := t_{\mathcal{F}} + \frac{s}{s+1}(t_{\mathcal{R}} + \bar{t}_{\mathcal{C}}) \leq \tau_{\max} := \frac{s}{s+1}(n - k) \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{t}_{\mathcal{C}} := \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s t_{\mathcal{C},j}.$$

The decoder requires on average $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} if $m \in O(s)$ applies.

Proof: As the argumentation in this section and, specifically, the proof of Theorem 7 have shown, the decoder in Algorithm 4 is correct. There is only one step that can potentially lead to a decoding failure. Namely, the solution space of the key

Algorithm 4: ERROR-ERASURE DECODING OF HILRS CODES

Input : A channel output $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{sn}$ with $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$, $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{C}}$, and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{e}) = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ satisfying $\tau_{\text{hor}}^* \leq \tau_{\text{max}}$,
 a vector $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t_{\mathcal{R}}}$ of the form in (41) such that $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}$ has the same column space as $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$,
 and a matrix $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t_{\mathcal{C}} \times sn}$ of the form in (41) such that $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}$ has the same row space as $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$,
 a parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{(n-k) \times n}$ of the form $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{h})_{\tilde{\xi}}$ of LRS $[\beta, \xi; \mathbf{n}, k]$,
 a left inverse $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i \times m}$ of $\text{ext}_q(\mathbf{h}^{(i)})$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

Output: The transmitted codeword $\mathbf{c} \in \text{HILRS}[\beta, \xi, s; \tilde{\mathbf{n}}, k]$ or “decoding failure”.

- 1 Compute the partial ESP $\sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \leftarrow \text{mpol}_{(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}})_{\tilde{\xi}}}(x)$.
- 2 **for** $j = 1, \dots, s$ **do**
- 3 Compute the component syndrome $\mathbf{s}_j \leftarrow \mathbf{y}_j \mathbf{H}^{\top}$ with \mathbf{y}_j being the j -th component of \mathbf{y} .
- 4 Set up the component-syndrome polynomial $s_j \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$.
- 5 Compute $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j} \leftarrow \mathbf{h} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C},j}^{\top}$ and set $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j} \leftarrow (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j}^{(\ell)})$.
- 6 Compute the partial component ELP $\lambda_{\mathcal{C},j}(x) \leftarrow \text{mpol}_{(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C},j})_{\tilde{\xi}}}(x)$.
- 7 Set up $\bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j}$ according to (54).
- 8 Set up the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomial $s_{RC,j}(x) \leftarrow \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \cdot s_j(x) \cdot \bar{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C},j}(x)$.
- 9 Solve the key equation (55) to obtain the partial ESP $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta^{-1}]$.
- 10 **if** the key equation (55) has a unique solution up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples **then**
- 11 Set up $(\sigma_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \cdot s_j)(x) \leftarrow \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \cdot s_j(x)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$.
- 12 Set up $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k-t_{\mathcal{F}}-t_{\mathcal{R}}}(\mathcal{D}_{\theta^{t_{\mathcal{F}}+t_{\mathcal{R}}}}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\xi})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\top} = \mathbf{v}^{\top}$ from (60) and solve it for $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}}$.
- 13 Compute $\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \leftarrow \text{mpol}_{(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathcal{C}})_{\tilde{\xi}}}(x)$.
- 14 Set up $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}}(x) \leftarrow \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{R}}(x)$.
- 15 Find $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)}$ whose entries extend $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}$ to a basis of the root space of $\sigma_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}}(\cdot)_{\tilde{\xi}_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.
- 16 Set up $\sigma(x) \leftarrow \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) \cdot \sigma_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}}(x)$.
- 17 Find $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}}^{(i)}$ whose entries extend $(\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)} \mid \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}}^{(i)})$ to a basis of the root space of $\sigma(\cdot)_{\tilde{\xi}_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.
- 18 Set up $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F},j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R},j})_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot (\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}} \mid \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}})^{\top} = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j^{\top}$ from (61) and solve it for $(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{F},j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{R},j})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s$.
- 19 Recover the error locations $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T},j}^{(i)\top} \leftarrow \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_q^{(i)} \cdot \text{ext}_q(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{T},j}^{(i)})$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}\}$, and $j = 1, \dots, s$ as in (50).
- 20 Set up $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T},j} \leftarrow \text{diag}(\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T},j}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{T},j}^{(s)})$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}\}$ and all $j = 1, \dots, s$.
- 21 Set up $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}} \leftarrow (\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F},1} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F},s})$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}} \leftarrow (\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R},1} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R},s})$.
- 22 Recover the error vector $\mathbf{e} \leftarrow \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{C}}$ as in (42).
- 23 **return** $\mathbf{c} \leftarrow \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{e}$.
- 24 **return** “decoding failure”.

equation (55) could have dimension larger than one. The decoder handles this case correctly and returns a decoding failure. Further, the claimed decoding radius was derived in (58).

The statements about the success probability of the decoder and the condition on the error weight for guaranteed unique decoding both directly depend on properties of the key equation (55). The coefficient vectors of the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials $s_{RC,1}, \dots, s_{RC,s}$ in the key equation can in fact be expressed as modified component syndromes of an error-only decoding instance. This follows from suitable extensions of the error-erasure decoder from [12], which was presented for horizontally interleaved Gabidulin codes in the rank metric. As the details overstretch the scope of this paper, we will discuss them in follow-up work. In any case, the outlined result justifies that we obtain the upper bound $\text{Pr}_{\text{fail}} \leq \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\text{max}}^* - \tau_{\text{hor}}^*) + 1)}$ on the failure probability Pr_{fail} by applying Lemma 4 from the error-only scenario. Moreover, the insights about the coefficients of the auxiliary component-syndrome polynomials allow to derive a simple proof that the decoder always decodes correctly when $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k - t_{\mathcal{R}} - \max_j \{t_{\mathcal{C},j}\})$ applies.

Next, we analyze the asymptotic complexity of the presented decoding algorithm by grouping similar tasks. We do not mention every step explicitly, as e.g. setting up vectors and matrices according to simple rules or determining a skew reverse are essentially for free. Lines 3, 5, 19, and 22 contain vector-matrix and matrix-matrix products which can be computed in at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Minimal skew polynomials are given by the formula (6) and since the occurrences in lines 1, 6, and 13 concern skew polynomials of degree bounded by n , their computation can be done in $O(sn^2)$. The skew-polynomial products in lines 8, 11, 14, and 16 involve factors of degree at most n and thus require at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} .

In the following, we will apply fast subroutines to achieve the stated overall decoding complexity. We describe the respective methods in Section VI. Multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis solves the key equation (55) in line 9 in at most

$O(s(n-k)^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Lines 12 and 18 contain linear systems of a particular form, which allow for a fast solution via the Gabidulin-like algorithm. Observe that the system in line 18 is over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and thus in $O(sn^2)$ but the one in line 12 is linear over the extension field $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Therefore, the latter requires at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ and we bound this complexity by $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} by means of a suitable \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$. In lines 15 and 17, the decoder needs to find a basis of the root space of a skew polynomial of degree at most n with respect to generalized operator evaluation with ℓ distinct evaluation parameters. The probabilistic Skachek–Roth-like algorithm achieves this in an average complexity of $O(\ell mn)$ over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Under the assumption $m \in O(s)$, this is upper-bounded by $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . The Skachek–Roth-like algorithm is the only probabilistic component of the decoder and we measure its complexity in terms of average complexity. All other parts were assessed with respect to worst-case complexity. In summary, the error-erasure decoder for HILRS codes has an asymptotic average complexity of $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . ■

Remark 12: Observe that the above theorem states an asymptotic complexity of $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ for the error-erasure decoder, while the error-only decoder can be executed in at most $O(sn^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . This originates from the fact that we solve the $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ -linear system (60) in $O(tc^2)$ operations over $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$ and bound this step's complexity by $\tilde{O}(stc^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} for a suitable \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -basis of $\mathbb{F}_{q^{ms}}$.

Note however that this is not necessary in many cases: it is likely that there is a $j = 1, \dots, s$ such that $\mathbf{x}_{C,j}$ has full sum-rank weight. In this case, $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_C$ can be recovered by solving only the corresponding \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system (59). As the Gabidulin-like algorithm over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} can achieve this in at most $O(tc^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , the overall decoding complexity is reduced to $O(sn^2)$ in these cases.

V. SIMULATIONS

We now present Monte Carlo simulations to experimentally verify the tightness of the upper bound on the decoding-failure probability of the derived error-only decoders for VILRS and HILRS codes. We use SageMath [50] for our implementations and fix a random component LRS code with the chosen parameters in each step of the Monte Carlo simulations. Then, we decode random codewords that were distorted by uniformly distributed sum-rank errors of the predefined weight and collect 100 decoding failures. Note that the parameters are selected such that decoding failures are observable within a reasonable time and they are thus far from suitable for practical applications. Namely, we consider a component LRS code with $q = 3$, $m = 4$, $k = 3$, and $n = 8$ with $\mathbf{n} = (4, 4)$ and $\ell = 2$. We investigate the two interleaving orders $s \in \{4, 5\}$ for both vertical and horizontal interleaving. In all cases, successful decoding can be guaranteed for all errors of sum-rank weight $\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}(n-k) = 2.5$. Probabilistic decoding is possible for error weights $\tau \leq \tau_{\max} = \frac{s}{s+1}(n-k)$ and our parameter choices yield $\tau_{\max} = 4$ for $s = 4$ and $\tau_{\max} = 4.167$ for $s = 5$. Thus, up to $\tau = 4$ sum-rank errors can be decoded with high probability and the two choices $\tau \in \{3, 4\}$ cover all possible scenarios for probabilistic decoding.

Note that the derived bounds on the failure probability for VILRS and HILRS codes coincide. The corresponding results were derived in Lemma 2 and in Lemma 4, respectively, and the bound reads as follows:

$$\Pr_{\text{fail}} \leq \kappa_q^{\ell+1} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max}-\tau)+1)}. \quad (62)$$

Here, $\tau_{\max} := \frac{s}{s+1}(n-k)$ is the maximal decoding radius and $\kappa_q < 3.5$ was defined as $\kappa_q = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1-q^{-i}}$ for integers $q \geq 2$ in (1). When we compute the bound explicitly in the following, we use the first 100 factors to approximate κ_q from above, i.e., we compute $\prod_{i=1}^{100} \frac{1}{1-q^{-i}} \geq \kappa_q$. Table I shows the evaluation of the standard bound (62) for the considered parameters as well as the experimentally observed failure probabilities for VILRS and HILRS codes. Note that the bounds for $\tau = 3$ are too small to be experimentally observed with reasonable constraints in time and resources. We thus only simulated the case $\tau = 4$ and obtained results between $1.3 \cdot 10^{-2}$ and $1.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$ for interleaving order $s = 4$ and between $1.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $1.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ for $s = 5$. The theoretical bound from (62) is about 5 to 6 times larger than the experimental observations.

TABLE I

PREDICTED AND EXPERIMENTALLY OBSERVED FAILURE PROBABILITY IN THE DECODING OF VERTICALLY AND HORIZONTALLY INTERLEAVED LRS CODES. THE PARAMETERS OF THE COMPONENT LRS CODE ARE $q = 3$, $m = 4$, $k = 3$, AND $\mathbf{n} = (4, 4)$.

| \Pr_{fail} | $\tau = 3$ | | $\tau = 4$ | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------|
| | Upper Bounds | | Upper Bounds | | Simulation Results | |
| | standard (62) | improved (63) | standard (62) | improved (63) | VILRS | HILRS |
| $s = 4$ | 2.015e-11 | 1.143e-11 | 7.026e-02 | 3.985e-02 | 1.302e-02 | 1.348e-02 |
| $s = 5$ | 3.071e-15 | 1.742e-15 | 8.674e-04 | 4.920e-04 | 1.569e-04 | 1.431e-04 |

The main ingredient for the standard bound in (62) is a result from [35]. However, this result can be improved by having a closer look at the proof of [35, Lem. 7] which reveals that one factor κ_q can actually be replaced by κ_{q^m} . As κ_q is decreasing and converges to 1 for growing q , this yields the improved upper bound

$$\Pr_{\text{fail}} \leq \kappa_{q^m} \kappa_q^{\ell} q^{-m((s+1)(\tau_{\max}-\tau)+1)}. \quad (63)$$

The ratio of κ_{q^m} and κ_q determines the multiplicative gain obtained from (63) with respect to (62). But since κ_q converges quickly to 1 for $q \rightarrow \infty$, this is mostly attractive for relatively small q or large m . The small parameters we selected for the presented simulations lie in this regime and we obtain $\kappa_3 \approx 1.785$ and $\kappa_{3^4} \approx 1.013$. Consequently, their ratio $\frac{\kappa_{3^4}}{\kappa_3} \approx 0.567$ shows that the values of (63) almost halve the ones obtained from (62). The concrete values are part of Table I and are less than a factor 3.5 larger than the simulation results for all cases. Figure 3 summarizes the results of this section graphically and visualizes the gain we obtained from the improved bound (63).




Fig. 3. Visualization of the observed decoding-failure probability for VILRS and HILRS codes and theoretical upper bounds. See Table I for numerical values.

VI. EFFICIENT SUBROUTINES FOR FAST DECODING

This section contains fast algorithms that can be applied to certain computationally expensive steps of the presented syndrome-based decoders to speed them up. Even though the techniques themselves are only remotely connected to the syndrome-based decoding approach, they are important to reach the claimed complexities.

A. Solving Key Equations

Each of the presented decoders relies on a key equation which needs to be solved in order to recover the ELP or the ESP corresponding to the full errors, respectively. The key equations can be expressed as systems of linear equations as shown in (18) and (32) for VILRS codes and in (45) and (57) for HILRS codes. Since the systems have a particular form, we do not need to rely on classical Gaussian elimination but can solve them faster by applying multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis as proposed in [28]. This allows us to achieve a complexity in $O(s(n-k)^2)$ over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} for this decoding step.

Multisequence skew-feedback shift-register synthesis takes s sequences $\mathbf{s}_j = (s_{j,d_j+1}, \dots, s_{j,n-k}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k-d_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$ of potentially different length as input and finds the shortest connection vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{\tau+1}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\tau$ satisfying the shift-register relations

$$\sum_{\nu=2}^{\tau+1} \sigma_\nu \theta^{-(\nu-1)}(s_{j,l-\nu+1}) = -s_{j,l} \quad \text{for all } l = d_j + \tau + 1, \dots, n-k \quad \text{and all } j = 1, \dots, s$$

with a fixed field automorphism θ of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} [28, Prob. 1]. The algorithm [28, Alg. 2] synthesizes $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ by means of an iterative procedure starting from the trivial connection vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (1)$ and trying to adapt and lengthen the shift register as necessary to accommodate each entry of every input sequence step by step. Note that the algorithm also outputs how many degrees of freedom were involved in every iteration. This allows to easily verify the uniqueness of the found solution up to \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -multiples by making sure that there were no ambiguous choices in any step. The explicit condition for checking this is given in [28, Cor. 7]. A fast variant of skew-feedback shift-register synthesis can be found in [51]. Since solving the key equation is not the computational bottleneck for our syndrome-based decoders, we do not discuss the speedup here.

B. Finding Roots of Skew Polynomials

All discussed decoders use error-locator polynomials (ELPs) or error-span polynomials (ESPs) which are skew polynomials of minimal degree that vanish precisely at the error locators or at the error values, respectively. Therefore, a fast method for finding a basis of the root space of a skew polynomial with respect to generalized operator evaluation is crucial to recover

the information about the error from the skew polynomials. We now present a probabilistic Skachek–Roth-like algorithm that accomplishes the task with an average complexity in $O(\ell m \deg(p))$ over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} for a skew polynomial $p \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ and its root spaces with respect to ℓ chosen evaluation parameters. In contrast, adapting the conventional approach for linearized polynomials described in [52, Chap. 11.1] would require $O(\ell m \deg(p)^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} in the worst case.

The authors showed in the patent [53] that Skachek and Roth’s approach for *linearized* polynomials [54] can be generalized to skew polynomials with respect to generalized operator evaluation. One of the main observations is that the skew polynomial $n(x) := x^m - \mathcal{N}_\theta^m(\xi) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ is the minimal skew polynomial vanishing at all \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -elements with respect to generalized operator evaluation and evaluation parameter ξ . We can factor it into $n(x) = h(x) \cdot g(x)$ with $h(x) = \text{gcd}(n(x), p(x))$ and $g(x) = \text{ldiv}(n(x), h(x))$. Then, the root spaces of h and p with respect to the chosen evaluation parameter ξ coincide and further, the root space of h is precisely the image space of g . When we want to find a basis of the zeros of $p \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$ with respect to $p(\cdot)_\xi$, we can thus instead probabilistically find a basis of the image of g .

The resulting procedure is depicted in Algorithm 5 and multiple evaluation parameters can be incorporated by computing a basis of the root space for one evaluation parameter at a time. Moreover, the algorithm allows to initialize the basis \mathcal{B}_i of the root space of p with respect to $p(\cdot)_{\xi_i}$ with a basis \mathcal{S}_i of a subspace of the respective root space for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. This incorporation of partial knowledge reduces the overall runtime of the algorithm.

Algorithm 5: SKACHEK–ROTH-LIKE ALGORITHM

Input : A skew polynomial $p \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x; \theta]$,
a vector $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\ell$ of evaluation parameters,
and a basis \mathcal{S}_i of a subspace of the root space of p with respect to $p(\cdot)_{\xi_i}$ (or $\mathcal{S}_i = \emptyset$) for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.
Output: A basis \mathcal{B}_i of the root space of p with respect to $p(\cdot)_{\xi_i}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$.

```

1 for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$  do
2    $n_i(x) \leftarrow x^m - \mathcal{N}_\theta^m(\xi_i)$ 
3    $h_i(x) \leftarrow \text{gcd}(n_i(x), p(x))$ 
4    $g_i(x) \leftarrow \text{ldiv}(n_i(x), h_i(x))$ 
5    $\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{S}_i$ 
6   while  $|\mathcal{B}_i| < \deg(g_i)$  do
7      $b \xleftarrow{\$} \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*$ 
8     if  $h(b)_{\xi_i} \notin \langle h(\mathcal{B}_i)_{\xi_i} \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$  then
9        $\mathcal{B}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{B}_i \cup \{b\}$ 
10 return  $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ 

```

C. Recovering Error Values and Error Locators

Our syndrome-based decoding schemes obtain the error by recovering the error values and the error locators separately. Recall that the VILRS decoders first recover the error locators and then compute the missing error values, whereas the HILRS decoders proceed in the opposite order and recover the error values first and then the error locators. When one of the parts is known and the other needs to be found, we are confronted with a system of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear equations of a particular form. Such systems arise e.g. in (23) for VILRS decoding and in (49) for HILRS decoding and look as follows:

Given $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{a}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{a}) = t \leq n - k$, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k}$ and a vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}' \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^\ell$ with entries belonging to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , we want to find the solution $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid \mathbf{x}^{(\ell)}) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}) = t$ of the \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system

$$\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{n-k}(\mathbf{x})_{\boldsymbol{\xi}'} \cdot \mathbf{a}^\top = \mathbf{s}^\top. \quad (64)$$

This system is equivalent to

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a})_{\theta^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\xi}')} \cdot \mathbf{x}^\top = \tilde{\mathbf{s}}^\top \quad (65)$$

with $\tilde{\mathbf{s}} = (s_1, \theta^{-1}(s_2), \dots, \theta^{-(n-k-1)}(s_{n-k}))$. This can be verified by applying $\theta^{-(l-1)}$ to the l -th equation for $l = 1, \dots, n-k$ and using (5). Recall that the generalized Moore matrix $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a})_{\theta^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\xi}')}$ has full \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank t if and only if the entries of $\theta^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\xi}')$ belong to pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{a}) = t$ applies [43, Thm. 4.5]. Thus, the requirements on $\boldsymbol{\xi}'$ and \mathbf{a} directly imply that the coefficient matrix of (65) has full rank and the solution \mathbf{x} is unique. Since (64) and (65) are equivalent, the matrix $\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{n-k}(\mathbf{x})_{\boldsymbol{\xi}'}$ needs to have full \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -rank and hence $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}) = t$ follows for the unique solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ by [43, Thm. 4.5].

A special case of problem (64) is the rank-metric setting, where the vectors \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{x} have only one block, $\boldsymbol{\xi}' = (1)$ contains the only evaluation parameter 1, and θ is the Frobenius automorphism \cdot^q . It arises in syndrome-based decoding of Gabidulin

codes and thus Gabidulin proposed an efficient algorithm to solve it in [55]. Gabidulin's algorithm exploits the structure of the underlying Moore matrix which allows for the successive elimination of variables. It requires at most $O(n^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} [56].

We now generalize his approach to the sum-rank-metric case that we stated in (64). In order to simplify the notation, we neglect the blockwise structure of the vectors \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{x} , i.e., we write $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_t)$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_t)$, and let the i -th entry of the vector $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_t) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ be the evaluation parameter corresponding to the i -th block with respect to the length partition of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{x} for each $i = 1, \dots, t$. Algorithm 6 describes the procedure and we analyze its complexity in the next lemma.

Algorithm 6: GABIDULIN-LIKE ALGORITHM

Input : A vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{a}) = t \leq n - k$,
a vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}' \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ with entries from pairwise distinct nontrivial conjugacy classes of \mathbb{F}_{q^m}
from which the vector $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_t) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ is constructed as described in the text,
and a vector $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{n-k}$.

Output: The solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^t$ of the \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^{n-k}(\mathbf{x})_{\boldsymbol{\xi}'} \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\top} = \mathbf{s}^{\top}$ from (64) with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{x}) = t$.

```

1  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^{t \times t} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$ 
2 for  $j = 1, \dots, t$  do
3    $A_{1,j} \leftarrow a_j$  /* Initialize first row of  $\mathbf{A}$  with  $\mathbf{a}$  */
4    $Q_{1,j} \leftarrow s_j$  /* Initialize first row of  $\mathbf{Q}$  with  $(s_1, \dots, s_t)$  */
5 for  $i = 1, \dots, t-1$  do
6    $\kappa_i \leftarrow A_{i,i}^{-1} \mathcal{D}_{\theta}(A_{i,i})_{\xi_i^{-1}}$ 
7   for  $j = 1, \dots, t$  do
8     if  $j > i$  then
9        $A_{i+1,j} \leftarrow A_{i,j} - \theta^{-1}(\kappa_i A_{i,j} \xi_j)$ 
10    if  $j \leq t-i$  then
11       $Q_{i+1,j} \leftarrow Q_{i,j} - \theta^{-1}(\kappa_i Q_{i,j+1})$ 
12  $x_t \leftarrow A_{t,t}^{-1} Q_{t,1}$ 
13 for  $i = t-1, \dots, 1$  do
14    $x_i \leftarrow A_{i,i}^{-1} (Q_{i,1} - \sum_{j=i+1}^t A_{i,j} x_j)$ 
15 return  $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow (x_1, \dots, x_t)$ 

```

Lemma 5: Algorithm 6 solves the problem described in (64) and requires at most $O(t^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} to do so.

Proof: Note that the system (64) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=1}^t A_{1,j} \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{l-1}(x_j)_{\xi_j} = Q_{1,l} \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, t \quad (66)$$

according to how we defined ξ_1, \dots, ξ_t and the matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{Q} . We can define $\kappa_1 = A_{1,1}^{-1} \mathcal{D}_{\theta}(A_{1,1})_{\xi_1^{-1}}$ and use it to eliminate the unknown x_1 from all but the first equation as follows: Multiply the l -th equation for each $l = 2, \dots, t$ with κ_1 , apply θ^{-1} to it, and subtract it from the previous equation with index $l-1$. Then, the new l -th equation has a zero at the first coefficient and we get the system

$$\sum_{j=2}^t A_{2,j} \mathcal{D}_{\theta}^{l-1}(x_j)_{\xi_j} = Q_{2,l} \quad \text{for all } l = 1, \dots, t-1. \quad (67)$$

In particular, (67) does not contain x_1 anymore and when we add the first equation from (66) to it, the system is equivalent to (66). We then repeat this procedure for the unknowns x_2, \dots, x_{t-1} in a similar fashion and finally obtain an \mathbb{F}_{q^m} -linear system with an upper-triangular matrix \mathbf{A} that is equivalent to (66). In particular, we get

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}^{\top} = \mathbf{q}_1$$

where \mathbf{q}_1 denotes the first column of \mathbf{Q} . Due to the upper-triangular structure of \mathbf{A} , the unknowns x_1, \dots, x_t can be recovered via back substitution, i.e., we obtain

$$x_t = A_{t,t}^{-1} Q_{t,1} \quad \text{and} \quad x_i = A_{i,i}^{-1} \left(Q_{i,1} - \sum_{j=i+1}^t A_{i,j} x_j \right) \quad \text{for all } i = t-1, \dots, 1.$$

The complexity analysis proceeds in a similar way as for the original Gabidulin algorithm [56]. The computation of the coefficients $A_{i+1,j}$ and $Q_{i+1,j}$ in the inner loop in lines 7 to 11 requires $O(t)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and κ_i can be computed in $O(1)$ in line 6. Therefore, the outer loop spanning lines 5 to 11 requires at most $O(t^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} . Due to the upper-triangular structure of \mathbf{A} , the unknowns x_1, \dots, x_t can be recovered via back substitution in lines 12 to 14. This requires at most $O(t^2)$ operations in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} and we obtain an overall worst-case complexity in $O(t^2)$ over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} for the Gabidulin-like algorithm. \blacksquare

Let us conclude this section with a short example that illustrates the triangular structure of \mathbf{A} and thus the applicability of back substitution.

Example 1: Consider the finite field \mathbb{F}_{3^2} constructed by the primitive polynomial $p(x) = x^2 + 2x + 2 \in \mathbb{F}_3[x]$ corresponding to the primitive element γ and let $\theta = \cdot^3$ be the Frobenius automorphism. Consider the vectors $\mathbf{a} = ((\gamma^7, \gamma^6) \mid (\gamma))$ with $\text{wt}_{\Sigma R}(\mathbf{a}) = 3$ and $\mathbf{s} = (\gamma, \gamma^4, \gamma^3)$. Suppose we want to find the solution $\mathbf{x} = ((x_1^{(1)}, x_2^{(1)}) \mid (x_1^{(2)}))$ of the system

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta}^3(\mathbf{x})_{\xi'} \cdot \mathbf{a}^\top = \mathbf{s}^\top \quad (68)$$

with $\xi' = (1, \gamma)$ and thus $\xi = (1, 1, \gamma)$. Algorithm 6 first constructs the two matrices

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^7 & \gamma^6 & \gamma \\ 0 & \gamma^5 & \gamma^7 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma^5 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & \gamma^4 & \gamma^3 \\ \gamma^3 & \gamma^2 & 0 \\ \gamma^6 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the first rows of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{Q} correspond to \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{s} , respectively. In fact, \mathbf{A} is a row-echelon form of the matrix

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^3(\mathbf{a})_{\theta^{-1}(\xi')} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^7 & \gamma^6 & \gamma \\ \gamma^5 & \gamma^2 & \gamma^6 \\ \gamma^7 & \gamma^6 & \gamma^5 \end{pmatrix}$$

which contains the first $t = 3$ rows of the coefficient matrix of the equivalent formulation

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a})_{\theta^{-1}(\xi')} \cdot \mathbf{x}^\top = (\gamma, \theta^{-1}(\gamma^4), \theta^{-2}(\gamma^3))^\top$$

of the system (68). This leads to the linear system

$$\underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \gamma^7 & \gamma^6 & \gamma \\ 0 & \gamma^5 & \gamma^7 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma^5 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \cdot \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} x_1^{(1)} \\ x_2^{(1)} \\ x_1^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ \gamma^3 \\ \gamma^6 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{q}_1}, \quad (69)$$

where \mathbf{q}_1 is the first column of \mathbf{Q} . Due to the upper-triangular structure of \mathbf{A} we can solve (69) efficiently for $\mathbf{x} = ((\gamma^2, 1) \mid (\gamma))$ via back substitution.

As we have seen in the previous example, the Gabidulin-like algorithm implicitly transforms the system (64) into its equivalent formulation (65) and simultaneously brings its coefficient matrix $\mathfrak{M}_{\theta^{-1}}^{n-k}(\mathbf{a})_{\theta^{-1}(\xi')}$, or rather the first t rows of it, into row-echelon form. Since the algorithm exploits the particular form of the system, this can be achieved much faster than with classical Gaussian elimination.

VII. CONCLUSION

We showed that both vertically and horizontally interleaved linearized Reed–Solomon (VILRS and HILRS) codes can be decoded with a syndrome-based approach. More precisely, we gave an error-only decoder in both cases and generalized it to an error-erasure scenario. The decoders for VILRS codes first determine the error-locator polynomial (ELP) and thus the row space of the full errors via an ELP key equation and then recover the missing column space. In contrast, HILRS decoders use a key equation based on the error-span polynomial (ESP) to first recover the column space of the full errors and then continue to retrieve their row space. This duality follows from the interleaving construction, as the components of vertically interleaved errors share the same row space, whereas horizontal interleaving leads to a shared column space for all component errors. The two presented error-only decoders have an average complexity in $O(sn^2)$ and the error-erasure variants need on average $\tilde{O}(sn^2)$ operations in the ambient field \mathbb{F}_{q^m} , where $s \in O(m)$ is the interleaving order and n the length of the component code. When $t_{\mathcal{F}}$, $t_{\mathcal{R}}$, and $t_{\mathcal{C}}$ denote the number of full errors, of row erasures, and of column erasures, respectively, successful decoding is guaranteed as long as the error weight $\tau = t_{\mathcal{F}} + t_{\mathcal{R}} + t_{\mathcal{C}}$ satisfies $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - k - t_{\mathcal{R}} - t_{\mathcal{C}})$. Moreover, probabilistic unique decoding allows to decode an error of weight τ with high probability if $t_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \frac{s}{s+1}(n - k - t_{\mathcal{R}} - t_{\mathcal{C}})$ applies. In fact, the error-erasure decoders have a slightly larger decoding region and the gain is with respect to row erasures for vertical interleaving (33) and with respect to column erasures for horizontal interleaving (58). We gave a tight upper bound on the probability of decoding failures and showcased its tightness for the error-only case with Monte Carlo simulations.

A straightforward theoretical generalization of the presented methods is the study of inhomogeneous interleaving. Moreover, linearized Reed–Solomon (LRS) codes arising from skew-polynomial rings with nonzero derivation could be considered.

However, it has to be taken into account that the dual of an LRS code might be a generalized Goppa code and not an LRS code in this setting [46].

Further, lifted variants of VILRS and HILRS codes and their properties in the sum-subspace metric are promising candidates for multishot network coding. The lifting of Gabidulin codes in the rank metric was studied and applied to single-shot network coding in [14] and the usage of multivariate polynomials in the decoder led to gains in the decoding radius [57], [58]. Generalizations of these techniques should yield similar results for lifted interleaved LRS codes and their application to multishot network coding.

Of course, the syndrome-based approach is not the only way to decode VILRS and HILRS codes. It stays an interesting question to study known and new decoders for these codes and compare their advantages and limitations. One open point in this area is the understanding of the error patterns for which probabilistic decoders fail and whether the failures depend on the decoding scheme or purely on the error.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors want to thank Sven Puchinger for fruitful brainstorming sessions and stimulating discussions that helped to develop and improve this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] U. Martínez-Peñas, “Skew and Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes and Maximum Sum Rank Distance Codes over any Division Ring,” *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 504, pp. 587–612, 2018.
- [2] H.-F. Lu and P. V. Kumar, “A Unified Construction of Space-Time Codes with Optimal Rate-Diversity Tradeoff,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 1709–1730, 2005.
- [3] R. W. Nóbrega and B. F. Uchôa-Filho, “Multishot Codes for Network Coding: Bounds and a Multilevel Construction,” in *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 428–432.
- [4] —, “Multishot Codes for Network Coding Using Rank-Metric Codes,” in *2010 Third IEEE International Workshop on Wireless Network Coding*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1–6.
- [5] U. Martínez-Peñas and F. R. Kschischang, “Reliable and Secure Multishot Network Coding Using Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 4785–4803, 2019.
- [6] H. Bartz and S. Puchinger, “Fast Decoding of Lifted Interleaved Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes for Multishot Network Coding,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 92, no. 8, pp. 2379–2421, 2024.
- [7] U. Martínez-Peñas, “Private Information Retrieval from Locally Repairable Databases with Colluding Servers,” in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1057–1061.
- [8] U. Martínez-Peñas and F. R. Kschischang, “Universal and Dynamic Locally Repairable Codes with Maximal Recoverability via Sum-Rank Codes,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 7790–7805, 2019.
- [9] S. Puchinger, J. Renner, and J. Rosenkilde, “Generic Decoding in the Sum-Rank Metric,” in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 54–59.
- [10] F. Hörmann, H. Bartz, and A.-L. Horlemann, “Distinguishing and Recovering Generalized Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes,” in *Code-Based Cryptography: CBCrypto 2022*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2023, pp. 1–20.
- [11] A.-L. Horlemann, S. Puchinger, J. Renner, T. Schamberger, and A. Wachter-Zeh, “Information-Set Decoding with Hints,” in *Code-Based Cryptography: CBCrypto 2021*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2022, pp. 60–83.
- [12] E. M. Gabidulin and N. I. Pilipchuk, “Error and Erasure Correcting Algorithms for Rank Codes,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 49, no. 1–3, pp. 105–122, 2008.
- [13] A. Wachter-Zeh and A. Zeh, “List and Unique Error-Erasure Decoding of Interleaved Gabidulin Codes with Interpolation Techniques,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 547–570, 2014.
- [14] D. Silva, F. R. Kschischang, and R. Kötter, “A Rank-Metric Approach to Error Control in Random Network Coding,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3951–3967, 2008.
- [15] G. Richter and S. Plass, “Error and Erasure Decoding of Rank-Codes with a Modified Berlekamp–Massey Algorithm,” in *5th International ITG Conference on Source and Channel Coding (SCC)*, 2004, pp. 203–210.
- [16] P. Gaborit, O. Ruatta, J. Schrek, and G. Zémor, “RankSign: An Efficient Signature Algorithm Based on the Rank Metric,” in *Post-Quantum Cryptography: PQCrypto 2014*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2014, pp. 88–107.
- [17] D. Silva and F. R. Kschischang, “Using Rank-Metric Codes for Error Correction in Random Network Coding,” in *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 796–800.
- [18] D. Silva, “Error Control for Network Coding,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 2009.
- [19] F. Hörmann, H. Bartz, and S. Puchinger, “Error-Erasure Decoding of Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes in the Sum-Rank Metric,” in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 7–12.
- [20] U. Martínez-Peñas and S. Puchinger, “Maximum Sum-Rank Distance Codes over Finite Chain Rings,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 3878–3890, 2024.
- [21] T. Jerkovits, H. Bartz, and A. Wachter-Zeh, “Randomized Decoding of Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes Beyond the Unique Decoding Radius,” in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 820–825.
- [22] —, “Support-Guessing Decoding Algorithms in the Sum-Rank Metric,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15806*, 2024.
- [23] P. Loidreau and R. Overbeck, “Decoding Rank Errors Beyond the Error-Correcting Capability,” in *Tenth International Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory (ACCT)*, 2006.
- [24] A. Wachter-Zeh, “Decoding of Block and Convolutional Codes in Rank Metric,” Ph.D. dissertation, Ulm University and Université Rennes 1, 2013.
- [25] H. Bartz, T. Jerkovits, S. Puchinger, and J. Rosenkilde, “Fast Decoding of Codes in the Rank, Subspace, and Sum-Rank Metric,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 8, pp. 5026–5050, 2021.
- [26] W. Li, V. Sidorenko, and D. Silva, “On Transform-Domain Error and Erasure Correction by Gabidulin Codes,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 571–586, 2014.
- [27] V. Sidorenko and M. Bossert, “Decoding Interleaved Gabidulin Codes and Multisequence Linearized Shift-Register Synthesis,” in *2010 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1148–1152.
- [28] V. R. Sidorenko, L. Jiang, and M. Bossert, “Skew-Feedback Shift-Register Synthesis and Decoding Interleaved Gabidulin Codes,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 621–632, 2011.

- [29] S. Puchinger, J. Rosenkilde né Nielsen, W. Li, and V. Sidorenko, "Row Reduction Applied to Decoding of Rank-Metric and Subspace Codes," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 82, no. 1–2, pp. 389–409, 2016.
- [30] S. Puchinger, S. Müelich, D. Mödinger, J. Rosenkilde né Nielsen, and M. Bossert, "Decoding Interleaved Gabidulin Codes using Alekhovich's Algorithm," *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 57, pp. 175–180, 2017.
- [31] N. Aragon, O. Blazy, P. Gaborit, A. Hauteville, and G. Zémor, "Durandal: A Rank Metric Based Signature Scheme," in *Advances in Cryptology: Eurocrypt 2019*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2019, pp. 728–758.
- [32] J. Renner, S. Puchinger, and A. Wachter-Zeh, "LIGA: A Cryptosystem Based on the Hardness of Rank-Metric List and Interleaved Decoding," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 89, no. 6, pp. 1279–1319, 2021.
- [33] N. Aragon, V. Dyseryn, P. Gaborit, P. Loidreau, J. Renner, and A. Wachter-Zeh, "LowMS: A New Rank Metric Code-Based KEM without Ideal Structure," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 92, no. 4, pp. 1075–1093, 2023.
- [34] J. Renner, S. Puchinger, and A. Wachter-Zeh, "Interleaving Loidreau's Rank-Metric Cryptosystem," in *2019 XVI International Symposium on Problems of Redundancy in Information and Control Systems (REDUNDANCY)*, 2019, pp. 127–132.
- [35] H. Bartz and S. Puchinger, "Fast Decoding of Interleaved Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes and Variants," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.01339*, 2023.
- [36] —, "Decoding of Interleaved Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes with Applications to Network Coding," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 160–165.
- [37] T. Jerkovits, F. Hörmann, and H. Bartz, "On Decoding High-Order Interleaved Sum-Rank-Metric Codes," in *Code-Based Cryptography: CBCrypto 2022*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2023, pp. 90–109.
- [38] —, "An Error-Code Perspective on Metzner–Kapturowski-like Decoders," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.01339*, 2024.
- [39] F. Hörmann and H. Bartz, "Fast Gao-Like Decoding of Horizontally Interleaved Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes," in *Code-Based Cryptography: CBCrypto 2023*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 2023, pp. 14–34.
- [40] J.-M. Couveignes and R. Lercier, "Elliptic Periods for Finite Fields," *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2009.
- [41] O. Ore, "On a Special Class of Polynomials," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 559–584, 1933.
- [42] —, "Theory of Non-Commutative Polynomials," *Annals of Mathematics*, pp. 480–508, 1933.
- [43] T.-Y. Lam and A. Leroy, "Vandermonde and Wronskian Matrices over Division Rings," *Journal of Algebra*, vol. 119, no. 2, pp. 308–336, 1988.
- [44] A. Leroy, "Pseudo Linear Transformations and Evaluation in Ore Extensions," *Bulletin of the Belgian Mathematical Society - Simon Stevin*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 321–347, 1995.
- [45] X. Caruso, "Residues of Skew Rational Functions and Linearized Goppa Codes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08430v1*, 2019.
- [46] X. Caruso and A. Durand, "Duals of Linearized Reed–Solomon Codes," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 241–271, 2022.
- [47] S. Puchinger, J. Renner, and J. Rosenkilde, "Generic Decoding in the Sum-Rank Metric," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 5075–5097, 2022.
- [48] G. Matsaglia and G. P. H. Styan, "Equalities and Inequalities for Ranks of Matrices," *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 269–292, 1974.
- [49] J. Renner, T. Jerkovits, and H. Bartz, "Efficient Decoding of Interleaved Low-Rank Parity-Check Codes," in *2019 XVI International Symposium on Problems of Redundancy in Information and Control Systems (REDUNDANCY)*, 2019, pp. 121–126.
- [50] The Sage Developers, *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 10.4)*, 2024, <https://www.sagemath.org>.
- [51] V. Sidorenko and M. Bossert, "Fast Skew-Feedback Shift-Register Synthesis," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 70, no. 1–2, pp. 55–67, 2012.
- [52] E. R. Berlekamp, *Algebraic Coding Theory (Revised Edition)*. World Scientific, 2015.
- [53] F. Hörmann and H. Bartz, "Verfahren und Decoder zur Fehlerkorrektur einer empfangenen Nachricht," German Patent DE102022204213B3, 2023, available at <https://depatisnet.dpma.de/DepatisNet/depatisnet?action=bibdat&docid=DE102022204213B3>.
- [54] V. Skachek and R. M. Roth, "Probabilistic Algorithm for Finding Roots of Linearized Polynomials," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 17–23, 2008.
- [55] E. M. Gabidulin, "Theory of Codes with Maximum Rank Distance," *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 1985.
- [56] M. Gadouleau and Z. Yan, "Complexity of Decoding Gabidulin Codes," in *2008 42nd Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1081–1085.
- [57] H. Bartz, M. Meier, and V. Sidorenko, "Improved Syndrome Decoding of Interleaved Subspace Codes," in *11th International ITG Conference on Systems, Communications and Coding (SCC)*, 2017.
- [58] H. Bartz and V. Sidorenko, "Improved Syndrome Decoding of Lifted L -interleaved Gabidulin Codes," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 547–567, 2019.