

On the Service Rate Region of Reed-Muller Codes

Hoang Ly, Emina Soljanin, and V. Lalitha,

Abstract

We study the Service Rate Region (SRR) of Reed-Muller (RM) codes in the context of distributed storage systems. The SRR is a convex polytope comprising all achievable data access request rates under a given coding scheme. It represents a critical metric for evaluating system efficiency and scalability. Using the geometric properties of RM codes, we characterize recovery sets for data objects, including their existence, uniqueness, and enumeration. This analysis reveals a connection between recovery sets and minimum-weight codewords in the dual RM code, providing a framework for identifying small recovery sets. Using these results, we derive explicit and tight bounds for the maximal achievable demand for individual data objects, which define the maximal simplex within the service rate region.

Index Terms

service rate region polytope, Reed-Muller codes, finite geometry, distributed storage systems, recovery set, coordinate-constrained enumerator.

H. Ly and E. Soljanin are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA, e-mail: {mh.ly,emina.soljanin}@rutgers.edu. V. Lalitha is with Signal Processing and Communications Research Center, IIIT Hyderabad, India, e-mail: lalitha.v@iiit.ac.in.

This research is partly based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant # CIF 2122400.

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern computing systems rely on efficient data access from their underlying storage layers to achieve high overall performance. Storage systems often replicate data objects across multiple servers to balance load and ensure reliability. The degree of replication of an object typically reflects its expected demand [1]. However, practical scenarios often involve fluctuations in access requests and the varying popularity of data objects. To address such challenges, redundancy schemes that combine erasure coding with replication have proven more effective than simple replication. The Service Rate Region (SRR) concept has recently emerged as a critical performance metric for evaluating and designing distributed storage systems. The SRR is defined as the set of all data access request rates that a system can support under its implemented redundancy scheme, thus providing information on the efficiency and scalability of the system; see, e.g., [1] for an introduction.

Recent advances in characterizing the *Service Rate Region (SRR)* of distributed storage systems have shed light on the efficiency of various redundancy schemes, particularly linear codes. Binary Simplex codes and Binary First-Order Reed-Muller codes have been studied thoroughly, the researchers explicitly describing their SRRs [2]. A notable result links the integrality of the SRR's demand vectors to batch codes, demonstrating that systems with integral SRRs correspond directly to batch coding schemes and vice versa [2]. These findings highlight the theoretical potential of linear codes for optimizing data access in distributed storage. Additionally, maximum-distance separable codes (MDS) have attracted significant attention for their optimal redundancy-reliability trade-off, making them highly popular in distributed systems [3], [4]. The authors in [1] have established strict limits on achievable data requests under systematic MDS-coded storage and demonstrated the optimality of a water-filling resource allocation algorithm. These results underscore the importance of systematically investigating SRR polytopes, as illustrated in recent work on calculating the volume of the SRR polytope for systematic MDS codes with specific parameters [5].

Much of the early research on coded distributed storage focused on internal uncertainties, such as straggling nodes. Recent studies have shifted toward addressing external uncertainties, such as fluctuating download requests [6]. This shift emphasizes the need to understand how redundancy schemes respond to variability in access demands. Building on these foundational studies, this paper aims to advance the understanding of SRRs in distributed storage systems employing Reed-Muller codes of arbitrary orders. By analyzing the SRR polytopes and their properties, we seek to bridge theoretical insights with practical

design considerations.

Binary Reed-Muller codes were introduced in [7], and soon after, Reed developed a majority-based decoding algorithm to decode these codes [8]. After the advent of polar codes, there has been renewed interest in proving that RM codes achieve the capacity of binary memoryless symmetric channels. In a breakthrough result [9], it was proved that RM codes achieve the capacity of binary erasure channels. More recently, a series of works [10], [11] have proved that RM codes achieve the capacity of general BMS channels. These results establish that RM codes are theoretically very good for communication purposes. For a survey on the results related to the decoding algorithms and the RM code capacity results, the interested reader is referred to [12]. Regarding applications, RM codes are used for very short block lengths in 5G NR [13]. In addition to communication, RM codes (second order) are used to design deterministic measurement matrices in compressed sensing [14]. In addition, they are also used to create private information retrieval schemes [15]. Reed-Muller codes are also natural in the service rate region as they have several disjoint parities involving a particular message bit, which can be seen from Reed's decoding algorithm. We also would like to point out that the geometric properties of RM codes have been used to prove capacity results [11].

This paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the problem setting and provides the necessary nomenclature, including the definition of a service rate region (SRR) for a coded storage system. Section III reviews the fundamental properties of Reed-Muller (RM) codes, including their construction, geometric interpretation, and dual code properties, which are crucial for analyzing recovery sets. Section IV presents the main results on recovery sets of RM codes, establishing their existence, uniqueness, enumeration, and connection to dual codewords. These findings provide the foundation for characterizing the SRR. Section V focuses on the derivation of explicit bounds of the SRR for RM codes, using the properties of the recovery set developed earlier. Finally, Section VI summarizes the paper's contributions and discusses potential directions for future research.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

A. Nomenclature

RM: Reed–Muller.

$\text{RM}_2(r, m)$: Binary Reed–Muller code of order r , length 2^m .

\mathbb{N} : set of nonnegative integers.

\mathbb{R} : set of real numbers.

$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$: set of nonnegative real numbers.

\mathbb{F}_q : finite field over some prime power q .

$\mathbb{F}_2 = \text{GF}(2)$: Galois field with two elements.

\mathbb{F}_q^n : n -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q .

$[n, k, d]_q$: a q -ary linear code, sometimes denoted as \mathcal{C} , of length n , dimension k , and minimum distance d . Code \mathcal{C} is a k -subspace of the n -dimensional vector space \mathbb{F}_q^n .

$w(\mathbf{x})$: Hamming weight of a codeword \mathbf{x} in \mathcal{C} .

$\mathbf{0}_k, \mathbf{1}_k$: all-zero and all-one column vectors of length k , respectively.

\mathbf{e}_i : binary unit column vector having a 1 at position i and 0s elsewhere.

$\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x})$: support of codeword \mathbf{x} .

$[i]$: set of positive integers not exceeding i , i.e. $\{1, 2, \dots, i\}$.

$[a, b]$: set of integers between a and b where $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a < b$.

$\binom{m}{r}_q = \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} \frac{1 - q^{m-i}}{1 - q^{i+1}} = \frac{(1 - q^m)(1 - q^{m-1}) \dots (1 - q^{m-r+1})}{(1 - q)(1 - q^2) \dots (1 - q^r)}$: Gaussian binomial coefficient that counts the number of subspaces of dimension r in a vector space of dimension m over \mathbb{F}_q , with $\binom{m}{0}_q = \binom{m}{m}_q = 1$. In other words, $\binom{m}{r}_q$ is the cardinality of the *Grassmannian* $\mathcal{G}_q(m, r)$.

B. Service Rate of Codes

Consider a storage system in which k data objects o_1, \dots, o_k are stored on n servers, labeled $1, \dots, n$, using a linear $[n, k]_q$ code with generator matrix $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k \times n}$. Let c_j denotes the j -th column of \mathbf{G} , for $1 \leq j \leq n$. A recovery set for the object o_i is a set of stored symbols that can be used to recover o_i . With respect to \mathbf{G} , a set $R \subseteq [n]$ is a *recovery set* for o_i if $\mathbf{e}_i \in \text{span}(R) = \text{span}(\cup_{i \in R} \{c_i\})$, i.e., the unit vector \mathbf{e}_i can be recovered by a linear combination of the columns of \mathbf{G} indexed by the set R . Without loss of generality, we restrict our attention to those *minimal* recovery sets $R : \mathbf{e}_i \notin \text{span}(S), \forall S \subsetneq R$. This ensures that to recover a data object, we never use more than what we need.

Let $\mathcal{R}_i = \{R_{i,1}, \dots, R_{i,t_i}\}$ be the $t_i \in \mathbb{N}$ recovery sets for the object o_i . Let $\mu_l \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the average rate at which the server $l \in [n]$ processes received data requests. We denote the service rates of servers $1, \dots, n$ by a vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$. We can assume that the servers have uniform capacity, that is, $\mu_j = 1, \forall j \in [n]$. We further assume that requests to download object o_i arrive at rate λ_i , for all $i \in [k]$. We denote the request rates for the object $1, \dots, k$ by the vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$.

Consider the class of scheduling strategies that assign a fraction of requests for an object to each of its recovery sets. Let $\lambda_{i,j}$ be the portion of requests for object o_i that are assigned to the recovery set $R_{i,j}, j \in [t_i]$. The service rate region (SRR) $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$ is defined as the set of all request vectors $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ that can be served by a coded storage system with generator matrix \mathbf{G} and service rate $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Alternatively, $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ can be defined as the set of all vectors $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ for which there exist $\lambda_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, i \in [k]$ and $j \in [t_i]$, satisfying the following constraints:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{t_i} \lambda_{i,j} = \lambda_i, \quad \forall i \in [k], \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ l \in R_{i,j}}}^{t_i} \lambda_{i,j} \leq \mu_l, \quad \forall l \in [n] \quad (2)$$

$$\lambda_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad \forall i \in [k], j \in [t_i]. \quad (3)$$

The constraints (1) guarantee that the demands for all objects are satisfied, and constraints (2) ensure that no server receives requests at a rate larger than its service capacity. Such vectors $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ form the service *polytope* in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$. An important property of the service polytope is that it is convex, as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 1. ([16], Lemma 1) *The service rate region $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ is a non-empty, convex, closed, and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$.*

C. Summary of Results

Our main concern is to determine, for a fixed, uniform server capacity $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{1}$ and a coding scheme \mathbf{G} , the $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{1})$ region. This paper provides an early analysis of the Service Rate Region (SRR) of Reed–Muller (RM) codes, in particular the authors establish the following key results:

- **Geometric and Combinatorial Framework:** Leveraging the connection between RM codes and finite geometry presented in section III, we characterize the recovery sets of each data object that are smaller than a fixed size and analyze their overlap (Theorems 4, 5, and 6). These results link recovery sets to the incidence vectors of flats in Euclidean geometries, and formalize their existence, uniqueness, and enumeration for general orders of RM codes. For larger recovery sets, we establish a mapping between each recovery set and the coordinate-constrained enumerators of dual codes (Remark 2), which remains an open problem.

- **Closed-Form Expressions for SRR Boundaries:** Explicit bounds are derived for the maximal achievable demand for any data object in a coded storage system using RM codes, which are shown to be tight. Using the characterized maximal achievable demands, we define the *maximal achievable simplex*, where every point inside is achievable. Additionally, we establish a bound on the sum of maximal rates for data objects associated with message symbols of the same order.

These results bridge theoretical insights with practical design considerations, advancing the understanding of RM codes' utility in optimizing redundancy schemes for scalable and efficient data storage.

III. REED–MULLER CODES PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce Reed-Muller (RM) codes, explore their relationship with Euclidean geometry, and discuss Reed decoding algorithms of message symbols. This will lay the foundation for characterizing message symbol recovery sets in the next section.

A. Reed–Muller Codes

We begin by defining Reed–Muller codes using the notation from [17].

Let $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m \in \mathbb{F}_2$ be m binary variables, and let $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m)$ represent the binary m -tuples (there are 2^m such tuples). Consider a Boolean function $f(\mathbf{v}) = f(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m)$ that outputs 0 or 1. The vector \mathbf{f} of length 2^m is derived from the truth table of f , listing the value of f for each possible input vector \mathbf{v} .

For example, when $m = 3$, the function $f(\mathbf{v}) = v_1 + v_2 + v_3$ (addition in \mathbb{F}_2) is specified by the following truth table:

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc}
 \mathbf{v}_3 : & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
 \mathbf{v}_2 : & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
 \mathbf{v}_1 : & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
 f : & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1
 \end{array}$$

The columns of the truth table are ordered naturally as illustrated above. In the sequel, all sums are understood to be summations within the field under consideration.

Definition 1. *The r -th order binary Reed–Muller code $RM(r, m)$ of length $n = 2^m$, for $0 \leq r \leq m$, consists of all vectors \mathbf{f} where $f(\mathbf{v})$ is a Boolean function that can be expressed as a polynomial of degree at most r .*

To illustrate, consider the first-order RM code $\text{RM}(1, 3)$ of length $2^3 = 8$, which contains 16 codewords of the form:

$$a_0 \mathbf{1} + a_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + a_2 \mathbf{v}_2 + a_3 \mathbf{v}_3, \quad \text{where } a_i \in \mathbb{F}_2,$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{v}_3 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This matrix serves as the *generator matrix* of $\text{RM}(1, 3)$.

Similarly, the generator matrix for $\text{RM}(2, 4)$ is given by:

$$\text{RM}(2, 4) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{v}_4 \\ \mathbf{v}_3 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_3 \mathbf{v}_4 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \mathbf{v}_4 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_4 \\ \mathbf{v}_2 \mathbf{v}_3 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_3 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

in which $\mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_j$ denotes the element-wise product of the row vectors \mathbf{v}_i and \mathbf{v}_j . In general, the Reed–Muller code $\text{RM}(r, m)$ is characterized by the parameters $(n, k, d) = (2^m, \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i}, 2^{m-r})$. Thus, $\text{RM}(r, m)$ is a linear code with length $n = 2^m$, dimension $k = \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i}$, and minimum distance $d = 2^{m-r}$. When $m \geq r + 1$, the dual code of $\text{RM}(r, m)$ is $\text{RM}(m - r - 1, m)$ [17]. Throughout this work, we assume $m \geq r + 1$, ensuring that the dual code $\text{RM}(m - r - 1, m)$ is always defined.

B. Geometric Interpretation

Many properties of Reed–Muller codes are elegantly described using finite geometry. Specifically, we utilize the *Euclidean geometry* $\text{EG}(m, 2)$ of dimension m over \mathbb{F}_2 , which consists of 2^m points, each corresponding to a binary vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m)$. For any subset S of the points in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$, its *incidence vector* $\chi(S)$ is a binary vector of length 2^m with entries:

$$\chi(S)_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P_j \in S, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where P_j denotes the j -th point in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$.

Understanding the geometric structure allows us to relate recovery sets and codewords more intuitively.

Table I
16 POINTS IN EG(4, 2).

P_1	P_2	P_3	P_4	P_5	P_6	P_7	P_8	P_9	P_{10}	P_{11}	P_{12}	P_{13}	P_{14}	P_{15}	P_{16}
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1

A set S serves as a recovery set for an object o_i if and only if it is a minimal set such that

$$\mathbf{G} \cdot \chi(S)^T = \mathbf{e}_i,$$

where \mathbf{G} is the generator matrix of the code, $\chi(S)$ is the incidence vector of S , and \mathbf{e}_i is the standard basis vector corresponding to o_i .

This geometric perspective allows us to view codewords of $\text{RM}(r, m)$ as incidence vectors of specific subsets of $\text{EG}(m, 2)$. For example, in $\text{EG}(4, 2)$, consider the points P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{16} with coordinates ordered as in Table I. The subset $S = \{P_5, P_6, P_7, P_8, P_{13}, P_{14}, P_{15}, P_{16}\}$ has an incidence vector $\chi(S) = 0000111100001111$, which is a codeword of $\text{RM}(2, 4)$. The numbering of points P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{2^m} follows the coordinate ordering shown above. Notably, P_1 has zeros in all coordinates and represents the origin.

In this framework, each vector \mathbf{x} of length 2^m corresponds to a subset of $\text{EG}(m, 2)$, comprising those points P_j for which $x_j = 1$. Here, \mathbf{x} is the incidence vector of the subset. The number of points in the subset is given by the weight $w(\mathbf{x})$ of \mathbf{x} .

This geometric interpretation is particularly advantageous as it allows us to characterize the codewords of Reed-Muller codes through geometric objects, as formalized by the following theorem.

Theorem 1. ([17], Chapter 13, Theorem 8) *The codewords of minimum weight in $\text{RM}(r, m)$ are precisely the incidence vectors of the $(m - r)$ -dimensional flats in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$.*

Theorem 2. ([17], Chapter 13, Theorem 12) *The set of incidence vectors of all $(m - r)$ -dimensional flats in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$ generates the Reed-Muller code $\text{RM}(r, m)$.*

To further explore the interactions between the flats in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$ and their corresponding codewords, we introduce the following lemma, which is instrumental in proving the aforementioned theorems and other results within this paper.

Lemma 2. ([17], Chapter 13) *Let H be any flat in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$ with incidence vector $\chi(H)$. If \mathbf{f} is the*

incidence vector of a set S , then the component-wise product $\chi(H) \cdot \mathbf{f}$ yields the incidence vector of the intersection $S \cap H$.

To illustrate the application of this lemma, consider the following example:

Example 2.1. In $RM(2, 4)$, consider $\chi_1 = 1111111100000000$ as the incidence vector of the 3-dimensional flat $H : v_1 = 0$, and $\chi_2 = 1111000011110000$ as the incidence vector of the flat $S : v_2 = 0$. The component-wise product $\chi_1 \cdot \chi_2 = 1111000000000000$ corresponds to the 2-dimensional flat:

$$H \cap S : \begin{cases} v_1 = 0, \\ v_2 = 0. \end{cases}$$

C. Decoding

Understanding the decoding process is crucial for practical applications of Reed-Muller codes. The **Reed Decoding Algorithm** is a well-known algorithm for decoding Reed-Muller codes. We illustrate its operation by examining the $[16, 11, 4]$ second-order Reed-Muller code $RM(2, 4)$.

The generator matrix of $RM(2, 4)$ has 11 rows, corresponding to the message symbols:

$$a = a_0 a_4 a_3 a_2 a_1 a_{34} a_{24} a_{14} a_{23} a_{13} a_{12},$$

which are encoded into the codeword:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= a \cdot \mathbf{G} = a_0 \mathbf{1} + a_4 \mathbf{v}_4 + \cdots + a_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \\ &+ a_{34} \mathbf{v}_3 \mathbf{v}_4 + \cdots + a_{12} \mathbf{v}_1 \mathbf{v}_2 \\ &= x_1 x_2 \dots x_{16}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

To recover the codeword, we first aim to recover the six symbols $a_{34}, a_{24}, a_{14}, a_{23}, a_{13}, a_{12}$. Observe the following relationships:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_{11} &= [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]^T \\ &= c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4 \\ &= c_5 + c_6 + c_7 + c_8 \\ &= c_9 + c_{10} + c_{11} + c_{12} \\ &= c_{13} + c_{14} + c_{15} + c_{16}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{e}_{11} is the 11-th standard basis vector. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{12} &= a \cdot \mathbf{e}_{11} \\
&= a(c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4) \\
&= a(c_5 + c_6 + c_7 + c_8) \\
&= a(c_9 + c_{10} + c_{11} + c_{12}) \\
&= a(c_{13} + c_{14} + c_{15} + c_{16}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

This implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{12} &= x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 = x_5 + x_6 + x_7 + x_8, \\
&= x_9 + x_{10} + x_{11} + x_{12} = x_{13} + x_{14} + x_{15} + x_{16}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

These four equations provide four ‘‘votes’’ for a_{12} . Thus, even if one error occurs, the majority vote will correctly determine a_1 , enabling accurate recovery. Similarly, the other symbols $a_{13}, a_{14}, a_{23}, a_{24}, a_{34}$ can be recovered using analogous majority voting methods. This approach is known as **majority decoding**.

Once the second-degree symbols are recovered, their contributions are subtracted from the received codeword, leaving a Boolean function of first and zero degrees. The decoding process is then iterated with these lower-degree terms. This sequential nature of the decoding algorithm ensures step-by-step recovery of all message symbols.

In general, for each $l \in [r]$, we define $\sigma^l = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \dots \sigma_l$ as any length- l tuple whose elements are unique and arranged in increasing order, i.e., drawn without replacement from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \dots < \sigma_l$. For instance, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, and 34 are all such length-2 tuples from the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. In particular, when $l = 0$, we denote σ^0 is the specific tuple (0), meaning $a_{\sigma^0} = a_0$. For a given $l \in [r]$, let i be any integer in the range:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \binom{m}{j} + 1 \leq i \leq \sum_{j=0}^l \binom{m}{j}. \tag{7}$$

Then, there exists a length- l tuple σ^l such that:

$$a_{\sigma^l} = a \cdot \mathbf{e}_i.$$

In this equation, the unit vector \mathbf{e}_i is associated with a message symbol of order l . Specifically, \mathbf{e}_i is used to decode the symbol a_{σ^l} . This equation generalizes Eq. (5).

In the sequel, for any $l \in [r]$ and any integer i in the range specified by Eq. (7), we will say that *data object i is associated with a message symbol of order l* . Each data object is uniquely associated with exactly one message symbol, ensuring a one-to-one correspondence.

IV. RECOVERY SETS OF REED-MULLER CODES

Building on the foundation from the previous sections, this section delves into the process of recovering message symbols in Reed–Muller (RM) codes through the use of recovery sets. Specifically, we formalize the relationship between recovery sets and message symbols, explore their properties, and quantify their structure. These results serve as the foundation for deriving key properties of the Service Rate Region (SRR) in the next section.

We now present the first theorem, which formalizes the recovery sets for message symbols of order r , as demonstrated by the majority decoding logic discussed in the previous section.

Theorem 3. (*[17], Chapter 13, Theorem 14*) *Each message symbol a_{σ^r} can be determined by partitioning the 2^m coordinates of the codeword $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{G}$ into 2^{m-r} pairwise disjoint subsets of size 2^r , where the sum of the coordinates within each subset equals a_{σ^r} .*

Having established the fundamental decoding strategy through Theorem 3, we now delve deeper into the structure of recovery sets and their uniqueness properties. The following theorems and corollaries build upon this foundation to elucidate how recovery sets are formed, counted, and uniquely characterized within Reed-Muller codes.

Theorem 4. *For any integer l with $1 \leq l \leq r$, each symbol a_{σ^l} can be recovered by summing a specific subset of 2^l coordinates of the codeword \mathbf{x} . Specifically, there exists a particular set of coordinates $S \subseteq [2^m]$ such that:*

$$\begin{cases} S \ni 1, \\ |S| = 2^l, \\ \sum_{j \in S} x_j = a_{\sigma^l}. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

We refer to S as a recovery set for the symbol a_{σ^l} .

Proof. Consider the code's generator matrix \mathbf{G} . Each row corresponding to $\mathbf{v}_{\sigma_1}, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_l}$ in \mathbf{G} represents the incidence vector of an $(m-1)$ -dimensional flat in the Euclidean geometry $\text{EG}(m, 2)$. Specifically,

for each σ_i (where $1 \leq i \leq l$), the following holds:

$$\mathbf{v}_{\sigma_i}(2^m) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_i}(1) = 0.$$

This implies that all such flats pass through the point P_{2^m} but exclude the origin P_1 .

By Lemma 2, the intersection of any two flats is also a flat. Consequently, the intersection of these $(m-1)$ -dimensional flats forms an $(m-l)$ -dimensional flat L in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$. The incidence vector of L , denoted as $\mathbf{v}_{\sigma_1} \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_2} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_l}$, is constructed as the element-wise product of $\mathbf{v}_{\sigma_1}, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_2}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_l}$.

Define the *complementary* flat T to L with the incidence vector:

$$\mathbf{v}_T = \mathbf{v}_{\tau_1} \mathbf{v}_{\tau_2} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{\tau_{m-l}},$$

where $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{m-l}\} = [m] \setminus \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l\} = \{\sigma_{l+1}, \sigma_{l+2}, \dots, \sigma_m\}$. The flat T intersects L only at the point P_{2^m} .

There are 2^{m-l} translates of T in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$, including T itself. Let:

$$T_1 = \{\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{1}_m, \text{ for all point } \mathbf{y} \in T\}.$$

Here, T_1 is a translation of T that contains the origin P_1 but excludes P_{2^m} . Consequently, T_1 is a $(m-l)$ -dimensional subspace of $\text{EG}(m, 2)$.

Express the codeword \mathbf{x} as:

$$\mathbf{x} = a \cdot \mathbf{G} = \sum_{\rho = \rho_1 \rho_2 \cdots \rho_k} a_\rho \mathbf{v}_{\rho_1} \mathbf{v}_{\rho_2} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{\rho_k},$$

where the sum is over all subsets $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k\}$ of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ with $k \leq r$ (This generalizes Equation (4)).

Therefore, the sum of the coordinates of \mathbf{x} indexed by T_1 is:

$$\sum_{P \in T_1} x_P = \sum_{\rho} a_\rho \sum_{P \in T_1} (\mathbf{v}_{\rho_1} \mathbf{v}_{\rho_2} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{\rho_k})_P \quad (9)$$

$$= \sum_{\rho} a_\rho N(T_1, \rho), \quad (10)$$

where $N(T_1, \rho)$ denotes the number of points in the intersection of T_1 with the flat W defined by the incidence vector $\mathbf{v}_{\rho_1} \mathbf{v}_{\rho_2} \cdots \mathbf{v}_{\rho_k}$.

Key Observations:

- 1) Parity of Intersections: All flats of dimension at least one contain an even number of points.
- 2) Intersection Dimension: By Lemma 2, the intersection $T_1 \cap W$ is a flat whose dimension depends on k relative to l .

Case Analysis:

- When $k < l$: The intersection $T_1 \cap W$ has dimension at least one, so $N(T_1, \rho)$ is even.
- When $k = l$ but $W \neq L$: At least one ρ_i matches a τ_j , causing the intersection $T_1 \cap W$ to have dimension at least one, making $N(T_1, \rho)$ even.
- When $W = L$: The intersection $T_1 \cap W$ consists solely of one point, so $N(T_1, \rho) = 1$.
- When $l < k \leq r$, then $N(T_1, \rho) = 0$ because the intersection conditions become impossible.

Supporting Lemmas:

Lemma 3. *If $W = L$, then $N(T_1, \rho) = 1$.*

Proof. When $W = L$, the incidence vector of W is $\mathbf{v}_{\sigma_1} \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_2} \dots \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_l}$. Since T_1 is defined as a translation of T by the all-ones vector $\mathbf{1}_m$, its incidence vector \mathbf{v}_{T_1} is obtained by taking the component-wise complement of the incidence vectors of the defining indices of T . Specifically:

$$\mathbf{v}_{T_1} = \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_1} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_2} \dots \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_{m-l}},$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_i}$ represents the bitwise complement of \mathbf{v}_{τ_i} .

Incidence vector of $T_1 \cap W$ by Lemma 2 is:

$$\mathbf{v}_{\sigma_1} \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_2} \dots \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_l} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_1} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_2} \dots \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_{m-l}}.$$

A point P_j lies in this intersection if and only if:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_1}(j) = \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_2}(j) = \dots = \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_l}(j) = 1, \\ \mathbf{v}_{\tau_1}(j) = \mathbf{v}_{\tau_2}(j) = \dots = \mathbf{v}_{\tau_{m-l}}(j) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{m-l}\} = [m] \setminus \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l\}$ and the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m$ form the set of all length- m binary vectors in \mathbb{F}_2^m , there exists exactly one such point P_j . \square

Lemma 4. *If $l < k \leq r$, then $N(T_1, \rho) = 0$.*

Proof. The incidence vector of $T_1 \cap W$ is:

$$\mathbf{v}_{T_1 \cap W} = \mathbf{v}_{T_1} \cdot \mathbf{v}_W = \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_1} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_2} \dots \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_{m-l}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\rho_1} \mathbf{v}_{\rho_2} \dots \mathbf{v}_{\rho_k}.$$

Since $k > l$, at least one ρ_i must coincide with a τ_j . Without loss of generality, assume $\rho_1 = \tau_1$. Then, for any point P_h in $T_1 \cap W$:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_{\rho_1}(h) = 1, \\ \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_1}(h) = 1. \end{cases}$$

This leads to a contradiction because $\mathbf{v}_{\rho_1}(h) = 1$ implies $\mathbf{v}_{\tau_1}(h) = 1$, which contradicts $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\tau_1}(h) = 1$. Therefore, no such points exist, and $N(T_1, \rho) = 0$. \square

From Equation (10), all terms $a_\rho N(T_1, \rho)$ vanish except when $\rho = \sigma^l$. In this case, $N(T_1, \sigma^l) = 1$, yielding:

$$\sum_{P \in T_1} x_P = a_{\sigma^l}.$$

Additionally, since T_1 contains the origin, it is an l -dimensional subspace and $|T_1| = 2^l$.

Thus, if we denote as S the coordinate positions of the points in set T_1 , constraints in (8) are satisfied, concluding our proof. \square

Having established the existence of recovery sets for each symbol a_{σ^l} , it is imperative to understand the uniqueness and minimality of these sets. The following theorem addresses these aspects, ensuring that recovery sets of smaller sizes are uniquely determined, while larger recovery sets exhibit specific cardinality constraints.

Theorem 5. *If $l < r$, then S is the **only** recovery set for the symbol a_{σ^l} with a cardinality (size) less than 2^r . Any other recovery set for a_{σ^l} must have a size of at least $2^{r+1} - |S| = 2^{r+1} - 2^l > 2^r$. Furthermore, when $l = r$, the set S has a size of 2^r , which is equal to the size of all other recovery sets for a_{σ^r} .*

This theorem generalizes Theorem 3, which is included as a special case when $l = r$.

Proof. Let S' be any recovery set for a_{σ^l} different from S . By definition of recovery sets, we have:

$$\sum_{j \in S} x_j = a_{\sigma^l} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in S'} x_j = a_{\sigma^l}.$$

Adding these two equations, we obtain:

$$\sum_{j \in S} x_j + \sum_{j \in S'} x_j = a_{\sigma^l} + a_{\sigma^l} = 0. \tag{11}$$

Define the set S_1 as the symmetric difference of S and S' :

$$S_1 = (S \cup S') \setminus (S \cap S').$$

Equation (11) then implies:

$$\sum_{j \in S_1} x_j = 0, \text{ for all codewords } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}.$$

This can be expressed in matrix form as:

$$\mathbf{G} \cdot \chi(S_1)^T = \mathbf{0}_k,$$

where $\chi(S_1)$ is the incidence vector of S_1 , and $\mathbf{0}_k$ is the zero vector of length k . Therefore, $\chi(S_1)$ belongs to the dual code \mathcal{C}^\perp of $\mathcal{C} = \text{RM}(r, m)$.

The dual of the Reed–Muller code $\text{RM}(r, m)$ is $\text{RM}(m - r - 1, m)$ when $r \geq m + 1$, which has a minimum distance of 2^{r+1} [17], and is the single codeword $\mathbf{0}_n$ when $r = m$. This implies that any non-zero codeword in \mathcal{C}^\perp must have a weight (number of non-zero coordinates) of at least 2^{r+1} . Hence:

$$w(\chi(S_1)) \geq 2^{r+1}.$$

Consequently, the size of S_1 satisfies:

$$|S_1| \geq 2^{r+1}.$$

Since $S_1 = S \cup S' \setminus S \cap S'$, we have:

$$|S'| = |S_1| - |S| + 2|S \cap S'| \geq |S_1| - |S| \geq 2^{r+1} - |S|.$$

Given that $|S| = 2^l$ from Theorem 4, it follows:

$$|S'| \geq 2^{r+1} - 2^l > 2^r,$$

whenever $l < r$. Moreover, any recovery set S' of size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$ must be disjoint with S , as otherwise if $|S \cap S'| > 0$ then $|S_1| = |S| + |S'| - 2|S \cap S'| < 2^{r+1}$, contradiction.

Special Case When $l = r$:

If $l = r$, substituting into the inequality gives:

$$|S'| \geq 2^{r+1} - 2^r = 2^r.$$

Therefore, when $l = r$, the recovery set S has a size of 2^r , which is the minimum possible size for any recovery set of a_{σ^r} . Moreover, other recovery sets also attain this minimum size, as established in Theorem 3. \square

With the existence and uniqueness of recovery sets established, it is now essential to quantify the number of such recovery sets and understand their distribution across different coordinates. The following theorem

accomplishes this by leveraging the Gaussian binomial coefficient to count recovery sets of specific size and determine their frequency of inclusion for individual coordinates.

Theorem 6. *For each symbol a_{σ^l} , the number of recovery sets of size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$ is given by the Gaussian binomial coefficient $\binom{m-l}{r+1-l}_2$. Furthermore, each coordinate x_j with $j \notin S$ is included in exactly $\binom{m-l-1}{r-l}_2$ of these recovery sets.*

Proof. We utilize the same notations established in the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5. Let \mathbf{e}_i denote the standard basis vector such that $a_{\sigma^l} = a \cdot \mathbf{e}_i$. This implies:

$$\mathbf{G} \cdot \chi(S)^T = \mathbf{e}_i.$$

From Theorem 4, the incidence vector $\chi(S)$ corresponds to an l -dimensional subspace T_1 in the Euclidean geometry $\text{EG}(m, 2)$.

Now, consider a recovery set S' for a_{σ^l} with size $|S'| = 2^{r+1} - 2^l$. Our goal is to establish a one-to-one correspondence between each such recovery set S' and a $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspace F that contains T_1 .

Step 1: Establishing the Correspondence

From the proof of Theorem 5, we know that S' must be disjoint from S . Define as $S_1 = S \cup S'$ the union of S and S' . The size of S_1 is:

$$|S_1| = |S| + |S'| = 2^l + (2^{r+1} - 2^l) = 2^{r+1}.$$

The incidence vector $\chi(S_1)$ is a codeword in the dual code \mathcal{C}^\perp of $\text{RM}(r, m)$, which is $\text{RM}(m-r-1, m)$. Since the weight of $\chi(S_1)$ is:

$$w(\chi(S_1)) = 2^{r+1},$$

it follows that $\chi(S_1)$ is a minimum-weight codeword in \mathcal{C}^\perp . By Theorem 1, $\chi(S_1)$ corresponds to an $(r+1)$ -dimensional flat F in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$.

Step 2: F is an $(r+1)$ -dimensional Subspace

Since $1 \in S \subset S_1$, it follows that $P_1 \in T_1 \subset F$ where P_1 is the origin. Therefore, F is an $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspace that contains the l -dimensional subspace T_1 .

Step 3: Establishing the Bijection

Conversely, assume F is an $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspace of $\text{EG}(m, 2)$ that contains T_1 and let $\chi(F)$ be its incidence vector. Theorem 1 implies that $\chi(F)$ is a minimum-weight codeword in \mathcal{C}^\perp , which means

that:

$$\mathbf{G} \cdot \chi(F)^T = \mathbf{0}_k.$$

Define:

$$C = F \setminus T_1,$$

and let $\chi(C)$ be its incidence vector. Then, the weight of $\chi(C)$ is:

$$w(\chi(C)) = w(\chi(F)) - w(\chi(S)) = 2^{r+1} - 2^l,$$

and:

$$\mathbf{G} \cdot \chi(C)^T = \mathbf{G} \cdot \chi(F)^T - \mathbf{G} \cdot \chi(S)^T = \mathbf{0}_k - \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{e}_i.$$

This shows that C is a recovery set for a_{σ^l} of size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$.

Therefore, there exists a bijective correspondence between recovery sets S' of size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$ and $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspaces F containing T_1 in $\text{EG}(m, 2)$.

Step 4: Counting the Recovery Sets

The number of such $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspaces F that contain the l -dimensional subspace T_1 is given by the Gaussian binomial coefficient:

$$\binom{m-l}{r+1-l}_2.$$

This coefficient counts the number of ways to choose an $(r+1-l)$ -dimensional extension of T_1 within the remaining $m-l$ dimensions [18].

Step 5: Inclusion of Coordinates Outside S

To demonstrate that each coordinate x_j with $j \notin S$ is included in exactly $\binom{m-l-1}{r-l}_2$ of these recovery sets, observe that P_j is not an element of T_1 . This implies that adding P_j to T_1 increases the dimension of the subspace by one:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(T_1 \cup \{P_j\}) &= \dim(T_1) + \dim(\text{span}(\{P_j\})) \\ &\quad - \dim(T_1 \cap \text{span}(\{P_j\})). \end{aligned}$$

Since $P_j \notin T_1$, the intersection $T_1 \cap \text{span}(\{P_j\})$ is trivial (i.e., has dimension 0), and $\text{span}(\{P_j\})$ is a 1-dimensional subspace ($P_j \notin T_1$ therefore P_j must be different from the origin P_1). Therefore:

$$\dim(T_1 \cup \{P_j\}) = l + 1.$$

This means that any $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspace F containing both T_1 and P_j must extend T_1 by one additional dimension. The number of such $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspaces F is determined by selecting an $(r-l)$ -dimensional subspace from the remaining $m-l-1$ dimensions (excluding the dimension added by P_j). The number of ways to do this is given by the Gaussian binomial coefficient:

$$\binom{m-l-1}{r-l}_2.$$

Therefore, each coordinate x_j not in S is included in exactly $\binom{m-l-1}{r-l}_2$ recovery sets of size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$.

Combining these observations, we conclude that: Number of recovery sets of size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$ for a_{σ^l} is $\binom{m-l}{r+1-l}_2$, and each coordinate x_j not in S is present in exactly $\binom{m-l-1}{r-l}_2$ such recovery sets. \square

Building on the results about recovery sets of message symbols from Theorems 4, 5, and 6, we now present an equivalent result about recovery sets of unit vectors associated with these message symbols. This result formulation will facilitate the articulation and proof of the results on the SRR of RM codes in the next section.

Remark 1. For each $l \in [r]$, let i be any integer satisfying:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{l-1} \binom{m}{j} + 1 \leq i \leq \sum_{j=0}^l \binom{m}{j}.$$

In other words, i is the object index associated with a message symbol of order l . Then, for each standard basis vector \mathbf{e}_i , there exists a coordinate subset $S \subseteq [2^m]$ of size 2^l such that:

$$\begin{cases} S \ni 1, \\ |S| = 2^l, \\ \sum_{j \in S} c_j = \mathbf{e}_i. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, the recovery set S satisfies the following uniqueness properties:

- **When $l < r$:** S is the **only** recovery set for \mathbf{e}_i with cardinality less than 2^r . Any other recovery set for \mathbf{e}_i must have a size of at least $2^{r+1} - |S| = 2^{r+1} - 2^l > 2^r$. The number of recovery sets of size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$ is $\binom{m-l}{r+1-l}_2$, and each column $c_j, j \in [2^m] \setminus S$, appears in exactly $\binom{m-l-1}{r-l}_2$ of these recovery sets.
- **When $l = r$:** The set S has a size of 2^r , which is equal to the size of all other recovery sets for \mathbf{e}_i . There are 2^{m-r} such recovery sets, and they are pairwise disjoint.

Connecting to Dual Codewords: Theorem 6 not only quantifies the number of recovery sets of size

$2^{r+1} - 2^l$ for each message symbol but also elucidates the relationship between these recovery sets and the minimum-weight codewords in the dual Reed-Muller code. We conclude this section with a comprehensive example illustrating the identification and enumeration of recovery sets within a specific Reed-Muller code. This is followed by a remark establishing a connection between the set of coordinate-constrained codewords in the dual code and all recovery sets, highlighting the existence of an injection map from the former to the latter. Finally, Corollary 1 demonstrates how these established results can be used to count the number of codewords in RM codes under specific constraints.

Example 6.1. *Consider the Reed-Muller code $RM(2, 4)$. This example aims to identify all recovery sets for the symbol a_1 .*

First, observe that the vector:

$$\mathbf{v}_T = \mathbf{v}_4 \mathbf{v}_3 \mathbf{v}_2 = 0000000000000011,$$

represents the incidence vector of a flat T consisting of the points P_{15} and P_{16} . Define the subspace $T_1 = \{P_{15} + \mathbf{1}_4, P_{16} + \mathbf{1}_4\} = \{P_1, P_2\}$, which is a 1-dimensional subspace with the incidence vector $\overline{\mathbf{v}}_4 \overline{\mathbf{v}}_3 \overline{\mathbf{v}}_2$.

Therefore, the symbol a_1 is given by:

$$a_1 = a \cdot \mathbf{e}_5 = x_1 + x_2,$$

indicating that $S = \{1, 2\}$ is a recovery set for a_1 with size 2.

Additionally, a_1 can be expressed in multiple ways as a sum of other coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= x_1 + x_2 \\ &= x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_7 + x_8 \\ &= x_3 + x_4 + x_9 + x_{10} + x_{11} + x_{12}, \\ &= x_5 + x_6 + x_9 + x_{10} + x_{13} + x_{14} \\ &= x_5 + x_6 + x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{15} + x_{16}, \\ &= x_3 + x_4 + x_{13} + x_{14} + x_{15} + x_{16} \\ &= x_7 + x_8 + x_9 + x_{10} + x_{15} + x_{16}, \\ &= x_7 + x_8 + x_{11} + x_{12} + x_{13} + x_{14}. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, the standard basis vector \mathbf{e}_5 can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{e}_5 &= [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]^T \\
&= c_1 + c_2 \\
&= c_3 + c_4 + c_5 + c_6 + c_7 + c_8 \\
&= c_3 + c_4 + c_9 + c_{10} + c_{11} + c_{12} \\
&= c_5 + c_6 + c_9 + c_{10} + c_{13} + c_{14} \\
&= c_5 + c_6 + c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{15} + c_{16} \\
&= c_3 + c_4 + c_{13} + c_{14} + c_{15} + c_{16} \\
&= c_7 + c_8 + c_9 + c_{10} + c_{15} + c_{16} \\
&= c_7 + c_8 + c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{13} + c_{14}.
\end{aligned}$$

In this scenario, $l = 1$ and $S = \{1, 2\}$. According to Theorem 6, the number of minimum-weight codewords \mathbf{x} in the dual code $RM(2, 4)^\perp = RM(1, 4)$ that include $S = \{1, 2\}$ in their support is:

$$\binom{4-1}{2+1-1}_2 = \binom{3}{2}_2 = 7.$$

These codewords have the following supports:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}^1) &= \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}; \\
\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}^2) &= \{1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12\}, \\
\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}^3) &= \{1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14\}; \\
\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}^4) &= \{1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 16\}, \\
\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}^5) &= \{1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, 16\}; \\
\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}^6) &= \{1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16\}, \\
\text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}^7) &= \{1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notably, for each $j \in \{3, 4, \dots, 16\}$, the coordinate j appears in exactly:

$$\binom{4-1-1}{2-1}_2 = \binom{2}{1}_2 = 3$$

of these codewords. Figure 2 illustrates how the recovery sets for \mathbf{e}_5 and \mathbf{e}_{11} are formed by the columns c_j .




Figure 1. Connection between specifying Σ, Ω with the related weight enumerator problem, and their relative difficulty.

Remark 2. (Connection to the coordinate-constrained enumerator problem.) When $l < r$, Theorems 4 and 6 imply that each message symbol a_{σ^l} has:

$$\begin{cases} 1 \text{ recovery set } S \text{ of size } 2^l, \\ \binom{m-l}{r+1-l}_2 \text{ other recovery sets, each of size } 2^{r+1} - 2^l. \end{cases}$$

Those are also the smallest recovery sets for a_{σ^l} . A natural question is how to specify all other recovery sets for a_{σ^l} or at least count the number of them. We now show that it is a hard problem.

Let Σ be the collection of all recovery sets for a_{σ^l} , and define $\Omega \subseteq \Sigma$ to be those that are disjoint from S ; i.e. for every $R \in \Omega$, we have $S \cap R = \emptyset$.

Following the argument in **Step 3** of the proof of Theorem 6, we establish a one-to-one correspondence between each recovery set $R \in \Omega$ and a codeword \mathbf{x} satisfying

$$\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}^\perp = \text{RM}(m - r - 1, m), \quad \text{and} \quad S \subseteq \text{Supp}(\mathbf{x}).$$

For instance, in Example 6.1, the smallest recovery set for a_1 in $\text{RM}(2, 4)$ is $S = \{1, 2\}$. Determining all recovery sets for a_1 is then equivalent to identifying all codewords $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}^\perp = \text{RM}(1, 4)$ whose support contains $\{1, 2\}$.

In a broad sense, finding all codewords of a Reed-Muller code that have specified coordinates being one is intimately related to the coordinate-constrained enumerator. It remains an open challenge for higher-order RM codes. We leave it to further works to explore this little-known connection. Fig. 1 illustrates the connection between enumerating all recovery sets and the related enumerator problem and their relative difficulty.

Corollary 1. We present an interesting result about the codewords of Reed-Muller (RM) codes derived from the theorems above.

From the proof of Theorem 4, we observe that the set of points $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{2^l}\}$ forms an l -dimensional




Figure 2. Recovery sets for \mathbf{e}_5 and \mathbf{e}_{11} in $\text{RM}(2, 4)$, with edges connecting each column c_j to the sets it belongs to. The sets S include c_1 and are the smallest recovery sets among all recovery sets for the same unit vector \mathbf{e}_j .

hyperplane, whose incidence vector is $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_m \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{m-1} \dots \bar{\mathbf{v}}_{m-l+1}$. Consequently, the set of indices corresponding to these points, $S = \{1, 2, \dots, 2^l\} = [2^l]$, serves as a recovery set of size 2^l for the message symbol $a_{12\dots l}$.

By Theorem 6, the number of minimum-weight dual codewords that include S in their support is equal to the number of $(r+1)$ -dimensional subspaces that contain the l -dimensional subspace T_1 associated with S . The Gaussian binomial coefficient $\binom{m-l}{r+1-l}_2$ precisely counts these subspaces. Therefore, the number of minimum-weight codewords \mathbf{x} in the dual Reed-Muller code $\text{RM}(r, m)^\perp = \text{RM}(m-r-1, m)$ that include the first 2^l coordinates in their support is given by $\binom{m-l}{r+1-l}_2$.

Equivalently, for each $l \in [r]$, the number of minimum-weight codewords \mathbf{x} in the Reed-Muller code $\text{RM}(r, m)$ that include the first 2^l coordinates in their support, $\{1, 2, \dots, 2^l\} \subseteq \text{Supp}(\mathbf{x})$, is given by the Gaussian binomial coefficient $\binom{m-l}{m-r-l}_2$.

V. SERVICE RATE OF REED-MULLER CODES

In this section, we leverage the results established in previous sections to analyze the SRR of Reed-Muller (RM) codes in distributed storage systems. Specifically, we derive explicit bounds on the maximal achievable demand for individual data objects. These results are grounded in the properties of recovery sets and their connections to the dual code. Additionally, we define the maximal achievable simplex, in which all request rates are achievable, and establish bounds on aggregate rates for data objects associated with message symbols of the same order. These findings have direct implications for the design of efficient and scalable distributed storage systems.

For each $j \in [k] = \left\{1, 2, \dots, \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i}\right\}$, we define

$$\lambda_j^{\max} = \max\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \mid \lambda \cdot \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{1})\}.$$

Geometrically, λ_j^{\max} represents the intercept of the service polytope with the axis defined by \mathbf{e}_j . Practically, λ_j^{\max} quantifies the maximal demand λ_j that our system can support. We therefore call it the maximum achievable demand for λ_j .

Define the simplex \mathcal{A} as:

$$\mathcal{A} = \text{conv}\left(\{\mathbf{0}_k, \lambda_1^{\max} \mathbf{e}_1, \lambda_2^{\max} \mathbf{e}_2, \dots, \lambda_k^{\max} \mathbf{e}_k\}\right),$$

where $\text{conv}(\mathcal{A})$ denotes the convex hull of the set \mathcal{A} , defined as $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_p\} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. Specifically, $\text{conv}(\mathcal{A})$ consists of all convex combinations of the elements in \mathcal{A} , i.e., all vectors of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \gamma_i \mathbf{v}_i, \quad \text{where } \gamma_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^p \gamma_i = 1,$$

as described in detail in [19]. From Lemma 1, we know that the service polytopes are convex. Consequently, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{1})$. This implies that all points within the simplex \mathcal{A} are achievable, and we refer to it as the *Maximal achievable simplex*. Therefore, characterizing these extreme points is of significant interest. The following theorem helps us to achieve this.

Theorem 7. *For each $j \in [k]$, let p be the largest integer such that*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \binom{m}{i} < j,$$

or equivalently,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \binom{m}{i} + 1 \leq j \leq \sum_{i=0}^p \binom{m}{i}.$$

In other words, object j is associated with a message symbol of order p . Then, the maximum achievable demand for \mathbf{e}_j is

$$\lambda_j^{\max} = 1 + \frac{\binom{m-p}{r-p+1}_2}{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2} = 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^p}{2^{r+1} - 2^p}.$$

Proof. We will establish the theorem by first proving an upper bound on λ_j^{\max} and then demonstrating that this bound is attainable.

1) Upper Bound (Converse)

The system comprises $n = 2^m$ nodes. From Remark 1, the standard basis vector \mathbf{e}_j has one recovery set S of size 2^p , and all other recovery sets for \mathbf{e}_j must have a size of at least $2^{r+1} - 2^p$. Therefore, the maximum number of recovery sets λ_j^{\max} for \mathbf{e}_j is bounded by:

$$\lambda_j^{\max} \leq 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^p}{2^{r+1} - 2^p}.$$

2) Achievability

To show that the upper bound is achievable, we construct an allocation of demands that reaches this bound.

Let $R_{j,1}$ be the unique recovery set of size 2^p for e_j . Denote by $t = \binom{m-p}{r-p+1}_2$ the number of additional recovery sets of size $2^{r+1} - 2^p$, which we label as $R_{j,2}, R_{j,3}, \dots, R_{j,t+1}$. Note that none of them overlap with $R_{j,1}$.

We assign the demands as follows:

$$\lambda_{j,1} = 1, \quad \lambda_{j,k} = \frac{1}{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2} \quad \text{for } k = 2, 3, \dots, t+1.$$

This assignment ensures that each recovery set of size $2^{r+1} - 2^p$ receives a demand of $\frac{1}{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2}$. According to Remark 1, each node $x_h \notin S$ is contained in exactly $\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2$ recovery sets. Therefore, the total demand assigned to any such node is:

$$\sum_{\substack{k=2, \\ \text{node } h \text{ in set } R_{j,k}}}^{t+1} \lambda_{j,k} = \frac{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2}{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2} = 1.$$

Thus we do not use more than 100% of any node. Moreover, the total demand serviced by this allocation is:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j &= \lambda_{j,1} + \sum_{k=2}^{t+1} \lambda_{j,k} \\ &= 1 + \frac{t}{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2} = 1 + \frac{\binom{m-p}{r-p+1}_2}{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{m-p}{r-p+1}_2}{\binom{m-p-1}{r-p}_2} &= \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{r-p} \frac{1 - 2^{m-p-i}}{1 - 2^{i+1}}}{\prod_{i=0}^{r-p-1} \frac{1 - 2^{m-p-1-i}}{1 - 2^{i+1}}} \\ &= \frac{2^m - 2^p}{2^{r+1} - 2^p}, \end{aligned}$$

thus we match the upper bound established earlier, thereby proving that it is indeed achievable. \square

Remark 3. For fixed values of r and $m \geq r+1$, observe that $f(p) := \frac{2^m - 2^p}{2^{r+1} - 2^p}$ is an increasing function




Figure 3. The service region of first-order RM(1, 2) is given by $\sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \leq 2$. It can also be defined by the vertices $\lambda_1^{\max} = (2, 0, 0)$, $\lambda_2^{\max} = (0, 2, 0)$, $\lambda_3^{\max} = (0, 0, 2)$, together with the origin [16]. In this case the service region of RM(1, 2) coincides with its maximal achievable simplex.

and $f(0) = \frac{2^m - 1}{2^{r+1} - 1} \geq 2^{m-r-1}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + 2^{m-r-1} &\leq \lambda_1^{\max} \leq \lambda_2^{\max} = \lambda_3^{\max} = \dots = \lambda_{m+1}^{\max} \\ &\leq \lambda_{m+2}^{\max} = \dots \leq \lambda_k^{\max} = 2^{m-r} = d_{RM(r,m)}. \end{aligned}$$

The last two equalities confirm that the bound in [16] (precisely in Corollary 2) is achieved by RM(r , m), which showed that the maximal achievable demand for each data object is upper bounded by the minimum distance of the code being used in the system.

Moreover, we observe that objects associated with symbols of higher order have larger maximal achievable demand, meaning they can be supported with higher demand. This implies that these objects exhibit higher availability, offering potential insights for system design and resource allocation strategies.

For each $l \in [r]$, define

$$p(l) = \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{m}{i} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad q(l) = \sum_{i=0}^l \binom{m}{i}.$$

Then, $[p(l), q(l)]$ is the range of indices of objects that are associated with message symbols of the same order l . We have the following bound that holds for the sum of demands λ_j of such objects.

Theorem 8. *In an RM(r , m)-coded storage system, the total request rate for all objects associated with message symbols of the same order l , for each $l \in [r]$, is upper bounded by:*

$$\sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_j \leq 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^l}{2^{r+1} - 2^l}.$$

Moreover, this bound is tight, meaning that there exists an allocation of demands $\{\lambda_j\}$ for which equality

is achieved.

Proof. We will establish Theorem 8 by first proving an upper bound (converse) on $\sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_j$ and then demonstrating that this bound is achievable.

1) Upper Bound (Converse)

Consider a system with $n = 2^m$ nodes. For each j such that $p(l) \leq j \leq q(l)$, the standard basis vector \mathbf{e}_j has:

- One unique recovery set S of size 2^l .
- Additional recovery sets, each of size at least $2^{r+1} - 2^l$.

From Remark 1, all recovery sets of size 2^l for different j share the first node (corresponding to column c_1). Let $\lambda_{j,1}$ denote the demand allocated to the recovery set S of size 2^l for \mathbf{e}_j .

Since all these recovery sets share the first node, the total demand allocated to this node cannot exceed 1 (i.e., 100% utilization). Therefore, we have:

$$\sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_{j,1} \leq 1. \quad (12)$$

Let B represent the total remaining demand for all \mathbf{e}_j :

$$B = \sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j,1}).$$

These remaining demands must be served by recovery sets of size at least $2^{r+1} - 2^l \geq 2^l$. To minimize the total capacity used, we need all such recovery sets have exactly size $2^{r+1} - 2^l$, and maximize the amount of demand served by recovery sets of size 2^l , i.e., Eq. (12) to hold. Therefore:

$$B \times (2^{r+1} - 2^l) \leq 2^m - \left(\sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_{j,1} \right) \cdot 2^l = 2^m - 2^l.$$

Solving for B :

$$B \leq \frac{2^m - 2^l}{2^{r+1} - 2^l}.$$

Combining the bounds on $\lambda_{j,1}$ and B , we obtain:

$$\sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_j = \sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_{j,1} + B \leq 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^l}{2^{r+1} - 2^l}.$$

Thus, the upper bound is established:

$$\sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_j \leq 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^l}{2^{r+1} - 2^l}.$$

2) Achievability

To demonstrate that the upper bound is achievable, we construct an allocation of demands that attain this bound.

For each j in the range $p(l) \leq j \leq q(l)$, set:

$$\lambda_j = 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^l}{2^{r+1} - 2^l}.$$

Specifically, we define the demand vector λ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_j, \dots, \lambda_k) \\ &= \left(0, \dots, 0, 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^l}{2^{r+1} - 2^l}, 0, \dots, 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This allocation vector λ lies within the service region $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{1})$, as shown in Theorem 7.

For this particular allocation, the total sum of demands is:

$$\sum_{j=p(l)}^{q(l)} \lambda_j = 1 + \frac{2^m - 2^l}{2^{r+1} - 2^l},$$

which matches the upper bound established earlier.

Similarly, for other values of j in the range $[p(l), q(l)]$, we can construct analogous allocations where only one λ_j is set to its maximum value while the others remain zero.

By the convexity of the service region $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{1})$, as established in Lemma 1, any linear combination of these allocation points also lies within $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{1})$. Therefore, the upper bound is achievable. □

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a detailed analysis of the Service Rate Region (SRR) of Reed-Muller (RM) codes, highlighting their utility in distributed storage systems. By leveraging finite geometry, we construct small-size recovery sets for data objects encoded in these systems. These recovery sets allow us to establish tight bounds on maximal demand vectors and demonstrate how these bounds can be achieved. These insights pave the way for optimizing redundancy schemes and enhancing the efficiency of data storage and retrieval in scalable distributed systems. Future research directions include further exploring the combinatorial

structure of RM codes through geometric approaches to comprehensively characterize their SRRs or extending this analysis to the SRRs of other code families.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was carried out in part when the second and third authors were visiting the Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru. The authors would like to thank the colleagues in IISc for their hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. S. Aktas, G. Joshi, S. Kadhe, F. Kazemi, and E. Soljanin, "Service rate region: A new aspect of coded distributed system design," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 12, pp. 7940–7963, 2021.
- [2] F. Kazemi, E. Karimi, E. Soljanin, and A. Sprintson, "A combinatorial view of the service rates of codes problem, its equivalence to fractional matching and its connection with batch codes," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2020, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 21-26, 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 646–651.
- [3] Z. Shen, Y. Cai, K. Cheng, P. P. C. Lee, X. Li, Y. Hu, and J. Shu, "A survey of the past, present, and future of erasure coding for storage systems," *ACM Trans. Storage*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2025.
- [4] A. G. Dimakis, K. Ramchandran, Y. Wu, and C. Suh, "A survey on network codes for distributed storage," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 99(3), pp. 476–489, 2011.
- [5] G. N. Alfarano, A. B. Kilic, A. Ravagnani, and E. Soljanin, "The service rate region polytope," *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 553–582, 2024.
- [6] A. B. Kilic, A. Ravagnani, and E. Soljanin, "On the parameters of codes for data access," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2024, Athens, Greece, July 7-12, 2024*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 819–824.
- [7] D. E. Muller, "Application of boolean algebra to switching circuit design and to error detection," *Transactions of the IRE professional group on electronic computers*, no. 3, pp. 6–12, 1954.
- [8] I. Reed, "A class of multiple-error-correcting codes and the decoding scheme," *Transactions of the IRE Professional Group on Information Theory*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 38–49, 1954.
- [9] S. Kudekar, S. Kumar, M. Mondelli, H. D. Pfister, E. Şaşıoğlu, and R. L. Urbanke, "Reed–muller codes achieve capacity on erasure channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 4298–4316, 2017.
- [10] G. Reeves and H. D. Pfister, "Reed–Muller codes on BMS channels achieve vanishing bit-error probability for all rates below capacity," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, pp. 1–1, 2023.
- [11] E. Abbe and C. Sandon, "A proof that Reed-Muller codes achieve Shannon capacity on symmetric channels," in *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2023, pp. 177–193.
- [12] E. Abbe, A. Shpilka, and M. Ye, "Reed-Muller codes: Theory and algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 3251–3277, 2021.
- [13] "Final report of 3gpp tsg ran wg1 #87 v1.0.0." [Online]. Available: <http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsgan/WG1RL1/TSGR187/Report/>
- [14] R. Calderbank, S. Howard, and S. Jafarpour, "Construction of a large class of deterministic sensing matrices that satisfy a statistical isometry property," *IEEE journal of selected topics in signal processing*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 358–374, 2010.
- [15] A. Beimel, Y. Ishai, and E. Kushilevitz, "General constructions for information-theoretic private information retrieval," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 213–247, 2005.

- [16] F. Kazemi, S. Kurz, and E. Soljanin, "A geometric view of the service rates of codes problem and its application to the service rate of the first order reed-muller codes," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2020, Los Angeles, CA, USA, June 21-26, 2020*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 66–71.
- [17] M. F. J. and S. N. J. A., *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1977.
- [18] M. Greferath, M. O. Pavcevic, N. Silberstein, and M. A. Vazquez-Castro, *Network Coding and Subspace Designs*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2018.
- [19] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1970.