### 16.1 Efficient List Decoding for Reed-Solomon Codes

Recall, that a code $C \subseteq \Sigma^{n}$ is $(\rho, L)$-list decodable if $\forall v \in \Sigma^{n},\left|\operatorname{Ball}\left(v, \rho_{n}\right) \cap C\right| \leq L$. Also recall the Johnson Bound, which states that if code $C$ has relative min distance $1-\epsilon$, then it has list decoding radius $1-\sqrt{\epsilon}-o(1)$. Thus the Reed-Solomon (RS) $[n, k, d=n-(k-1)]$ code has list-decoding radius at least $1-\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}}$.

We will see a simpler version of Sudan's list decoding algorithm for RS codes that works till a relative radius of $1-\frac{2 k}{\sqrt{n}}$.
Recall that Poly ${ }_{\leq m}$ denotes the set of polynomials of degree less than or equal to $m$. The list decoding problem can be framed as follows: given $f: \mathbb{F}_{q} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q}$, find all $p \in \operatorname{Pol} y_{\leq k-1}$ such that $\operatorname{Pr} r_{x \sim \mathbb{F}_{q}}[f(x)=$ $p(x)] \geq \gamma$, where $\gamma \geq 2 k / \sqrt{n}$.

On a high level, the algorithm generalizes the Welch-Berlekamp algorithm.
We use the following algorithm:
Step $a$ : Find a nonzero bivariate polynomial $Q(x, y)$ over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ satisfying the following properties:

- $\operatorname{deg}_{x}(Q) \leq \sqrt{n}\left(\operatorname{deg}_{x}(Q)\right.$ is the degree of $Q$ with respect to $x$ (i.e. the degree of $Q$ as a univariate polynomial with $y$ held constant).
- $\operatorname{deg}_{y}(Q) \leq \sqrt{n}$
- $\forall x \in \mathbb{F}_{q}, Q(x, f(x))=0$.

Step $b$ : Find all factors of $Q(x, y)$ of the form $y-p(x)$. For each such factor, check if $p(x) \in p o l y_{\leq k-1}$ and $\operatorname{Pr}[f(x)=p(x)] \geq \gamma$.
If this check results in YES, add $p$ to the output list $L$.
Now, we claim that this algorithm works correctly if $\gamma \geq \frac{2 k}{\sqrt{n}}$.
The first part of this proof is showing that there exists a nontrivial $Q$. Write $Q(x, y)=\sum_{i=0, j=0}^{\sqrt{n}} \lambda_{i j} x^{i} y^{j}$. This equation has $(\sqrt{n}+1)(\sqrt{n}+1)>n$ unknowns, while the constraints on $Q$ determine $q=n$ equations. Thus, there exists nontrivial $Q$, since there are more unknowns than equations defining $Q$. We use the fact that the factor finding step can be done efficiently.
We now need the following result.

Theorem 16.1 Bezout's Theorem (special case): Given any two polynomials $A(x, y), B(x, y)$ of degree $d_{1}$ and $d_{2}$ respectively, if $\left|\left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}_{q}^{2}: A(x, y)=0, B(x, y)=0\right\}\right|>d_{1} d_{2}$, then both polynomials share $a$ common factor.

Consider a codeword $p(x) \in \operatorname{Ball}(z,(1-\gamma) n)$. Let the received word be $z=(f(0), f(1), \ldots, f(q-1))$. By the definition of the ball, $\operatorname{Pr}[p(x)=f(x)] \geq \gamma$. Thus, we claim that $y-p(x)$ and $Q(x, y)$ have at least $\gamma n$ common zeros. This is because at each point where $f(x)=p(x), y-p(x)=0$ at the point $(x, f(x))$. Further, by definition, $Q$ is zero at all points $(x, f(x))$.
$\operatorname{deg}(y-p(x)) \leq k-1$, and $\operatorname{deg}(Q(x, y)) \leq 2 \sqrt{n}$, both by definition of these polynomials. Thus, choosing $\gamma$ such that $\gamma n \geq 2 k \sqrt{n}, \gamma>\frac{2 k}{\sqrt{n}}$, this would lead to $y-p(x)$ and $Q(x, y)$ having a common factor; hence $(y-p(x)) \mid Q(x, y)$. This completes the proof.

### 16.2 Seeded Extractors from error-correcting codes

Lemma 16.2 Let $C$ be an $[n, k, d]_{q}$ code, with $d=n\left(1-\gamma-\frac{1}{q}\right)$. Define Ext $: \mathbb{F}_{q}^{k} \times[n] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q}$, which is $\operatorname{Ext}(x, y)=C(x)_{y}$ (slight notation overloading here, $C$ is both the code and the encoder function). This extractor is a $\left(\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right), \sqrt{2 q \delta}\right)$ strong seeded extractor.
The proof is very similar to that of the Leftover Hash Lemma (proved in Lecture 12). Let X be a weak-source with min-entropy $\log (1 / \delta)$ and $Y$ be uniformly distributed on $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Let cp denote the collision probability. We have

$$
c p(Y, \operatorname{Ext}(X, Y)) \leq c p(Y)\left(c p(X)+\max _{x \neq x^{\prime}, x, x^{\prime} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}, y \sim U_{m}} \operatorname{Pr}\left[\operatorname{Ext}(x, y)=\operatorname{Ext}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right)\right]\right.
$$

Considering the last quantity, $\operatorname{Pr}\left[C(x)_{y}=C\left(x^{\prime}\right)_{y}\right] \leq 1-\frac{d}{n}$ by the distance of the code and the definition of the extractor. Thus,

$$
c p(Y, \operatorname{Ext}(X, Y)) \leq \frac{1}{n q}(1+2 \gamma q)
$$

Using a lemma from a previous class (Lecture 11), we conclude $\mid\left(Y, \operatorname{Ext}(X, Y)-\left(U_{[N]}, U_{\mathbb{F}_{q}}\right) \mid \leq \sqrt{2 q \delta}\right.$.

