On Minimum Distance of Locally Repairable Codes

Mehrtash Mehrabi, and Masoud Ardakani

arXiv:1702.02642v1 [cs.IT] 8 Feb 2017

***Abstract*—Distributed and cloud storage systems are used to reliably store large-scale data. Erasure codes have been recently proposed and used in real-world distributed and cloud storage systems such as Google File System, Microsoft Azure Storage, and Facebook HDFS-RAID, to enhance the reliability. In order to decrease the repair bandwidth and disk I/O, a class of erasure codes called locally repairable codes (LRCs) have been proposed which have small locality compare to other erasure codes. Although LRCs have small locality, they have lower minimum distance compare to the Singleton bound. Hence, seeking the largest possible minimum distance for LRCs have been the topic of many recent studies. In this paper, we study the largest possible minimum distance of a class of LRCs and evaluate them in terms of achievability. Furthermore, we compare our results with the existence bounds in the literature.**

***Index Terms*—Minimum distance, erasure coding, distributed storage system, locally repairable codes.**

I. Introduction

A. Motivation

Reliability is one of the most important measures of performance in distributed and cloud storage systems. Since hardware and software failures can result in data unavailability or even permanent data loss, it is crucial to add redundancy to the stored data. This way, the lost data can be restored using the available redundancies. The simplest solution for adding redundancy is to store multiple replicas of the data. This simple solutions, known as the replication method, is widely used in distributed storage systems [1]. However, with the rapid growth of data and the significant storage overhead (and therefore maintenance cost) of replication method, this solution is becoming less attractive.

Using channel codes (in particular, those suitable for recovering erasures, also known as erasure codes) is another way for introducing redundancy in distributed and cloud storage systems. Erasure codes can provide the redundancy needed in distributed storage systems with significantly lower storage overhead compared to replication solutions. Recently, erasure codes have been employed in real-world distributed and cloud storage systems, such as Google File Systems [2], Microsoft Windows Azure Storage [3], and Facebook HDFS-RAID [1]. In order to use erasure codes in a distributed storage system, first the original data is divided into k information blocks and then by using an (n, k) erasure code n encoded blocks are generated and stored in n distant storage nodes. By using an (n, k) erasure code with minimum distance d, the distributed storage system is able to tolerate up to $d-1$ node failures. In an (n, k, d) erasure code, the minimum distance d is bounded to

$$d \leq n - k + 1.$$

This bound is known as the Singleton bound. Maximum distance separable codes (MDS codes) are a class of erasure codes where the Singleton bound is achieved, i.e., $d = n - k + 1$.

One problem with using conventional erasure codes in distributed storage systems is the high repair cost. While, in the replication method, a failed node is recovered by accessing only one available replica, in erasure codes, recovering one failure may need accessing many nodes, resulting in huge amounts of disk I/O and data traffic. For example, MDS codes provide the largest possible minimum distance for a given storage overhead $n - k$, but, recovering even a single node failure needs access to k available nodes. Considering the size of data centers, the high traffic load caused by conventional optimal erasure codes cannot be tolerated [1]. Hence, reducing the number of nodes that must be accessed during the recovery process of a failed node is essential for distributed and cloud storage systems.

More recently, locally repairable codes (LRCs) are suggested to reduce the number of required active nodes during the recovery process of a failed node [4]–[9]. For LRCs, maximum number of nodes required to be accessed to recover a missing block is defined as the locality of the code. It is desirable to find codes that have a large minimum distance d as well as a small locality r. Naturally, there is a bound on how much d can be improved for a given n, k and r. In [4] and [5] the following bound is established,

$$d \leq n - k - \left\lceil \frac{k}{r} \right\rceil + 2. \tag{1}$$

Note that if the locality of code (r) is equal to k, same as MDS codes, this bound will be changed to the Singleton bound. LRCs that achieve this bound with equality are called *optimal*. Using optimal LRCs in distributed and cloud storage systems leads to high tolerance against node failures, improved storage efficiency, repair bandwidth, and disk I/O.

Recently, there have been a lot of studies on LRCs. For example, In [7]–[9], in order to decrease the computational complexity associated with coding, LRCs over small fields are proposed. In [6], a class of LRCs called t-LRCs are introduced having *t* disjoint recovery groups for each node. By generalizing bound (1), an upper bound for t-LRCs is proposed in [6]. In [10], an upper bound on the minimum distance of LRCs depending on the alphabet size is established.

Since the bound in (1) is not always achievable, finding the largest achieveable minimum distance has attracted a lot of interest recently [6], [11], [12]. In this paper, we will present some new results on this problem.

B. Related Work

Unlike the Singleton bound which is achievable for all n and k $(n > k)$, the bound in (1) is not achievable for every n, k, r. Therefore, finding the largest possible minimum distance for an LRC in terms of code parameters n, k and r is an interesting topic. Thus, recently, there have been many studies on this problem.

When $(r+1) \mid n$, a class of (n,k,r) LRCs with minimum distance equal to the upper bound (1) was introduced in [4] and [5]. However, when $r+1 \nmid n$, there is no guarantee that an LRC with d equal to the bound in (1) exists.

In [11], Prakash *et al.* improve the upper bound (1). The authors, represent a recursive solution to find the largest possible minimum distance and they propose a tight bound on the minimum distance d for an (n,k,r) LRC. In their recursive solution, they define e_m for an (n,k,r) LRC as

$$e_{m-1} = e_m - \left\lceil \frac{2e_m}{m} \right\rceil + (r+1),$$

where $2 \leq m \leq b$, $b = \lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil$ and $e_b = n$. Then, a unique integer l is found such that $e_l < k+l < e_{l+1}$ is satisfied. Finally, the minimum distance d is upper bounded by

$$d \leq n+1-(k+l). \tag{2}$$

Using integer programming, another upper bound on the minimum distance d for an (n,k,r) LRC is obtained in [12]. They have 3 main results in their work. The first one is an integer programing based bound on the minimum distance which does not have a closed form. The second result, is an explicit upper bound on the minimum distance which is established by solving the integer programing for the LRCs with $n_1 > n_2$, where $n_1 = \lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil$ and $n_2 = n_1(r+1) - n$. In this case their bound is

$$d \leq n-k+1-\tilde{\eta}, \tag{3}$$

where $\tilde{\eta} = \min(\lceil \frac{(\lambda+1)(k-1)+1}{(\lambda+1)(r-1)+1} \rceil, \lceil \frac{\lambda(k-1)+\nu+1}{\lambda(r-1)+1} \rceil) - 1$, $\lambda = \lfloor \frac{n_1}{n_1-n_2} \rfloor$ and $\nu = n_1 - \lambda(n_1-n_2)$. The third result of their work is designing LRCs with $n_1 > n_2$ that achieve the bound in (3).

C. Our Contributions

Since, the bound (1) is not tight for all cases, the main problem studied in this paper is determining the largest possible minimum distance for an LRC. In this paper, we find an achievable upper bound on the minimum distance for a class of LRCs.

Defining $z_1 \equiv n \pmod{r+1}$, $z_2 \equiv d-2 \pmod{r+1}$, $z_3 \equiv k + \lceil \frac{k}{r} \rceil \pmod{r+1}$ and $z_4 \equiv k \pmod{r+1}$[1], we show that when $z_1 \geq z_3$,

$$d \leq n-k-\left\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \right\rceil + 2 + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{r}(n-k-\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil) \right\rfloor,$$

is an achievable bound on the minimum distance.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II includes the required preliminaries. In Section III, we present our main results. In Section IV, we propose a consrtuction method for LRCs that achieve our proposed bound. In Section V, we compare our results with former bounds on the minimum distance of LRCs. Finally, in Section VI, we conclude the paper.

[1]We will use z_2 and z_4 later.

Notations: We denote matrices and vectors by capital bold letters and bold letters, respectively. $\mathbb{F}_q$ and $(\cdot)^T$ stand for a finite field of order q and matrix transpose operation, respectively. $\mathbf{I}_a$ and $\mathbf{0}_{b\times c}$ represent an identity matrix of size a and a zero matrix of size $b \times c$, respectively. For an integer a, $[a] = \{1, \cdots, a\}$. $|\mathcal{A}|$ represents the cardinality of set $\mathcal{A}$.

II. Preliminaries

Systematic linear block codes: The generator matrix of an (n,k) systematic linear block code can be presented as $\mathbf{G} = [\mathbf{I}_k, \mathbf{P}] \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k\times n}$, where $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k\times(n-k)}$. Assuming that $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, ..., x_k] \in \mathbb{F}_q^{1\times k}$ and $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, y_2, ..., y_n] \in \mathbb{F}_q^{1\times n}$ are the information and encoded vectors, respectively, we have $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{G}$. The parity check matrix of the code is $\mathbf{H} = [-\mathbf{P}^T, \mathbf{I}_{n-k}] \in \mathbb{F}_q^{(n-k)\times n}$ satisfying $\mathbf{G}\mathbf{H}^T = \mathbf{0}_{1\times(n-k)}$.

Minimum distance of code (d): The minimum distance d of an erasure code is defined as the minimum Hamming distance between any two codewords of that code. Any (n,k) erasure code with minimum distance d tolerates any $d-1$ symbol erasures.

Locality: In an (n,k) linear block code, r_i (denoting the locality of the i-th encoded block) is defined as the minimum number of other blocks needed for recovering y_i. In other words, in the case that y_i is missing, at least r_i other blocks are required to reconstruct it. Locality of a code, denoted r, is defined as the maximum of r_i for $i \in [n]$, i.e. $r = \max_{i\in[n]} r_i$.

Tanner/Factor graph ([13], [14]): Consider an (n,k) linear block code. Tanner graph (Factor graph) of this code is a bipartite graph including n variable nodes on one side (usually shown by circles) and $n-k$ check nodes on the other side (usually shown by squares). In the parity check matrix $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{(n-k)\times n}$ associated with this code, columns and rows are representative of variable and check nodes, respectively. There exists an edge between j-th ($j \in [n]$) variable node and i-th ($i \in [n-k]$) check node in the Tanner graph iff element $h_{i,j}$ (element of i-th row and j-th column of $\mathbf{H}$) is non zero.

Local groups, local and global check nodes and parity nodes: In the Tanner graph of an (n,k,r) LRC there are k variable nodes representing the k information blocks. The remaining $n-k$ variable nodes are called parity nodes. A minimal set of check nodes (each having at most $r+1$ edges) that cover all variable nodes are called *local check nodes*. Variable nodes connected to a local check node constitute a *local group*. Therefore, a failed variable node can be reconstructed within its local group. Note that the locality r_i of each variable node is the size of its local group minus one. Check nodes which are not local are called *global check nodes*. Furthermore, parity nodes associated with local check nodes are called *local parity nodes*; and the rest of parity nodes associated with global check nodes are called *global parity nodes*.

The following theorem will be used in establishing our results. The theorem, taken from [15], relates the Tanner graph of an (n, k) linear block code to its minimum distance d.

Theorem 1. *For an (n, k, d) linear block code with Tanner graph $\mathcal{T}$, a necessary and sufficient condition to achieve the minimum distance d is that every γ check nodes cover at least $\gamma + k$ variable nodes, where $\gamma \in \{n-k-d+2, n-k-d+3, \cdots, n-k\}$.*

Proof: Please see the proof in [15]. ∎

III. Results

Let us define $z_1 \equiv n \pmod{r+1}$, $z_2 \equiv d-2 \pmod{r+1}$, $z_3 \equiv k + \lceil \frac{k}{r} \rceil \pmod{r+1}$ and $z_4 \equiv k \pmod{r+1}$. In this section we study the minimum distance associated with a class of (n, k, r) LRCs where $z_1 \geq z_3$. Before stating and proving our main result, we need to prove a series of lemmas and theorems. Notice that when $z_1 = 0$ or in other words $r+1|n$, the bound in (1) is known to be achievable [4], [5]. Hence, in the rest of our discussion, we always assume $z1 \neq 0$.

Lemma 2. *In any (n, k, r) LRCs with minimum distance d, we have*

$$n - k - d + 2 \geq \left\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{d-2}{r+1} \right\rceil \tag{4}$$

Proof: From the upper bound in (1) we have

$$d \leq n - k - \left\lceil \frac{k}{r} \right\rceil + 2 \leq n - k(1 + \frac{1}{r}) + 2.$$

Hence,

$$d \leq n - k(1 + \frac{1}{r}) + 2$$

and

$$k \leq n(1 - \frac{1}{r+1}) - (d-2)(1 - \frac{1}{r+1}).$$

Therefore,

$$d - 2 - \frac{d-2}{r+1} \leq n - k - \frac{n}{r+1},$$

and by doing the floor function on both side we have

$$d - 2 - \left\lceil \frac{d-2}{r+1} \right\rceil \leq n - k - \left\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \right\rceil,$$

resulting

$$n - k - d + 2 \geq \left\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{d-2}{r+1} \right\rceil.$$

∎

Lemma 3. *In an (n,k,r) LRC, where, $z_3 = 0$, $r \mid k$.*

Proof: By contradiction, we assume that $r \nmid k$, hence we have

$$k = rs_4 + z_4,$$

where $0 < z_4 < r$. Thus

$$k + \lceil \frac{k}{r} \rceil = rs_4 + z_4 + s_4 + 1$$

and since $z_3 = 0$ we must have

$$s_4(r+1) + z_4 + 1 \mid r+1,$$

resulting, $z_4 + 1 \mid r+1$, which is possible only when $z_4 = r$ contradicting our assumption. Hence, in order to have $z_3 = 0$, $r \mid k$ must be satisfied. ∎

Lemma 4. *In an (n, k, r) LRC, where, $z_1 > z_3$, and $z_1, z_2, z_3 \neq 0$, we have $z_1 > z_2$*

Proof: For the proof we use the bound in (1) and the fact that the largest minimum distance of an (n, k, r) LRC is either equal to this bound or one less than the bound [16]. Hence, we consider two cases.

Case 1: $d - 2 = n - k - \lceil \frac{k}{r} \rceil$.
In this case, since $z_1 > z_3$, $z_2 = z_1 - z_3$. Now, since $z_3 > 0$, $z_1 > z_2$. This proves the lemma.

Case 2: $d - 2 = n - k - \lceil \frac{k}{r} \rceil - 1$
In this case, since $z_1 \geq z_3 + 1$, $z_2 = z_1 - z_3 - 1$ and using $z_3 > 0$, again $z_1 > z_2$. ∎

Lemma 5. *In an (n, k, r) LRC where $z_1 \geq z_3$ we have*

$$d - 2 - \left\lfloor \frac{d-2}{r+1} \right\rfloor \leq n - k - \left\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \right\rceil, \tag{5}$$

Proof: By contradiction, we assume that

$$n - k - \left\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \right\rceil < d - 2 - \left\lfloor \frac{d-2}{r+1} \right\rfloor, \tag{6}$$

resulting

$$n - k - d + 2 \leq \left\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \right\rceil - \left\lfloor \frac{d-2}{r+1} \right\rfloor - 1. \tag{7}$$

Now from Theorem 1, we know that in the Tanner graph of an (n, k, r) LRC with minimum distance d, any γ check nodes, where $\gamma \in \{n-k-d+2, n-k-d+3, \cdots, n-k\}$, must cover at least $\gamma + k$ variable nodes. Hence, because of (7) any $\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil - \lfloor \frac{d-2}{r+1} \rfloor - 1$ check nodes must cover more than $n-d+2$ variable nodes.

Considering that in an (n, k, r) LRC there are at least $\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil$ local check nodes, we choose $\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil - \lfloor \frac{d-2}{r+1} \rfloor - 1$ check nodes out of local check nodes where each of them covers at most $r+1$ variable nodes. Therefore, $\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil - \lfloor \frac{d-2}{r+1} \rfloor - 1$ local check nodes cover at most

$$(r+1)\Big(\lceil \frac{n}{r+1} \rceil - \lfloor \frac{d-2}{r+1} \rfloor - 1\Big)$$

variable nodes. We now show that this coverage is less than $n - d + 2$, hence contradicting the assumption. To show this, we define s_1, s_2, s_3 such that [2]

$$n = (r+1)s_1 + z_1,$$

$$d - 2 = (r+1)s_2 + z_2$$

$$k + \lceil \frac{k}{r} \rceil = (r+1)s_3 + z_3,$$

[2]Note that if $z_1 = 0$ then $s_1 = n_1$, otherwise $s_1 = n_1 - 1$.

Hence, the number of variable nodes covered by the selected group of local check nodes is

$$(r+1)\Big(\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\rceil-\lfloor\frac{d-2}{r+1}\rfloor-1\Big)=(r+1)(s_1+1-s_2-1),$$
$$=(n-z_1)-(d-2-z_2)$$
$$=(n-d+2)-(z_1-z_2).$$

In the following we consider three cases.

Case 1: $z_1, z_2, z_3 \neq 0$, $z_1 \neq z_3$.
In this case, using Lemma 4 we conclude that $z_1 > z_2$, hence the coverage of the selected group of local check nodes is less than $n-d+2$. Therefore, the minimum distance could not be d. In other words, (5) must be satisfied.

Case 2: $z_3 = 0$ and $z_1, z_2 \neq 0$.
In this case, we can easily verify that if Case 2 of the proof of Lemma 4 has happened we have $z_1 > z_2$. Hence, similar to above, the coverage of the selected group of local check nodes is less than $n-d+2$ and (5) must be satisfied.

In Case 1 of the proof of Lemma 4, however, we get $z_1 = z_2$. Then, knowing that the bound in (1) is achieved with equality, we can replace $d-2$ with $n-k-\lceil\frac{k}{r}\rceil$ in (6). Using Lemma 3, after some manipulations we get $\frac{k}{r} < \frac{1}{2}$ which is impossible. Hence, (5) must be satisfied.

Case 3: $z_2 = 0$ or equivalently $(z_1 = z_3)$.
In an (n,k,r) LRC with minimum distance d, where $z_2 = 0$ (in other words $r+1 \mid d-2$) and we can conclude from Proposition 2

$$d-2-\frac{d-2}{r+1} \leq n-k-\Big\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\Big\rceil,$$

which is equivalent to (5). Hence the lemma is proved. ∎

Using the above lemma, we can establish the following bound on the minimum distance.

Theorem 6. *In an (n,k,r) LRC where $z_1 \geq z_3$, the minimum distance d is upper bounded by*

$$d \leq n-k-\Big\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\Big\rceil+2+\Big\lfloor\frac{1}{r}(n-k-\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\rceil)\Big\rfloor. \quad (8)$$

Proof: From Lemma 5 we have

$$n-k-\Big\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\Big\rceil \geq \Big\lceil\frac{r(d-2)}{r+1}\Big\rceil,$$

resulting

$$d \leq \Big\lfloor(1+\frac{1}{r})\Big(n-k-\Big\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\Big\rceil\Big)\Big\rfloor+2.$$

Hence, we have

$$d \leq n-k-\Big\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\Big\rceil+2+\Big\lfloor\frac{1}{r}(n-k-\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\rceil)\Big\rfloor.$$

∎

Later, in Section IV, by construction, we show that this bound is achievable.




Figure 1: Tanner graph of an $(n,k,r) = (16,10,5)$ LRC with the same parameters as the LRC used in Facebook HDFS-RAID [1], with minimum distance $d = 5$ equal to our proposed bound in (8).

IV. Achievability of Our Proposed Bound

In this section by construction the Tanner graph $\mathcal{T}$ associated with the (n,k,r) LRCs where $z_1 \geq z_3$, we show that our bound in (8) is always achievable.

Now, we are ready to construct $\mathcal{T}$. To construct $\mathcal{T}$, first n variable nodes must be partitioned into $\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\rceil$ local groups and construct local parity nodes. Then, by connecting all variable nodes except local parity nodes to each global check node we generate global parity nodes. In order to have minimum distance d based on Theorem 1, any $n-k-d+2$ local check nodes must cover at least $n-d+2$ variable nodes. We also know from Lemma 5 that

$$n-k-d+2 \geq \Big\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\Big\rceil-\Big\lfloor\frac{d-2}{r+1}\Big\rfloor,$$

achieved by achieving our bound in (8)(result of Theorem 6). Thus, in an (n,k,r) LRC with $\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\rceil$ local check nodes, at most $d-2$ variable nodes can be disconnected by removing $\lfloor\frac{d-2}{r+1}\rfloor$ local check nodes which is always true since we have

$$(r+1)\Big\lfloor\frac{d-2}{r+1}\Big\rfloor \leq d-2.$$

Therefore, (n,k,r) LRCs where $z_1 \geq z_3$ with $\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\rceil$ local groups can always achieve our bound in (8).

In the following example we construct a Tanner graph for a code that achieve the minimum distance equal to our proposed bound in (8).

Example 1. *In an $(n,k,r) = (16,10,5)$ LRC, similar to the parameters of the LRC used in Facebook HDFS-RAID [1], we have where $z_1 = 4 > z_3 = 0$, based on bound (8) we have*

$$d \leq n-k-\Big\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\Big\rceil+2+\Big\lfloor\frac{1}{r}(n-k-\lceil\frac{n}{r+1}\rceil)\Big\rfloor = 5.$$

But, from the upper bound (1) we have

$$d \leq n-k-\Big\lceil\frac{k}{r}\Big\rceil+2 = 6.$$

Our result shows that $d = 5$ is the best that one can hope for here and that $n = 6$ suggested by (1) is not achievable. The Tanner graph associated with this code is shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 2: Comparison of the obtained minimum distance from our results with Gopalan *et al.*'s Bound [4] in (1) and Wang *et al.*'s Bound [12] in (3) for (n, k, r) LRCs where $n = 53$ and $r = 6$.

V. Comparison of Our Results With Other Related Work

In this section by presenting a figure we compare the minimum distance of (n, k, r) LRCs, where $z_1 \geq z_3$, obtained from our bound in (8) with the bound in (1) and the bound (3) (know as a tightest bound for the (n, k, r) LRCs where $r \leq \sqrt{n} - 1$.)

In Fig. 2 we compare the minimum distance of (n, k, r) LRCs where $z_1 \geq z_3$, $n = 53$, $r = 6$ and $14 \leq k \leq 38$, obtained from our results, with the existence bounds on the minimum distance in (1) and (3). Note that in this figure the minimum distance obtained from our results is the same as the bound in (3) which was proved to be the tightest bound for (n, k, r) LRCs where $r \leq \sqrt{n} - 1$ in [12].

In the following example we find the minimum distance of a LRC where the $r \nleq \sqrt{n} - 1$ and consequently, bound (3) does not work. However, our proposed bound is still working and beat bound (1).

Example 2. *In an* $(n, k, r) = (20, 15, 5)$ *LRC, we have where* $z_1 = 2 > z_3 = 0$*, by using our proposed bound in (8) we achieve*

$$d \leq 3$$

But, from the upper bound (1) we have

$$d \leq n - k - \left\lceil \frac{k}{r} \right\rceil + 2 = 4.$$

Also, since $r \nleq \sqrt{n} - 1$*, we can not use bound (3). Thus, our proposed bound is the tighest bound for the* (n, k, r) *LRCs where* $z_1 \geq z_3$.

VI. Conclusion

Recently, locally repairable codes (LRCs) are used in distributed storage systems to provide reliability and reduce the huge amounts of disk I/O and data traffic. Using LRCs with the largest possible minimum distance for a given set of parameters (n, k, r) is desirable as it improves the reliability of the system. Hence, our main focus in this work was on finding the largest minimum distance for a class of (n, k, r) LRC. We also showed that our established bound for this class of LRCs is achievable. Finally, we evaluated our results by comparing them with other recent studies.

References

[1] M. Sathiamoorthy, M. Asteris, D. Papailiopoulos, A. G. Dimakis, R. Vadali, S. Chen, and D. Borthakur, "Xoring elephants: Novel erasure codes for big data," *Proc. VLDB*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 325–336, 2013.

[2] D. Ford, F. Labelle, F. Popovici, M. Stokely, V.-A. Truong, L. Barroso, C. Grimes, and S. Quinlan, "Availability in globally distributed storage systems," *Proc. USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, pp. 61–74, 2010.

[3] C. Huang, H. Simitci, Y. Xu, A. Ogus, B. Calder, P. Gopalan, J. Li, S. Yekhanin *et al.*, "Erasure coding in Windows Azure storage." *Proc. USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, pp. 15–26, 2012.

[4] P. Gopalan, C. Huang, H. Simitci, and S. Yekhanin, "On the locality of codeword symbols," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 6925–6934, Nov 2012.

[5] D. Papailiopoulos and A. Dimakis, "Locally repairable codes," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5843–5855, Oct 2014.

[6] I. Tamo, A. Barg, and A. Frolov, "Bounds on the parameters of locally recoverable codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3070–3083, June 2016.

[7] S. Goparaju and R. Calderbank, "Binary cyclic codes that are locally repairable," in *Information Theory (ISIT), 2014 IEEE International Symposium on*, June 2014, pp. 676–680.

[8] M. Shahabinejad, M. Khabbazian, and M. Ardakani, "An efficient binary locally repairable code for hadoop distributed file system," *Communications Letters, IEEE*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 1287–1290, Aug 2014.

[9] T. Ernvall, T. Westerbck, R. Freij-Hollanti, and C. Hollanti, "Constructions and properties of linear locally repairable codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 1129–1143, March 2016.

[10] V. Cadambe and A. Mazumdar, "An upper bound on the size of locally recoverable codes," in *2013 International Symposium on Network Coding (NetCod)*, June 2013, pp. 1–5.

[11] N. Prakash, V. Lalitha, and P. Kumar, "Codes with locality for two erasures," *Information Theory (ISIT), 2014 IEEE International Symposium on*, pp. 1962–1966, June 2014.

[12] A. Wang and Z. Zhang, "An integer programming-based bound for locally repairable codes," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 5280–5294, Oct 2015.

[13] R. Tanner, "A recursive approach to low complexity codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 533–547, Sep 1981.

[14] F. R. Kschischang, B. J. Frey, and H. A. Loeliger, "Factor graphs and the sum-product algorithm," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 498–519, Feb 2001.

[15] M. Shahabinejad, M. Ardakani, and M. Khabbazian, "An erasure code with reduced average locality for distributed storage systems," in *2017 International Conference on Computing, Networking and Communications (ICNC): Cloud Computing and Big Data (ICNC'17 CLD)*, Silicon Valley, USA, Feb. 2017.

[16] I. Tamo and A. Barg, "A family of optimal locally recoverable codes," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 4661–4676, Aug 2014.