

Efficient (nonrandom) construction and decoding of non-adaptive group testing

Thach V. BUI^{a,*}, Tetsuya KOJIMA^b, Minoru KURIBAYASHI^c, Roghayeh HAGHVIRDINEZHAD^d, Isao ECHIZEN^{e,*}

^a*SOKENDAI (The Graduate University for Advanced Studies), Kanagawa, Japan.*

^b*National Institute of Technology, Tokyo College, Japan.*

^c*Graduate School of Natural Science and Technology, Okayama University, Japan.*

^d*New Jersey Institute of Technology, New Jersey, USA.*

^e*National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan.*

Abstract

The task of non-adaptive group testing is to identify up to d defective items from N items by testing subsets of N items. Usually, a test is positive if it contains at least one defective item, and negative otherwise. If there are t tests, they can be represented as a $t \times N$ measurement matrix. This measurement matrix is well designed if it can be used to satisfy two criteria: efficient identification of defective items and easy construction. Such family of the matrix is achievable. We have answered the question that there exists a scheme such that a larger measurement matrix, built from a given $t \times N$ measurement matrix, can be used to identify up to d defective items in time $O(t \log_2 N)$. In the meantime, a $t \times N$ nonrandom measurement matrix with $t = O\left(\frac{d^2 \log_2^2 N}{(\log_2(d \log_2 N) - \log_2 \log_2(d \log_2 N))^2}\right)$ can be obtained to identify up to d defective items in time $\text{poly}(t)$. This is so far better than the best well-known bound $t = O(d^2 \log_2^2 N)$. For the special case $d = 2$, there exists an efficient nonrandom construction in which at most 2 defective items can be identified in time $4 \log_2^2 N$ using $t = 4 \log_2^2 N$ tests. Numerical results show that our proposed scheme is the best for practice compared with existing works. On

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: bvthach@nii.ac.jp (Thach V. BUI), kojt@tokyo-ct.ac.jp (Tetsuya KOJIMA), kminoru@okayama-u.ac.jp (Minoru KURIBAYASHI), rh284@njit.edu (Roghayeh HAGHVIRDINEZHAD), iechizen@nii.ac.jp (Isao ECHIZEN)

the other hand, experimental results confirm our theoretical analysis. In particular, at most $2^7 = 128$ defective items can be identified in less than 16 seconds even when $N = 2^{100}$.

Keywords: Non-adaptive Group Testing, Nonrandom construction, Efficient decoding, Combinatorics.

2000 MSC: 68R05, 68P30

1. Introduction

Group testing dates back to World War II, when an economist, Robert Dorfman, solved the problem of identifying which draftees has syphilis [1]. It turned out to a problem of finding up to d defective items in a huge number of items N by testing t subsets of N items. “Items”, “defective items”, and “tests” depend on context. Classically, a test is positive if there exists at least one defective item, and negative otherwise. Damaschke [2] generalizes this problem into threshold group testing in which a test is positive if it contains at least u defective items, negative if it contains at most l defective items, and arbitrary otherwise. When $u = 1$ and $l = 0$, threshold group testing reduces to classical group testing. In this work, we stick with classical group testing in which a test is positive if there exists a least one defective item, and negative otherwise. For testing design, there are two main approaches: adaptive and non-adaptive designs. In *adaptive group testing*, tests are performed in many stages and the later tests depend on the earlier tests. With this approach, the number of tests can be theoretically optimized [3]. However, it takes long time due to many stages. Therefore, it is preferred to use *non-adaptive group testing* (NAGT)[4] in which all tests are designed in advance and performed simultaneously. The proliferation of applying NAGT in various fields such as compressed sensing [5], data stream [6], has made it become more attractive recently. We only focus on NAGT in this work.

If there are t tests needed to identify at most d defective items among N items, they can be seen as a $t \times N$ measurement matrix. The procedure to get the matrix is called *construction procedure*, the procedure to get the outcome of t tests using the $t \times N$ measurement matrix is called *encoding procedure*, and the procedure to get the defective items from t outcomes is called *decoding procedure*. Note that the encoding procedure includes the construction procedure. The objective of NAGT is to design a scheme such that all defective items are “efficiently” identified from encoding procedure

to decoding procedure. There are six criteria to consider the efficiency of a scheme: construction type of a measurement matrix, the number of tests needed, the decoding time, the time to generate an entry of the measurement matrix, the space to generate an entry of the measurement matrix, and the probability of successful decoding. However, the last criterion is only used to reduce the number of tests and/or the decoding complexity. With high probability, Cai et al. [7] and Lee et al. [8] achieve a low number of tests and decoding complexity, namely $O(t)$, where $t = O(d \log d \cdot \log N)$ (\log is referred to the logarithm of base 2). However, the construction type is random and it is demanded to store the whole measurement matrix for implementation, which is limited to real-time applications. For example, in data stream [6], routers have limited resources and need to access any column of the measurement matrix assigned to an IP address as quickly as possible to perform their functions. The proposed schemes in [7] and Lee et al. [8] therefore are inadequate for this application.

For exact identification of defective items, there are four main criteria to be considered: construction type of a measurement matrix, the number of tests needed, the decoding time, and the time to generate an entry of the measurement matrix. A measurement matrix is nonrandom if it always satisfies the preconditions after the construction procedure with probability 1. On the contrary, a measurement matrix is random if it satisfies the preconditions after the construction procedure with some probability. A $t \times N$ measurement matrix is the best for practice if it is nonrandom, t is small, the decoding time is a polynomial of t ($\text{poly}(t)$), and the time to generate its entry is also $\text{poly}(t)$. However, there is always the trade-off between these criteria. Kautz and Singleton [9] proposed a scheme that each entry of a $t \times N$ measurement matrix can be generated in $\text{poly}(t)$ where $t = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$. However, the decoding time is $O(tN)$. Indyk et al. [10] improved the decoding time to $\text{poly}(t)$ while keeping the order of the number of tests and the time to generate its entries. However, the number of tests in a nonrandom measurement matrix is not optimal. In term of the pessimum number of tests, Guruswami and Indyk [11] proposed a linear time decoding in accordance with the number of tests of $O(d^4 \log N)$. To achieve an optimal bound on the number of tests, i.e., $O(d^2 \log N)$, while keeping the conditions that the time decoding is $\text{poly}(t)$ and each entry of the matrix can be computed in $\text{poly}(t)$, Indyk et al. [10] proposed a random construction. Although the authors try to derandomize their schemes, it takes $\text{poly}(t, N)$ time to construct such matrices, which is impractical when d and N is sufficiently large. Cheraghchi [12] also

achieved a similar results. However, his proposed schemes can be dealt with presence of noise in the test outcomes. Recently, Porat and Rothschild [13] show that it is possible to construct a nonrandom $t \times N$ measurement matrix in time $O(tN)$ while keeping the number of tests as $O(d^2 \log N)$. However, each entry of the resulting matrix is identified after the construction is completed. It is equivalent to the fact that each entry would be generated in time $O(tN)$. If we scarify the number of tests, the nonrandom construction proposed by Indyk et al. [10] are still the best for practice.

1.1. Contributions

Overview: There are two main contributions in this work. First, we have answered the question that there exists a scheme such that a larger measurement matrix built from a given $t \times N$ measurement matrix can be used to identify up to d defective items in time $O(t \log N)$. Second, a $t \times N$ nonrandom measurement matrix with $t = O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^2 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^2}\right)$ can be obtained to identify up to d defective items in time $\text{poly}(t)$. This is so far better than the best well-known bound $t = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$. There is a special case for $d = 2$ in which there exists a $4 \log^2 N \times N$ nonrandom measurement matrix such that it can be used to identify up to 2 defective items in time $4 \log^2 N$. Numerical results show that our proposed scheme is the best for practice and experimental results confirm our theoretical analysis. For instance, at most $2^7 = 128$ defective items can be identified in less than 16 seconds even when $N = 2^{100}$.

Comparison: We compare our proposed schemes with existing schemes in Table 1. There are six criteria to consider efficiency of a scheme: construction type of a measurement matrix, the number of tests needed, the decoding time, the time to generate an entry of the measurement matrix, the space to generate an entry of the measurement matrix, and the probability of successful decoding (not appeared in the table). However, the last criterion is only used to reduce the number of tests. If the number of tests and the decoding time are the first priorities, the construction in [\(11\)](#) is the best choice. Since the probability of successful decoding is at least $1 - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, some defective items may not be identified.

From now, we only consider the probability of successful decoding is 1, i.e., all defective items will be identified. There are the trade-offs among the first five criteria. When $d = 2$, the number of tests in our proposed scheme in [\(8\)](#) is slightly larger than the one in [\(7\)](#). However, the remaining criteria in

our proposed scheme are outperformed. When $d > 2$, we have the following comparison. First, if the certainty of generating a measurement matrix is needed, the best choices are $\langle 1 \rangle, \langle 2 \rangle, \langle \mathbf{3} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{4} \rangle, \langle 5 \rangle$, and $\langle \mathbf{6} \rangle$. Second, if the number of tests is as low as possible, the best choices are $\langle 2 \rangle, \langle 5 \rangle$, and $\langle 9 \rangle$. Third, if the decoding time is prioritized, the best choices are our proposed schemes, i.e., $\langle \mathbf{4} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{6} \rangle$, and $\langle \mathbf{10} \rangle$. Fourth, if the time to generate an entry of a measurement matrix is prioritized, the best choices are $\langle 1 \rangle, \langle \mathbf{3} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{4} \rangle, \langle 7 \rangle, \langle 9 \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{10} \rangle$. Finally, if the space to generate an entry of a measurement matrix is prioritized, the best choices are $\langle 1 \rangle, \langle 2 \rangle, \langle \mathbf{3} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{4} \rangle, \langle 7 \rangle, \langle 9 \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{10} \rangle$.

For real-time applications, because “defective items” are usually considered as *abnormal activities* to the systems [6], it is demanded to identify them as fast as possible. Therefore, it is acceptable if we pay some more tests to gain fast identification of defective items. Moreover, the measurement matrix deployed in the system should not be stored in the system. It is equivalent to the fact that the construction type is nonrandom, and time and space to generate an entry should be $\text{poly}(t)$. Thus, the most promising choice is $\langle \mathbf{4} \rangle$ and the second promising choice is $\langle \mathbf{3} \rangle$.

Table 1: Comparison with existing scheme.

No.	Scheme	Construction type	Number of tests t	Decoding time	Time to generate an entry	Space to generate an entry
$\langle 1 \rangle$	Indyk et al. [10] (Theorem 3)	Nonrandom	$O(d^2 \log^2 N)$	$O\left(\frac{d^9 (\log N)^{16+1/3}}{(\log(d \log N))^{7+1/3}}\right)$	$O(t)$	$O(t)$
$\langle 2 \rangle$	Indyk et al. [10] (Theorem 2)	Nonrandom	$O(d^2 \log N)$	$\text{poly}(t) = O(d^{11} \log^6 N)$	$\text{poly}(t, N)$	$\text{poly}(t)$
$\langle \mathbf{3} \rangle$	Proposed (Theorem 8)	Nonrandom	$O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^2 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^2}\right)$	$O\left(\frac{d^{5.57} \log^{6.26} N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^{6.26}}\right) + O\left(\frac{d^6 \log^4 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^4}\right)$	$O(t)$	$O(t)$
$\langle \mathbf{4} \rangle$	Proposed (Corollary 3)	Nonrandom	$O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^3 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^2}\right)$	$O(t)$	$O(t)$	$O(t)$
$\langle 5 \rangle$	Porat-Rothschild [13] (Theorem 1)	Nonrandom	$O(d^2 \log N)$	$O(tN) = O(d^2 \log N \times N)$	$O(tN)$	$O(tN)$
$\langle \mathbf{6} \rangle$	Proposed (Corollary 2)	Nonrandom	$O(d^2 \log^2 N)$	$O(t) = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$	$O(tN)$	$O(tN)$
$\langle 7 \rangle$	Indyk et al. [10] (Theorem 3)	Nonrandom $d = 2$	$2 \log N (2 \log N - 1)$	$\frac{2^9 (\log N)^{16+1/3}}{(\log(2 \log N))^{7+1/3}}$	$\log^2 N$	$\log N$
$\langle \mathbf{8} \rangle$	Proposed (Theorem 7)	Nonrandom $d = 2$	$4 \log^2 N$	$4 \log^2 N$	4	$2 \log N + \log(2 \log N)$
$\langle 9 \rangle$	Indyk et al. [10] (Theorem 2)	Random	$O(d^2 \log N)$	$\text{poly}(t) = O(d^{11} \log^6 N)$	$\text{poly}(t)$	$\text{poly}(t)$
$\langle \mathbf{10} \rangle$	Proposed (Corollary 1)	Random	$O(d^2 \log^2 N)$	$O(t) = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$	$\text{poly}(t)$	$\text{poly}(t)$
$\langle \mathbf{11} \rangle$	Proposed (Corollary 4)	Random	$O(d \log N \cdot \log \frac{d}{\epsilon})$	$O(d \log N \cdot \log \frac{d}{\epsilon})$	$O(tN)$	$O(tN)$

1.2. Outline

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some preliminaries on tensor product, disjunct matrices, list-recoverable codes, and a previous scheme. Section 3 describes how to achieve an efficient decoding scheme when having a given measurement matrix. Section 4 presents nonrandom constructions for identifying up to 2 defective items and more. The numerical and experimental results are in Section 5. The last section concludes our work and addresses some open problems.

2. Preliminaries

Notation is defined here for consistency. We use capital calligraphic letters for matrices, non-capital letters for scalars, and bold letters for vectors. Matrices and vectors are binary. We also list some frequent notations as follows:

- N, d : number of items and maximum number of defective items. For simplicity, suppose that N is the power of 2.
- $|\cdot|$: the weight, i.e, the number of non-zero entries, of the input vector or the cardinality of the input set.
- \otimes, \odot, \circ : operation for NAGT, tensor product, concatenation code, respectively, to be defined later.
- \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B} : $k \times N$ measurement matrices which are used to identify at most one defective item, where $k = 2 \log_2 N$.
- $\mathcal{M} = (m_{ij})$: $t \times N$ d -disjunct matrix, where integer $t \geq 1$ is the number of tests.
- $\mathcal{T} = (t_{ij})$: $T \times N$ measurement matrix to identify at most d defective items, where integer $T \geq 1$ is the number of tests.
- \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} : binary representation of N items, binary representation of the test outcomes.
- $\mathcal{S}_j, \mathcal{B}_j, \mathcal{M}_j, \mathcal{M}_{i,*}$: column j of matrix \mathcal{S} , column j of matrix \mathcal{B} , column j of matrix \mathcal{M} , and row i of matrix \mathcal{M} .

- \mathbb{D} : index set of defective items, e.g., $\mathbb{D} = \{2, 6\}$ means the items 2 and 6 are defective.
- $\text{diag}(\mathcal{M}_{i,*}) = \text{diag}(m_{i1}, m_{i2}, \dots, m_{iN})$: diagonal matrix constructed by input vector $\mathcal{M}_{i,*} = (m_{i1}, m_{i2}, \dots, m_{iN})$.
- $e, \log, \ln, \exp(\cdot)$: the base of natural logarithm, the logarithm of base 2, the natural logarithm, and the exponential function.
- $\lceil x \rceil, \lfloor x \rfloor$: the ceiling and the floor functions of x .

2.1. Tensor product

Let \odot be the tensor product notation. Given a $f \times N$ matrix \mathcal{A} and a $s \times N$ matrix \mathcal{S} , their tensor product is defined as

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(\mathcal{A}_{1,*}) \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(\mathcal{A}_{f,*}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}\mathcal{S}_1 & \dots & a_{1N}\mathcal{S}_N \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{f1}\mathcal{S}_1 & \dots & a_{fN}\mathcal{S}_N \end{bmatrix} \in \{0, 1\}^{fs \times N}, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ is the diagonal matrix constructed by the input vector, $\mathcal{A}_{h,*} = (a_{h1}, \dots, a_{hN})$ is the h th row of \mathcal{A} for $h = 1, \dots, f$, and \mathcal{S}_j is the j th column of \mathcal{S} for $j = 1, \dots, N$. The size of \mathcal{R} is $r \times N$, where $r = f \times s$. One can imagine that an entry a_{hj} of matrix \mathcal{A} would be replaced by the vector $a_{hj} \times \mathcal{S}_j$ after using the tensor product. For instance, suppose that $f = 2, s = 3$, and $N = 4$. Matrices \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{S} are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Then $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{S}$ is

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & 0 \times \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & 1 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & 0 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ 0 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & 1 \times \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & 1 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & 1 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

2.2. Disjunct matrix

To have insight about disjunct matrices, we present the concept of an identity matrix inside a set of vectors. This concept will be used to construct a d -disjunct matrix later.

Definition 1. Any c column vectors of same size contain an $c \times c$ identity matrix if an $c \times c$ identity matrix could be obtained by placing those columns in an appropriate order.

We note that there may exist more than one identity matrix inside those c vectors. For example, let \mathbf{b}_1 , \mathbf{b}_2 , and \mathbf{b}_3 be vectors of size 4×1 as follows:

$$\mathbf{b}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{b}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{b}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

then $(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)$ and $(\mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3)$ contain 2×2 identify matrices, while $(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_3)$ does

not.

$$[\mathbf{b}_1 \quad \mathbf{b}_2] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, [\mathbf{b}_2 \quad \mathbf{b}_3] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

The union of l vectors is defined as follows. Suppose that l vectors $\mathbf{y}_w = (y_{1w}, y_{2w}, \dots, y_{Bw})^T$ for $w = 1, \dots, l$ and some integer $B \geq 1$. The union of $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_l$ is defined as vector $\mathbf{y} = \vee_{i=1}^l \mathbf{y}_i = (\vee_{i=1}^l y_{1i}, \dots, \vee_{i=1}^l y_{Bi})^T$, where \vee is the OR operator. It is noted that the definition 1 is interchangeably defined as follows: the union of at most $c - 1$ vectors does not contain the remaining vector. In this paper, we stick with the definition 1. Then the definition of a d -disjunct matrix is as follows:

Definition 2. A binary $t \times N$ matrix is called a d -disjunct matrix if and only if there exists an $(d + 1) \times (d + 1)$ identity matrix contained in its arbitrary $d + 1$ columns.

For example, an 3×3 identity matrix is a 2-disjunct matrix. Then we go to define the encoding and decoding procedure to identify at most d defective items using a d -disjunct matrix. Suppose that $\mathcal{M} = (m_{ij})$ is a $t \times N$ measurement matrix, which is used to identify at most d defective items. Item j is represented by column \mathcal{M}_j for $j = 1, \dots, N$. Test i is represented by the row i in which $m_{ij} = 1$ iff the item j belongs to the test i , and $m_{ij} = 0$ otherwise, where $i = 1, \dots, t$. Usually, \mathcal{M} is a d -disjunct matrix. However, it is not necessary to be d -disjunct. In section 3, we will see that \mathcal{M} may not be d -disjunct to identify at most d defective items.

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^T$ be a binary representation for N items, in which $x_j = 1$ iff the item j is defective for $j = 1, \dots, N$. The outcome of t tests, denoted as $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_t)^T \in \{0, 1\}^t$, is:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathbf{x} = \bigvee_{j=1}^N x_j \mathcal{M}_j = \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{D}} \mathcal{M}_j, \quad (8)$$

where \mathbb{D} is the index set of defective items. The procedure to get \mathcal{M} is called *construction procedure*. The procedure to get \mathbf{y} is called *encoding procedure*. Note that the encoding procedure includes the construction procedure. The procedure to recover \mathbf{x} from \mathbf{y} and \mathcal{M} is called *decoding procedure*.

We next list some recent results on construction and decoding of disjunct matrices. The naive decoding works as follows: remove all items belonged to the tests which have negative outcomes, the remaining items are defective. The decoding complexity of this approach is $O(tN)$. Note that the naive decoding is mostly not used here because the decoding time is high. We classify construction types based on the time to generate an entry of a matrix. The first construction is weakly explicit (nonrandom).

Theorem 1 (Theorem 1 [13]). *Given $1 \leq d < N$. A nonrandom $t \times N$ d -disjunct matrix that can be constructed in time $O(tN)$, where $t = O(d^2 \log N)$. Moreover, the decoding time is $O(tN)$, and each entry is generated in time and space $O(tN)$.*

Then, the second construction is strongly explicit.

Theorem 2 (Corollary 5.1 [10]). *Given $1 \leq d < N$. There exists a $t \times N$ d -disjunct matrix that can be decoded in time $\text{poly}(t) = O(d^{11} \log^6 N)$, where $t = 4800d^2 \log N = O(d^2 \log N)$. And each entry can be generated in time and space $\text{poly}(t)$. Furthermore, the matrix can be deterministically (nonrandomly) determined in time $\text{poly}(t, N)$ and space $\text{poly}(t)$.*

Finally, the last construction is nonrandom. We analyze this construction in details for later comparison. Although the precise formulas are not obvious in [10], the translation can be obtained.

Theorem 3 (Corollary C.1 [10]). *Given $1 \leq d < N$. A nonrandom $t \times N$ d -disjunct matrix can be decoded in time $O\left(\frac{d^9 (\log N)^{16+1/3}}{(\log(d \log N))^{7+1/3}}\right) = \text{poly}(t)$, where $t = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$. Moreover, each entry can be generated in time and space $O(t)$. When $d = 2$, the number of tests is $2 \log N \times (2 \log N - 1)$, the decoding time is higher than $\frac{2^9 (\log N)^{16+1/3}}{(\log(2 \log N))^{7+1/3}}$, and each entry is generated in time $\log^2 N$ and space $\log N$.*

2.3. List recoverable codes

The problem in the physical world is that we might want to recover a similar codeword from a given codeword. For example, one goes to a searching website such as Google to search a word “intercept”. However, by mistyping, the input word is “inrercep”. The website should suggest a *list* of similar words which are “close” to the input word such as “intercept” or “intercede”.

This idea forms a notion of *list recoverable codes*. The basic idea of list recoverable codes is that given a list of subsets in which each subset contains at most ℓ symbols in a given alphabet Σ (a finite field), the decoder of the list recoverable codes produces at most L codewords from the list. Formally, it can be defined as follows:

Definition 3 (Definition 2.2 [14]). *Given integers $1 \leq \ell \leq L$, a code $C \in \Sigma^n$ is said to be (ℓ, L) -list-recoverable if for all sequences of subsets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n with each $S_a \subset \Sigma$ satisfying $|S_a| \leq \ell$, there are at most L codewords $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C$ with the property that $c_a \in S_a$ for $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The value ℓ is referred to as the input list size.*

Note that for any $\ell' \leq \ell$, a (ℓ, L) -list-recoverable code is also a (ℓ', L) -list-recoverable code. For example, set $\Sigma = \{a, b, \dots, z\}$, $\ell = 2$, $n = 9$, $L = 2$. We have the input and output as follows:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} S_1 = \{e, g\} \\ S_2 = \{r, x\} \\ S_3 = \{o, q\} \\ S_4 = \{t, u\} \\ S_5 = \{e, i\} \\ S_6 = \{s\} \\ S_7 = \{i, q\} \\ S_8 = \{t, u\} \\ S_9 = \{e\} \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{\text{decode}} c = \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{c} e \\ x \\ q \\ u \\ i \\ s \\ i \\ t \\ e \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} g \\ r \\ o \\ t \\ e \\ s \\ q \\ u \\ e \end{array} \right] \right\}. \quad (9)$$

2.4. Reed-Solomon codes

We first introduce the concept of $(n, r, D)_q$ code C as follows:

Definition 4. *Let n, r, D, q be positive integers. A $(n, r, D)_q$ code is a subset of Σ^n such that*

1. Σ is a finite field, which is called the alphabet of the code, and $|\Sigma| = q$. From now, we set $\Sigma = \mathbb{F}_q$.
2. Each codeword is considered as a vector of $\mathbb{F}_q^{n \times 1}$.
3. For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in C$, the number of positions in which the corresponding entries differ is at least D .
4. The cardinality of C , i.e., $|C|$, is at least q^r .

These parameters n, r, D, q are known as the block length, dimension, minimum distance, and alphabet size of C . If the minimum distance is not considered, we called C as $(n, r)_q$. Given a full-rank $n \times r$ matrix $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n \times r}$. Suppose that for any $\mathbf{y} \in C$, there exists a message $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$ such that $\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{G}\mathbf{x}$. Then C is called a linear code and denoted as $[n, r, D]_q$. Let \mathcal{M}_C denote the $n \times q^r$ matrix whose columns are the codewords in C .

We next introduce a common and widely used code which is Reed-Solomon code. Reed-Solomon (RS) codes are constructed by using a polynomial method over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q . It is a $[n, r, D]_q$ -code C where $|C| = q^r$ and $D = n - r + 1$. Since D is determined from n and r , we refer $[n, r, D]_q$ -RS code as $[n, r]_q$. Guruswami [14] (section 4.4.1) shows that any $[n, r]_q$ -RS code is also a $\left(\left\lceil \frac{n}{r} \right\rceil - 1, O\left(\frac{n^4}{r^2}\right)\right)$ -list-recoverable code. To efficiently decode RS code, Chowdhury et al. [15] proposed an efficient scheme as follows:

Theorem 4 (Corollary 16 [15]). *Let $1 \leq r \leq n \leq q$ be integers. Then any $[n, r]_q$ -RS code, which is also $\left(\left\lceil \frac{n}{r} \right\rceil - 1, O\left(\frac{n^4}{r^2}\right)\right)$ -list-recoverable code, can be decoded in time $n^{3.57}r^{2.69} = O(n^{3.57}r^{2.69})$.*

We note that a codeword of the $[n, r]_q$ -RS code can be computed in time $O(r^2 \log \log r) \approx O(r^2)$ and space $O(r \log q / \log^2 r)$ [16].

2.5. Concatenated codes

Concatenated codes C are constructed by using an $(n_1, k_1)_q$ outer code C_{out} , where $q = 2^{k_2}$ (in general, $q = p^{k_2}$ where p is a prime number), and a $(n_2, k_2)_2$ binary inner code C_{in} , and denoted as $C = C_{\text{out}} \circ C_{\text{in}}$.

Given a message $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k_1}$, let $C_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{m}) = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_1}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1}$. Then $C_{\text{out}} \circ C_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{m}) = (C_{\text{in}}(x_1), C_{\text{in}}(x_2), \dots, C_{\text{in}}(x_{n_1})) \in (\{0, 1\}^{n_2})^{n_1}$. Note that C is an $(n_1 n_2, k_1 k_2)_2$ code.

Using a suitable outer code and a suitable inner code, d -disjunct matrices can be generated. For example, let C_{out} and C_{in} be $(3, 1)_8$ and $(3, 3)_2$ codes, where $|C_{\text{out}}| = 12$ and $|C_{\text{in}}| = 8$. Their corresponding matrices are $\mathcal{H} =$

$\mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{out}}}$ and $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{in}}}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 7 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 & 1 & 2 & 4 & 1 & 2 & 4 & 0 & 7 & 0 \\ 1 & 4 & 2 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 7 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

If we concatenate each element of \mathcal{H} with its 3-bit binary representation such as matrix \mathcal{K} , we get a 2-disjunct matrix $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{K}$:

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{K} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

We state a powerful result on decoding scheme using concatenation codes and list-recoverable codes as follows:

Theorem 5 (Simplified version of Theorem 4.1 [10]). *Let $d, L \geq 1$ be integers. Let C_{out} be an $(n_1, k_1)_{2^{k_2}}$ code which can be (d, L) -list recovered in time $T_1(n_1, d, L, k_1, k_2)$. Let C_{in} be $(n_2, k_2)_2$ codes such that $\mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{in}}}$ is a d -disjunct matrix and can be decoded in time $T_2(n_2, d, k_2)$. Suppose the matrix $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{out}} \circ C_{\text{in}}}$ is d -disjunct. Note that \mathcal{M} is a $t \times N$ matrix where $t = n_1 n_2$ and $N = 2^{k_1 k_2}$. Further, suppose that any arbitrary position in any codeword in C_{out} and C_{in} can be computed in space $S_1(n_1, d, L, k_1, k_2)$ and $S_2(n_2, d, k_2)$, respectively. Then:*

- (a) *given any outcome produced by at most d positives, the positive positions can be recovered in time $n_1 T_2(n_2, d, k_2) + T_1(n_1, d, L, k_1, k_2) + 2Lt = n_1 T_2(n_2, d, k_2) + T_1(n_1, d, L, k_1, k_2) + O(Lt)$; and*
- (b) *any entry in \mathcal{M} can be computed in $\log t + \log N + S_1(n_1, d, L, k_1, k_2) + S_2(n_2, d, k_2) = O(\log t + \log N) + O(\max\{S_1(n_1, d, L, k_1, k_2), S_2(n_2, d, k_2)\})$ space.*

Since the decoding scheme requires knowledge from several fields which are not used in our work, we do not present it here. Readers are recommended referring to [10] for further reading.

2.6. Review of Bui et al.'s scheme

We review a scheme proposed by Bui et al. [17], which plays an important role in our later construction. Its task is to identify at most one defective item while never producing a wrong one. The technical details are as follows.

Encoding procedure: By using $\log N$ -bit representation of an integer, Lee et al. [8] propose the $k \times N$ measurement matrix \mathcal{S} to detect at most 1 defective item:

$$\mathcal{S} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 & \mathbf{b}_2 \dots \mathbf{b}_N \\ \bar{\mathbf{b}}_1 & \bar{\mathbf{b}}_2 \dots \bar{\mathbf{b}}_N \end{bmatrix} = [\mathcal{S}_1 \dots \mathcal{S}_N], \quad (10)$$

where $k = 2 \log N$, \mathbf{b}_j is the $\log N$ -bit binary representation of integer $j - 1$, $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_j$ is \mathbf{b}_j 's complement, and $\mathcal{S}_j := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_j \\ \bar{\mathbf{b}}_j \end{bmatrix}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Note that the weight of every column in \mathcal{S} is $k/2 = \log N$.

Given an input vector $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N$, the measurement matrix \mathcal{S} is generalized as follows:

$$\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(\mathbf{g}) = [g_1 \mathcal{S}_1 \quad \dots \quad g_N \mathcal{S}_N], \quad (11)$$

where $\text{diag}(\mathbf{g}) = \text{diag}(g_1, \dots, g_N)$ is the diagonal matrix constructed by input vector \mathbf{g} , and $\mathcal{B}_j = g_j \mathcal{S}_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, N$. It is obvious that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{S}$ when \mathbf{g} is the vector of all ones, i.e., $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \{1\}^N$. Moreover, the column weight of \mathcal{B} is either $k/2 = \log N$ or 0.

For example, let us consider the case $N = 8, k = 2 \log N = 6$, and

$\mathbf{g} = (1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. The measurement matrix \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{B} are:

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(\mathbf{g}) = \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1) \\ &= [1 \times \mathcal{S}_1 \ 0 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \ 1 \times \mathcal{S}_3 \ 0 \times \mathcal{S}_4 \ 1 \times \mathcal{S}_5 \ 1 \times \mathcal{S}_6 \ 1 \times \mathcal{S}_7 \ 1 \times \mathcal{S}_8] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then given a representation vector of N items $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^T \in \{0, 1\}^N$, the outcome vector is:

$$\mathbf{y}' = \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathbf{x} = \bigvee_{j=1}^N x_j \mathcal{B}_j \quad (14)$$

$$= \bigvee_{j=1}^N x_j g_j \mathcal{S}_j = \bigvee_{\substack{j=1 \\ x_j g_j = 1}}^N \mathcal{S}_j. \quad (15)$$

It is noted that even there is only one entry $x_{j_0} = 1$ in \mathbf{x} , the index j_0 cannot be recovered if $g_{j_0} = 0$.

Decoding procedure: From (15), the outcome \mathbf{y}' is the union of at most $|\mathbf{x}|$ columns of \mathcal{S} . Because the weight for each column of \mathcal{S} is $\log N$, if the weight of \mathbf{y}' is $\log N$, the index of one non-zero entry in \mathbf{x} is recovered by checking the first half of \mathbf{y}' . On the other hand, the weight of \mathbf{y}' is never equal to $\log N$ if it is the union of at least 2 columns of \mathcal{S} or zero vector. This case is considered as there is no defective item identified. Therefore, given an $k \times 1$ input vector, we can either identify one defective item or no defective item in time $k = 2 \log N = O(\log N)$. Moreover, the decoding procedure never produces any wrong defective items.

For example, given $\mathbf{x}_1 = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T$, $\mathbf{x}_2 = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T$, and $\mathbf{x}_3 = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T$, their corresponding outcomes by using the measurement matrix \mathcal{B} in (13) are $\mathbf{y}'_1 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)^T$, $\mathbf{y}'_2 = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)^T$, and $\mathbf{y}'_3 = (0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1)^T$. Since $|\mathbf{y}'_1| = 0$, there is no defective item identified. Since $|\mathbf{y}'_2| = |\mathbf{y}'_3| = 3 = \log N$, the only defective item identified from the first half of \mathbf{y}'_2 or \mathbf{y}'_3 , i.e., $(0, 1, 0)$ is 3. Note that event $|\mathbf{x}_1| \neq |\mathbf{x}_2|$, the same defective item is identified.

3. Efficient decoding scheme by using a given measurement matrix

In this section, we present a simple but powerful tool to find defective items using a given measurement matrix. As a result, we have answered the question that there exists a scheme such that a larger $T \times N$ measurement matrix built from a given $t \times N$ measurement matrix, can be used to identify at most d defective items in time $\text{poly}(t) = t \times \log N = T$. It can be summarized as follows:

Theorem 6. *For any $\epsilon \geq 0$, suppose each d columns of a given $t \times N$ matrix \mathcal{M} contains a $d \times d$ identity matrix with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Then there exists a $T \times N$ matrix \mathcal{T} constructed from \mathcal{M} that can be used to identify at most d defective items in time $T = t \times 2 \log N$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Further, suppose that any entry of \mathcal{M} can be computed in time β and space γ , then every entry of \mathcal{T} can be computed in time $O(\beta \log N)$ and space $O(\log T + \log N) + O(\gamma \log N)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{M} = (m_{ij}) \in \{0, 1\}^{t \times N}$. Then the $T \times N$ measurement matrix \mathcal{T} is generated by using the tensor product of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{S} in (10) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{M} \odot \mathcal{S} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(\mathcal{M}_{1,*}) \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(\mathcal{M}_{t,*}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}^1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{B}^t \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} m_{11}\mathcal{S}_1 & \dots & m_{1N}\mathcal{S}_N \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ m_{t1}\mathcal{S}_1 & \dots & m_{tN}\mathcal{S}_N \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $T = t \times k = t \times 2 \log N$ and $\mathcal{B}^i = \mathcal{S} \times \text{diag}(\mathcal{M}_{i,*})$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. Note that \mathcal{B}^i is an instantiation of \mathcal{B} when setting $\mathbf{g} = \mathcal{M}_{i,*}$ in (11). Then for any

$N \times 1$ representation vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N$, the outcome vector is

$$\mathbf{y}^* = \mathcal{T} \otimes \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}^1 \otimes \mathbf{x} \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{B}^t \otimes \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}'_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}'_t \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{y}'_i = \mathcal{B}^i \otimes \mathbf{x}$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. Note that \mathbf{y}'_i is obtained by replacing \mathcal{B} by \mathcal{B}_i in (14).

The decoding procedure is quite simple: one can scan all \mathbf{y}'_i for $i = 1, \dots, t$. By using the decoding procedure in section 2.6, if $|\mathbf{y}'_i| = \log N$, take the first half of \mathbf{y}'_i to calculate the defective item. Thus, the decoding complexity is $T = t \times 2 \log N = O(T)$.

Our task now is to prove that the decoding procedure above can recover all defective items with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Let $\mathbb{D} = \{j_1, \dots, j_{|\mathbb{D}|}\}$ be the defective set, where $|\mathbb{D}| = g \leq d$. We will prove that there exists $\mathbf{y}'_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_{i_g}$ such that j_a can be recovered from \mathbf{y}'_{i_a} for $a = 1, \dots, g$. Because any d columns of \mathcal{M} contain an $d \times d$ identity matrix with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, any $g \leq d$ columns j_1, \dots, j_g of \mathcal{M} also contain an $g \times g$ identity matrix with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Let i_1, \dots, i_g be the row indexes of \mathcal{M} such that $m_{i_a j_a} = 1$ and $m_{i_a j_b} = 0$, where for each $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, g\}$, $b \in \{1, 2, \dots, g\} \setminus \{a\}$. Then the probability where rows i_1, \dots, i_g exist is at least $1 - \epsilon$.

For any outcome \mathbf{y}'_{i_a} where $a = 1, \dots, g$, using (15), we have:

$$\mathbf{y}'_{i_a} = \mathcal{B}^{i_a} \otimes \mathbf{x} = \bigvee_{\substack{j=1 \\ x_j m_{i_a j} = 1}}^N \mathcal{S}_j = \bigvee_{\substack{j \in \mathbb{D} \\ x_j m_{i_a j} = 1}} \mathcal{S}_j = \mathcal{S}_{j_a}, \quad (18)$$

because there are only g non-zero entries x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_g} in \mathbf{x} . Thus, all defective items j_1, \dots, j_g can be recovered by checking the first half of $\mathbf{y}'_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_{i_g}$, respectively. Since the probability where rows i_1, \dots, i_g exist is at least $1 - \epsilon$, the probability where defective items j_1, \dots, j_g are recovered is also at least $1 - \epsilon$.

We next estimate the computational complexity of computing an entry of \mathcal{T} . An entry at the row $1 \leq i \leq T$ and the column $1 \leq j \leq N$ needs $\log T + \log N$ bits (space) to be indexed. And it is belonged to vector the $m_{i_0 j} \mathcal{S}_j$, where $i_0 = i/(2 \log N)$ if $i \bmod (2 \log N) \equiv 0$ and $i_0 = \lfloor i/(2 \log N) \rfloor$

if $i \bmod (2 \log N) \neq 0$. Since each entry of \mathcal{M} needs γ space to compute, every entry of \mathcal{T} can be computed in space $O(\log T + \log N) + O(\gamma \log N)$ after mapping it to the corresponding column of \mathcal{S} . The time to generate an entry of \mathcal{T} is straightforwardly obtained as $\beta \log N = O(\beta \log N)$. \square

A part of Theorem 6 is implicit in a couple of papers such as [7], [8], [17], and [18]. However, the authors of those papers only consider the very specific cases to solve their own problems. They mainly focus on how to generate the matrix \mathcal{M} by using complicated techniques and non-constructive method, i.e., random construction, such as [7] and [8]. As a result, their decoding schemes are randomized. Moreover, they have not considered the computational cost to compute an entry of \mathcal{M} . For deterministic decoding, i.e., $\epsilon = 0$, the decoding time is not scaled to $t \times \log N$ in [17, 18]. Our contribution is to *generalize* their ideas into a framework of non-adaptive group testing. We next instantiate Theorem 6 in the broad range of measurement matrix construction.

3.1. In case of $\epsilon = 0$

We consider the case where $\epsilon = 0$, i.e., a given matrix \mathcal{M} is always $(d-1)$ -disjunct. There are three indications to evaluate how good each instantiation is: the number of tests, construction type, and the time to generate an entry of \mathcal{T} . We first present an instantiation on a strongly explicit construction. Let \mathcal{M} be a given measurement matrix generated from Theorem 2. Then $t = O(d^2 \log N)$, $\beta = \text{poly}(t)$, and $\gamma = \text{poly}(t)$. Thus, we obtain efficient NAGT with the number of tests and the decoding time as $O(d^2 \log^2 N)$.

Corollary 1. Let $1 \leq d \leq N$ be integers. There exists a random $T \times N$ measurement matrix \mathcal{T} with $T = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$ such that at most d defective items can be identified in time $O(T)$. Moreover, each entry of \mathcal{T} can be computed in time and space $\text{poly}(T)$.

It is also possible to construct \mathcal{T} deterministically. However, it would take $\text{poly}(t, N)$ in time and $\text{poly}(t)$ in space, which is intolerant for practice. Therefore, we should increase the generating time of an entry of \mathcal{T} in order to get nonrandom construction, the same number of tests $T = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$ and low construction time. The following theorem is based on the weakly explicit construction of a given measurement matrix as in Theorem 1, i.e., $t = O(d^2 \log N)$, $\beta = O(tN)$, and $\gamma = O(tN)$.

Corollary 2. Let $1 \leq d \leq N$ be integers. There exists a nonrandom $T \times N$ measurement matrix \mathcal{T} with $T = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$, which is used to identify at most d defective items in time $O(T)$. Moreover, each entry of \mathcal{T} can be computed in time and space $O(TN)$.

Although the number of tests is low and the construction type is nonrandom, the time to generate an entry of \mathcal{T} is high. If we increase the number of tests, one can achieve both nonrandom construction and low generating time for an entry as follows:

Corollary 3. Let $1 \leq d \leq N$ be integers. There exists a nonrandom $T \times N$ measurement matrix \mathcal{T} with $T = O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^3 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^2}\right)$, which is used to identify at most d defective items in time $O(T)$. Moreover, each entry of \mathcal{T} can be computed in time and space $O(T)$.

The above corollary is obtained by choosing a measurement matrix as a d -disjunct matrix in Theorem 8 (appeared in section 4), i.e., $t = O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^2 N}{(\ln(d \log N) - \ln \ln(d \log N))^2}\right)$, $\beta = O(t)$, and $\gamma = O(t)$.

3.2. In case of $\epsilon > 0$

To reduce the number of tests and the decoding complexity, it is compulsory to randomize the construction process of a given measurement matrix. We construct it as follows. A $t \times N$ given matrix $\mathcal{M} = (m_{ij})$ is generated randomly in which $\Pr(m_{ij} = 1) = \frac{1}{d}$ and $\Pr(m_{ij} = 0) = 1 - \frac{1}{d}$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $j = 1, \dots, N$. Set $t = ed \ln \frac{d}{\epsilon}$. Then for each set of d columns of \mathcal{M} , the probability that they do not contain an $d \times d$ identity matrix is at most:

$$\binom{d}{1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right)^{d-1}\right)^t \quad (19)$$

$$\leq d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{d-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right)^d t\right) \quad (20)$$

$$\leq d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{t}{d-1} \cdot e^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right)\right) \quad (21)$$

$$\leq d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{t}{ed}\right) = d \cdot \exp\left(-\ln \frac{d}{\epsilon}\right) \quad (22)$$

$$\leq \epsilon. \quad (23)$$

We got (20) because $(1+x)^y \leq \exp(xy)$ for all $|x| \leq 1$ and $y \geq 1$. Equation (21) is obtained because $(1+\frac{x}{n})^n \geq e^x (1-\frac{x^2}{n})$ for $n > 1$ and $|x| < n$. Therefore, there exists a $t \times N$ matrix \mathcal{M} with $t = O(d \ln \frac{d}{\epsilon})$ such that each set of d columns contains an $d \times d$ identity matrix with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$, for any $\epsilon > 0$. Note that $\beta = \gamma = O(tN)$. Then we have the following corollary:

Corollary 4. Given integers $1 \leq d \leq N$ and a scalar $\epsilon > 0$. There exists a random $T \times N$ measurement matrix \mathcal{T} with $T = O(d \log N \cdot \log \frac{d}{\epsilon})$, which is used to identify at most d defective items in time $O(T)$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. Furthermore, each entry of \mathcal{T} can be computed in time and space $O(TN)$.

The result in Corollary 4 is similar to the result in [7] and [8]. However, it is much simple to construct the matrix \mathcal{M} compared with those. Note that it is possible to achieve the number of tests $t = O(d \log \frac{d}{\epsilon} \cdot \log N)$ when *each* set of d columns of \mathcal{M} contains an $d \times d$ identity matrix with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. However, it is impossible to achieve such number of tests for *every* set of d columns, in which they contain an $d \times d$ identity matrix with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$. In this case, with the same procedure of generating a random matrix \mathcal{M} , by resolving the inequality $\binom{N}{d} \binom{d}{1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d} (1 - \frac{1}{d})^{d-1}\right)^t \leq \epsilon$, the number of tests needed is $t = O(d^2 \log N + d \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$. However, the number of tests in this case is larger than the one needed when $\epsilon = 0$, which is $O(d^2 \log N)$. Therefore, it is not beneficial to consider this case.

4. Nonrandom disjunct matrices

It is extremely important to have nonrandom constructions for measurement matrices in real-time applications. Therefore, we devote this section to consider nonrandom constructions. We have shown that the well-known barrier on the number of tests $O(d^2 \log^2 N)$ for constructing a d -disjunct matrix, can be overcome.

4.1. In case of $d = 2$

When $d = 2$, the measurement matrix is $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S} \odot \mathcal{S}$, where \mathcal{S} is in (10). Note that the size of \mathcal{S} is $k \times N$, where $k = 2 \log N$, and \mathcal{T} is not a 2-disjunct matrix. We start proving that for any two columns of \mathcal{S} , they

contain an 2×2 identity matrix. Indeed, suppose $\mathbf{b}_w = (b_{1w}, \dots, b_{(k/2)w})^T$, which is a $\log N$ -bit binary representation of $0 \leq w - 1 \leq N - 1$. For any two vectors \mathbf{b}_{w_1} and \mathbf{b}_{w_2} , there exists a position i_0 such that $b_{i_0 w_1} = 0$ and $b_{i_0 w_2} = 1$, or $b_{i_0 w_1} = 1$ and $b_{i_0 w_2} = 0$ for any $1 \leq w_1 \neq w_2 \leq N$. Then their corresponding complementary vectors $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{w_1} = (\bar{b}_{1w_1}, \dots, \bar{b}_{(k/2)w_1})^T$ and $\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{w_2} = (\bar{b}_{1w_2}, \dots, \bar{b}_{(k/2)w_2})^T$ satisfy: $\bar{b}_{i_0 w_1} = 0$ and $\bar{b}_{i_0 w_2} = 1$ when $b_{i_0 w_1} = 0$ and $b_{i_0 w_2} = 1$, or $\bar{b}_{i_0 w_1} = 1$ and $\bar{b}_{i_0 w_2} = 0$ when $b_{i_0 w_1} = 1$ and $b_{i_0 w_2} = 0$. Thus, for any two columns w_1 and w_2 of \mathcal{S} , there always exists an 2×2 identity matrix inside. By using Theorem 6 (set $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{S}$), we have:

Theorem 7. *Let $2 \leq N$ be an integer. A $4 \log^2 N \times N$ nonrandom measurement matrix \mathcal{T} can be used to identify at most 2 defective items in time $4 \log^2 N$. Moreover, each entry of \mathcal{T} can be computed in space $2 \log N + \log(2 \log N)$ with four operations.*

Proof. For an entry at the row i and the column j , it takes $\gamma = 2 \log N + \log(2 \log N)$ bits to be indexed. It needs only two shift operations and a mod operation to exactly locate the position of the entry in column \mathcal{S}_j . Therefore, it needs at most four operations ($\beta = 4$) and $2 \log N + \log(2 \log N)$ bits to locate the entry in the matrix \mathcal{T} . The decoding time is straightforwardly obtained because of Theorem 6 ($t = k = 2 \log N$). \square

4.2. General case

Indyk et al. [10] used Theorem 5 and Parvaresh-Vardy (PV) codes [19] to come up with Theorem 3. Since the authors would like to convert a RS code to a list-recoverable code, they instantiate the PV code into the RS code. However, because a PV code is powerful in terms of solving general problems, its decoding complexity is high. Therefore, the decoding complexity in Theorem 3 is pretty high. In this paper, with the aid of converting a RS code into a list-recoverable code using Theorem 4, we carefully use Theorem 5 to construct and decode disjoint matrices. Then, the number of tests and the decoding time of a nonrandom disjoint matrix can be significantly reduced.

Let $W(x)$ be a Lambert W function in which $W(x)e^{W(x)} = x$ for any $x \geq -\frac{1}{e}$. When $x > 0$, $W(x)$ is an increasing function. One useful bound [20] for the Lambert W function is $\ln x - \ln \ln x \leq W(x) \leq \ln x - \frac{1}{2} \ln \ln x$ for any $x \geq e$. Theorem 5 is used to achieve the following theorem with careful setting on C_{out} and C_{in} :

Theorem 8. Let $1 \leq d \leq N$ be integers. Then there exist a nonrandom d -disjunct matrix \mathcal{M} with $t = O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^2 N}{(W(d \log N))^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{d^2 \ln^2 N}{(\ln(d \ln N) - \ln \ln(d \ln N))^2}\right)$. Each entry of \mathcal{M} can be computed in time and space $O(t)$. And \mathcal{M} can be used to identify up to d' defective items, where $d' \geq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor + 1$, in time

$$O\left(\frac{d^{3.57} \log^{6.26} N}{(\ln(d \ln N) - \ln \ln(d \ln N))^{6.26}}\right) + O\left(\frac{d^6 \ln^4 N}{(\ln(d \ln N) - \ln \ln(d \ln N))^4}\right).$$

When d is the power of 2, $d' = d - 1$.

Proof. Construction: We use the classical method proposed by Kautz and Singleton [9] to construct a d -disjunct matrix. First, C_{out} is chosen as a $[n = q - 1, r]_q$ -RS code, where

$$q = \begin{cases} 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} = \frac{d \ln N}{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} & \text{if } 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \text{ is the power of 2.} \\ 2^{\eta+1} & \text{if } 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \text{ is not the power of 2.} \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

where η is an integer satisfying $2^\eta < 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} < 2^{\eta+1}$. Set $r = \lceil \frac{q-2}{d} \rceil$, and let C_{in} be an $q \times q$ identity matrix. The complexity of q is still $O(e^{W(d \ln N)}) = O\left(\frac{d \ln N}{W(d \ln N)}\right)$ in both cases because

$$2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} = \frac{d \ln N}{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \leq q < 2 \cdot 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} = \frac{2d \ln N}{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)}. \quad (25)$$

Let $C = C_{\text{out}} \circ C_{\text{in}}$. We are going to prove that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_C$ is d -disjunct for such q and r . It is well known [9] that if $d \leq \frac{q-1-1}{r-1}$, \mathcal{M} is d -disjunct with $t = q(q-1)$ tests. Indeed, we have

$$\frac{q-1-1}{r-1} = \frac{q-2}{\lceil \frac{q-2}{d} \rceil - 1} \geq \frac{q-2}{\frac{q-2}{d} + 1 - 1} = d. \quad (26)$$

Since $q = O\left(\frac{d \ln N}{W(d \ln N)}\right)$, the number of tests in \mathcal{M} is

$$\begin{aligned} t = q(q-1) &= O\left(\frac{d^2 \ln^2 N}{(W(d \ln N))^2}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{d^2 \ln^2 N}{(\ln(d \ln N) - \ln \ln(d \ln N))^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

because $\ln x - \ln \ln x \leq W(x) \leq \ln x - \frac{1}{2} \ln \ln x$ for any $x \geq e$. Since C_{out} is a $[n, r]_q$ -RS code, each of its codewords can be computed [16] in time

$$O(r^2) = O\left(\left(\frac{\ln N}{\ln(d \ln N) - \ln \ln(d \ln N)}\right)^2\right) = O\left(\frac{t}{d^2}\right) = O(t),$$

and space

$$S_1 = O(r \log q / \log^2 r) = O(q \log q) = O(d \ln N) = O(t). \quad (27)$$

Our task is now to prove that the number of columns in \mathcal{M}_C , i.e., q^r , is at least N . The range of $\frac{d \ln N}{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \leq q < \frac{2d \ln N}{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)}$ is:

$$d + 2 < \frac{d \ln N}{\ln(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N) - \frac{1}{2} \ln \ln(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \leq q \quad (28)$$

$$q \leq \frac{2d \ln N}{\ln(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N) - \ln \ln(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} < 2d \ln N. \quad (29)$$

We got these inequality because $\ln x - \ln \ln x \leq W(x) \leq \ln x - \frac{1}{2} \ln \ln x$ for any $x \geq e$. Then we have:

$$q^{(q-2)/d} = \left(\frac{q^q}{q^2}\right)^{1/d} \quad (30)$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{1}{q^2} \times \left(2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)}\right)^q\right)^{1/d} = \left(\frac{2^q}{q^2} \times \left(e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)}\right)^q\right)^{1/d} \quad (31)$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{2^q}{q^2} \times \left(e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N) \times 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)}}\right)\right)^{1/d} = \left(\frac{2^q}{q^2} \times e^{2 \times \frac{1}{2}d \ln N}\right)^{1/d} \quad (32)$$

$$\geq N \times \left(\frac{2^q}{q^2}\right)^{1/d} \quad (33)$$

$$> N. \quad (34)$$

Equation (32) is achieved because $W(x)e^{W(x)} = x$. And equation (34) is obtained because $\left(\frac{2^q}{q^2}\right)^{1/d} \geq 1$ for any $q \geq 5$. Since $\frac{q-2}{d} \leq r = \lceil \frac{q-2}{d} \rceil < \frac{q-2}{d} + 1$, the number of codewords in C_{out} is:

$$N < q^{(q-2)/d} \leq q^r < q^{(q-2)/d+1} = q \times q^{(q-2)/d} \quad (35)$$

$$< \frac{d \ln N}{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \left(\frac{2^q}{q^2}\right)^{1/d} \times N. \quad (36)$$

Equation (35) indicates that the number of columns in \mathcal{M}_C is more than N . To get a $t \times N$ matrix, one simply removes $q^r - N$ columns in \mathcal{M}_C . The maximum number of columns we remove is $O(d \ln N \times N^2)$ because of (36).

Decoding: Let consider the ratio $\frac{q-1}{r}$ which is implied the list size $d' = \lceil \frac{q-1}{r} \rceil - 1 = \lceil \frac{q-1}{\lceil (q-2)/d \rceil} \rceil - 1$ of $[q-1, r]_q$ -RS code. Parameter d' is also the maximum number of defective items that \mathcal{M} can be used to identify because of Theorem 5. We have:

$$d' = \left\lceil \frac{q-1}{\lceil (q-2)/d \rceil} \right\rceil - 1 \geq d \left(1 - \frac{d-1}{q+d-2} \right) > \frac{d}{2}, \quad (37)$$

because $q+d-2 \geq 2d > 2(d-1)$. Since d' is an integer, $d' \geq \lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor + 1$.

Next we prove that $d' = d-1$ when d is the power of 2, e.g., $d = 2^x$ for some positive integer x . Since q is also the power of 2 as (24), suppose that $q = 2^y$ for some positive integer y . Because $q > d$ in (28), $2^y > 2^x$. Then $r = \lceil \frac{q-1}{d} \rceil = 2^{y-x}$. Therefore, $d' = \lceil \frac{q-1}{r} \rceil - 1 = 2^x - 1 = d - 1$.

The decoding complexity of our proposed scheme is analyzed here. We have:

- Code C_{out} is a $(d' = \lceil \frac{q-1}{\lceil (q-2)/d \rceil} \rceil - 1, L = O(\frac{n^4}{r^2}) = O(q^2 d^2))$ -list recoverable code as in Theorem 4. It can be decoded in time

$$T_1 = O(n^{3.57} r^{2.69}) = O\left(\frac{d^{3.57} \log^{6.26} N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^{6.26}}\right).$$

Moreover, any codeword entry in C_{out} can be computed in time $O(r^2) = O(\frac{t}{d^2})$ and space S_1 as in (27).

- C_{in} is an $q \times q$ identity matrix. Then $\mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{in}}}$ is a q -disjunct matrix. Since $d' \leq d < q$, $\mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{in}}}$ is also a d' -disjunct matrix. It can be decoded in time $T_2 = d'q$ and each codeword can be computed in space $S_2 = \log q$.

By using Theorem 5, given any outcome produced by at most d' defective

items, they can be identified in time

$$\begin{aligned}
T_s &= nT_2 + T_1 + O(Lt) \\
&= nd'q + O\left(\frac{d^{3.57} \ln^{6.26} N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^{6.26}}\right) \\
&\quad + O\left(\frac{d^6 \ln^4 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^4}\right) \\
&= O\left(\frac{d^{3.57} \ln^{6.26} N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^{6.26}}\right) \\
&\quad + O\left(\frac{d^6 \ln^4 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^4}\right). \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, each entry in \mathcal{M} can be computed in time $O(t)$ and space $O(\log t + \log N) + O(\max\{S_1, S_2\}) = O(d \log N) = O(t)$. \square

If we substitute d by $2^{\lfloor \log_2 d \rfloor + 1}$ in the theorem above, the measurement matrix is $2^{\lfloor \log_2 d \rfloor + 1}$ -disjunct. Therefore, it can be used to identify at most $d' = 2^{\lfloor \log_2 d \rfloor + 1} - 1 \geq d$ defective items. The number of tests and the decoding complexity in the theorem remain unchanged because $d < 2^{\lfloor \log_2 d \rfloor + 1} \leq 2d$.

5. Evaluation

Our simulations are carried out by testing $d = 2, 2^3, 2^7, 2^{10}, 2^{12}$ and $N = 2^{20}, 2^{40}, 2^{60}, 2^{80}, 2^{100}$. We run simulations for our proposed schemes in Matlab R2015a and test them on a HP Compaq Pro 8300SF with 3.4 GHz Intel Core i7-3770 and 16 GB memory.

5.1. Numerical settings on N, d , and q

We focus on nonrandom construction of a $t \times N$ d -disjunct matrix \mathcal{M} in which the time to generate an entry is poly(t). Given integers d and N , a $[n = q - 1, r]_q$ code C_{out} and an $q \times q$ identity matrix C_{in} are set up to create $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{C_{\text{out}} \circ C_{\text{in}}}$. The precise formulas of q, r, t are: $q = 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)}$ or $q = 2^{\eta+1}$ as in (24), $r = \lceil \frac{q-2}{d} \rceil$, and $t = q(q-1)$. Note that the integer q is the power of 2. Moreover, $N' = q^r$ is the maximum number of items such that the resulting $t \times N'$ matrix generated from this RS code is still d -disjunct. Parameter $d' = \lceil \frac{q-1}{r} \rceil - 1 = \lceil \frac{q-1}{\lceil (q-2)/d \rceil} \rceil - 1$ is the maximum number of defective items that the matrix \mathcal{M} can be used to identify them. And the

parameters $t_2 = 4800d^2 \log N$ and $t_1 = d \log N(d \log N - 1)$ are the number of tests in Theorem 2 and 3. The numerical results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Parameter settings for $[q-1, r]_q$ -RS code and the resulting $q(q-1) \times N$ d -disjunct matrix. They are the number of items N , the maximum number of defective items d , the alphabet size q as in (24), the dimension $r = \lceil \frac{q-2}{d} \rceil$, and the number of tests $t = q(q-1)$. Moreover, $N' = q^r$ is the maximum number of items such that the resulting $q(q-1) \times N'$ matrix generated from this RS code is still d -disjunct. Parameter $d' = \lceil \frac{q-1}{\lceil (q-2)/d \rceil} \rceil - 1$ is the maximum number of defective items that the $t \times N$ resulting matrix can be used to identify. Parameters $t_2 = 4800d^2 \log N$ and $t_1 = d \log N(d \log N - 1)$ are the number of tests in Theorem 2 and 3.

d	N	q	$t = q(q-1)$	r	d'	N'	$t_1 = d \log N(d \log N - 1)$	$t_2 = 4800d^2 \log N$
$2^3 = 8$	2^{20}	$2^6 = 64$	4,032	8	$d-1$	2^{48}	25,440	6,144,000
	2^{40}	$2^7 = 128$	16,256	16	$d-1$	2^{102}	102,080	12,288,000
	2^{60}	$2^7 = 128$	16,256	16	$d-1$	2^{102}	229,920	18,432,000
	2^{80}	$2^7 = 128$	16,256	16	$d-1$	2^{102}	408,960	24,576,000
	2^{100}	$2^8 = 256$	65,280	32	$d-1$	2^{256}	639,200	30,720,000
$2^7 = 128$	2^{20}	$2^9 = 512$	261,632	4	$d-1$	2^{36}	6,551,040	1,572,864,000
	2^{40}	$2^{10} = 1,024$	1,047,552	8	$d-1$	2^{80}	26,209,280	3,145,728,000
	2^{60}	$2^{10} = 1,024$	1,047,552	8	$d-1$	2^{80}	58,974,720	4,718,592,000
	2^{80}	$2^{11} = 2,048$	4,192,256	16	$d-1$	2^{176}	104,847,360	6,291,456,000
	2^{100}	$2^{11} = 2,048$	4,192,256	16	$d-1$	2^{176}	163,827,200	7,864,320,000
$2^{10} = 1,024$	2^{20}	$2^{11} = 2,048$	4,192,256	2	$d-1$	2^{22}	419,409,920	100,663,296,000
	2^{40}	$2^{12} = 4,096$	16,773,120	4	$d-1$	2^{48}	1,677,680,640	201,326,592,000
	2^{60}	$2^{13} = 8,192$	67,100,672	8	$d-1$	2^{104}	3,774,812,160	301,989,888,000
	2^{80}	$2^{13} = 8,192$	67,100,672	8	$d-1$	2^{104}	6,710,804,480	402,653,184,000
	2^{100}	$2^{14} = 16,384$	268,419,072	16	$d-1$	2^{224}	10,485,657,600	503,316,480,000
$2^{12} = 4,096$	2^{20}	$2^{13} = 8,192$	67,100,672	2	$d-1$	2^{26}	6,710,804,480	1,610,612,736,000
	2^{40}	$2^{14} = 16,384$	268,419,072	4	$d-1$	2^{56}	26,843,381,760	3,221,225,472,000
	2^{60}	$2^{15} = 32,768$	1,072,398,336	8	$d-1$	2^{120}	60,397,731,840	4,831,838,208,000
	2^{80}	$2^{15} = 32,768$	1,072,398,336	8	$d-1$	2^{120}	107,373,854,720	6,442,450,944,000
	2^{100}	$2^{15} = 32,768$	1,072,398,336	8	$d-1$	2^{120}	167,771,750,400	8,053,063,680,000

Since the number of test in Theorem 2 is $O(d^2 \log N)$, it *literally* should smaller than the number of tests in Theorem 3, which is $t = O(d^2 \log^2 N)$, and Theorem 8, which is $t = O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^2 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^2}\right)$. However, the numerical results in Table 2 show the opposite fact. Even when $d = 2^{12} \approx 0.4\%$ of N , the number of tests in Theorem 2 is largest. Moreover, there is no efficient construction scheme associated with it. The main reason is that the multiplicity of $O(d^2 \log N)$ is 4,800, which is quite huge. Figure 1 shows the ratio between the number of tests in Theorem 2 and Theorem 8 (our proposed scheme), and Theorem 3 and Theorem 8 (our proposed scheme). It

is obvious that the number of tests in our proposed scheme is quite smaller than the existing schemes, even when $N = 2^{100}$. One implies that matrices generated from Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 are *good in theoretical analysis*, but *bad in practice*.




Figure 1: The ratios of the number of tests in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 to the number of tests in the proposed scheme (Theorem 8) for $d = 2^3, 2^{10}$ and $N = 2^{20}, 2^{40}, 2^{60}, 2^{80}, 2^{100}$. The ratio is always larger than 1.

On the other hand, a nonrandom d -disjunct matrix is easily generated from Theorem 8. It also can be used to identify at most $d - 1$ defective items. If we would like to identify at most d defective items, one generates a nonrandom $(d + 1)$ -disjunct matrix in which the number of tests is still smaller than t_1 and t_2 . Since the number of tests in Theorem 8 is the lowest, its decoding time is also the lowest. In summary, for implementation, we recommend using the nonrandom construction in Theorem 8.

5.2. Experimental results

Since the time to generate an entry of a measurement matrix would be high if it is $O(tN)$, we only focus on implementing the methods in which the time to generate an entry of a measurement matrix is $\text{poly}(t)$, i.e., $\langle \mathbf{3} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{4} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{8} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{9} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{10} \rangle$ in Table 1. However, to apply a measurement matrix into applications, random constructions are not preferable. Therefore, we only focus on nonrandom constructions. In this paper, we are unable to

program decoding on list recoverable codes because it requires knowledge on algebra, finite field, linear algebra, and probability. Therefore, our proposed schemes are conducted by implementing [4](#) (Theorem 7) and [8](#) (Corollary 3). It is reasonable because as analyzed in section 5.1, for nonrandom constructions, the number of tests in Theorem 8 are the best for implementation. Since Corollary 3 is derived from Theorem 8, its decoding time also should be the best for implementation.

We run experiments for $d = 2$ in Theorem 7 and $d = 2^3, 2^7$ in Corollary 3. The cases $d = 2^{10}, 2^{12}$ are not implemented because there is not enough memory (more than 100 GB of RAM needed). Decoding time is calculated in seconds and the average of a hundred implementations. When $d = 2$, the decoding time is smaller than 1 millisecond. Experimental results in Figure 2 confirm our theoretical analysis, which is the decoding time is linear to the number of tests. Moreover, it is extremely fast to identify defective items (less than 16 seconds) even when $N = 2^{100}$. Note that the accuracy is always 1, i.e., all defective items are exactly identified.




Figure 2: Decoding time for $d = 2^3, 2^7$ in Theorem 7. The number of items N is set to be $\{2^{20}, 2^{40}, 2^{60}, 2^{80}, 2^{100}\}$.

6. Conclusion

We present two main contributions in this work: proposal of a scheme such that a larger measurement matrix built from a given $t \times N$ measurement

matrix can be decoded in time $O(t \log N)$ and a construction of a nonrandom d -disjunct matrix with $t = O\left(\frac{d^2 \log^2 N}{(\log(d \log N) - \log \log(d \log N))^2}\right)$ tests. It implies that the upper bound for nonrandom construction is not $O(d^2 \log^2 N)$ so far. Although the number of tests in our proposed schemes is not optimal in term of theoretical analysis, it is the best for implementation. In particular, the decoding time is less than 16 seconds even when $d = 2^7 = 128$ and $N = 2^{100}$. Moreover, in nonrandom constructions, there is no need to store a measurement matrix because each of its columns can be generated efficiently.

Open problem: The interesting fact that N is quite smaller than N' when q grows in Table 2. Our hypothesis is that that the number of tests needed may be smaller than $2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \left(2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} - 1\right)$. This paves the way to have a very efficient construction and decoding time without using randomness. It would be more interesting to answer the question that whether there exists a $t \times N$ d -disjunct matrix with $t \leq 2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} \left(2e^{W(\frac{1}{2}d \ln N)} - 1\right)$, constructed in time $O(tN)$, each entry is generated in time and space $\text{poly}(t)$, and the decoding time is $O(t^2)$.

7. Acknowledgments

The first author would like to thank Dr. Mahdi Cheraghchi for his fruitful discussions.

8. References

References

- [1] R. Dorfman, The detection of defective members of large populations, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 14 (4) (1943) 436–440.
- [2] P. Damaschke, Threshold group testing, in: *General theory of information transfer and combinatorics*, Springer, 2006, pp. 707–718.
- [3] D. Du, F. K. Hwang, F. Hwang, *Combinatorial group testing and its applications*, Vol. 12, World Scientific, 2000.
- [4] A. G. D'yachkov, V. V. Rykov, Bounds on the length of disjunctive codes, *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* 18 (3) (1982) 7–13.

- [5] G. K. Atia, V. Saligrama, Boolean compressed sensing and noisy group testing, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 58 (3) (2012) 1880–1901.
- [6] G. Cormode, S. Muthukrishnan, What’s hot and what’s not: tracking most frequent items dynamically, *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 30 (1) (2005) 249–278.
- [7] S. Cai, M. Jahangoshahi, M. Bakshi, S. Jaggi, Grotesque: noisy group testing (quick and efficient), in: *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2013 51st Annual Allerton Conference on, IEEE, 2013, pp. 1234–1241.
- [8] K. Lee, R. Pedarsani, K. Ramchandran, Saffron: A fast, efficient, and robust framework for group testing based on sparse-graph codes, in: *Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2016 IEEE International Symposium on, IEEE, 2016, pp. 2873–2877.
- [9] W. Kautz, R. Singleton, Nonrandom binary superimposed codes, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 10 (4) (1964) 363–377.
- [10] P. Indyk, H. Q. Ngo, A. Rudra, Efficiently decodable non-adaptive group testing, in: *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SIAM, 2010, pp. 1126–1142.
- [11] V. Guruswami, P. Indyk, Linear-time list decoding in error-free settings, in: *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, Springer, 2004, pp. 695–707.
- [12] M. Cheraghchi, Noise-resilient group testing: Limitations and constructions, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 161 (1-2) (2013) 81–95.
- [13] E. Porat, A. Rothschild, Explicit non-adaptive combinatorial group testing schemes, in: *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, Springer, 2008, pp. 748–759.
- [14] V. Guruswami, et al., Algorithmic results in list decoding, *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science* 2 (2) (2007) 107–195.
- [15] M. F. Chowdhury, C.-P. Jeannerod, V. Neiger, E. Schost, G. Villard, Faster algorithms for multivariate interpolation with multiplicities and

- simultaneous polynomial approximations, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 61 (5) (2015) 2370–2387.
- [16] J. Von Zur Gathen, M. Nöcker, Exponentiation in finite fields: theory and practice, in: *International Symposium on Applied Algebra, Algebraic Algorithms, and Error-Correcting Codes*, Springer, 1997, pp. 88–113.
 - [17] T. V. Bui, T. Kojima, M. Kuribayashi, I. Echizen, Efficient decoding schemes for noisy non-adaptive group testing when noise depends on number of items in test, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.06105*.
 - [18] T. V. Bui, M. Kuribayashi, M. Cheraghchi, I. Echizen, Efficiently decodable non-adaptive threshold group testing, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.07509*.
 - [19] F. Parvaresh, A. Vardy, Correcting errors beyond the guruswami-sudan radius in polynomial time, in: *Foundations of Computer Science, 2005. FOCS 2005. 46th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, IEEE, 2005, pp. 285–294.
 - [20] A. Hoorfar, M. Hassani, Inequalities on the lambert w function and hyperpower function, *J. Inequal. Pure and Appl. Math* 9 (2) (2008) 5–9.