

Revisiting zero-rate bounds on the reliability function of discrete memoryless channels

Marco Bondaschi* and Marco Dalai*

December 11, 2019

Abstract

We present a new proof of Berlekamp's zero-rate upper bound on the reliability function of discrete memoryless channels, in its extended form for list-decoding as first proved by Blinovsky. The Berlekamp-Blinovsky proof, which is the only one available in the literature, is based on a rather unusual procedure which prevents the combination with other tools for possible extensions of the result. We present a proof that - we think - is more transparent and more convenient to play with. The main ideas and tools used are not new and our aim is indeed to give a *standardized* proof based on well established and reusable principles. An important part, namely the use of Ramsey theory and of a beautiful result by Komlós, was already considered by Blinovsky himself for a similar problem of packing in Hamming spaces. However, we use some variations and combinations with other tools which lead, in our opinion, to a cleaner proof also for this specific problem. To the best of our knowledge, this was never presented before.

1 Introduction

For discrete memoryless channels with no zero-error capacity, it was proved by Berlekamp in his PhD thesis [1] that the expurgated bound [2] is tight at $R = 0$. The result was published in the celebrated joint paper with Shannon and Gallager in 1967 [4] and combined with the sphere packing bound, by means of the so-called straight-line bound [3], to give the first important upper bound on reliability function in the low rate region.

*The authors are with the Department of Information Engineering at the University of Brescia, Via Branze 38, I-25123 Brescia, Italy. Email: m.bondaschi@studenti.unibs.it, marco.dalai@unibs.it

Berlekamp's theorem is really a spectacular result, but also a rather singular case in the literature on error probability in channel coding. Roughly speaking, the starting point is the fact that the probability of error in the discrimination between two codewords \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' has exponent given by the quantity

$$\max_s \left(-\log \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})^{1-s} P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}')^s \right), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{Y}^n is the set of output sequences and P is the channel transition probability. The main problem is then to show that in a large code there must be two codewords for which that quantity is at most roughly n times the single-letter quantity

$$\max_Q \left[-\sum_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}} Q(x)Q(x') \log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{P(y|x)P(y|x')} \right]. \quad (2)$$

The idea is to attempt averaging (1) over many pairs of codewords and exploit the additivity of the log to use a double counting trick (over pairs of codewords and over coordinates), as usually done in the Plotkin bound. The difficulty is due to the presence of the maximization over s , which is achieved at different values of s for different pairs of codewords. Berlekamp uses a brilliant procedure to overcome this difficulty. He starts first by selecting an *ordered* subcode for which the maximum over s is obtained for $s \geq 1/2$ whenever $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{x}'$. He then uses a variation of the Plotkin averaging trick where \mathbf{x} is taken in the first half of the code and \mathbf{x}' in the second half. Finally, he applies a recursive partition of the code and concatenation of codewords which allows him to show that if the average was too large than one would end up building an impossible sequence. The proof is rather striking, but we think it is fair to say that, in his cleverness, it has remained an anomaly in this field.

Blinovsky extended the result to list decoding in [5]. The case of list decoding adds some additional difficulties due to the fact that the maximization in (1) is replaced by a multivariate maximization. Blinovsky manages to extend the original proof essentially maintaining its structure, but some of his statements require subtle complicated verifications which make the proof even more difficult to inspect. Only one step in the proof changes in a substantial way; for the initial selection of a nice subcode, Blinovsky uses Ramsey theory. Blinovsky also uses this idea in another related paper [6] for packing balls in the Hamming space, where he exploits additional insights by Komlós [7] on the existence, in any sufficiently large set of random variables, of two with almost joint symmetric distribution.

The objective of this paper is to expand this idea of Blinovsky of using Komlós' result and combine it with standard tools in information theory (like the method of types, Sanov theorem and duality relations) to derive a neater proof of the

Berlekamp-Blinovsky theorem. The resulting proof is perhaps slightly longer, but we think it has some advantages. First, it seems to be more convenient for possible attempts toward extensions of the result by means of other tools in the literature. Second, it is easier to inspect in all details even for general list-size L .

2 Problem Formulation

For a given discrete memoryless channel with input alphabet \mathcal{X} , output alphabet \mathcal{Y} and transition probability matrix $P(y|x)$, and a given code \mathcal{C} with M messages $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} : \mathcal{M} &\rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n \\ m &\mapsto \mathbf{x}_m \end{aligned}$$

we search for the best L -list decoding scheme

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{-1} : \mathcal{Y}^n &\rightarrow [\mathcal{M}]^L \\ \mathbf{y} &\mapsto \{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_L\} \end{aligned}$$

where the symbol $[\mathcal{M}]^L$ denotes the set of all subsets of \mathcal{M} of cardinality L . Such a decoding scheme implicitly defines a set of M decoding regions $\mathcal{Y}_m \subset \mathcal{Y}^n$, each one containing all the output sequences \mathbf{y} whose decoded list $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\mathbf{y})$ has the message m in it. The best decoding scheme is the one with the smallest probability of error P_e , defined as

$$P_e = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M P_{e,m} \quad (3)$$

where for any $m \in \mathcal{M}$ we define

$$P_{e,m} = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_m^c} P_m(\mathbf{y}). \quad (4)$$

$P_m(\mathbf{y})$ is the probability that the output sequence is \mathbf{y} given that the input message is m (or, equivalently, that the input codeword is \mathbf{x}_m). This probability is given by

$$P_m(\mathbf{y}) = P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}_m) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(y_i|x_{m,i}). \quad (5)$$

In order to find this optimal L -list decoding scheme, we first find the probability of error of the optimal scheme for codes with $L + 1$ codewords. Next, we show that that decoding scheme can be adapted to codes with an arbitrary number of codewords $M \geq L + 1$ with (asymptotically) the same probability of error; since the probability of error decreases with M for fixed L and n , that decoding scheme is optimal.

3 Probability of error for $L + 1$ codewords

Consider a fixed code with $L + 1$ messages $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, \dots, L + 1\}$ and their associated codewords $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{L+1}\}$, $\mathbf{x}_m \in \mathcal{X}^n$. The decoding scheme that achieves the minimum probability of error P_e is the maximum-likelihood one, i.e., the one that decodes each output sequence \mathbf{y} with all the messages except for the one with the smallest probability $P_m(\mathbf{y})$.

With such a decoding scheme, the complementary of each decoding region \mathcal{Y}_m^c (the set of all output sequences that do *not* have the message m in their decoded list) contains sequences \mathbf{y} such that $\min_i P_i(\mathbf{y}) = P_m(\mathbf{y})$; furthermore, each sequence \mathbf{y} belongs to one, and only one, \mathcal{Y}_m^c . We want to group together sequences that have the same $P_m(\mathbf{y})$ for all m , since all them belong to the same \mathcal{Y}_m^c and have the same impact on the overall probability of error P_e .

Suppose for example that there are two coordinates i and j , with $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, such that each of the $L+1$ codewords has the same symbol at those two coordinates, i.e., $x_{m,i} = x_{m,j}$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$. Then, for any sequence \mathbf{y} we can invert the symbols at coordinates i and j and obtain a sequence \mathbf{y}^* with $P_m(\mathbf{y}^*) = P_m(\mathbf{y})$ for all m . For this reason, we partition the set of coordinates $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into $|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}$ groups $\mathbf{I} = (I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}})$, one for each possible sequence of $L + 1$ input symbols, and we assign each coordinate k to the partition corresponding to the sequence $(x_{1,k}, x_{2,k}, \dots, x_{L+1,k})$. Then, all the output sequences \mathbf{y} that have the same symbols (each symbol the same number of times, but possibly in a different order) in every set of coordinates I_k , have the same probabilities $P_m(\mathbf{y})$ for all m . Hence, we can consider them together as a group since they are all decoded in the same way. Therefore, we can partition the set of all possible output sequences \mathcal{Y}^n into groups depending on the frequency of occurrences of the different output symbols in each group of coordinates I_k . Each partition I_k contains a number of coordinates n_k , with $\sum_k n_k = n$. To lighten the notation, we define the vector $\mathbf{n} \triangleq (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}})$. Finally, we define for each sequence \mathbf{y} its *type* as $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{y}) \triangleq (T_1(\mathbf{y}), \dots, T_{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}}(\mathbf{y}))$, where each $T_k(\mathbf{y})$ is a probability vector on \mathcal{Y} containing in each component the fraction of times the symbol $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ is present in the region I_k ; if $n_k = 0$ for some k , we set $T_k(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{0}$ for all \mathbf{y} .

Example 1. Suppose we have binary alphabets $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$ and a code with $M = 3$ codewords of block length $n = 10$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_1 &= 0000011111 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 &= 0101010101 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 &= 0101011111. \end{aligned}$$

For these codewords, we only have 4 sequences of input symbols that appear at one or more coordinates: $(0, 0, 0)$ at coordinates 1, 3 and 5, $(0, 1, 1)$ at coordinates

2 and 4, $(1, 0, 1)$ at coordinates 7 and 9, and $(1, 1, 1)$ at coordinates 6, 8 and 10. For simplicity, we call I_1, I_2, I_3 and I_4 the sets of coordinates corresponding to those sequences of inputs (in the same order); all the other partitions are empty. Furthermore, we have $n_1 = n_4 = 3$ and $n_2 = n_3 = 2$.

Consider now the output sequence

$$\mathbf{y} = 0101110011.$$

In the first set of coordinates I_1 , i.e., coordinates 1, 3 and 5, symbol 0 occurs 2 out of 3 times, and symbol 1 occurs 1 out of 3 times; hence, $T_1(\mathbf{y}) = (\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$. The same reasoning applies to the other three sets of coordinates, yielding $T_2(\mathbf{y}) = (0, 1)$, $T_3(\mathbf{y}) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $T_4(\mathbf{y}) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$. Any other output sequence with the same type as \mathbf{y} , for example

$$\mathbf{y}^* = 1101011100$$

has the same probabilities P_1, P_2 and P_3 as \mathbf{y} , regardless of the discrete memoryless channel under consideration.

The setting illustrated above is a generalization of the classic method of types by Csiszár and Körner [8]. Also in this case, the key idea is that the number of different types \mathbf{T} is polynomial in n , while the number of sequences of the same type is exponential in n . We now state some properties of generalized types that are analogous to those of classic types; their proofs follow closely those found in Csiszár and Körner [8] or Cover and Thomas [9]. Throughout the paper, we will use the notation $\exp(t) = 2^t$.

Lemma 1. *For a given partition \mathbf{I} of the set of coordinates, with vector of lengths \mathbf{n} , and a set of possible output sequences \mathcal{Y}^n , the following properties hold:*

1. *The number of different types $|\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}|$ is upper bounded by*

$$|\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{n}}| \leq \prod_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} (n_k + 1)^{|\mathcal{Y}|} \leq (n + 1)^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}|\mathcal{Y}|} \quad (6)$$

2. *The number of sequences of a given type \mathbf{T} is bounded by*

$$\frac{1}{(n + 1)^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}|\mathcal{Y}|}} \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k H(T_k) \right\} \leq |\mathbf{T}| \leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k H(T_k) \right\} \quad (7)$$

3. *Given a probability distribution Q on \mathcal{Y}^n such that for any $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$,*

$$Q(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} \prod_{i \in I_k} Q_k(y_i) \quad (8)$$

where for all k , $Q_k(y)$ is a probability distribution on \mathcal{Y} . Then, the total probability (under Q) of all sequences \mathbf{y} of type \mathbf{T} is bounded by

$$Q(\mathbf{T}) \geq \frac{1}{(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}|\mathcal{Y}|}} \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k || Q_k) \right\} \quad (9)$$

$$Q(\mathbf{T}) \leq \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k || Q_k) \right\} \quad (10)$$

Notice that P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{L+1} are all in the form (8), since in the regions I_k the corresponding codewords have the same symbol. Notice also that if each of the codewords is composed by one symbol repeated n times then all the coordinates belong to the same partition I and the types are reduced to the classic ones.

We can now proceed to study the overall probability of error for the maximum-likelihood L -list decoding scheme. For all $m \in \mathcal{M}$ we have that

$$\mathbf{y} \in Y_m^c \implies \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}} P_i(\mathbf{y}) = P_m(\mathbf{y}) \iff \log \frac{P_i(\mathbf{y})}{P_m(\mathbf{y})} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (11)$$

The last implication can be rewritten with some manipulations as

$$\mathbf{y} \in Y_m^c \implies \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k(\mathbf{y}) || P_{m,k}) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k(\mathbf{y}) || P_{i,k}) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (12)$$

Hence, we can see the decoding regions as decoding regions on types instead of sequences, and rewrite the implication above as

$$\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_m^c \implies \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k || P_{i,k}) = \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k || P_{m,k}). \quad (13)$$

In order to avoid that some of the KL divergences go to infinity, in the following we will consider only the output sequences \mathbf{y} belonging to the set

$$\mathcal{Y}_*^n = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n \mid P_1(\mathbf{y})P_2(\mathbf{y}) \cdots P_{L+1}(\mathbf{y}) > 0\}. \quad (14)$$

This is equivalent to assume that the channel we consider has zero-error capacity (for L -list decoding) $C_{0,L} = 0$. This is not a limitation since if for some m , $P_m(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, then that sequence is always (L -list) decoded correctly and it does not contribute to P_e . This also means that for all the coordinates belonging to region I_k we only consider the output symbols y that belong to the set

$$\mathcal{Y}_k^* = \{y \in \mathcal{Y} \mid P_{1,k}(y)P_{2,k}(y) \cdots P_{L+1,k}(y) > 0\} \quad (15)$$

and this in turn implies that types T_k may be constrained to have some components equal to 0.

We now proceed to compute the probability of error of our code with $L + 1$ codewords of length n .

$$\begin{aligned} P_e &= \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{m=1}^{L+1} P_{e,m} = \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{m=1}^{L+1} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_m^c} P_m(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{m=1}^{L+1} \sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_m^c} P_m(\mathbf{T}) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Using the upper bound (10) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} P_e &\leq \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{m=1}^{L+1} \sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_m^c} \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k \| P_{m,k}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{m=1}^{L+1} \sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_m^c} \exp \left\{ - \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k \| P_{i,k}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{L+1} \sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*} \exp \left\{ - \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k \| P_{i,k}) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{T}^*|}{L+1} \exp \left\{ - \min_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*} \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k \| P_{i,k}) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}|\mathcal{Y}|}}{L+1} \exp \left\{ - n \min_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*} \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} \frac{n_k}{n} D(T_k \| P_{i,k}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where \mathcal{T}^* is the set of all types \mathbf{T} with $T_k(y) = 0$ for the y that meet condition (15). If instead we put the lower bound (9) into (16) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} P_e &\geq \frac{(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}|\mathcal{Y}|}}{L+1} \sum_{m=1}^{L+1} \sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_m^c} \exp \left\{ - \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k \| P_{m,k}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}|\mathcal{Y}|}}{L+1} \sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*} \exp \left\{ - \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k \| P_{i,k}) \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}|\mathcal{Y}|}}{L+1} \exp \left\{ - n \min_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}^*} \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} \frac{n_k}{n} D(T_k \| P_{i,k}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We now analyze more closely the exponent in equations (17) and (18). First of all, if we define for any type \mathbf{T} the probability distribution

$$T(\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \prod_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} \prod_{i \in I_k} T_k(y_i) \quad (19)$$

then we can use the additivity property of the KL divergence to obtain:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|^{L+1}} n_k D(T_k \| P_{i,k}) = D(T \| P_i) \quad (20)$$

so that the exponential dependency on the block length n becomes, apart from a minus sign,

$$\frac{1}{n} \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}^*} \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} D(T \| P_i). \quad (21)$$

If we now introduce a vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{L+1})$ with $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$, we can also write that

$$\frac{1}{n} \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}^*} \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} D(T \| P_i) = \frac{1}{n} \min_{T \in \mathcal{T}^*} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \alpha_i D(T \| P_i) \quad (22)$$

since the maximum over $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is obtained when the weight is all on the largest KL divergence.

We are interested in the value the exponent assumes asymptotically as n goes to infinity. For each k , when $n \rightarrow \infty$ there are two possibilities:

1. $n_k \rightarrow \infty$, so that $\{T_k\} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_k^*)$, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_k^*)$ is the set of all probability distributions on \mathcal{Y}_k^* .
2. $n_k \nrightarrow \infty$, so that $n_k/n \rightarrow 0$ and the contribution of $D(T_k \| P_{i,k})$ vanishes as n goes to infinity. In such a case, we can substitute the set of possible types $\{T_k\}$ with the set of probability distributions $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_k^*)$ with asymptotically no effect on the exponent's value.

Hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the set of types \mathcal{T}^* in which we search for the minimum in (22) tends to $\mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)$, which is the set of probability distributions on \mathcal{Y}_*^n in the form (8).

Furthermore, it is also true that

$$\min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \alpha_i D(Q \| P_i) \geq \min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \alpha_i D(Q \| P_i) \quad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)$ is the set of all probability distributions on \mathcal{Y}_*^n , since $\mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{Y}_*^n) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)$. Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\}$ are convex and compact, and since $\sum_i \alpha_i D(Q \| P_i)$ is continuous and concave (even linear) in $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ for any given Q , and it is continuous and convex in Q for any given $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, thanks to the convexity of $D(Q \| P)$, the min and max can exchange, leading to

$$\min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \alpha_i D(Q \| P_i) = \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)} \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \alpha_i D(Q \| P_i). \quad (24)$$

We can now apply the following lemma.

Lemma 2 (Shayevitz [10]). *Define*

$$\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \triangleq -\log \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_*^n} P_1(\mathbf{y})^{\alpha_1} P_2(\mathbf{y})^{\alpha_2} \dots P_{L+1}(\mathbf{y})^{\alpha_{L+1}}. \quad (25)$$

Then,

$$\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)} \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \alpha_i D(Q \| P_i) \quad (26)$$

and the minimizing Q is

$$Q^*(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{P_1(\mathbf{y})^{\alpha_1} P_2(\mathbf{y})^{\alpha_2} \dots P_{L+1}(\mathbf{y})^{\alpha_{L+1}}}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{Y}_*^n} P_1(\mathbf{y}')^{\alpha_1} P_2(\mathbf{y}')^{\alpha_2} \dots P_{L+1}(\mathbf{y}')^{\alpha_{L+1}}}. \quad (27)$$

If we now let

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^* \triangleq \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (28)$$

we have that, thanks to (24),

$$\min_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)} \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^{L+1} \alpha_i D(Q \| P_i) = \mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*). \quad (29)$$

Finally, since $Q^*(\mathbf{y})$ can be put in the form (8), it follows that $Q^* \in \mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{Y}_*^n)$, and therefore equation (23) is actually true with equality.

Next, we can use the fact that $\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is additive, i.e.,

$$\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (30)$$

where

$$\mu_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \triangleq -\log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_k^*} P(y|x_{1,i})^{\alpha_1} P(y|x_{2,i})^{\alpha_2} \dots P(y|x_{L+1,i})^{\alpha_{L+1}} \quad (31)$$

for $i \in I_k$. Since $\mu_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is equal for all $i \in I_k$, we can write:

$$\mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = n \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} q(\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (32)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{L+1})$ is a vector of $L+1$ input symbols (representing one of the regions I_k), $q(\mathbf{x})$ is the fraction of times the vector \mathbf{x} appears at a coordinate of the $L+1$ codewords (i.e., it is equal to n_k/n for the corresponding region I_k), and

$$\mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \triangleq -\log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{x}}^*} P(y|x_1)^{\alpha_1} P(y|x_2)^{\alpha_2} \dots P(y|x_{L+1})^{\alpha_{L+1}} \quad (33)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathbf{x}}^* = \{y \in \mathcal{Y} \mid P(y|x_1)P(y|x_2) \dots P(y|x_{L+1}) > 0\}. \quad (34)$$

Finally, if we define, for the $L+1$ messages $\mathbf{M} = \{1, 2, \dots, L+1\}$ we are considering,

$$D_{\mathbf{M}} \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \mu(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} q(\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*) \quad (35)$$

and we put this equation and equation (29) into (17) and (18), we can conclude that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a n_0 such that

$$\exp \{ -n(D_{\mathbf{M}} + \delta) \} \leq P_e \leq \exp \{ -n(D_{\mathbf{M}} - \delta) \} \quad \forall n \geq n_0. \quad (36)$$

4 Probability of error for M codewords

Consider a fixed code \mathcal{C} with $M \geq L+1$ messages $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ and the corresponding codewords $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M\}$ of block length n , and consider a fixed L -list decoding scheme with decoding regions \mathcal{Y}_m . For any subset of $L+1$ messages \mathbf{M} we have, thanks to equation (36), that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a n_0 such that for at least a message $m \in \mathbf{M}$,

$$P_{e,m} \geq \exp \{ -n(D_{\mathbf{M}} + \delta) \} \quad \forall n \geq n_0. \quad (37)$$

If we define

$$D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}) \triangleq \min_{\mathbf{M} \subset \mathcal{M}} D_{\mathbf{M}} \quad (38)$$

where the minimum is over all $(L+1)$ -subsets of \mathcal{M} , then, since the probability of error of \mathcal{C} is lower bounded by

$$P_e \geq \frac{P_{e,m}}{M}$$

for any message m , it follows that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a n_0 such that the probability of error of \mathcal{C} is lower bounded by

$$P_e \geq \exp \{ -n(D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}) + \delta) \} \quad \forall n \geq n_0. \quad (39)$$

Finally, we show that there exists a decoding scheme for \mathcal{C} that achieves the same exponential dependency as the lower bound, thus proving its optimality. We define the decoding regions Y_m as follows: for each message m , its decoding region Y_m is chosen to be the intersection of the maximum-likelihood decoding regions (of that message) for the codes formed by all the $(L+1)$ -subsets of \mathcal{M} that contain m (the probability of error for these codes is exactly that computed in the previous section), i.e.,

$$Y_m = \bigcap_{\mathbf{M} \subset \mathcal{M}: m \in \mathbf{M}} Y_m(\mathbf{M}). \quad (40)$$

This decoding scheme is legitimate since there is no \mathbf{y} that belongs to more than L decoding regions. Clearly, for the complements of the decoding regions it is true that

$$Y_m^c = \bigcup_{\mathbf{M} \subset \mathcal{M}: m \in \mathbf{M}} Y_m^c(\mathbf{M}) \quad (41)$$

and therefore, for this decoding scheme,

$$P_{e,m} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{M}} P_{e,m}(\mathbf{M}). \quad (42)$$

Finally, since all $P_{e,m}(\mathbf{M})$ are upper bounded by (36), it follows from (38) that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a n_0 such that

$$P_e \leq \exp \{ -n(D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}) - \delta) \} \quad \forall n \geq n_0. \quad (43)$$

Equations (39) and (43) show that the minimum probability of error for the code \mathcal{C} behaves asymptotically as

$$P_e \approx 2^{-nD_{\min}(\mathcal{C})}.$$

In the following sections we want to find an upper bound to the exponent of the probability of error for L -list decoding at rate $R = 0$ for the channel under consideration. The exponent as a function of the rate R is called *reliability function* and it is formally defined as

$$E_L(R) \triangleq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log P_e(L, R, n)}{n} \quad (44)$$

where $P_e(L, R, n)$ is the smallest probability of error for L -list decoding for codes with rate R and block length n . In order to achieve our objective, we first need a probability theory result by Komlós, which he originally derived for pairs of random variables. In the next section we generalize this theorem for groups of K random variables.

5 Generalization of Komlós' pigeon-hole principle

Consider a set of M random variables $\mathcal{M} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m\}$ taking values in a finite alphabet \mathcal{X} . Let us call

$$\chi_m(i) \triangleq \chi(X_m = i) \quad (45)$$

the indicator function over the sample space Ω of the random variable X_m taking the value $i \in \mathcal{X}$. With this notation,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \chi_m(i) dP &= P(X_m = i) \\ \int \chi_m(i)\chi_{m'}(j) dP &= P(X_m = i, X_{m'} = j) \end{aligned}$$

and so on. Define also the averages

$$\bar{\chi}_m(i) \triangleq \frac{\chi_1(i) + \chi_2(i) + \dots + \chi_m(i)}{m}. \quad (46)$$

Then, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 3 (Komlós [7]). *If for a fixed $i \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists a number r_i such that for all $m < m' \in \mathcal{M}$,*

$$\left| \int \chi_m(i)\chi_{m'}(i) dP - r_i \right| \leq \varepsilon \quad (47)$$

then, for all $m < m'$,

$$\int (\bar{\chi}_m(i) - \bar{\chi}_{m'}(i))^2 dP \leq \frac{2}{m} \left(1 - \frac{m}{m'}\right) + 4\varepsilon \left(1 - \frac{m}{m'}\right)^2. \quad (48)$$

Thanks to this lemma we can prove also the following lemma, which is a generalization for K random variables of the original result by Komlós.

Lemma 4. *Consider any fixed sequence of K symbols $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$, and consider a sequence $\mathbf{x}' = (x_1, \dots, x_{k+1}, x_k, \dots, x_K)$ obtained from \mathbf{x} by swapping any two adjacent symbols. Suppose that for all $i \in \mathbf{x}$, the functions $\chi_m(i)$ satisfy lemma 3 with the same ε . If for all ordered subsets of K random variables $\{X_{m_1}, X_{m_2}, \dots, X_{m_K}\} \subset \mathcal{M}$, $m_i < m_j$ for $i < j$,*

$$\left| \int \chi_{m_1}(x_1) \cdots \chi_{m_k}(x_k) \chi_{m_{k+1}}(x_{k+1}) \cdots \chi_{m_K}(x_K) dP - r_{\mathbf{x}} \right| \leq \delta \quad (49)$$

and

$$\left| \int \chi_{m_1}(x_1) \cdots \chi_{m_k}(x_{k+1}) \chi_{m_{k+1}}(x_k) \cdots \chi_{m_K}(x_K) dP - r_{\mathbf{x}'} \right| \leq \delta \quad (50)$$

then

$$|r_{\mathbf{x}} - r_{\mathbf{x}'}| \leq 4K \sqrt{\frac{2K}{M}} + 8K \sqrt{\varepsilon} + 2\delta. \quad (51)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the original by Komlós [7], with minor adjustments. Define for any $i \in \mathcal{X}$ the averages

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(i) &\triangleq \frac{K}{M} (\chi_1(i) + \cdots + \chi_{M/K}(i)) \\ A_2(i) &\triangleq \frac{K}{M} (\chi_{M/K+1}(i) + \cdots + \chi_{2M/K}(i)) \\ &\vdots \\ A_K(i) &\triangleq \frac{K}{M} (\chi_{(K-1)M/K+1}(i) + \cdots + \chi_M(i)). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (49) we have that for all $M/K < m_2 < \cdots < m_K$,

$$\left| \int A_1(x_1) \chi_{m_2}(x_2) \cdots \chi_{m_K}(x_K) dP - r_{\mathbf{x}} \right| \leq \delta.$$

Furthermore, for all $2M/K < m_3 < \cdots < m_K$,

$$\left| \int A_1(x_1) A_2(x_2) \chi_{m_3}(x_3) \cdots \chi_{m_K}(x_K) dP - r_{\mathbf{x}} \right| \leq \delta$$

and so on, until we obtain:

$$\left| \int A_1(x_1) \cdots A_k(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) \cdots A_K(x_K) dP - r_{\mathbf{x}} \right| \leq \delta. \quad (52)$$

The same reasoning can be applied to (50) to get:

$$\left| \int A_1(x_1) \cdots A_k(x_{k+1}) A_{k+1}(x_k) \cdots A_K(x_K) dP - r_{\mathbf{x}} \right| \leq \delta. \quad (53)$$

Next, thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int A_1(x_1) \cdots [A_k(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_k(x_{k+1}) A_{k+1}(x_k)] \cdots A_K(x_K) dP \right| \\ &\leq \left\| \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq K \\ i \neq k, k+1}} A_i(x_i) \right\| \left\| A_k(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_k(x_{k+1}) A_{k+1}(x_k) \right\|. \quad (54) \end{aligned}$$

The first term is upper bounded by 1, while for the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| A_k(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_k(x_{k+1}) A_{k+1}(x_k) \right\| \\
&= \left\| A_k(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_{k+1}(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + A_{k+1}(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_k(x_{k+1}) A_{k+1}(x_k) \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| A_k(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_{k+1}(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) \right\| \\
&\quad + \left\| A_{k+1}(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_k(x_{k+1}) A_{k+1}(x_k) \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| A_k(x_k) - A_{k+1}(x_k) \right\| + \left\| A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_k(x_{k+1}) \right\| \quad (55)
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it is easy to verify that for any $i \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$A_k(i) - A_{k+1}(i) = (k+1)(\bar{X}_{kM/K} - \bar{X}_{(k+1)M/K}) + (k-1)(\bar{X}_{kM/K} - \bar{X}_{(k-1)M/K}) \quad (56)$$

so that, thanks to lemma 3,

$$\left\| A_k(i) - A_{k+1}(i) \right\| \leq 2K\sqrt{\frac{2K}{M}} + 4K\sqrt{\varepsilon} \quad \forall k. \quad (57)$$

Thanks to this and equations (54) and (55) we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int A_1(x_1) \cdots [A_k(x_k) A_{k+1}(x_{k+1}) - A_k(x_{k+1}) A_{k+1}(x_k)] \cdots A_K(x_K) dP \right| \\
&\leq 4K\sqrt{\frac{2K}{M}} + 8K\sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (58)
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, equations (52), (53) and (58) lead to (51). \square

Notice that if we have a set of random variables \mathcal{M} for which the hypotheses of lemma 4 hold for *any* sequence of K symbols \mathbf{x} , then we can bound $|r_{\mathbf{x}} - r_{\mathbf{x}'}|$ for *any permutation* \mathbf{x}' of \mathbf{x} , since any permutation of \mathbf{x} can be obtained as a succession of adjacent elements exchanges (bubble sort algorithm). Since the number of exchanges is lower than $K^2/2$, we obtain the bound

$$|r_{\mathbf{x}} - r_{\mathbf{x}'}| \leq 2K^3\sqrt{\frac{2K}{M}} + 4K^3\sqrt{\varepsilon} + K^2\delta.$$

We can now link this result on random variables to codes thanks to the natural association between codewords and random variables: we associate each codeword \mathbf{x}_m to a random variable X_m such that if we define $q_m(i)$ to be the fraction of times the input symbol $i \in \mathcal{X}$ appears in \mathbf{x}_m , then

$$q_m(i) = P(X_m = i).$$

In the same way, if $q_{m,m'}(i, j)$ is the fraction of times the pair of input symbols (i, j) appears at the same coordinate in the pair of codewords \mathbf{x}_m and $\mathbf{x}_{m'}$, then

$$q_{m,m'}(i, j) = P(X_m = i, X_{m'} = j)$$

and in general, if $q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the fraction of times the sequence of symbols $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K)$ appears at the same coordinate in the group of codewords $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{x}_{m_1}, \mathbf{x}_{m_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m_K})$, then

$$q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) = P(X_{m_1} = x_1, X_{m_2} = x_2, \dots, X_{m_K} = x_K).$$

In such a way, we can combine lemmas 3 and 4 and the remark immediately afterwards to obtain the following result on codes.

Lemma 5. *Consider a code \mathcal{C} with M codewords $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M\}$ of length n . If for each $i \in \mathcal{X}$ there exists a number r_i such that for all $m < m'$,*

$$|q_{m,m'}(i, i) - r_i| \leq \varepsilon \quad (59)$$

and if for each sequence of K symbols $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_K) \in \mathcal{X}^K$ there exists a number $r_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that for all ordered subsets of K codewords $\mathbf{m} = \{\mathbf{x}_{m_1}, \mathbf{x}_{m_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m_K}\}$, $m_i < m_j$ for $i < j$,

$$|q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) - r_{\mathbf{x}}| \leq \delta \quad (60)$$

then for any permutation \mathbf{x}' of \mathbf{x} ,

$$|q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) - q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}')| \leq 2K^3 \sqrt{\frac{2K}{M}} + 4K^3 \sqrt{\varepsilon} + (K^2 + 2)\delta. \quad (61)$$

We now show, thanks to Ramsey's theorem, that from a code large enough we can always extract a subcode that satisfies the conditions of lemma 5, and that the size of this subcode tends to infinity as the size of the original code tends to infinity.

Theorem 1. *For any integer $t > 0$ there exists a positive integer M_0 such that from any code \mathcal{C} with $M \geq M_0$ codewords a subcode $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{C}$ can be extracted with M' codewords $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{M'}\}$ such that for any subset of K codewords $\mathbf{m} \subset \mathcal{C}'$, for any sequence of input symbols \mathbf{x} and any of its permutations \mathbf{x}' ,*

$$|q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) - q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}')| \leq 2K^3 \sqrt{\frac{2K}{M'}} + 4K^3 \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{X}|^{K-2}}{2t}} + \frac{K^2 + 2}{2t} \triangleq \Delta(M', t). \quad (62)$$

and $M' \rightarrow \infty$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Consider a complete hyper-graph with M vertices, where each vertex is associated with a different codeword of \mathcal{C} , and each edge is an ordered subset of K vertices — i.e., of K ordered codewords. We color each edge of the graph with a *vector-color* with $|\mathcal{X}|^K$ components, each corresponding to one of the sequences of K input symbols \mathbf{x} . For each component we define t possible colors, corresponding to the t equal subintervals of the interval $[0, 1]$. To each edge $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{C}$ (an ordered subset of K codewords) we assign as a color to each component \mathbf{x} the subinterval of $[0, 1]$ that contains the value of $q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x})$.

By Ramsey's theorem, if $M \geq K$, we can always extract from this graph a complete *monochromatic* subgraph, i.e., a subset of the vertices for which all the edges have the same vector-color, and the size of this subgraph goes to infinity as M goes to infinity.

If we choose the vertices-codewords of this subgraph as our subcode \mathcal{C}' , the graph being monochromatic means that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^K$, $q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x})$ is in the same subinterval of $[0, 1]$ for all ordered $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{C}'$; this means that \mathcal{C}' meets condition (60) with the midpoint of the subinterval as $r_{\mathbf{x}}$, and δ equal to half the length of the subinterval, i.e., $\delta = 1/(2t)$.

We now show that if the size of \mathcal{C}' is greater than $2K - 2$, then the subcode of \mathcal{C}' obtained removing the last $K - 2$ codewords also meets condition 59. In fact, consider all the ordered edges of \mathcal{C}' such that the last $K - 2$ codewords are fixed as the last $K - 2$ codewords of \mathcal{C}' , and the first two are taken from all the ordered pairs (m, m') of the other codewords. Since all these edges have the same color, it follows that for each pair (m, m') ,

$$q_{m,m'}(i, i) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^K \\ x_1=x_2=i}} q_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}}(\mathbf{x}) \quad (63)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}$ is the concatenation of (m, m') and the last $K - 2$ codewords of \mathcal{C}' . Since the $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}$'s have the same vector-color for all (m, m') , we have that

$$|q_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}}(\mathbf{x}) - r_{\mathbf{x}}| \leq \delta \quad \forall \tilde{\mathbf{m}}. \quad (64)$$

If we define

$$r \triangleq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^K \\ x_1=x_2=i}} r_{\mathbf{x}} \quad (65)$$

then from equations (63) and (64) it follows that for any $i \in \mathcal{X}$, for all (m, m') ,

$$|q_{m,m'}(i, i) - r| = \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^K \\ x_1=x_2=i}} (q_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}}(\mathbf{x}) - r_{\mathbf{x}}) \right| \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^K \\ x_1=x_2=i}} |q_{\tilde{\mathbf{m}}}(\mathbf{x}) - r_{\mathbf{x}}| \leq |\mathcal{X}|^{K-2} \delta \quad (66)$$

so that \mathcal{C}' without the last $K - 2$ codewords meets condition (59) with $\varepsilon = |\mathcal{X}|^{K-2} \delta = |\mathcal{X}|^{K-2}/(2t)$, in addition to condition (60), which is inherited from \mathcal{C}' provided that the latter has at least K codewords other than the last $K - 2$. Ramsey's theorem satisfies this last condition provided that the starting code \mathcal{C} is greater than a certain finite number M_0 that depends on t . Finally, equation (62) follows from lemma 5 with $\delta = 1/(2t)$ and $\varepsilon = |\mathcal{X}|^{K-2}/(2t)$. \square

6 Bound on $E_L(0)$ for L -list decoding

Gallager derived a well-known lower bound for the reliability function, the *expurgated bound*, which can be easily generalized to list decoding using the same reasoning. This bound at rate $R = 0$ assumes the form

$$E_L(0) \geq \max_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left[- \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} Q(x_1) \cdots Q(x_{L+1}) \log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt[L+1]{P(y|x_1) \cdots P(y|x_{L+1})} \right]. \quad (67)$$

In this section we want to find an *upper* bound to $E_L(0)$. In order to do this, we will employ the previous theorem with $K = L + 1$. In fact, starting from any code \mathcal{C} with M codewords of length n we can extract the subcode \mathcal{C}' with M' codewords of length n indicated by theorem 1. Since $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{C}$, we have that, according to equation (38),

$$D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}') \leq D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}). \quad (68)$$

Moreover, for any subset of $L + 1$ codewords $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{C}'$ we have:

$$D_{\mathbf{m}} \triangleq \max_{\alpha} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\alpha) = \max_{\alpha} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_*^{L+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in S(\mathbf{x})} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}') \mu_{\mathbf{x}'}(\alpha) \quad (69)$$

where \mathcal{X}_*^{L+1} is the set of all sequences of $L + 1$ input symbols $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{L+1})$ such that $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_{L+1}$, and $S(\mathbf{x})$ is the set of all permutations of \mathbf{x} . Then, thanks to (62),

$$D_{\mathbf{m}} = \max_{\alpha} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_*^{L+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in S(\mathbf{x})} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}') \mu_{\mathbf{x}'}(\alpha) \quad (70)$$

$$\leq \max_{\alpha} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_*^{L+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in S(\mathbf{x})} (q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) + \Delta(M', t)) \mu_{\mathbf{x}'}(\alpha) \quad (71)$$

$$\leq \left(\max_{\alpha} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_*^{L+1}} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in S(\mathbf{x})} \mu_{\mathbf{x}'}(\alpha) \right) + \Delta(M', t) \max_{\alpha} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\alpha). \quad (72)$$

By symmetry, the term in brackets is maximized in the center of mass of the standard simplex $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\}$, i.e., it is maximized for

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \left(\frac{1}{L+1}, \dots, \frac{1}{L+1} \right) \quad (73)$$

and therefore,

$$D_{\mathbf{m}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_*^{L+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in S(\mathbf{x})} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}'}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) + \Delta(M', t) \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (74)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_*^{L+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in S(\mathbf{x})} (q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}') + \Delta(M', t)) \mu_{\mathbf{x}'}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) + \Delta(M', t) \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \quad (75)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) + \Delta(M', t) \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} (\mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) + \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})) \quad (76)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) + C \Delta(M', t) \quad (77)$$

where the inequality in the second line is again due to (62), and in the last line we defined the finite positive quantity

$$C \triangleq \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} (\mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) + \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})). \quad (78)$$

Next, since $D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}')$ is lower than or equal to the average of $D_{\mathbf{m}}$ over all subsets of $L+1$ codewords $\mathbf{m} \subset \mathcal{C}'$, it follows that

$$D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}') \leq \frac{1}{M'(M'-1)\dots(M'-L)} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} D_{\mathbf{m}} \quad (79)$$

$$\leq C \Delta(M', t) + \frac{(M'-L-1)!}{M'!} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} q_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \quad (80)$$

The double sum can be computed on a column-by-column basis:

$$D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}') \leq C \Delta(M', t) + \frac{(M'-L-1)!}{M'!} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{c=1}^n \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} M_c(x_1) M_c(x_2) \dots M_c(x_{L+1}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$$

where $M_c(x)$ is the number of times the input symbol x appears in the column c over all the codewords of \mathcal{C}'' . Furthermore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}') &\leq C \Delta(M', t) + \left(\frac{M'}{M'-L} \right)^L \frac{1}{n} \sum_{c=1}^n \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} \frac{M_c(x_1)}{M'} \frac{M_c(x_2)}{M'} \dots \frac{M_c(x_{L+1})}{M'} \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \\ &\leq C \Delta(M', t) + \left(\frac{M'}{M'-L} \right)^L \max_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} Q(x_1) Q(x_2) \dots Q(x_{L+1}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the last bound is independent on the choice of \mathcal{C} . If we now let $M \rightarrow \infty$ (so that also $M' \rightarrow \infty$, by theorem 1) we get that for any integer $t > 0$ we have

$$D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}) \leq 4C(L+1)^3 \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{X}|^{L-1}}{2t}} + C \frac{(L+1)^2 + 2}{2t} + \max_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} Q(x_1) Q(x_2) \cdots Q(x_{L+1}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\alpha}) \quad (81)$$

where we used the definition of $\Delta(M', t)$ in (62). Since the last bound is true for every $t > 0$, we can take the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ to get:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\min}(\mathcal{C}) &\leq \max_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} Q(x_1) \cdots Q(x_{L+1}) \mu_{\mathbf{x}}(\tilde{\alpha}) \quad (82) \\ &= \max_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left[- \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} Q(x_1) \cdots Q(x_{L+1}) \log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} {}^{L+1}\sqrt{P(y|x_1) \cdots P(y|x_{L+1})} \right]. \quad (83) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, thanks to equations (39) and (43), and since we took the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$ *after* the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the following upper bound on the reliability function of the channel under consideration at rate $R = 0$:

$$E_L(0) \leq \max_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left[- \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} Q(x_1) \cdots Q(x_{L+1}) \log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} {}^{L+1}\sqrt{P(y|x_1) \cdots P(y|x_{L+1})} \right]. \quad (84)$$

Since the upper bound coincides with the lower bound given by Gallager's expurgated bound (67), we conclude that

$$E_L(0) = \max_{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} \left[- \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{L+1}} Q(x_1) \cdots Q(x_{L+1}) \log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} {}^{L+1}\sqrt{P(y|x_1) \cdots P(y|x_{L+1})} \right]. \quad (85)$$

References

- [1] E. R. Berlekamp, *Block Coding with Noiseless Feedback*, Ph.D. thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1964.
- [2] R. G. Gallager, “A simple derivation of the coding theorem and some applications,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 3-18, 1965.
- [3] C. E. Shannon, R. G. Gallager, and E. R. Berlekamp, “Lower bounds to error probability for coding on discrete memoryless channels. I,” *Information and Control*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 65-103, 1967.
- [4] C. E. Shannon, R. G. Gallager, and E. R. Berlekamp, “Lower bounds to error probability for coding on discrete memoryless channels. II,” *Information and Control*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 522-552, 1967.
- [5] V. M. Blinovskiy, “Error probability exponent of list decoding at low rates,” *Problems of Information transmission*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 277-287, 2001.
- [6] V. M. Blinovskiy, “Code bounds for multiple packings over a nonbinary finite alphabet,” *Problems of Information Transmission*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 23-32, 2005.
- [7] J. Komlós, “A strange pigeon-hole principle,” *Order*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 107-113, 1990.
- [8] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information theory: coding theorems for discrete memoryless systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [9] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [10] O. Shayevitz, “A Note on a Characterization of Rényi Measures and its Relation to Composite Hypothesis Testing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.4401*, 2010.
- [11] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2017.