

Universal Bounds on the Scaling Behavior of Polar Codes

Ali Goli, S. Hamed Hassani and Rüdiger Urbanke

Abstract—We consider the problem of determining the trade-off between the rate and the block-length of polar codes for a given block error probability when we use the successive cancellation decoder. We take the sum of the Bhattacharyya parameters as a proxy for the block error probability, and show that there exists a universal parameter μ such that for any binary memoryless symmetric channel W with capacity $I(W)$, reliable communication requires rates that satisfy $R < I(W) - \alpha N^{-\frac{1}{\mu}}$, where α is a positive constant and N is the block-length. We provide lower bounds on μ , namely $\mu \geq 3.553$, and we conjecture that indeed $\mu = 3.627$, the parameter for the binary erasure channel.

I. INTRODUCTION

Polar coding schemes provably achieve the capacity of a wide array of channels including binary memoryless symmetric (BMS) channels. Let W be a BMS channel with capacity $I(W)$. In [1], Arikan showed that for any rate $R < I(W)$ the block error probability of the successive cancellation (SC) decoder is upper bounded by $N^{-1/4}$ for block-length N large enough. In [2], Arikan and Telatar significantly tightened this result. They showed that for any rate $R < I(W)$ and any $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$, the block error probability is upper bounded by 2^{-N^β} for N large enough. Later in [3], these bounds were refined to be dependent on R and it was shown that similar asymptotic lower bounds are valid when we perform MAP decoding. Hence, SC and MAP decoders share the same asymptotic performance in this sense. Such an exponential decay suggests that error floors should not be a problem for polar codes even at moderate block lengths (e.g. $N > 10^4$).

Another problem of interest in the area of polar codes is to determine the trade-off between the rate and the block-length for a given error probability when we use the successive cancellation (SC) decoder. In other words, in order to have reliable transmission with block error probability at most ϵ , how does the maximum possible rate R scale in terms of the block-length N ? This problem has been previously considered in [4] and [5] mainly for the family of Binary Erasure Channels (BEC). In both [4] and [5], the authors provide strong evidence (both numerically and analytically) that for polar codes with the SC decoder, reliable communication over the BEC requires rates $N^{-\frac{1}{\mu}}$ below capacity, where $\mu \approx 3.627$.

In this paper, we provide rigorous lower bounds on the value of μ , such that for any BMS channel W , reliable transmission

(in the sense that the sum of the Bhattacharyya parameters is small) requires rates at least $N^{-\frac{1}{\mu}}$ below capacity. We begin by giving the notation and the general problem set-up.

A. Preliminaries

Let $W : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ be a BMS channel, with input alphabet $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, output alphabet \mathcal{Y} , and the transition probabilities $\{W(y|x) : x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. We consider the following three parameters for the channel W ,

$$H(W) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W(y|1) \log \frac{W(y|1) + W(y|0)}{W(y|1)}, \quad (1)$$

$$Z(W) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{W(y|0)W(y|1)}, \quad (2)$$

$$E(W) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W(y|1) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\ln \frac{W(y|1)}{W(y|0)} + |\ln \frac{W(y|1)}{W(y|0)}|)}. \quad (3)$$

The parameter $H(W)$ is equal to the entropy of the output of W given its input when we assume uniform distribution on the inputs, i.e., $H(W) = H(X|Y)$. Hence, we call the parameter $H(W)$ the entropy of the channel W . Also note that the capacity of W , which we denote by $I(W)$, is given by $I(W) = 1 - H(W)$. The parameter $Z(W)$ is called the Bhattacharyya parameter of W and $E(W)$ is called the error probability of W . It can be shown that $E(W)$ is equal to the error probability in estimating the channel input x on the basis of the channel output y via the maximum-likelihood decoding of $W(y|x)$ (with the further assumption that the input has uniform distribution). It can be shown that the following relations hold between these parameters (see for e.g., [1] and [6, Chapter 4]):

$$0 \leq 2E(W) \leq H(W) \leq Z(W) \leq 1, \quad (4)$$

$$H(W) \leq h_2(E(W)), \quad (5)$$

$$Z(W) \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - H(W))^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $h_2(\cdot)$ denotes the binary entropy function.

B. Channel transform

Let \mathcal{W} denote the set of all the BMS channels and consider a transform $W \rightarrow (W^-, W^+)$ that maps \mathcal{W} to \mathcal{W}^2 in the following manner. Having the channel $W : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, the channels $W^- : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^2$ and $W^+ : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \times \mathcal{Y}^2$ are defined as

$$W^-(y_1, y_2|x_1) = \sum_{x_2 \in \{0,1\}} \frac{1}{2} W(y_1|x_1 \oplus x_2) W(y_2|x_2) \quad (7)$$

$$W^+(y_1, y_2, x_1|x_2) = \frac{1}{2}W(y_1|x_1 \oplus x_2)W(y_2|x_2), \quad (8)$$

A direct consequence of the chain rule of entropy yields

$$\frac{H(W^+) + H(W^-)}{2} = H(W) \quad (9)$$

One can also show that,

$$H(W) \leq H(W^-) \leq 1 - (1 - H(W))^2, \quad (10)$$

$$H(W)^2 \leq H(W^+) \leq H(W). \quad (11)$$

C. Polarization process

Let $\{B_n, n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of iid Bernoulli($\frac{1}{2}$) random variables. Denote by $(\mathcal{F}, \Omega, \mathbb{P})$ the probability space generated by this sequence and let $(\mathcal{F}_n, \Omega_n, \mathbb{P}_n)$ be the probability space generated by (B_1, \dots, B_n) . For a BMS channel W , define a random sequence of channels $W_n, n \in \mathbb{N} \triangleq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, as $W_0 = W$ and

$$W_n = \begin{cases} W_{n-1}^+ & \text{If } B_n = 1, \\ W_{n-1}^- & \text{If } B_n = 0, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where the channels on the right side are given by the transform $W_{n-1} \rightarrow (W_{n-1}^-, W_{n-1}^+)$. Let us also define the random processes $\{H_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{Z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as $H_n = H(W_n)$, $I_n = I(W_n) = 1 - H(W_n)$ and $Z_n = Z(W_n)$. From (9) one can easily observe that H_n (and I_n) is a martingale with $\mathbb{E}[H_n] = H(W)$. It is further known from [1] that the processes H_n and Z_n converge almost surely to limit random variables H_∞ and Z_∞ and furthermore, these limit random variables take their values in the set $\{0, 1\}$ with $\Pr(H_\infty = 0) = \Pr(Z_\infty = 0) = H(W)$.

D. Polar codes

Given the rate $R < I(W)$, polar coding is based on choosing a set of $2^n R$ rows of the matrix $G_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes n}$ to form a $2^n R \times 2^n$ matrix which is used as the generator matrix in the encoding procedure¹. The way this set is chosen is dependent on the channel W and is briefly explained as follows: At time $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider a specific realization of the sequence (B_1, \dots, B_n) , and denote it by (b_1, \dots, b_n) . The random variable W_n outputs a BMS channel, according to the procedure (12), which we can naturally denote by $W^{(b_1, \dots, b_n)}$. Let us now identify a sequence (b_1, \dots, b_n) by an integer i in the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$ such that the binary expansion of $i - 1$ is equal to the sequence (b_1, \dots, b_n) , with b_1 as the least significant bit. As an example for $n = 3$, we identify $(b_1, b_2, b_3) = (0, 0, 1)$ with 5 and $(b_1, b_2, b_3) = (1, 0, 0)$ with 2. To simplify notation, we use $W_n^{(i)}$ to denote $W^{(b_1, \dots, b_n)}$. Given the rate R , the indices of the matrix G_n are chosen as follows: Choose a subset of size NR from the set of channels $\{W_N^{(i)}\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ that have the least possible error probability (given in (3)) and choose the rows G_n with the same indices as these channels. E.g., if the channel $W_N^{(j)}$ is chosen, then the j -th row of G_n is selected. In the following, given N , we

call the set of indices of NR channels with the least error probability, the set of good indices and denote it by $\mathcal{I}_{N,R}$.

It is proved in [1] that the block error probability of such polar coding scheme under SC decoding, denoted by $P_e(N, R)$, is bounded from both sides by²

$$\max_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{N,R}} E(W_N^{(i)}) \leq P_e(N, R) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{N,R}} E(W_N^{(i)}). \quad (13)$$

E. Main results

Consider a BMS channel W and let us assume that a polar code with block-error probability at most a given value $\epsilon > 0$, is required. One way to accomplish this is to ensure that the right side of (13) is less than ϵ . However, this is only a sufficient condition that might not be necessary. Hence, we call the right side of (13) *the strong reliability condition*. Based on this measure of the block-error probability, we provide bounds on how the rate R scales in terms of the block-length N .

Theorem 1: For any BMS channel W with capacity $I(W) \in (0, 1)$, there exist constants $\epsilon, \alpha > 0$, which depend only on $I(W)$, such that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{N,R}} E(W_N^{(i)}) \leq \epsilon, \quad (14)$$

implies

$$R < I(W) - \frac{\alpha}{N^\mu}, \quad (15)$$

where μ is a universal parameter lower bounded by 3.553. ■ A few comments are in order:

1) As we will see in the sequel, we can obtain an increasing sequence of lower bounds, call this sequence $\{\mu_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, for the universal parameter μ . For each m , in order to show the validity of the lower bound we need to verify the concavity of a certain polynomial (defined in (20)) in $[0, 1]$. For small values of m concavity can be proved directly using pen and paper. For larger values of m we can automate this process: each polynomial has rational coefficients. Hence also its second derivative has rational coefficients. To show concavity it suffices to show that there are no roots of this second derivative in $[0, 1]$. This task can be accomplished exactly by computing so-called Sturm chains (see Sturm's Theorem [8]). Computing Sturm chains is equivalent to running Euclid's algorithm starting with the second and third derivative of the original polynomial. The lower bound for μ stated in Theorem 1 is the one corresponding to $m = 8$, an arbitrary choice. If we increase m we get e.g., $\mu_{16} = 3.614$. We conjecture that the sequence μ_m converges to $\mu = 3.627$, the parameter for the BEC.

2) Let ϵ, α, μ be as in Theorem 1. If we require the block-error probability to be less than ϵ (in the sense that the condition (14) is fulfilled), then the block-length N should be at least

$$N > \left(\frac{\alpha}{I(W) - R} \right)^\mu. \quad (16)$$

¹There are extensions of polar codes given in [7] which use different kinds of matrices.

²Note here that by (3) the error probability of a BMS channel is less than its Bhattacharyya value. Hence, the right side of (13) is a better upper bound for the block error probability than the sum of the Bhattacharyya values.

3) It is well known that the value of μ for the random linear ensemble is $\mu = 2$, which is the optimal value since the variations of the channel itself require $\mu \geq 2$. Thus, given a block-length N , reliable transmission by polar codes requires a larger gap to the channel capacity than the optimal value.

The rest of the paper is devoted to proving Theorem 1. In Section II, we provide universal lower bounds on how fast the process H_n converges to its limit H_∞ . We then use these bounds to prove Theorem 1 in Section III. Finally, Section IV concludes the paper with stating the related open questions.

II. UNIVERSAL LOWER BOUNDS ON THE SPEED OF POLARIZATION

Consider a channel W with its entropy process $H_n = H(W_n)$. Since the bounded process H_n converges almost surely to a 0 – 1 valued random variable, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)] = 0$. In this section, we provide universal lower bounds on the speed with which the quantity $\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)]$ decays to 0. We first derive such lower bounds for the family of Binary Erasure Channels (BEC) and then extend them to other BMS channels.

A. Binary erasure channel

Consider a binary erasure channel with erasure probability $h \in [0, 1]$ which we denote by $\text{BEC}(h)$. One can show that (see [6, Chapter 4]) for such a channel we have

$$H(\text{BEC}(h)) = Z(\text{BEC}(h)) = 2E(\text{BEC}(h)) = h. \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{BEC}(h))^+ &= \text{BEC}(h^2), \\ (\text{BEC}(h))^- &= \text{BEC}(1 - (1 - h)^2), \end{aligned}$$

both proved in [1]. Hence, the processes H_n and Z_n for $\text{BEC}(h)$ are equal and have a simple closed form expression as the following: Let $H_0 = h$ and³

$$H_n = \begin{cases} H_{n-1}^2, & \text{If } B_n = 1, \\ 1 - (1 - H_{n-1})^2, & \text{If } B_n = 0. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Let us now define the sequence of functions $\{f_n(h)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as $f_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and for $h \in [0, 1]$,

$$f_n(h) = \mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)]. \quad (19)$$

Here, note that for $h \in [0, 1]$ the value of $f_n(h)$ is a deterministic value that is dependent on the process H_n with the starting value $H_0 = h$. By using the recursive relation (18), one can easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(h) &= h(1 - h), \\ f_n(h) &= \frac{f_{n-1}(h^2) + f_{n-1}(1 - (1 - h)^2)}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Let us also define a sequence of numbers $\{a_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ as

$$a_m = \inf_{h \in [0, 1]} \frac{f_{m+1}(h)}{f_m(h)}. \quad (21)$$

³Note that to simplify notation we have dropped the dependency of H_n to its starting value $H_0 = h$.

m	0	2	4	6	8
a_m	0.75	0.7897	0.8075	0.8190	0.8228
μ_m	2.409	2.935	3.241	3.471	3.553

TABLE I

Remark 2: One can compute the value of a_m by finding the extreme points of the function $\frac{f_{m+1}}{f_m}$ (i.e., finding the roots of the polynomial $g_m = f'_{m+1}f_m - f_{m+1}f'_m$) and checking which one gives the global minimum. Again, for small values e.g., $m = 0, 1$, pen and paper suffice. For higher values of m we can again automatize the process: all these polynomials have rational coefficients and therefore it is possible to determine the number of real roots exactly and to determine their value to any desired precision (by computing Sturm chains as mentioned earlier). Hence, we can find the value of a_m to any desired precision. Table I contains the numerical value of a_m up to precision 10^{-4} for $m \leq 8$. As the table shows, the values a_m are increasing (see Lemma 3), and we conjecture that they converge to $2^{-\frac{1}{3.62713}} = 0.8260$, the corresponding value for the channel BEC. \diamond

We now show that each of the values a_m is a lower bound on the speed of decay of the sequence f_n .

Lemma 3: Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For all $n \geq m$ and $h \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$(a_m)^{n-m} f_m(h) \leq f_n(h). \quad (22)$$

Furthermore, the sequence a_m is an increasing sequence.

Proof: The proof goes by induction on $n - m$. For $n - m = 0$ the result is trivial. Now, assume that the relation (22) holds for a $n - m = k$, i.e., for $h \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$(a_m)^k f_m(h) \leq f_{m+k}(h) \quad (23)$$

We show that (22) is indeed true for $k + 1$ and $h \in [0, 1]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{m+k+1}(h) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{f_{m+k}(h^2) + f_{m+k}(1 - (1 - h)^2)}{2} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{(a_m)^k f_m(h^2) + (a_m)^k f_m(1 - (1 - h)^2)}{2} \\ &= (a_m)^k f_{m+1}(h) \\ &= (a_m)^k \frac{f_{m+1}(h)}{f_m(h)} f_m(h) \\ &\geq (a_m)^k \left[\inf_{h \in [0, 1]} \frac{f_{m+1}(h)}{f_m(h)} \right] f_m(h) \\ &= (a_m)^{k+1} f_m(h). \end{aligned}$$

Here, (a) follows from (20) and (b) follows from the left side inequality in (23), and hence the lemma is proved via induction. \blacksquare

B. BMS Channels

For a BMS channel W , there is no simple 1-dimensional recursion for process H_n as for BEC. However, by using (10) and (11), one can give bounds on how H_n evolves. In this section, we use the functions $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined in (20) to provide universal lower bounds on the quantity $\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)]$.

We start by introducing one further technical condition given as follows.

Definition 4: We call an integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$ *suitable* if the function $f_m(h)$, defined in (20), is concave on $[0, 1]$.

Remark 5: For small values of m , i.e., $m \leq 2$, it is easy to verify by hand that the function f_m is concave. As discussed previously, for larger values of m we can use Sturm's theorem [8] and a computer algebra system to verify this claim. Note that the polynomials f_m have integer coefficients. Hence, all the required computations can be done exactly. Unfortunately, the degree of f_m is 2^{m+1} . We have checked up to $m = 8$ that f_m is concave and we conjecture that in fact this is true for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. \diamond

In the rest of this section, we show that for any BMS channel W , the value of a_m is a lower bound on the speed of decay of H_n provided that m is a suitable integer.

Lemma 6: Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be a suitable integer and W a BMS channel. We have for $n \geq m$

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)] \geq (a_m)^{n-m} f_m(H(W)), \quad (24)$$

where a_m is given in (21).

Proof: We use induction on $n - m$: For $n - m = 0$ there is nothing to prove. Now, assume that the result of the lemma is correct for $n - m = k$. Hence, for any BMS channel W with $H_n = H(W_n)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[H_{m+k}(1 - H_{m+k})] \geq (a_m)^k f_m(H(W)). \quad (25)$$

We now prove the lemma for $m - n = k + 1$. For the BMS channel W , let us recall that the transform $(W \rightarrow (W^-, W^+))$ yields two channels W^- and W^+ such that the relation (9) holds. Define the process $\{(W^-)_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ as the channel process that starts with $(W^-)_0 = W^-$ and evolves as in (12) similarly define $\{(W^+)_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ similarly with $(W^+)_0 = W^+$. Let us also define the two processes $H_n^- = H((W^-)_n)$ and $H_n^+ = H((W^+)_n)$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[H_{m+k+1}(1 - H_{m+k+1})] \\ \stackrel{(a)}{=} & \frac{\mathbb{E}[H_{m+k}^-(1 - H_{m+k}^-)] + \mathbb{E}[H_{m+k}^+(1 - H_{m+k}^+)]}{2} \\ \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} & (a_m)^k \frac{f_m(H(W^-)) + f_m(H(W^+))}{2} \\ \stackrel{(c)}{\geq} & (a_m)^k \frac{f_m(1 - (1 - H(W))^2) + f_m(H(W)^2)}{2} \\ \stackrel{(d)}{=} & (a_m)^k f_{m+1}(H(W)) \\ = & (a_m)^k \frac{f_{m+1}(H(W))}{f_m(H(W))} f_m(H(W)) \\ \geq & (a_m)^k \left[\inf_{h \in [0,1]} \frac{f_{m+1}(h)}{f_m(h)} \right] f_m(H(W)) \\ \stackrel{(e)}{=} & (a_m)^{m+1} f_m(H(W)). \end{aligned}$$

In the above chain of inequalities, relation (a) follows from the fact that W_m has 2^m possible outputs among which half of them are branched out from W^+ and the other half are branched out from W^- . Relation (b) follows from the induction hypothesis given in (25). Relation (c) follows from (10), (11) and the fact that the function f_m is concave. More

precisely, since f_m is concave on $[0, 1]$, we have the following inequality for any sequence of numbers $0 \leq x' \leq x \leq y \leq y' \leq 1$ that satisfy $\frac{x+y}{2} = \frac{x'+y'}{2}$:

$$\frac{f_m(x') + f_m(y')}{2} \leq \frac{f_m(x) + f_m(y)}{2}. \quad (26)$$

In particular, we set $x' = H(W)^2$, $x = H(W^+)$, $y = H(W^-)$, $y' = 1 - (1 - H(W))^2$ and we know from (10) and (11) that $0 \leq x' \leq x \leq y \leq y' \leq 1$. Hence, by (26) we obtain (c). Relation (d) follows from the recursive definition of f_m given in (20). Finally, relation (e) follows from the definition of a_m given in (21). \blacksquare

III. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

To fit the bounds of Section II into the framework of Theorem 1, let us first introduce the sequence $\{\mu_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ as

$$\mu_m = -\frac{1}{\log a_m}, \quad (27)$$

where a_m is defined in (21). In the last section, we proved that for a suitable m , the speed with which the quantity $\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)]$ decays is lower bounded by $a_m = 2^{-\frac{1}{\mu_m}}$, i.e. for $n \geq m$ we have $\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)] \geq 2^{-\frac{(n-m)}{\mu_m}} f_m(H(W))$. To relate the strong reliability condition in (14) to the rate bound in (15), we need the following lemma.

Lemma 7: Consider a BMS channel W and assume that there exist positive real numbers γ, θ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)] \geq \gamma 2^{-n\theta}$ for $n \geq m$. Let $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ be such that $2\alpha + \beta = \gamma$, we have for $n \geq m$

$$\Pr(H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}) \leq I(W) - \beta 2^{-n\theta}. \quad (28)$$

Proof: The proof is by contradiction. Let us assume the contrary, i.e., we assume there exists $n \geq m$ s.t.,

$$\Pr(H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}) > I(W) - \beta 2^{-n\theta}. \quad (29)$$

In the following, we show that with such an assumption we reach to a contradiction. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)] \\ = & \mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n) | H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}] \Pr(H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}) \\ & + \mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n) | H_n > \alpha 2^{-n\theta}] \Pr(H_n > \alpha 2^{-n\theta}). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

It is now easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n) | H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}] \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta},$$

and since $\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)] \geq \gamma 2^{-n\theta}$, by using (30) we get

$$\mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n) | H_n > \alpha 2^{-n\theta}] \Pr(H_n > \alpha 2^{-n\theta}) \geq 2^{-n\theta}(\gamma - \alpha). \quad (31)$$

We can further write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(1 - H_n)] &= \mathbb{E}[1 - H_n | H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}] \Pr(H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[1 - H_n | H_n > \alpha 2^{-n\theta}] \Pr(H_n > \alpha 2^{-n\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and by noting the fact that $H_n \geq H_n(1 - H_n)$ we can plug in (31) in (32) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(1 - H_n)] \geq \mathbb{E}[1 - H_n | H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta}] \Pr(H_n \leq \alpha 2^{-n\theta})$$

$$+ 2^{-n\theta}(\gamma - \alpha). \quad (33)$$

We now continue by using (29) in (33) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(1 - H_n)] &> (I(W) - \beta 2^{-n\theta})(1 - \alpha 2^{-n\theta}) + 2^{-n\theta}(\gamma - \alpha) \\ &\geq I(W) + 2^{-n\theta}(\gamma - \alpha(1 + I(W)) - \beta), \end{aligned}$$

and since $2\alpha + \beta = \gamma$, we get $\mathbb{E}[1 - H_n] > I(W)$. However, this is a contradiction since H_n is a martingale and $\mathbb{E}[1 - H_n] = I(W)$. ■

Let us now use the result of Lemma 7 to conclude the proof of Theorem 1. By Lemma 6, we have for $n \geq m$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[H_n(1 - H_n)] &\geq 2^{-\frac{(n-m)}{\mu_m}} f_m(H(W)) \\ &= 2^{-\frac{n}{\mu_m}} (2^{\frac{m}{\mu_m}} f_m(H(W))). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we now let

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= 2^{\frac{m}{\mu_m}} f_m(H(W)), \\ 2\alpha &= \beta = \frac{\gamma}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

then by using Lemma 7 we obtain

$$\Pr(H_n \leq \frac{\gamma}{4} 2^{-\frac{n}{\mu_m}}) \leq I(W) - \frac{\gamma}{2} 2^{-\frac{n}{\mu_m}}. \quad (34)$$

Now, assume we desire to achieve a rate R equal to

$$R = I(W) - \frac{\gamma}{4} 2^{-\frac{n}{\mu_m}}. \quad (35)$$

Let $\mathcal{I}_{N,R}$ be the set of indices chosen for such a rate R , i.e., $\mathcal{I}_{N,R}$ includes the $2^n R$ indices of the sub-channels with the least value of error probability. Define the set A as

$$A = \{i \in \mathcal{I}_{N,R} : H(W_N^{(i)}) \geq \frac{\gamma}{4} 2^{-\frac{n}{\mu_m}}\}. \quad (36)$$

In this regard, note that (34) and (35) imply that

$$|A| \geq \frac{\gamma}{4} 2^{n(1 - \frac{1}{\mu_m})}, \quad (37)$$

and as a result, by using (4) and (5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{N,R}} E(W_N^{(i)}) &\geq \sum_{i \in A} E(W_N^{(i)}) \geq \frac{\gamma^2}{16} 2^{n(1 - \frac{1}{\mu_m})} h_2^{-1}(2^{-\frac{n}{\mu_m}}) \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma^2}{16} 2^{n(1 - 2 \frac{1}{\mu_m})} \frac{1}{8n \frac{1}{\mu_m}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the fact that for $x \in [0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}]$, we have $h_2^{-1}(x) \geq \frac{x}{8 \log(\frac{1}{x})}$. Thus, having a block-length $N = 2^n$, in order to get to block-error probability (measured by (13)) less than $\frac{\gamma^2}{16} \frac{2^{n(1 - 2 \frac{1}{\mu_m})}}{8n \frac{1}{\mu_m}}$, the rate can be at most $R = I(W) - \frac{\gamma}{4} 2^{-\frac{n}{\mu_m}}$.

Finally, if we let $m = 8$ (by the discussion in Remark 5, we know that $m = 8$ is suitable), then $\mu_8 = \frac{1}{-\log(a_8)} = 3.553$ and choosing

$$\epsilon = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{N,R}} E(W_N^{(i)}) \right], \quad (38)$$

where R is given in (35), then we know for sure that $\epsilon > 0$ (since $\frac{1}{\mu_8} > 2$) and furthermore, to have block-error probability less than ϵ the rate should be less than R given in (35).

IV. OPEN PROBLEMS

The results of this paper can be extended in the following ways.

1) In this paper, we take the right side of (13) as a proxy for the block error probability and hence our results are with respect to the strong reliability condition (14). A significant step in this regard would be to prove equivalent bounds for the block error probability.

2) Another way to improve the results of this paper is to provide better values of the universal parameter μ . Based on numerical experiments, we conjecture that the value of μ can be increased up to the scaling parameter of the channel BEC. That is, the right value of μ to plug in (15) is equal to $\mu = 3.62713$. Thus, the ultimate goal would be to show that for the channel BEC, the polarization phenomenon takes place faster than all the other BMS channels. One way to do this, is to prove that the functions f_n defined in (20) are concave on the interval $[0, 1]$.

3) The result of Theorem 1 suggests that in terms of finite-length performance, polar codes are far from optimal. However, we might get different results if we consider extended polar codes with $\ell \times \ell$ kernels ([7]). It is not very hard to prove that at least for the BEC, as ℓ grows large, for almost all the $\ell \times \ell$ kernels the finite-length performance of polar codes improves towards the optimal one (i.e., $\mu \rightarrow 2$). However, this is at the cost of an increase in complexity proportional to 2^ℓ . This suggests that there might still exist kernels with reasonable size with superior finite-length properties than the original 2×2 kernel. Hence, an interesting open problem is the finite-length analysis of polar codes that are constructed from $\ell \times \ell$ kernels and relate such analysis to finding kernels with better finite-length properties.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Arıkan, "Channel polarization: A method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051–3073, 2009.
- [2] E. Arıkan and E. Telatar, "On the rate of channel polarization," in *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Symposium on Inform. Theory*, Seoul, South Korea, July 2009, pp. 1493–1495.
- [3] S. H. Hassani, R. Mori, T. Tanaka and R. Urbanke, "Rate dependent analysis of the asymptotic behavior of channel polarization", Submitted to *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*.
- [4] S. B. Korada, A. Montanari, E. Telatar and R. Urbanke, "An empirical scaling law for polar codes", in *Proc. ISIT (2010)*, pp.884-888.
- [5] S. H. Hassani, K. Alishahi and R. Urbanke, "On the scaling of Polar codes: II. The behavior of un-polarized channels", in *Proc. ISIT (2010)*, pp.879-883.
- [6] T. Richardson and R. Urbanke, *Modern Coding Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [7] S. B. Korada and E. Şaşıoğlu and R. Urbanke, "Polar Codes: Characterization of Exponent, Bounds, and Constructions", in *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol 56, no. 12 pp.6253 - 6264 (2010).
- [8] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sturms_theorem