

On the Distribution of Weights Less than $2w_{\min}$ in Polar Codes

Zicheng Ye^{†‡*}, Yuan Li^{†‡*}, Huazi Zhang^{*}, Jun Wang^{*}, Guiying Yan^{†‡}, and Zhiming Ma^{†‡}

[†] School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

[‡] Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS

^{*} Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd.

Email: {yezicheng3, liyuan299, zhanghuazi, justin.wangjun}@huawei.com,
yangy@amss.ac.cn, mazm@amt.ac.cn

Abstract—The number of low-weight codewords is critical to the performance of error-correcting codes. In 1970, Kasami and Tokura characterized the codewords of Reed-Muller (RM) codes whose weights are less than $2w_{\min}$, where w_{\min} represents the minimum weight. In this paper, we extend their results to decreasing polar codes. We present the closed-form expressions for the number of codewords in decreasing polar codes with weights less than $2w_{\min}$. Moreover, the proposed enumeration algorithm runs in polynomial time with respect to the code length.

Index Terms—Polar codes, weight distribution, codewords with weight less than twice the minimum weight, polynomial representation.

I. INTRODUCTION

POLAR codes [1], introduced by Arikan, are a significant breakthrough in coding theory. As the code length approaches infinity, polar codes can approach channel capacity under successive cancellation (SC) decoding. For short to moderate block lengths, successive cancellation list (SCL) decoding [2], [3] can significantly improve the error-correcting performance. In fact, SCL algorithms can approach the maximum likelihood (ML) decoding performance when the list size is large enough.

The weight distribution of linear codes has a significant impact on the ML decoding performance, which can be estimated accurately through the union bound with the number of low-weight codewords [25]. Due to the importance of the weight distribution, many researches have approximated the weight distribution of different codes [5]–[7]. However, in the general case, the complexity of computing the exact weight distribution grows exponentially with the code length.

For polar codes, since the number of low-weight codewords affects the performance of SCL decoding with a large list size, there have been many attempts to study the weight distribution of polar codes. In [8], SCL decoding with a very large list size at a high SNR was proposed to collect the low-weight codewords. This method was improved in [9] to save memory. In [10], [11], polynomial-complexity probabilistic approaches were proposed to approximate the weight distribution of polar codes. The authors in [12] designed an

algorithm to calculate the exact weight distribution of original or specific pre-transformed polar codes [13] by coset method, but the complexity is still exponential. In [14], [15], the authors proposed efficient recursive formulas to calculate the average weight spectrum of pre-transformed polar codes with polynomial complexity.

RM codes [16], [17] are closely related to polar codes. Existing researches on the weight distribution of RM codes may shed light on the characterization of polar code weight spectrum. In [18], the numbers of codewords with weights less than $2w_{\min}$ in RM codes were determined, and the result was then generalized to $2.5w_{\min}$ in [19], where w_{\min} is the minimum weight.

The authors in [20] regarded polar codes as decreasing monomial codes and used the lower triangular affine transformation automorphism to calculate the number of codewords with weight w_{\min} . Recently, the same method was applied to calculate the number of codewords with weight $1.5w_{\min}$ [21]. Their methods rely on the observation that the codewords with weight w_{\min} and $1.5w_{\min}$ can be obtained by lower triangular affine transformations of a single row or a summation of two rows. However, this property no longer holds for codewords with weight larger than $1.5w_{\min}$. Therefore, we propose a unified method to calculate the number of codewords with weight less than $2w_{\min}$. A detailed comparison between our method and the existing results is provided in subsection II-D.

In this paper, we generalize the results in [18] and provide closed-form expressions for the number of codewords with weights less than $2w_{\min}$ in decreasing polar codes. A decreasing polar code is a subcode of some RM code, possessing the same minimum weight. In brief, our task is to select those low-weight codewords that belong to the polar code. However, it is worth noting that the enumeration procedure for polar codes is more complex compared to that of RM codes. We divide codewords into disjoint subsets based on the largest terms of their monomial representations. The size of subsets grows logarithmically with the code length, while the number of subsets is less than the square of code length. As a result, the time complexity of the enumeration algorithm is almost proportional to the square of code length.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we provide a concise introduction to polar codes and

This work was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (2023YFA1009602).

RM codes. In addition, we outline our proof. In section III, we classify and enumerate the codewords with weight less than $2w_{\min}$, and provide algorithms to compute the weight distribution. In section IV, the closed-form expressions for the number of codewords and the algorithm complexity is presented. Finally, in section V, we draw some conclusions.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Polar codes as monomial codes

Let $G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $G_N = G^{\otimes m}$, where \otimes is Kronecker product:

$$A \otimes B = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}B & \cdots & a_{1k}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{t1}B & \cdots & a_{tk}B \end{bmatrix}.$$

Polar codes can be constructed by selecting K rows of G_N as the information set \mathcal{I} . $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{I}^c$ is called the frozen set. Denote the polar code with information set \mathcal{I} by $C(\mathcal{I})$.

Polar codes can be described as monomial codes [20]. The monomial set is denoted by

$$\mathcal{M} \triangleq \{x_1^{a_1} \dots x_m^{a_m} \mid (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{F}_2^m\}.$$

Let $e = x_1^{a_1} \dots x_m^{a_m}$ be a monomial in \mathcal{M} , the degree of e is defined as $\deg(e) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i$. In particular, 1 is a monomial with degree zero. The polynomial set is denoted by

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}} \triangleq \left\{ \sum_{e \in \mathcal{M}} a_e e \mid a_e \in \mathbb{F}_2 \right\},$$

and the degree of the non-zero polynomial $g = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{M}} a_e e$ is defined as $\deg(g) = \max_{a_e \neq 0} \{\deg(e)\}$, and the zero polynomial has no degree.

A polynomial g is said to be linear if $\deg(g) = 1$. We say a linear polynomial g is a linear factor of a non-zero polynomial f if $f = gh$, where h is a polynomial. Linear polynomials g_1, \dots, g_i are said to be linearly independent if $a_1 g_1 + \dots + a_i g_i + a_0 = 0$ implies $a_0 = a_1 = \dots = a_i = 0$.

Example 1. x_1, \dots, x_m are linearly independent polynomials. $x_1, x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 1$ are not linearly independent since $x_1 + x_2 + (x_1 + x_2 + 1) + 1 = 0$.

For a linear polynomial f , define the largest term of f to be the largest x_i appearing in f , and define $F(f)$ to be its index, i.e., if $f = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i x_i + a_0$, $F(f) = \max\{i \mid a_i \neq 0\}$. Notice that linear polynomials with different largest terms are linearly independent.

Let $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$. Denote $g(b)$ to be the evaluation of g at point b . We say a linear polynomial g is a linear factor of f if $f = gh$, i.e., for any $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$, $g(b) = 0$ implies $f(b) = 0$.

The length- $N = 2^m$ evaluation vector of $g \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$ is denoted by

$$\text{ev}(g) \triangleq (g(x))_{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^m}.$$

And the weight of g is defined as the Hamming weight of $\text{ev}(g)$.

In fact, each row of G_N can be expressed by $\text{ev}(e)$ for some $e \in \mathcal{M}$. To see this, for each $z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2^m - 1\}$, there is

a unique binary $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ of $2^m - 1 - z$, where a_1 is the least significant bit, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m 2^{i-1} a_i = 2^m - 1 - z.$$

Then we can check that $\text{ev}(x_1^{a_1} \dots x_m^{a_m})$ is exactly the $(2^m - z - 1)$ -th row of G_N . As seen, the three forms, i.e., the integer z , the binary representation of $2^m - 1 - z = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and the corresponding monomial $x_1^{a_1} \dots x_m^{a_m}$ all refer to the same thing. Therefore, the information set \mathcal{I} can be regarded as a subset of the monomial set \mathcal{M} .

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{I} be a set of monomials. The monomial code $C(\mathcal{I})$ with code length $N = 2^m$ is defined as

$$C(\mathcal{I}) \triangleq \text{span}\{\text{ev}(e) : e \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

If the maximum degree of monomials in \mathcal{I} is r , we say the monomial code $C(\mathcal{I})$ is r -th order. As mentioned, we use the polynomials in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$ to represent the corresponding codewords in monomial codes.

Example 2. The example shows the row vector representations of F_8 .

$x_1 =$	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
$x_2 =$	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
$x_3 =$	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
$x_1 x_2 x_3$	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$x_2 x_3$	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
$x_1 x_3$	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
x_3	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
$x_1 x_2$	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
x_2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
x_1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

If the information set is $\mathcal{I} = \{1, x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, then the generator matrix of the polar code $C(\mathcal{I})$ is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

B. Decreasing monomial codes

The partial order of monomials was defined in [20] and [22]. Two monomials with the same degree are ordered as $x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_t} \preceq x_{j_1} \dots x_{j_t}$ if and only if $i_l \leq j_l$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, where we assume $i_1 < \dots < i_t$ and $j_1 < \dots < j_t$. This partial order is extended to monomials with different degrees through divisibility, namely $e \preceq e'$ if and only if there is a divisor e'' of e' such that $e \preceq e''$. In fact, $e \preceq e'$ means e is universally more reliable than e' .

An information set $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is decreasing if $\forall e \preceq e'$ and $e' \in \mathcal{I}$ we have $e \in \mathcal{I}$. A decreasing monomial code $C(\mathcal{I})$ is a monomial code with a decreasing information set \mathcal{I} . If the information set is selected according to the Bhattacharyya parameter or the polarization weight (PW) method [23], the polar codes are decreasing. Decreasing polar codes $C(\mathcal{I})$ can

be generated by \mathcal{I}_{\min} , when \mathcal{I} is the smallest decreasing set containing \mathcal{I}_{\min} , i.e., $\mathcal{I} = \{e \in \mathcal{M} \mid \exists e' \in \mathcal{I}_{\min}, e \preceq e'\}$. From now on, we always suppose \mathcal{I} is decreasing.

C. Weight distribution of RM codes

Definition 2. The r -th order RM code $\text{RM}(m, r)$ is defined as

$$\text{RM}(m, r) \triangleq \text{span} \{ \text{ev}(e) : e \in \mathcal{M}, \deg(e) \leq r \}.$$

Clearly, RM codes are decreasing monomials codes. It is well-known that the minimum weight of non-zero polynomials in $\text{RM}(m, r)$ is 2^{m-r} .

The number of codewords with weight i in C is denoted as

$$A_i(C) \triangleq |\{c \in C \mid \text{wt}(c) = i\}|.$$

The sequence $(A_i(C))_{i=0}^N$ is called the weight distribution of C .

The weight distribution as well as the polynomials in RM codes with weight less than $2w_{\min}$ is presented in [18].

Theorem 1 ([18]). *Let f be a non-zero polynomial in $\text{RM}(m, r)$. If the weight of f is less than 2^{m-r+1} , then $\text{wt}(f) = 2^{m-r+1} - 2^{m-r+1-\mu}$, where μ is a positive integer. Moreover, f can be written as one of the following forms:*

$$\begin{aligned} & P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2}) \triangleq \\ & g_1 \cdots g_{r-2}(g_{r-1}g_r + g_{r+1}g_{r+2} + \cdots + g_{r+2\mu-3}g_{r+2\mu-2}), \\ & m - r + 2 \geq 2\mu \geq 2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} & Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu}) \triangleq \\ & g_1 \cdots g_{r-\mu}(g_{r-\mu+1} \cdots g_r + g_{r+1} \cdots g_{r+\mu}), \\ & m \geq r + \mu, r \geq \mu \geq 3. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here g_1, g_2, \dots are linearly independent linear polynomials. We call the Equation (1) the type-I polynomials, and Equation (2) the type-II polynomials.

Example 3. Let $m = 7$ and $r = 4$, the minimum weight w_{\min} of $\text{RM}(7, 4)$ is 8,

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1 = x_1x_2x_3x_4, \text{ by Equation (1), } \mu = 1, \text{ wt}(f_1) = 8; \\ & f_2 = x_1x_2(x_3x_4 + x_5x_6), \text{ by Equation (1), } \mu = 2, \text{ wt}(f_1) = 12; \\ & f_3 = x_1(x_2x_3x_4 + x_5x_6x_7), \text{ by Equation (2), } \mu = 3, \text{ wt}(f_1) = 14. \end{aligned}$$

We say $P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2})$ and $P(g'_1, \dots, g'_{r+2\mu-2})$ (or $Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu})$ and $Q(g'_1, \dots, g'_{r+\mu})$) have different forms if there exists some i such that $g_i \neq g'_i$. It is important to note that different forms can lead to the same polynomial. For instance, consider the case when $m = 4$ and $r = 2$. Let $g_1 = x_1, g_2 = x_4, g_3 = x_2, g_4 = x_2, g'_1 = x_1, g'_2 = x_4 + x_2, g'_3 = x_2, g'_4 = x_3 + x_2$. In this example, we have $P(g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) = P(g'_1, g'_2, g'_3, g'_4)$, despite $g_2 \neq g'_2$ and $g_4 \neq g'_4$. This is one of the main challenges in the enumeration process.

D. Weight distribution of polar codes

In this paper, we utilize Theorem 1 to enumerate the polynomials with weight less than $2w_{\min}$ in decreasing polar codes. Note that an r -th order decreasing monomial code $C(\mathcal{I})$ is a subcode of the r -th RM code.

Example 4. Let $C(\mathcal{I})$ be a $[128, 80]$ decreasing polar code where \mathcal{I} is generated by $\mathcal{I}_{\min} = \{x_1x_2x_5x_7, x_1x_3x_4x_7, x_1x_4x_5x_6, x_2x_3x_5x_6, x_4x_6x_7\}$. By Theorem 1, the minimum weight of $C(\mathcal{I})$ is 8.

As an example, let us consider polynomials in $C(\mathcal{I})$ with weight less than 16. Since $C(\mathcal{I})$ is a subcode of $\text{RM}(7, 4)$, according to Theorem 1, the polynomials in $C(\mathcal{I})$ with weight less than 16 can be written as the type-I polynomials $P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2})$ where $r = 4$ and $\mu = 1, 2$ or the type-II polynomials $Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu})$ where $r = 4$ and $\mu = 3$. We select g_1, g_2, \dots in order to enumerate these polynomials.

During the enumeration process, g_1, g_2, \dots must be linearly independent, as stated in Theorem 1. Besides, we must guarantee that the polynomial belongs to the subcode $C(\mathcal{I})$.

Moreover, it is important to note that different forms may represent the same polynomial, and thus it is redundant to include all these forms in the enumerations. For example, let us consider $f = x_1x_2(x_3x_6 + x_4x_5) = P(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_6, x_4, x_5)$ and $f' = x_1x_2(x_3(x_6+x_4) + x_4(x_5+x_3)) = P(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_6+x_4, x_4, x_5+x_3)$. It is straightforward to confirm that $f = f'$, i.e., both f and f' represent the same polynomial.

In conclusion, in order to enumerate the type-I and type-II polynomials in $C(\mathcal{I})$ accurately, we need to carefully consider the following points in the enumeration procedure:

- 1) The linear polynomials g_1, g_2, \dots should be linearly independent;
- 2) The polynomial $P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2})$ or $Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu})$ must belong to $C(\mathcal{I})$;
- 3) Different forms may represent the same polynomial. Thus, it is important to eliminate the redundant forms during the enumeration.

The authors in [18] applied Theorem 1 to calculate the number of polynomials with weight less than $2w_{\min}$ in RM codes. It should be noted that in their study, since all monomials with degree r belong to $\text{RM}(m, r)$, the second point is automatically satisfied. The polynomials are selected carefully so that they do not become linear combinations of the previously selected polynomials. The third point only appears in the type-I polynomial, and the number is calculated based on the weight distribution of the second order RM codes [24].

Since r -th order decreasing polar code $C(\mathcal{I})$ is a subcode of r -th order RM code, the polynomials with weight less than $2w_{\min}$ can be expressed as the type-I polynomials or the type-II polynomials, so there is no concern about miscounting. However, only a fraction of the type-I and type-II polynomials actually belong to r -th order polar codes. This distinction gives rise to completely different methods to examine the three above points to avoid overcounting in the enumeration procedure for polar codes. The first point is necessary, otherwise the polynomial is not a codeword with weight less than $2w_{\min}$. The second point ensures that

we exclude polynomials not in $C(\mathcal{I})$, while the third point prevents counting the same polynomials multiple times. To facilitate this examination process, the largest term of a linear polynomial can be utilized as a helpful tool, which will be explained in detail later.

The case $\mu = 1$, i.e., the number of polynomials with w_{\min} , was calculated in [20], and the case $\mu = 2$, with weight $1.5w_{\min}$, was addressed in [21]. In these studies, they applied the lower-triangular affine automorphism group to partition the codewords into different orbits.

When $\mu = 2$, the authors in [21] provided a technique to avoid overcounting for $f + g = f' + g'$, where f, g, f', g' are degree-2 polynomials. However, when $\mu \geq 3$, avoiding overcounting with the sum of μ polynomials is more complex, which cannot be solved by [21]. To handle this problem, we present a novel method by dividing the low-weight polynomials into different sets based on their first terms rather than orbits. And we count the free coefficients in polynomials in Algorithm 1.

Additionally, when $\mu \geq 3$, it is necessary to consider type-II polynomials, which is not involved in [21]. To solve this problem, we also divide the low-weight polynomials into different sets based on their first terms. And we count the linearly independent polynomials in Algorithm 2.

E. Proof Outline

We describe our proof briefly as follows. In subsection III-A, we demonstrate that every polynomial can be expressed in a restricted form that satisfies the conditions in Lemma 3. Besides, when considering restricted forms, the linear factors of a polynomial are unique. Although repetitive counting has not been completely eliminated, this transformation reduces the number of possible forms, which simplifies subsequent enumeration significantly.

In subsection III-B, we calculate the number of the type-I polynomials $P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2})$. Focusing on the restricted forms, we ensure that the largest terms of $g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2}$ can be rewritten to be all distinct and unique, as proven in Lemma 4 and 5. Therefore, we can classify the polynomials into subsets based on their largest terms. This prevents duplications and enables clear categorization.

To calculate the size of each subset, we choose the linear polynomials $g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2}$ in order so that the three points outlined in Example 4 are satisfied. Checking the first two conditions is straightforward. The challenge lies in the fact that different forms may result in the same polynomial, as shown in Example 4.

The number of choices for g_1, \dots, g_{r-2} is $2^{\lambda_{x_{F(g_1)} \dots x_{F(g_{r-2})}}} = 2^{\sum_{t=1}^{r-2} (F(g_t) - t + 1)}$. Next, the number of distinct polynomials $\sum_{j=1}^{\mu} g_{r-3+2j} g_{r-2+2j}$ is computed in Theorem 3, and the proof is divided into two parts. In the first part (Lemma 7), we establish the feasibility of rewriting the polynomials while fixing certain coefficients of $g_{r-1}, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2}$ to 0. Then the number of possible polynomials is upper bounded by $2^{\alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}$, where $\alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u$ is the number of the remaining coefficients defined in subsection III-B. In the second part, we illustrate

that the remaining coefficients are actually free, i.e., any value of these coefficients yields a different polynomial. Therefore, the number of low-weight codewords is exactly $2^{\alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}$.

In subsection III-C, we calculate the number of the type-II polynomials $Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu})$. Similar to the previous case, we focus on the restricted forms. As shown in Lemma 6, we can also classify the polynomials into subsets based on their largest terms. Similarly, we need to choose the linear polynomials to satisfy three points in Example 4. By Lemma 6, regardless of order, different restricted forms represent different polynomials. Therefore, the third point is satisfied, and the challenge lies in the first and the second points.

The number of choices for g_1, \dots, g_r is $2^{\lambda_{x_{F(g_1)} \dots x_{F(g_r)}}}$. We then choose $g_{r+1}, \dots, g_{r+\mu}$ in order so that the linearly independence condition is satisfied, i.e., g_{r+j} is not the linear combination of g_1, \dots, g_{r+j-1} for all $1 \leq j \leq \mu$. For the second point, the difficulty arises when $F(g_{r-\mu+j}) = F(g_{r+j})$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \mu$. Since the largest term is cancelled, $x_{F(g_1)} \dots x_{F(g_r)} \in \mathcal{I}$ is not a necessary condition for $Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$. In this case, the coefficients of monomials not belonging to $C(\mathcal{I})$ in $g_1 \dots g_r$ and $g_1 \dots g_{r-\mu} g_{r+1} \dots g_{r+\mu}$ must be equal thus are cancelled and disappear in $Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu})$. We calculate the number of choices for $g_{r+1}, \dots, g_{r+\mu}$ satisfying this condition in Theorem 5.

III. CLASSIFICATION AND ENUMERATION OF POLYNOMIALS

In this section, we focus on the classification and enumeration of the polynomials with weight less than $2w_{\min}$ in r -order decreasing monomial codes $C(\mathcal{I})$. According to Theorem 1, we know $w_{\min} = 2^{m-r}$ and there are two kind of polynomials with weight less than 2^{m-r+1} : the type-I and the type-II polynomials. We enumerate the number of polynomials in each type respectively by dividing polynomials into disjoint sets and calculating the size of each set.

For $u = (i_1, \dots, i_l)$, define the number of indices i_j with $j \in [s, t]$ and $i_j < k$ to be $\varphi_{u, [s, t]}(k) = |\{s \leq j \leq t \mid i_j < k\}|$, and define $\bar{\varphi}_{u, [s, t]}(k) = k - \varphi_{u, [s, t]}(k)$. This definition simplifies the enumeration of low-weight codewords.

A. Restricted form of polynomials

As illustrated in Example 4, a polynomial can be expressed in various forms. However, we prove that every polynomial can be expressed in a way that satisfies the conditions stated in Lemma 3. This allows us to reduce the number of possible forms, which is beneficial for the subsequent enumeration.

Lemma 1. *Let $f = gh$ where g is a linear polynomial with $F(g) = t$. Construct h' by replacing every x_t in h with $g + x_t + 1$. Then $f = gh'$ and x_t does not appear in h' .*

Proof. Let $b = (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$. If $g(b) = 0$, then $0 = g(b)h(b) = g(b)h'(b)$. If $g(b) = 1$, then $b_t = g(b) + b_t + 1$, so $h'(b) = h(b)$. Therefore, for any $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$, $f(b) = g(b)h'(b)$. \square

Example 5. Let $g = x_2 + x_1$ and $h = x_2 + x_2x_3$, then $h' = x_1 + 1 + (x_1 + 1)x_3$ by replacing every x_2 in h by $x_1 + 1$.

Now $(x_2 + x_1)(x_2 + x_2x_3) = (x_2 + x_1)(x_1 + 1 + (x_1 + 1)x_3)$ and x_2 does not appear in h' .

Lemma 2. *Let $f = g$. f', g' are the polynomials by replacing every x_t in f, g with another polynomial h . Then $f' = g'$.*

Proof. Assume there exists some $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$ such that $f'(b) \neq g'(b)$. Define $b' \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$ satisfying $b'_j = b_j$ for $j \neq t$ and $b'_t = h(b)$. Then $f(b') = f'(b) \neq g'(b) = g(b')$, which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3. *Any non-constant polynomial f with linear factors can be expressed as:*

$$f = g_1 \cdots g_k g.$$

satisfying

a) g_1, \dots, g_k are linearly independent linear polynomials and g has no linear factors;

b) $F(g_1) < \dots < F(g_k)$, and for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $x_{F(g_i)}$ only appears in g_i .

If f has no linear factors, we simply write $f = g$.

We call $f = g_1 \cdots g_k g$ is expressed in the restricted form. Furthermore, the restricted form is unique, that is, if f can be expressed in two different ways:

$$f = g_1 \cdots g_k \cdot g = h_1 \cdots h_j \cdot h$$

and both of the two forms satisfy the above conditions a) and b), then $k = j$, $g_i = h_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $g = h$.

The proof of the lemma is in Appendix A.

Remark 1. To simplify the enumeration process for the type-I and type-II polynomials, we apply Lemma 3 to reduce the number of different forms. For example, consider the polynomial $f = (x_2 + x_1)x_1(x_3x_4 + x_5x_6)$. Although it is not in the restricted form, we can rewrite it as $f = x_1(x_2 + 1)(x_3x_4 + x_5x_6)$. This allows us to only consider the restricted forms in the enumeration procedure. However, it is worth noting that it is still challenging to address the third point in Example 4. For example, we can also write f as $f = x_1(x_2 + 1)(x_3(x_4 + x_5) + x_5(x_6 + x_3))$ which still satisfies the conditions in Lemma 3. Thus, efficient methods need to be explored to eliminate duplicate counting according to the characteristics of the type-I and the type-II polynomials respectively.

By Lemma 3, we calculate the number of minimum-weight codewords in decreasing monomial codes, which has been shown in [20]. In fact, from Theorem 1, the minimum-weight codewords are exactly the type-I polynomials with $\mu = 1$.

Corollary 1. *Let $C(\mathcal{I})$ be an r -th order decreasing monomial code. Define $\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}} = \sum_{t=1}^r (i_t - t + 1)$, then the number of $g_1 \cdots g_r$ with $F(g_t) = i_t$ for $1 \leq t \leq r$ is $2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}}$. Furthermore, the number of minimum-weight codewords is*

$$A_{2^{m-r}}(C(\mathcal{I})) = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{I}_r} 2^{\lambda_f}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{I}_r is the set of all degree- r monomials in \mathcal{I} .

Proof. According to Theorem 1, each polynomial f with weight 2^{m-r} in $C(\mathcal{I})$ is a product of r linearly independent

polynomials. Then f can be expressed as the restricted form $f = g_1 \cdots g_r$. The number of undetermined coefficients in g_t is $(F(g_t) - t + 1)$ since the coefficient of $x_{F(g_j)}$ in g_t must be zero for $j < t$. Therefore, the number of polynomials g_1, \dots, g_r with the largest terms $x_{F(g_1)}, \dots, x_{F(g_r)}$ is $2^{\lambda_{x_{F(g_1)} \cdots x_{F(g_r)}}}$.

To prove Equation (3), we verify the three points given in Example 4. First, Lemma 3 ensures that g_1, \dots, g_k are linearly independent. Next, since $C(\mathcal{I})$ is decreasing, $f \in C(\mathcal{I})$ if and only if $x_{F(g_1)} \cdots x_{F(g_r)} \in \mathcal{I}$. For the third point, Lemma 3 shows that $g_1 \cdots g_r = h_1 \cdots h_r$ if and only if $g_i = h_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$, so different forms lead to different polynomials in this situation.

Therefore, $A_{2^{m-r}}(C(\mathcal{I}))$ is equal to the sum of 2^{λ_f} where $f \in \mathcal{I}_r$. \square

Example 6. Let $C(\mathcal{I})$ be the polar code defined in Example 4 with minimum weight 8.

For example, if $f = x_1x_2x_5x_7$ then

$$\lambda_f = 1 + (2 - 1) + (5 - 2) + (7 - 3) = 9,$$

so the number of $g_1 \cdots g_4$ with $F(g_1) = 1, F(g_2) = 2, F(g_3) = 5, F(g_4) = 7$ is $2^9 = 512$.

We calculate that $A_8(C(\mathcal{I})) = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{I}_4} 2^{\lambda_f} = 5680$.

Next, we extend our analysis to other low-weight codewords. Since each low-weight codeword can be expressed as either a type-I or type-II polynomial, we calculate the number of both types respectively.

B. Number of the type-I polynomials

In this subsection, our objective is to calculate the number of polynomials which can be expressed as equation (1) in the r -th order decreasing monomial code $C(\mathcal{I})$ when $\mu \geq 2$. The case $\mu = 1$, i.e., the number of minimum-weight codewords, has already been solved in Corollary 1. Thanks to Theorem 1, we can classify the type-I polynomials into disjoint set and the number of polynomials in each set is calculated in Theorem 3.

For a type-I polynomial f , we define the form $f = P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2})$ to be proper if both f itself and $g_{r-3+2t}g_{r-2+2t}$ for each $1 \leq t \leq \mu$ satisfy the two conditions a) and b) in Lemma 3. According to Lemma 3, each f can be expressed as a proper form, so we only need to consider proper forms from now on.

Example 7. $f = x_1((x_4 + x_2)(x_2 + 1) + x_3(x_5 + x_1))$ is not proper since the largest term of $x_2 + 1$ is x_2 , which appears in $x_4 + x_2$. We can rewrite it as the proper form $f = x_1(x_2(x_4 + 1) + x_3(x_5 + 1))$.

Define A_μ to be the set of proper polynomials $P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$. Denote $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2})$, and define A_u to be the subset of A_μ such that $F(g_t) = i_t$. Define $S_\mu = \{(i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2}) \mid P(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{r+2\mu-2}}) \in C(\mathcal{I}), i_{r-1} < i_{r+1} < \dots < i_{r+2\mu-3}, \text{ and } i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2} \text{ are all different}\}$. Due to the proper condition, we also have $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{r-2}$ and $i_j < i_{j+1}$ for $j = r - 1, r + 1, \dots, r + 2\mu - 3$.

In fact, S_μ is defined to avoid the repetition of counting due to exchange of polynomials (e.x. $g_1 \cdots g_{r-2} (g_{r-1}g_r + g_{r+1}g_{r+2} + \cdots + g_{r+2\mu-3}g_{r+2\mu-2}) = g_1 \cdots g_{r-2} (g_{r+1}g_{r+2} + g_{r-1}g_r + \cdots + g_{r+2\mu-3}g_{r+2\mu-2})$). By defining S_μ , we ensure each type-I polynomial belongs to a unique A_u for some $u \in S_\mu$. This prevents duplication in the classification of the polynomials and allows for a clear and distinct categorization.

Theorem 2.

$$A_\mu = \bigcup_{u \in S_\mu} A_u.$$

And different A_u are disjoint. Therefore,

$$|A_\mu| = \sum_{u \in S_\mu} |A_u|.$$

In order to prove the theorem 2, we rely on the following lemmas to show that every polynomial $f = \sum_{i=1}^\mu f_{2i-1}f_{2i}$ can be rewritten so that the largest terms of linear polynomials f_i are different regardless of the order.

Lemma 4. Let $f_1, \dots, f_{2\mu}$ be linearly independent polynomials and $f = \sum_{i=1}^\mu f_{2i-1}f_{2i}$. Then there exists linearly independent polynomials $g_1, \dots, g_{2\mu}$ with different largest terms such that $f = \sum_{i=1}^\mu g_{2i-1}g_{2i}$.

The proof of the lemma is in Appendix B.

Lemma 5. Assume $\sum_{i=1}^\mu f_{2i-1}f_{2i} = \sum_{i=1}^\mu g_{2i-1}g_{2i}$, where all $F(f_i)$ are different, $F(f_1) < F(f_3) < \cdots < F(f_{2\mu-1})$, $F(f_{2j-1}) < F(f_{2j})$ for $1 \leq j \leq \mu$, and g_i satisfy similar conditions. Then $F(f_i) = F(g_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 2\mu$.

The proof of the lemma is in Appendix C.

Proof of Theorem 2. Denote $f = P(f_1, \dots, f_{r+2\mu-2}) \in A_\mu$. Since f is proper, for all $1 \leq i \leq r-2$, $x_{F(f_i)}$ only appears in f_i . According to Lemma 4, we suppose that $F(f_1), \dots, F(f_{r+2\mu-2})$ are all different. Therefore, each polynomial in A_μ belongs to some A_u after sorting the linear polynomials based on the largest terms.

Now let us assume there exists another proper form $g = P(g_1, \dots, g_{r+2\mu-2}) \in A_v$ such that $f = g$. By Lemma 3, we find that $f_i = g_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq r-2$ and $f_{r-1}f_r + \cdots + f_{r+2\mu-3}f_{r+2\mu-2} = g_{r-1}g_r + \cdots + g_{r+2\mu-3}g_{r+2\mu-2}$. Since $u, v \in S_\mu$, the conditions in Lemma 5 are satisfied. Thus, $F(f_i) = F(g_i)$ for $r-1 \leq i \leq r+2\mu-2$. Therefore, we conclude that $u = v$, which implies that the different sets A_u are disjoint. \square

Now we proceed to calculate $|A_\mu|$. For $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2}) \in S_\mu$. We aim to determine the number of different polynomials which can be expressed as $f = P(f_1, \dots, f_{r-2}, h_1, g_1, \dots, h_\mu, g_\mu) = f_1 \cdots f_{r-2} (h_1g_1 + \cdots + h_\mu g_\mu) \in A_u$ by assigning values to the coefficients in $f_1, \dots, f_{r-2}, h_1, g_1, \dots, h_\mu, g_\mu$.

We verify the three points in Example 4. Firstly, since $i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2}$ are all different, the linearly independence is naturally satisfied. Next, since $C(\mathcal{I})$ is decreasing, $f \in C(\mathcal{I})$ if and only if $P(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{r+2\mu-2}}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$, i.e., the μ

Algorithm 1 Calculate $|A_\mu|$

Input: information set \mathcal{I} of the r -order decreasing polar code, weight $2^{m-r+1} - 2^{m-r+1-\mu}$.

Output: the number M of the type-I polynomials with weight $2^{m-r+1} - 2^{m-r+1-\mu}$.

- 1: $M \leftarrow 0$
 - 2: **for** $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2}) \in S_\mu$ **do**
 - 3: Calculate the number α_u of the integer pairs (k, t) satisfying $1 \leq k < t \leq \mu, i_{r-2+2k} > i_{r-2+2t} > i_{r-3+2k} > i_{r-3+2t}$;
 - 4: Calculate the number β_u of the integer pairs (s, t) satisfying $i_{r-2+2t} > s > i_{r-3+2t}$ and s does not appear in u ;
 - 5: Calculate the number γ_u of the integer pairs (s, t) satisfying $i_{r-3+2t} > s$ and s does not appear in i_1, \dots, i_{r-2} ;
 - 6: $M \leftarrow M + 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-2}}} + \alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}$;
 - 7: **end for**
-

polynomials $x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}, x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-2}} x_{i_{r+1}} x_{i_{r+2}}, \dots, x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-2}} x_{i_{r+2\mu-3}} x_{i_{r+2\mu-2}} \in \mathcal{I}$. However, the challenge arises from the fact that different forms may lead to the same polynomial.

Since f is proper, different f_t with $1 \leq t \leq r-2$ will result in different f by Lemma 3. Thus, there are $2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-2}}}}$ choices for f_1, \dots, f_{r-2} .

For $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2}) \in S_\mu$, define $\alpha_u = |\{(k, t) \mid 1 \leq k < t \leq \mu, i_{r-2+2k} > i_{r-2+2t} > i_{r-3+2k} > i_{r-3+2t}\}|$, $\beta_u = \sum_{t=1}^\mu (\varphi_{u, [1, r+2\mu-2]}(i_{r-2+2t}) - \varphi_{u, [1, r+2\mu-2]}(i_{r-3+2t}))$, i.e., the number of the integer pairs (s, t) satisfying $i_{r-2+2t} > s > i_{r-3+2t}$ and s does not appear in u , $\gamma_u = \sum_{t=1}^\mu \varphi_{u, [1, r-2]}(i_{r-3+2t})$, i.e, the number of the integer pairs (s, t) satisfying $i_{r-3+2t} > s$ and s does not appear in i_1, \dots, i_{r-2} . In fact, $\alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u$ is the number of free coefficients in $\sum_{j=1}^\mu h_j g_j$ which can be determined arbitrarily.

Theorem 3. For $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2}) \in S_\mu$,

$$|A_u| = 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-2}}} + \alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}. \quad (4)$$

Therefore,

$$|A_\mu| = \sum_{u \in S_\mu} |A_u| = \sum_{u \in S_\mu} 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-2}}} + \alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}. \quad (5)$$

The proof of the theorem is in Appendix D.

The Algorithm 1 concludes the procedure for calculating $|A_\mu|$.

Remark 2. As m approaches infinity, the complexity of calculating $\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r+2\mu-2}}}, \alpha_u, \beta_u$ and γ_u is $O(r + 2\mu - 2)$, $O(\mu^2)$, $O(\mu m)$ and $O(\mu r)$ respectively. Consequently, the complexity of calculating $|A_u|$ is $O(\mu m)$. Additionally, the size of S_μ is smaller than $\binom{m}{r+2\mu-2}$. Therefore, the time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $O(\mu m \binom{m}{r+2\mu-2})$.

Remark 3. When $\mu = 2$, Theorem 3 provides the same result as Theorem 4 in [21] with the number of sets S_2 being identical. Moreover, the complexity associated with calculating the size of each set is also at $O(m)$, thus the complexity is similar.

Example 8. Let $C(\mathcal{I})$ be the polar code defined in Example 4. We have calculated $A_8(C(\mathcal{I}))$ in Example 6. Now we calculate $A_{12}(C(\mathcal{I}))$ with $\mu = 2$.

For example, if $u = (1, 7, 2, 5, 3, 4) \in S_2$, $|A_u|$ is the number of different polynomials $f_1 f_2 (h_1 g_1 + h_2 g_2)$ with $F(f_1) = 1, F(f_2) = 7, F(h_1) = 2, F(g_1) = 5, F(h_2) = 3$ and $F(g_2) = 4$. Then $\lambda_{x_1 x_7} = 7$. Since $F(g_1) > F(g_2) > F(h_2) > F(h_1)$, we have $\alpha_u = 0$. Besides, β_u is the sum of number of s does not appear in u satisfying $5 > s > 2$ and $4 > s > 3$. Since only 6 does not appear in u , $\beta_u = 0$. Next, $\varphi_{u, [1,2]}(2) = \varphi_{u, [1,2]}(3) = 1$, so $\gamma_u = 2 - 1 + 3 - 1 = 3$. In fact, x_7, x_6 and x_1 do not appear in $g_1 h_1 + g_2 h_2$. For x_5 , the coefficients of x_5 can be determined arbitrarily by assigning h_1 . For x_4 , the coefficients of $x_4 x_2$ and x_4 can be determined arbitrarily by assigning h_2 . For x_3 and x_2 , the coefficients of $x_3 x_2$, x_3 and x_2 can be determined arbitrarily. Therefore, $|A_u| = 2^{7+6} = 8192$.

From Theorem 1 and 3, we have $A_{12}(C(\mathcal{I})) = \sum_{u \in S_2} |A_u| = \sum_{u \in S_2} 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r-2}} + \alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}} = 508672$.

C. Number of the type-II polynomials

In this subsection, our objective is to calculate the number of polynomials which can be expressed as equation (2) for $\mu \geq 3$ in the r -th order decreasing monomial code $C(\mathcal{I})$. As in section III-B, we classify the type-II polynomials into disjoint set and the number of polynomials in each set is calculated in Theorem 5.

For a type-II polynomial f , we define the form $f = Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu})$ to be proper if f itself, $g_{r-\mu+1} \dots g_r$ and $g_{r+1} \dots g_{r+\mu}$ satisfies the conditions a) and b) in Lemma 3, also satisfy those conditions. According to Lemma 3, each f can be expressed as a proper form, so we only need to consider proper forms from now on.

Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_\mu), b = (b_1, \dots, b_\mu) \in \mathbb{N}^\mu$, define the lexicographic order $a \leq_l b$ if and only if there exists some i such that $a_i < b_i$ and $a_j = b_j$ for all $i < j \leq \mu$ or $a_j = b_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \mu$.

Define B_μ to be the set of polynomials $Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$. Denote $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+\mu})$. Define B_u to be the subset of B_μ such that $F(g_t) = i_t$. Define $T_\mu = \{(i_1, \dots, i_{r+\mu}) \mid Q(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{r+\mu}}) \in C(\mathcal{I}), (i_{r-\mu+1}, \dots, i_r) \leq_l (i_{r+1}, \dots, i_{r+\mu})\}$. Due to the proper condition, we also have $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{r-\mu}, i_{r-\mu+1} < \dots < i_r, i_{r+1} < \dots < i_{r+\mu}$, and i_1, \dots, i_r are all distinct as well as $i_1, \dots, i_{r-\mu+1}, i_{r+1}, \dots, i_{r+\mu}$.

In fact, the introduction of the lexicographic order in T_μ is to avoid repetition of counting due to exchange of polynomials (e.g., $g_1 \dots g_{r-\mu} (g_{r-\mu+1} \dots g_r + g_{r+1} \dots g_{r+\mu}) = g_1 \dots g_{r-\mu} (g_{r+1} \dots g_{r+\mu} + g_{r-\mu+1} \dots g_r)$).

By defining T_μ , we ensure each type-II polynomial belongs to a unique B_u for some $u \in S_\mu$. This prevents duplication in the classification of the polynomials and allows for a clear

and distinct categorization, similar to what we have seen in section III-B.

Theorem 4.

$$B_\mu = \bigcup_{u \in T_\mu} B_u.$$

And different B_u are disjoint. Therefore,

$$|B_\mu| = \sum_{u \in T_\mu} |B_u|.$$

In order to prove the theorem 4, we rely on the following lemma presented in [18] (L6) to show that different $g_{r-\mu+1}, \dots, g_{r+\mu}$ lead to different polynomials.

Lemma 6 ([18]). Suppose $\mu \geq 3$, $f = g + h = g' + h'$, $g = y_1 \dots y_\mu$, $h = y_{\mu+1} \dots y_{2\mu}$, $g' = y'_1 \dots y'_\mu$, $h' = y'_{\mu+1} \dots y'_{2\mu}$, $y_1, \dots, y_{2\mu}$ are linearly independent, $y'_1, \dots, y'_{2\mu}$ are also linearly independent. Then

$$g = g', \quad h = h' \quad \text{or} \quad g = h', \quad h = g'.$$

Proof of Theorem 4. Let $f = Q(f_1, \dots, f_{r+\mu}) \in B_\mu$. Since f is proper, every polynomial in B_μ belongs to some B_u after sorting the linear polynomials based on their largest terms.

If there exists another proper form $g = Q(g_1, \dots, g_{r+\mu}) \in B_v$ such that $f = g$. According to Lemma 3, we have $f_i = g_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq r - \mu$ and $f_{r-\mu+1} \dots f_r + f_{r+1} \dots f_{r+\mu} = g_{r-\mu+1} \dots g_r + g_{r+1} \dots g_{r+\mu}$. Then by Lemma 6 and the lexicographic order, we deduce that $f_{r-\mu+1} \dots f_r = g_{r-\mu+1} \dots g_r, f_{r+1} \dots f_{r+\mu} = g_{r+1} \dots g_{r+\mu}$. Once again, applying Lemma 3, $f_i = g_i$ for $r - \mu + 1 \leq i \leq r + \mu$. Therefore, we conclude that $u = v$, which implies different sets are disjoint. \square

Now we proceed to calculate $|B_\mu|$. Denote $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+\mu}) \in T_\mu$. From the proof of Theorem 4, $Q(f_1 \dots f_{r+\mu}) = Q(g_1 \dots g_{r+\mu})$ if and only if $f_i = g_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r + \mu$, so the third point in Example 4 is satisfied trivially. However, we still need to check the first two points.

There are $\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_r}}$ choices for f_1, \dots, f_r . Next, we need to choose linearly independent $f_{r+1}, \dots, f_{r+\mu}$ with given largest terms such that $Q(f_1 \dots f_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$.

Now, if $i_{r-\mu+j} \neq i_{r+j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq \mu$, $Q(x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r+\mu}}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$ if and only if $Q(f_1 \dots f_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$. However, if $i_{r-\mu+j} = i_{r+j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \mu$, $Q(x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r+\mu}}) = 0$ so $C(\mathcal{I})$ does not imply $Q(f_1 \dots f_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$, so we need to examine the second point carefully. Define $b_u(k) = \max\{t \mid x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r-\mu}} x_{i_{r+1}} \dots x_{i_{r+k-1}} x_t x_{i_{r+k+1}} \dots x_{i_{r+\mu}} \in \mathcal{I}, t \neq i_{r+1}, \dots, i_{r+\mu}\}$. If $x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r-\mu}} x_{i_{r+1}} \dots x_{i_{r+k-1}} x_1 x_{i_{r+k+1}} \dots x_{i_{r+\mu}} \notin \mathcal{I}$, $b_u(k)$ is defined to be 0. In this situation, $Q(f_1 \dots f_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$ if and only if for all $1 \leq k \leq \mu$, the coefficients of x_j with $j > b_u(k)$ in $f_{r-\mu+k}$ and f_{r+k} are equal. If $b_u(k) = 0$, then $f_{r-\mu+k} = f_{r+k} + a_0$ which contradicts against the linear independence condition, so $B_u = \emptyset$.

Define $s_u(k)$ to be the number of choices for f_{r+k} .

Case 1) $i_{r-\mu+j} \neq i_{r+j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq \mu$,

Subcase I) $i_{r+k} \neq i_{r-j}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq \mu - 1$, $s_u(k) = 2^{\varphi_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k})-k+1}$.

Subcase II) $i_{r+k} = i_{r-j}$ for some $0 \leq j \leq \mu - 1$, $s_u(k) = 2^{\varphi_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k})-k+1} - 2^{\varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(i_{r+k})+1}$ if $\varphi_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k}) - k > \varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(i_{r+k})$ and 0 otherwise.

Case 2) $i_{r-\mu+j} = i_{r+j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \mu$.

$s_u(k) = 2^{\varphi_{u,[1,r]}(b_u(k))+1} - 2^k$ if $\varphi_{u,[1,r]}(b_u(k)) + 1 > k$ and 0 otherwise.

Finally, define $\sigma_u = \prod_{k=1}^{\mu} s_u(k)$ for Case 1 and $\sigma_u = (\prod_{k=1}^{\mu} s_u(k))/2$ for Case 2. We need to divide the value by 2 in Case 2 since $Q(f_1, \dots, f_{r+\mu}) = Q(f_1, \dots, f_{r-\mu}, f_{r+1}, \dots, f_{r+\mu}, f_{r-\mu+1}, \dots, f_r)$ is calculated twice.

Next, we prove the correctness of the definition of $s_u(k)$ and derive $|B_\mu|$ in Theorem 5.

Theorem 5. For $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+\mu}) \in T_\mu$,

$$|B_u| = 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_r}}} \sigma_u. \quad (6)$$

Therefore,

$$|B_\mu| = \sum_{u \in T_\mu} |B_u| = \sum_{u \in T_\mu} 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_r}}} \sigma_u. \quad (7)$$

The proof of the theorem is in Appendix E.

The Algorithm 2 concludes the procedure for calculating $|B_\mu|$.

Remark 4. As m approaches infinity, the complexity of calculating $\varphi_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(k)$, $\varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(k)$ and $b_u(k)$ is $O(m)$ since u is vector with length $r + \mu \leq m$. So the complexity of calculating $s_u(k)$ is $O(m)$. Then the complexity of calculating σ_u and further $|B_u|$ is $O(m^2)$. The size of T_μ is $\binom{m}{r} \binom{m-r+\mu}{\mu}$. Therefore, the time complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(m^2 \binom{m}{r} \binom{m-r+\mu}{\mu})$.

Example 9. Let $C(\mathcal{I})$ be the polar code defined in Example 4. We have calculated $A_8((C(\mathcal{I}))$ and $A_{12}((C(\mathcal{I}))$ in Example 6 and 8. Now we calculate $A_{14}(C(\mathcal{I}))$ with $\mu = 3$.

For example, if $u = (1, 2, 5, 7, 3, 4, 7) \in T_3$ then $\lambda_{x_1 x_2 x_5 x_7} = 9$. For the choice of f_5 , we have $F(f_5) = 3$, x_3 does not appear in $x_2 x_5 x_7$ and $\varphi_{u,[1,1]}(3) = 2$, so there are $2^{2-1+1} = 4$ choices for f_5 . Similarly there are 4 choices for f_6 . For f_7 , we have $F(f_7) = 7$ and x_7 appears in $x_2 x_5 x_7$, since $\varphi_{u,[2,4]}(7) = 2$, there are $2^{6-3+1} - 2^{2+1} = 8$ choices for f_7 . Therefore, $|B_u| = 2^9 \times 4 \times 4 \times 8 = 65536$.

In another example, if $v = (1, 4, 5, 7, 4, 5, 7) \in T_3$ then $\lambda_{x_1 x_4 x_5 x_7} = 11$. Since $x_1 x_3 x_5 x_7 \notin \mathcal{I}$ and $x_1 x_2 x_5 x_7 \in \mathcal{I}$, $b_v(1) = 2$, $\varphi_{v,[2,4]}(b_v(1)) = 2$. Similarly, $b_v(2) = 3$, $\varphi_{v,[2,4]}(b_v(2)) = 3$, $b_v(3) = 6$, $\varphi_{v,[2,4]}(b_v(3)) = 4$. Hence, f_7, f_6, f_5 have $2^2 - 2 = 2$, $2^3 - 2^2 = 4$, $2^4 - 2^3 = 16$ choices, respectively. Therefore, $|B_v| = 2^{11} \times 2 \times 4 \times 16/2 = 131072$.

By Theorem 1 and 5, it can be calculated that $A_{14}(C(\mathcal{I})) = \sum_{v \in T_\mu} 2^{\lambda_{x_{v_1} \dots x_{v_{r-\mu}}} \sigma_v = 1835008$.

IV. NUMBER OF LOW-WEIGHT POLYNOMIALS

In this section, we provide the closed-form expressions and the enumeration complexity for the number of codewords with weight less than $2w_{\min}$.

By Corollary 1, Theorem 3 and Theorem 5, we have

Algorithm 2 Calculate $|B_\mu|$

Input: the information set \mathcal{I} of r -order decreasing polar codes, weight $2^{m-r} - 2^{m-r-\mu}$.

Output: the number M of type-II polynomials with weight $2^{m-r+1} - 2^{m-r+1-\mu}$.

```

1:  $M \leftarrow 0$ ;
2: for  $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+\mu}) \in T_\mu$  do
3:   if there exists some  $1 \leq j \leq \mu$  such that  $i_{r-\mu+j} \neq i_{r+j}$ 
   then
4:      $L \leftarrow 1$ ;
5:     for  $k = 1$  to  $\mu$  do
6:       if there exists some  $0 \leq j \leq \mu - 1$  such that
        $i_{r+k} = i_{r-j}$  then
7:          $L \leftarrow 2^{\varphi_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k})-k+1} L$ ;
8:       else
9:         if  $\varphi_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k}) - k \leq \varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(i_{r+k})$ 
         then
10:           $L \leftarrow 0$ ;
11:          Return
12:        else
13:           $L \leftarrow 2^{(\varphi_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k})-k+1} - 2^{\varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(i_{r+k})+1}) L$ ;
14:        end if
15:      end if
16:    end for
17:     $M \leftarrow M + 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_r}}} L$ ;
18:   else
19:      $L \leftarrow 1$ ;
20:     for  $k = 1$  to  $\mu$  do
21:       if  $\varphi_{u,[1,r]}(b_u(k)) + 1 \leq k$  then
22:          $L \leftarrow 0$ ;
23:       Return
24:     else
25:        $L \leftarrow (2^{\varphi_{u,[1,r]}(b_u(k))+1} - 2^k) L$ ;
26:     end if
27:   end for
28:    $M \leftarrow M + 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_r}}} L/2$ ;
29: end if
30: end for

```

Theorem 6. Let $(C(\mathcal{I}))$ be an r -order monomial code and μ be a positive integer. Denote $M = A_{2^{m-r+1}-2^{m-r+1-\mu}}(C(\mathcal{I}))$.

When $\mu = 1$,

$$M = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{I}_r} 2^{\lambda_f}. \quad (8)$$

When $\mu = 2$,

$$M = \sum_{u \in S_\mu} 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r-2}}} + \alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}. \quad (9)$$

When $3 \leq \mu \leq \min\{(m-r+2)/2, m-r, r\}$,

$$M = \sum_{u \in T_\mu} 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r-2}}} \sigma_u + \sum_{u \in S_\mu} 2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r-\mu}}} + \alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}. \quad (10)$$

The closed-form expressions for case $\mu = 1$ and 2 have been discovered in [20] and [21].

Remark 5. As m approaches infinity, the complexity of calculating the number of codewords with weight less than $2w_{\min}$ in a decreasing monomial code is determined by the combined complexity of Algorithm 1 and 2, which is given by $O(m^2(\binom{m}{r+2\mu-2} + \binom{m}{r} \binom{m-r+\mu}{\mu}))$.

When r is a constant, i.e., independent of m , the time complexity is $O(m^{2+\max\{r+2\mu-2, r+\mu\}}) = O((\log N)^{2+\max\{r+2\mu-2, r+\mu\}})$ where N is code length.

When r is proportional to m , i.e., $r = am, a \in (0, 1)$, the time complexity is $O(m^{2\max\{1, 2h(a)\}m}) = O((\log N)^2 N^{\max\{1, 2h(a)\}})$ where $h(a) = -a \log a - (1-a) \log(1-a)$.

Therefore, our algorithms provide polynomial time complexity for calculating the number of codewords with weight less than $2w_{\min}$. In comparison to the approach of using SCL decoding with a very large list to collect low-weight codewords [8], our algorithms are efficient and guarantee an accurate collection of low-weight codewords.

Example 10. We check our results for RM(6, 3). From Theorem 6, we calculate that $A_8(C(\mathcal{I})) = 11160$, $A_{12}(C(\mathcal{I})) = 174999$ and $A_{14}(C(\mathcal{I})) = 28555680$, which is consistent with the results obtained from Theorem 1 [18]. Therefore, our result is correct for RM codes.

Next we examine our findings for $C(\mathcal{I})$ where \mathcal{I} is generated by $\mathcal{I}_{\min} = \{15, 21, 55\}$. Since $C(\mathcal{I})$ is a subcode of RM(6, 3), we list all the polynomials of RM(6, 3) with weight less than 16 and verify whether each one is a codeword in $C(\mathcal{I})$. The result shows that $A_8(C(\mathcal{I})) = 2456$, $A_{12}(C(\mathcal{I})) = 142208$ and $A_{14}(C(\mathcal{I})) = 868325$, which yields the same value as Theorem 6.

We also validate our results for the code whose weight distribution was previously calculated in [12, Table VIII]. By calculating the codewords with less than 16 in $C(\mathcal{I})$, we obtain $A_8(C(\mathcal{I})) = 304$, $A_{12}(C(\mathcal{I})) = 768$ and $A_{14}(C(\mathcal{I})) = 0$. These results perfectly align with those presented in [12, Table VIII]. It is worth noting that the complexity of the method in [12] is exponential, while our algorithm runs in polynomial time relative to the code length.

Example 11. Table 1 and Table 2 present a comparison of the weight distribution of different [128,80] and [256, 94] decreasing monomial codes with minimum distance 8 and 16, respectively. It is worth noting that different constructions yield significantly different weight distributions.

	\mathcal{I}_{\min}	A_8	A_{12}	A_{14}
code 1	{23, 44, 50, 70, 73}	5680	508672	1835008
code 2	{15, 28, 73}	5168	367360	1376256
code 3	{23, 38, 97}	7216	596736	4128768
code 4	{29, 39, 41}	8752	897792	6881280

Table 1: The number of codewords in [128,80] codes with weight less than 16

Example 12. Figure 1 illustrates the union bounds [25] calculated by the weight distribution less than $2w_{\min}$ and

	\mathcal{I}_{\min}	A_{16}	A_{24}	A_{28}
code 1	{63, 91, 103, 120, 204, 210, 225}	1584	49920	0
code 2	{63, 94, 103, 151, 180, 204, 209}	2096	84376	0
code 3	{63, 94, 107, 151, 180, 202, 209}	2608	127740	65536
code 4	{63, 92, 107, 155, 167, 201}	4144	264960	589824

Table 2: The number of codewords in [256,94] codes with weight less than 32




Fig. 1: SCL performance and union bound for different [128, 80] polar codes

the performance of SCL decoding with list size 8 for four different [128, 80] polar codes as outlined in Table 1. In these cases, the performance of SCL8 decoding is close to the ML decoding. Here the union bounds are calculated as $\sum_{d < 2w_{\min}} A_d Q(-\sqrt{d}/\sigma)$ where σ is the standard variance of additive white Gaussian noise and $Q(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-z^2/2} dz$ is the distribution function of the standard normal distribution. The simulation results show that the union bound calculated by our results is closed to the performance of ML decoding, particularly at high signal-to-noise ratios (SNR).

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present a comprehensive framework for classifying and enumerating the codewords with weights less than $2w_{\min}$ in decreasing polar codes. We provide the closed-form expressions and the algorithms to calculate the number of these codewords. Importantly, the time complexity of the algorithms is in polynomial with respect to the code length. Our work contributes to a better understanding of the algebraic structure for polar codes and may provide valuable insights that can potentially guide practical constructions in the future.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Proof. Apparently, each non-constant polynomial f with linear factors can be expressed as $g_1 \cdots g_k g$ where g_i are linear polynomials and g has no linear factors. First we prove that f can be rewritten to satisfy the conditions a) and b).

Assume g_k is a linear combination of g_1, \dots, g_{k-1} , i.e., $g_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i g_i + a_0$. Since $g_1(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i g_i + a_0) = g_1(a_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} a_i g_i + a_0)$, $g_1 \cdots g_k = g_1 \cdots g_{k-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i$. As f is non-zero, $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} a_i = 1$ and $g_1 \cdots g_k = g_1 \cdots g_{k-1}$. Therefore, without loss of generality we can assume that g_1, \dots, g_k are linearly independent.

Assume $F(g_i) = F(g_j) = t$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. According to Lemma 1, we replace x_t in g_j by $g_i + x_t + 1$. The new polynomial is $g'_j = g_i + g_j + 1$, then $g_i g_j = g_i g'_j$ and $F(g'_j) < F(g_j)$. Note that this procedure does not break the condition a). As $\sum_{i=1}^k F(g_i)$ cannot decrease infinitely, after finite procedures, $F(g_1), \dots, F(g_k)$ will be all different from each other. Then we reorder g_1, \dots, g_k so that $F(g_1) < \dots < F(g_k)$.

Assume $x_t = F(g_i)$ appears in some g_j with $j > i$, by Lemma 1, replacing x_t in g_j by $g_i + x_t + 1$ does not change the value of $g_i g_j$. Note that this procedure does not break the condition a) or change $F(g_j)$. Similar procedure can also be applied to g to avoid the appearance of $x_{F(g_i)}$. In this way, x_t only appears in g_i , and thus condition b) satisfies.

Next, we prove the second part of the lemma by induction. When $k = 0$, since g has no linear factor, we have $j = k$ and $g = h$.

For the inductive step $k-1 \rightarrow k$, we replace $x_{F(g_i)}$ by $g_i + x_{F(g_i)} + 1$ for all $i \leq k$ on both sides. After this replacement, g_i becomes 1, g does not change since $x_{F(g_i)}$ does not appear in g , and h_t and h becomes h'_t and h' respectively. Then by Lemma 2, $g = h'_1 \cdots h'_j \cdot h'$. Since g has no linear factors, $h'_1 \cdots h'_j = 1$.

Suppose $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ satisfying $g_1(b) \cdots g_k(b) = 1$, then $b_{F(g_i)} = g_i(b) + b_{F(g_i)} + 1$, it follows that $h_t(b) = h'_t(b)$ and then $h_1(b) \cdots h_j(b) = 1$. Similarly, $h_1(b') \cdots h_j(b') = 1$ implies $g_1(b') \cdots g_k(b') = 1$ for $b' \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. Hence, $h_1 \cdots h_j = g_1 \cdots g_k$.

Since $\deg(h_1 \cdots h_j) = \deg(g_1 \cdots g_k)$, we deduce that $j = k$. Assume $F(h_k) > F(g_k)$, then $x_{F(g_k)}$ appears in $h_1 \cdots h_k$ but not in $g_1 \cdots g_k$, which means the equality cannot hold. Similarly, $F(h_k) < F(g_k)$ is also impossible. Therefore, $F(h_k) = F(g_k)$.

Since $x_{F(g_k)}$ only appears in g_k and h_k , $f = x_{F(g_k)} g_1 \cdots g_{k-1} g + g'' = x_{F(g_k)} h_1 \cdots h_{k-1} h + h''$, where $x_{F(g_k)}$ does not appear in g'' or h'' . Therefore, we have $g_1 \cdots g_{k-1} g = h_1 \cdots h_{k-1} h$. By the inductive hypothesis, $g_i = h_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $g = h$. Similarly, expanding f in terms of $x_{F(g_{k-1})}$ implies $g_k = h_k$. \square

APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Proof. Denote $a = \sum_{i=1}^{2\mu} F(f_i)$ to be the sum of indices of the largest terms.

First, if $F(f_{2i-1}) = F(f_{2i}) = t$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \mu$, as in Lemma 1, we replace f_{2i} by $f_{2i-1} + f_{2i} + 1$. This procedure does not change the value of f or break the linear independence condition, and a will decrease.

Second, if $F(f_{2i-1}) = F(f_{2j-1}) = t$ for some $i \neq j$, denote $f_{2i-1} = x_t + g$ and $f_{2j-1} = x_t + h$. Without loss of generality, let $F(f_{2j}) \leq F(f_{2i})$. Since

$$(x_t + g)f_{2i} + (x_t + h)f_{2j} = (x_t + g)(f_{2i} + f_{2j}) + (g + h)f_{2j}, \quad (11)$$

we can rewrite f so that a decreases. Similarly, this procedure does not change the value of f or break the linear independence condition.

When $F(f_{2i-1}) = F(f_{2j}), F(f_{2i}) = F(f_{2j-1})$, or $F(f_{2i}) = F(f_{2j})$, the procedure is similar.

As a cannot decrease infinitely, after finite procedures described above, f can be rewritten to satisfy that all the largest terms are different. \square

APPENDIX C PROOF OF LEMMA 5

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction. When $\mu = 1$, the lemma is implied by Lemma 3. For the induction step $\mu - 1 \rightarrow \mu$, if $F(f_{2\mu}) > F(g_{2\mu})$, then $x_{F(f_{2\mu})}$ appears in the left side but not in the right side, which means the equality cannot hold. Similarly, $F(f_{2\mu}) < F(g_{2\mu})$ is also impossible. Therefore, $F(f_{2\mu}) = F(g_{2\mu})$. Since $x_{F(f_{2\mu})}$ does not appear in other linear polynomials, we have $f_{2\mu-1} = g_{2\mu-1}$. Denote $F(f_{2\mu-1}) = t$.

Define f'_j to be the polynomial by replacing every x_t in f_j by $f_{2\mu-1} + x_t$, and g'_j is defined similarly. Then $g'_{2\mu-1} = f'_{2\mu-1} = 0$. By Lemma 2, $\sum_{i=1}^{\mu-1} f'_{2i-1} f'_{2i} = \sum_{i=1}^{\mu-1} g'_{2i-1} g'_{2i}$. Since x_t cannot be the largest term of other linear polynomials, replacing x_t by $f_{2\mu-1} + x_t$ does not change the largest terms of other polynomials. Then by induction hypothesis, $F(f'_j) = F(g'_j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq 2\mu - 2$. Therefore, $F(f_i) = F(g_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 2\mu$. \square

APPENDIX D PROOF OF THEOREM 3

We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 7. Suppose $\sum_{t=1}^{\mu} h_t g_t$ is proper and satisfies the conditions in Lemma 5, then we can rewrite $g_t = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} b_j^{(t)} x_j + b_0^{(t)}$ and $h_t = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} c_j^{(t)} x_j + c_0^{(t)}$, such that the conditions in Lemma 5 still hold, in addition, $\forall 1 \leq t, t' \leq \mu$,

- 1) $b_{F(g_{t'})}^{(t)} = 0$, if $F(g_t) > F(g_{t'}) > F(h_{t'}) > F(h_t)$;
- 2) $b_{F(h_{t'})}^{(t)} = 0$, if $F(g_t) > F(h_{t'}) > F(h_t)$;
- 3) $b_{F(h_{t'})}^{(t')} = 0$ ($\sum_{t=1}^{\mu} h_t g_t$ is still proper).

Proof. First, if $b_{F(g_{t'})}^{(t)} = 1$ for some $F(g_t) > F(g_{t'}) > F(h_{t'}) > F(h_t)$, since

$$h_t g_t + h_{t'} g_{t'} = h_t (g_t + g_{t'}) + (h_t + h_{t'}) g_{t'}, \quad (12)$$

we can replace g_t by $g_t + g_{t'}$ and $h_{t'}$ by $h_t + h_{t'}$ such that $b_{F(g_{t'})}^{(t)} = 0$ without changing $b_s^{(t)}$ for $s > F(g_{t'})$ and $c_s^{(t')}$ for $s > F(h_{t'})$, so the largest terms of g_t and h_t are not changed, thus the conditions in Lemma 5 still hold.

Similarly, if $b_{F(h_{t'})}^{(t)} = 1$ for some $F(g_t) > F(h_{t'}) > F(h_t)$, since

$$h_t g_t + h_{t'} g_{t'} = h_t(g_t + h_{t'}) + h_{t'}(g_{t'} + h_t), \quad (13)$$

we can replace g_t by $g_t + h_{t'}$ and $g_{t'}$ by $h_t + g_{t'}$ such that $b_{F(h_{t'})}^{(t)} = 0$ without changing $b_s^{(t)}$ for $s > F(h_{t'})$ and $b_s^{(t)}$ for $s > F(h_t)$.

If $b_{F(h_{t'})}^{(t)} = 1$, since

$$h_{t'} g_{t'} = h_{t'}(g_{t'} + h_{t'} + 1), \quad (14)$$

we can replace $g_{t'}$ by $g_{t'} + h_{t'} + 1$ such that $b_{F(h_{t'})}^{(t)} = 0$ without changing $b_s^{(t)}$ for $s > F(h_{t'})$.

Since all the above procedures do not influence $b_s^{(t)}$ with larger subscript, we sort $F(g_{t'})$ and $F(h_{t'})$ for all $1 \leq t' \leq \mu$ in descending order. Then for all $1 \leq t \leq \mu$, check whether conditions 1)-3) satisfy, if not, apply the above procedures (12)-(14). Note that the previously satisfied conditions remain intact throughout the subsequent steps, we can rewrite $\sum_{t=1}^{\mu} h_t g_t$ to satisfy conditions 1)-3). \square

Now we are going to calculate $|A_u|$. By Lemma 3 and Lemma 7, in order to avoid counting the same polynomials multiple times, we can fix some coefficients to zeros, thus the number of polynomials in A_u is at most 2 to the power of the number of the remaining coefficients, which is $2^{\alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}$ as shown in Theorem 3. Now we prove that any value of these coefficients yields a different polynomial. Therefore, the number of low-weight codewords is exactly $2^{\alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u}$.

Proof of Theorem 3. Denote $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+2\mu-2}) \in S_\mu$. We calculate the number of different polynomials $f = P(f_1, \dots, f_{r-2}, h_1, g_1, \dots, h_\mu, g_\mu) \in A_u$. Since f is proper, there are $2^{\lambda_{x_{i_1} \dots x_{i_{r-2}}}}$ choices for f_1, \dots, f_{r-2} .

Next we calculate the number of choices for $g = \sum_{t=1}^{\mu} h_t g_t$. Let us write $g = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} a_{j,k} x_j x_k + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m} a_{0,k} x_k + a_{0,0}$, $g_t = \sum_{1 \leq s \leq m} b_s^{(t)} x_s + b_0^{(t)}$ and $h_t = \sum_{1 \leq s \leq m} c_s^{(t)} x_s + c_0^{(t)}$. Since $g = \sum_{t=1}^{\mu} h_t g_t$ and $x_j^2 = x_j$, we have

$$a_{j,k} = \sum_{t=1}^{\mu} (b_j^{(t)} c_k^{(t)} + b_k^{(t)} c_j^{(t)}) \quad (15)$$

for $1 \leq j < k \leq m$ and

$$a_{0,k} = \sum_{t=1}^{\mu} (b_k^{(t)} c_0^{(t)} + b_0^{(t)} c_k^{(t)}) \quad (16)$$

for $0 \leq k \leq m$.

Some of the coefficients in g_t and h_t are prefixed. Firstly, $b_{F(g_t)}^{(t)} = 1$ and $b_s^{(t)} = 0$ for $s > F(g_t)$, $c_{F(h_t)}^{(t)} = 1$ and $c_s^{(t)} = 0$ for $s > F(h_t)$. Besides, since f is proper, $b_s^{(t)} = 0$ if $s = F(h_t)$ or $s = F(f_l)$ for $1 \leq l \leq r-2$, $c_s^{(t)} = 0$ if $s = F(f_l)$ for $1 \leq l \leq r-2$. Furthermore, we assume the coefficients in g_t which satisfy the conditions in Lemma 7 are fixed to zeros.

We are going to assign values to the remaining $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ in a specific order such that for each remaining $b_s^{(t)}$

and $c_s^{(t)}$, there exists one different coefficient $a_{j,k}$ determined by it, thus different values of $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ yield different polynomials. First, we assign values to $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ appearing in the expanded formula of $a_{j,m}$ from $j = m-1$ to 0. Then, we assign values to other $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ appearing in the expanded formula of $a_{j,m-1}$ from $j = m-2$ to 0, and so on. In this way, some $a_{j,k}$ can be freely determined by assigning specific values to $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ as desired, while other $a_{j,k}$ are determined by other coefficients in f determined earlier. The number of choices for $g = \sum_{i=1}^{\mu} h_i g_i$ is exactly the 2 to the power of the number of free coefficients.

Next, we specify the stage when we assign $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ in the predefined order. If $s > F(h_t)$, $b_s^{(t)}$ first appears in the coefficient of $x_{F(h_t)} x_s$. Thus, $b_s^{(t)}$ is assigned when determining $a_{F(h_t),s}$. If $s < F(h_t)$, $b_s^{(t)}$ is assigned when determining $a_{s,F(h_t)}$. And $c_s^{(t)}$ is assigned when determining $a_{s,F(g_t)}$, since $c_s^{(t)}$ first appears in the coefficient of $x_s x_{F(g_t)}$.

Now we prove that the first appearance of the free coefficients $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ are at different stages, that is, they are assigned to determine different $a_{j,k}$. It is clear that all the $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_{s'}^{(t')}$ are assigned at different stages. Assume that for $t \neq t'$, $b_s^{(t)}$ and $b_{s'}^{(t')}$ are assigned when determining the same $a_{j,k}$. If $s > F(h_t)$ and $s' > F(h_{t'})$, the subscripts of $a_{F(h_t),s}$ and $a_{F(h_{t'}),s'}$ are the same, thus $F(h_t) = F(h_{t'})$, which is against that the largest terms are different. Similarly, the case $s < F(h_t)$ and $s' < F(h_{t'})$ is impossible. W.l.o.g, assume $s > F(h_t)$ and $s' < F(h_{t'})$, we have $j = F(h_t) = s'$, $k = s = F(h_{t'})$. Therefore,

$$F(h_t) = s' < F(h_{t'}) = s < F(g_t).$$

Since we fix the coefficients in g_t which satisfy the conditions 2) in Lemma 7 to zeros, $b_s^{(t)} = b_{F(h_{t'})}^{(t)} = 0$ needs not be considered in our procedure. Therefore, all $b_s^{(t)}$ and $b_{s'}^{(t')}$ are assigned at different stages.

Assume that for $t \neq t'$, $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_{s'}^{(t')}$ are assigned when determining the same $a_{j,k}$. If $s > F(h_t)$, the subscripts $j = F(h_t) = s'$, $k = F(g_{t'}) = s$. Therefore,

$$F(h_t) = s' < F(h_{t'}) < F(g_{t'}) = s < F(g_t).$$

Since we fix the coefficients in g_t which satisfy the conditions 1) in Lemma 7 to zeros, $b_s^{(t)} = b_{F(g_{t'})}^{(t)} = 0$ needs not be considered in our procedure. If $s < F(h_t)$, then $F(h_t) = F(g_{t'})$, which is against that the largest terms are different. Therefore, $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_{s'}^{(t')}$ are assigned at different stages.

Now assume that for $t \neq t'$, $c_s^{(t)}$ and $c_{s'}^{(t')}$ are assigned when determining the same $a_{j,k}$. Therefore, $F(h_t) = F(h_{t'})$, which is against that the largest terms are different.

Note that all the free $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$ are assigned at different stages, their values determine the corresponding $a_{j,k}$, since other terms in the expanded formula are already assigned. The number of $\sum_{i=1}^{\mu} h_i g_i$ is exactly 2 to the power of the number of free coefficients in $b_s^{(t)}$ and $c_s^{(t)}$. Now we count the number of the coefficients:

1) The number of $c_s^{(t)}$ with $s \neq i_1, \dots, i_{r-2}$ is $\bar{\varphi}_{u, [1, r-2]}(i_{r-3+2t})$.

2) The number of $b_s^{(t)}$ with $s < F(h_t)$ and $s \neq i_1, \dots, i_{r-2}$ is $\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r-2]}(i_{r-3+2t})$.

3) The number of $b_s^{(t)}$ with $s > F(h_t)$ and $s \neq i_l, 1 \leq l \leq r+2\mu-2$ is $\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r+2\mu-2]}(i_{r-2+2t}) - \bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r+2\mu-2]}(i_{r-3+2t})$.

4) The number of $b_s^{(t)}$ with $s > F(h_t)$ and $s = F(g_k)$ is the number of k satisfying $F(g_t) > F(g_k) > F(h_k) > F(h_t)$.

In conclusion, the number of free coefficients is $|\{(k, t) | 1 \leq k < t \leq \mu, i_{r-2+2k} > i_{r-2+2t} > i_{r-3+2k} > i_{r-3+2t}\}| + \sum_{t=1}^{\mu} (\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r+2\mu-2]}(i_{r-2+2t}) - \bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r+2\mu-2]}(i_{r-3+2t})) + 2 \sum_{t=1}^{\mu} \bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r-2]}(i_{r-3+2t}) = \alpha_u + \beta_u + 2\gamma_u$, which implies Equation (4). Equation (5) follows from Equation (4) and Theorem 2. \square

APPENDIX E PROOF OF THEOREM 5

Proof. Denote $u = (i_1, \dots, i_{r+\mu}) \in T_\mu$. From the proof of Theorem 4, $Q(f_1 \cdots f_{r+\mu}) = Q(g_1 \cdots g_{r+\mu})$ if and only if $f_i = g_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r + \mu$. There are $\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}$ choices for f_1, \dots, f_r . Next we discuss the choice of $f_{r+1}, \dots, f_{r+\mu}$ with largest terms $i_{r+1}, \dots, i_{r+\mu}$ such that $f = Q(f_1 \cdots f_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$ is proper and the linear independence condition is satisfied. We first assign the coefficients in f_{r+1} , then f_{r+2} and so on. To guarantee the linear independence condition, we need to ensure that

$$f_{r+k} = \sum_{t=1}^{r-\mu} a_t f_t + \sum_{t=r-\mu+1}^r a_t f_t + \sum_{t=r+1}^{r+k-1} a_t f_t + a_0. \quad (17)$$

does not hold for any $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_2$.

Now we consider two cases for u :

1) $i_{r-\mu+j} \neq i_{r+j}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq \mu$. In this case, $Q(f_1 \cdots f_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$ if and only if $x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}$ and $x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-\mu}} x_{i_{r+1}} \cdots x_{i_{r+\mu}}$ belong to \mathcal{I} . Next, we calculate the choices of $f_{r+1}, \dots, f_{r+\mu}$ satisfying the linear independence condition.

Assume we have already determined f_{r+j} for $1 \leq j < k$. There are two cases for f_{r+k} :

I) $i_{r+k} \neq i_{r-j}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq \mu - 1$. Assume, by contradiction, Equation (17) holds.

For $1 \leq t \leq r - \mu$, since x_{i_t} only appears in f_t , a_t must be 0, so we can delete them from the equation:

$$f_{r+k} = \sum_{t=r-\mu+1}^r a_t f_t + \sum_{t=r+1}^{r+k-1} a_t f_t + a_0.$$

For $r - \mu + 1 \leq t \leq r$ and $i_t > i_{r+k}$, since x_{i_t} does not appear in other f_l with $r - \mu + 1 \leq l \leq r + k - 1$, a_t must be 0. Since $i_{r+k} \neq i_{r-j}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq \mu - 1$, the equation becomes:

$$f_{r+k} = \sum_{\substack{t=r-\mu+1, \\ i_t < i_{r+k}}}^r a_t f_t + \sum_{t=r+1}^{r+k-1} a_t f_t + a_0.$$

Now all the f_t remained in the equation satisfy $i_t < i_{r+k}$, and f_{r+k} cannot be linear combination of these linear polynomials.

Therefore, we conclude that f_{r+k} cannot be a linear combination of any f_j where $1 \leq j \leq r + k - 1$, so the linear independence condition is always satisfied in this case.

The coefficients of x_{i_j} with $1 \leq j \leq r - \mu$ or $r + 1 \leq j \leq r + k$ in f_{r+k} must be 0 to satisfy the proper condition. Since $\varphi_{u,[r+1,r+k-1]}(i_{r+k}) = k - 1$, there are $2^{\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k}) - k + 1}$ choices for f_{r+k} .

II) $i_{r+k} = i_{r-j}$ for some $0 \leq j \leq \mu - 1$. Assume Equation (17) holds.

Similarly, a_t must be 0 when $1 \leq t \leq r - \mu$, or $r - \mu + 1 \leq t \leq r$ with $i_t > i_{r+k}$. Since $i_{r+k} = i_{r-j}$, the equation becomes:

$$f_{r+k} = a_{r-j} f_{r-j} + \sum_{\substack{t=r-\mu+1, \\ i_t < i_{r+k}}}^r a_t f_t + \sum_{t=r+1}^{r+k-1} a_t f_t + a_0.$$

Now $x_{i_{r+k}}$ only appears in f_{r+k} and f_{r-j} , so a_{r-j} must be 1. For $r - \mu + 1 \leq t \leq r$ and $i_t < i_{r+k}$, a_t can be assigned arbitrarily. And for $r - 1 \leq t \leq r + k - 1$, since the form is proper, a_t must be assigned so that x_{i_t} does not appear in f_{r+k} .

Therefore, the free coefficients are a_0 and a_t with $r - \mu + 1 \leq t \leq r$ and $i_t < i_{r+k}$. Since all the polynomials are linear independent, there are $2^{\varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(i_{r+k})+1}$ choices for f_{r+k} such that Equation (17) holds.

Therefore, there are $s_u(k) = 2^{\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k}) - k + 1} - 2^{\varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(i_{r+k})+1}$ choices for f_{r+k} . If $\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r-\mu]}(i_{r+k}) - k \leq \varphi_{u,[r-\mu+1,r]}(i_{r+k})$, then there does not exist any f_{r+k} such that linear independence holds, so $B_u = \emptyset$.

2) $i_{r-\mu+j} = i_{r+j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \mu$. It should be noted that in this case $x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}$ may not belong to \mathcal{I} . Then $f_{r+1}, \dots, f_{r+\mu}$ must be chosen to be linearly independent and $Q(f_1, \dots, f_{r+\mu}) \in C(\mathcal{I})$. We first analyse f_{r+1} , then f_{r+2} and so on.

To guarantee $f \in C(\mathcal{I})$, notice that the coefficients larger than $b_u(k)$ in f_{r+k} and $f_{r-\mu+k}$ must be equal, and then the monomials that do not belong to \mathcal{I} in $f_{r-\mu} \cdots f_r$ and $f_{r+1} \cdots f_{r+\mu}$ will cancel each other out. Therefore, the number of free coefficients of f_{r+k} is $\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r]}(b_u(k)) + 1$. Next we analyse the number of linearly dependent choices. Similar to the first case, assume Equation (17) holds. Since $x_{i_{r+j}}$ with $1 \leq j < k$ only appears in f_{r+j} and $f_{r+j-\mu}$, we have $a_{r+j} = a_{r-\mu+j}$. Then there are 2^k choices for f_{r+k} such that Equation (17) holds.

Therefore, there are $s_u(k) = 2^{\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r]}(b_u(k))+1} - 2^k$ choices for f_{r+k} . If $\bar{\varphi}_{u,[1,r]}(b_u(k)) + 1 \leq k$, $B_u = \emptyset$.

In conclusion, since there are $\lambda_{x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}}$ choices for f_1, \dots, f_r and σ_u choices for $f_{r+1}, \dots, f_{r+\mu}$, we prove Equation (6). Equation (7) follows from Equation (6) and Theorem 4. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Arikan, "Channel Polarization: A Method for Constructing Capacity-Achieving Codes for Symmetric Binary-Input Memoryless Channels," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051-3073, July 2009.
- [2] K. Niu and K. Chen, "CRC-Aided Decoding of Polar Codes," in *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 1668-1671, October 2012.

- [3] I. Tal and A. Vardy, "List Decoding of Polar Codes," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 2213-2226, May 2015.
- [4] I. Sason and S. Shamai, "Performance analysis of linear codes under maximum-likelihood decoding: A tutorial", *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 2006, 3(1-2): 1-222.
- [5] I. Krasikov and S. Litsyn, "On spectra of BCH codes," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 786-788, May 1995.
- [6] C. Di, T. J. Richardson and R. L. Urbanke, "Weight Distribution of Low-Density Parity-Check Codes," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 4839-4855, November 2006.
- [7] T. Kasami, T. Fujiwara and S. Lin, "An approximation to the weight distribution of binary linear codes," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 769-780, November 1985.
- [8] B. Li, H. Shen and D. Tse, "An Adaptive Successive Cancellation List Decoder for Polar Codes with Cyclic Redundancy Check," in *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 2044-2047, December 2012.
- [9] Z. Liu, K. Chen, K. Niu and Z. He, "Distance spectrum analysis of polar codes," *2014 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, Istanbul, Turkey, 2014, pp. 490-495.
- [10] M. Valipour and S. Yousefi, "On Probabilistic Weight Distribution of Polar Codes," in *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 2120-2123, November 2013.
- [11] Q. Zhang, A. Liu and X. Pan, "An Enhanced Probabilistic Computation Method for the Weight Distribution of Polar Codes," in *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 2562-2565, December 2017.
- [12] H. Yao, A. Fazeli and A. Vardy, "A Deterministic Algorithm for Computing the Weight Distribution of Polar Codes," *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Melbourne, Australia, 2021, pp. 1218-1223.
- [13] B. Li, H. Zhang, J. Gu. "On Pre-transformed Polar Codes," arXiv:1912.06359, 2019.
- [14] Y. Li, H. Zhang, R. Li, J. Wang, G. Yan and Z. Ma, "On the Weight Spectrum of Pre-Transformed Polar Codes," *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Melbourne, Australia, 2021, pp. 1224-1229.
- [15] Y. Li, Z. Ye, H. Zhang, J. Wang, G. Yan and Z. Ma, "On the Weight Spectrum Improvement of Pre-transformed Reed-Muller Codes and Polar Codes," *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Taipei, Taiwan, 2023, pp. 2153-2158.
- [16] I. S. Reed, "A class of multiple-error-correcting codes and the decoding scheme," Massachusetts Inst of Tech Lexington Lincoln Lab, 1953.
- [17] D. E. Muller, "Application of Boolean algebra to switching circuit design and to error detection," in *Transactions of the I.R.E. Professional Group on Electronic Computers*, vol. EC-3, no. 3, pp. 6-12, September 1954.
- [18] T. Kasami and N. Tokura, "On the weight structure of Reed-Muller codes," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 752-759, November 1970.
- [19] T. Kasami, N. Tokura and S. Azumi, "On the weight enumeration of weights less than 2.5 d of Reed—Muller codes", *Information and control*, 1976, 30(4): 380-395.
- [20] M. Bardet, V. Dragoi, A. Otmami and J. -P. Tillich, "Algebraic properties of polar codes from a new polynomial formalism," *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2016, pp. 230-234.
- [21] M. Rowshan, V. -F. Drăgoi and J. Yua, "On the Closed-form Weight Enumeration of Polar Codes: 1.5d-weight Codewords", arXiv:2305.02921, 2023.
- [22] C. Schürch, "A partial order for the synthesized channels of a polar code," *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2016, pp. 220-224.
- [23] G. He et al., " β -Expansion: A Theoretical Framework for Fast and Recursive Construction of Polar Codes," *IEEE Global Communications Conference*, Singapore, 2017, pp. 1-6.
- [24] N. Sloane and E. Berlekamp, "Weight enumerator for second-order Reed-Muller codes," in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 745-751, November 1970.
- [25] I. Sason, S. Shamai, "Performance analysis of linear codes under maximum-likelihood decoding: A tutorial," *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 2006, 3(1-2): 1-222.