

Achieving Secrecy Capacity of the Wiretap Channel and Broadcast Channel with a Confidential Component

Talha Cihad Gulcu, *Student Member, IEEE*, Alexander Barg, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The wiretap channel model of Wyner is one of the first communication models with both reliability and security constraints. Capacity-achieving schemes for various models of the wiretap channel have received considerable attention in recent literature. In this paper, we show that capacity of the general (not necessarily degraded or symmetric) wiretap channel under a “strong secrecy constraint” can be achieved using a transmission scheme based on polar codes. We also extend our construction to the case of broadcast channels with confidential messages defined by Csiszár and Körner, achieving the entire capacity region of this communication model.

Index Terms—Polar codes, chaining construction, strong secrecy, coordinate partition.

I. INTRODUCTION

The wiretap channel model \mathcal{W} was introduced by Wyner in 1975 [29]. In this model, there are two receivers Y, Z and a single transmitter X . The transmitter aims at sending messages to Receiver 1 through a communication channel W_1 . The information sent from X to Y is also received by Receiver 2 through another channel W_2 . The transmission problem in the system $\mathcal{W}(W_1, W_2)$ calls for designing a coding system that supports communication between X and Y in a way that is both reliable and secure. The reliability requirement is the usual one for communication systems, namely, that the error probability of decoding the information by Y be made arbitrarily low by increasing the block length of the encoding. At the same time, the transmission needs to be made secure in the sense that the information extracted by Receiver 2 about the message of X approaches zero as a function of the block length.

To describe the problem in formal terms, denote the input alphabet of the transmitter by \mathcal{X} , and the output alphabets of the channels W_1 and W_2 by \mathcal{Y} and \mathcal{Z} , respectively. The messages that the transmitter can convey to Receiver 1 form a finite set denoted below by \mathcal{M} . For transmission over the channel the message is encoded using a mapping $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^N$, where \mathcal{X}^N is an N -fold repetition of the input alphabet. We say that f is a

length- N block encoder of the transmitter. Capacity-attaining schemes for the wiretap channel rely on randomized encoding, i.e., a mapping that sends \mathcal{M} to a probability distribution on \mathcal{X}^N . In other words, the message $m \in \mathcal{M}$ is encoded as a sequence $x^N \in \mathcal{X}^N$ with probability $f(x^N|m)$, and the encoder is defined as a matrix of conditional probabilities $(f(x^N|m))_{m \in \mathcal{M}}^{x^N \in \mathcal{X}^N}$.

The decoder of Receiver 1 is a mapping $\phi : \mathcal{Y}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. We also denote by $P_{Y|X}$ and $P_{Z|X}$ the conditional distributions induced by the channels W_1 and W_2 , respectively, and define the induced distributions $P_{Y^N|X^N}, P_{Z^N|X^N}$, where, for instance, $P_{Y^N|X^N}(y^N|x^N) = \prod_{i=1}^N P_{Y|X}(y_i|x_i)$, where y_i and x_i refer to the i -th symbol of the vectors y^N and x^N , respectively.

Definition I.1. We say that the encoder-decoder pair (f, ϕ) gives rise to (N, ϵ) -transmission over the wiretap channel \mathcal{W} if for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\sum_{x^N \in \mathcal{X}^N} f(x^N|m) P_{Y^N|X^N}(\phi(y^N) = m|x^N) \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad (1)$$

and

$$I(M; Z^N) \leq \epsilon, \quad (2)$$

where M is the message random variable (RV) and Z^N is the RV that corresponds to the observations of Receiver 2.

In Definition I.1, Eq. (1) represents the reliability of communication condition while (2) answers the security of transmission requirement. We note that in many works on transmission with a secrecy constraint the security condition was formulated in a more relaxed way, namely as the inequality

$$(1/N)I(M; Z^N) < \epsilon. \quad (3)$$

This is particularly true about pre-1990s works in information theory, but also applies to some very recent works on the wiretap channel, e.g., [25], [11], [15]. However, as shown by Maurer in [17], [18], this constraint does not fulfill the intuitive security requirements in the system. More specifically, it is possible to construct examples in which inequality (3) is satisfied and at the same time Receiver 2 is capable of learning $N^{1-\epsilon}$ out of N bits of the encoding x^N . In view of this, Maurer suggested (2) as a better alternative to condition (3). As a result, currently (3) is called the “weak security constraint” as opposed to the stronger constraint (2). In this paper we design coding schemes that provide strong secrecy, so below we work only with condition (2).

The secrecy capacity of the wiretap channel is defined as follows.

T. C. Gulcu was with the Department of ECE and Institute for Systems Research, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA, e-mail: gulcu@umd.edu. Research supported in part by NSF grant CCF1217245.

A. Barg is with the Department of ECE and Institute for Systems Research, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, and IITP, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia. Email: abarg@umd.edu. Research supported in part by NSF grants CCF1217245, CCF1217894, and CCF1422955.

Manuscript received October 2014; revised March 2015; accepted October 2016. The results of this paper were presented in part at the IEEE Information Theory Workshop, Jerusalem, Israel, April 27-May 1, 2015.

Definition I.2. The value $R > 0$ is called an achievable rate for the wiretap channel \mathcal{W} if there exists a sequence of message sets \mathcal{M}_N and encoder-decoder pairs (f_N, ϕ_N) giving rise to (N, ϵ_N) transmission with $\epsilon_N \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{1}{N} \log |\mathcal{M}_N| \rightarrow R$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The secrecy capacity C_s is the supremum of achievable rates for the wiretap channel.

The following theorem provides an expression for C_s .

Theorem 1. ([9]; see also [10, p.411]) *The secrecy capacity of the wiretap channel \mathcal{W} equals*

$$C_s = \max[I(V; Y) - I(V; Z)], \quad (4)$$

where the maximum is computed over all RVs V, X, Y, Z such that the Markov condition $V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, Z$ holds true, and such that $P_{Y|X} = W_1, P_{Z|X} = W_2$.

While most general constructive coding schemes for the wiretap channels rely on polar codes, there were some constructive solutions even before the publication of Arkan's seminal work [2]. At the same time, these schemes applied only to some special cases of the channels W_1, W_2 . For instance the case when W_1 is noiseless and W_2 is a binary erasure channel was addressed in [23], [25] which show that in this case the capacity C_s can be achieved using low-density parity-check codes. The results in [25] are based on the weak security assumption while strong security is considered in [23]. Moreover, [25] extends the construction to the cases when both W_1 and W_2 are erasure channels, and when W_1 is noiseless and W_2 is a binary symmetric channel.

Another special case of the wiretap channel relates to the combinatorial version of the erasure channel (the so-called wiretap channel of type II) in which Receiver 2 can choose to observe any t symbols out of N transmitted symbols. Constructive capacity-achieving solutions for this case are based on MDS codes [26] or extractors [6].

In [5], it is shown that C_s is achievable with strong security using invertible extractors, if both W_1 and W_2 are binary symmetric channels. Both encoding and decoding algorithms in [5] have polynomial complexity. Moreover, [5] also claims that its proof method can be easily extended to other wiretap channels as long as both W_1 and W_2 are symmetric.

After the introduction of polar codes by Arkan, achieving C_s via polar coding has been considered by different works, mostly under the degradedness assumption. Recall that a channel $W_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is called *degraded* with respect to a channel $W_1 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ if there exists a stochastic $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{Z}|$ matrix $P_{Z|Y}(z|y)$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}$

$$P_{Z|X}(z|x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{Y|X}(y|x) P_{Z|Y}(z|y). \quad (5)$$

The wiretap channel \mathcal{W} is called degraded if the channel to the eavesdropper is degraded with respect to the main channel. In this case Theorem 1 affords a simpler formulation because there is no need in the auxiliary RV V . Namely, in the degraded case the secrecy capacity equals [10, Probl. 17.8]

$$C_s = C(W_1) - C(W_2) \quad (6)$$

(this specialization is true under more general assumptions, but we will not need them below).

Communication over degraded wiretap channels using polar codes was considered in a number of papers, notably, [16], [11], [1], [15]. The main result of these works is that secrecy capacity (6) can be attained under the weak security constraint. We note that the degraded case is easier to handle with polar codes because of the specific nature of the polar codes construction (more on this below in Sec. III). Another step was made by [22] which suggested a polar coding scheme that attains the rate C_s of a symmetric degraded wiretap channel \mathcal{W} under the strong security requirement (2). More details about the results of [22] are given in Sec. III below.

The problem of attaining secrecy capacity of the general wiretap channel (4) under the strong secrecy condition and without the degradedness assumption was further studied in [24]. The coding scheme employed in [24] relies on two nested layers of the polarizing transform. The decoder for the second (outer) layer works with the probability distribution generated by the first decoder, which is not easily computable. Thus, the low complexity decoding claim of the construction made in [24] is not supported by the known decoding procedures for polar codes. For these reasons the construction in [24] does not resolve the question of constructing a capacity-achieving polar coding scheme for the nondegraded case of wiretap channels.

In related works [28], [20] the problem of constructing capacity achieving schemes for wiretap channels was addressed for the case of quantum channels. The constructions suggested in these works attain symmetric secrecy capacity of quantum wiretap channels. These constructions require a shared secret key between the transmitter and Receiver 1. This requirement seems to be intrinsic to polar code constructions for this problem including our work. However the constructions in [28], [20] require a positive-rate shared key, whereas the bit partition introduced by our encoding setup makes it possible to have a vanishing rate shared key, as explained in Sec. IV.

To summarize, to the best of our knowledge the question of constructing capacity-achieving polar coding schemes for the non-degraded wiretap channel with strong secrecy is an open problem.¹

It is this problem that we aim to solve in this paper by removing the degradedness assumption (5). We also do not assume that either of the channels W_1, W_2 is symmetric. The main idea of our work is to exploit the Markov chain conditions intrinsic to secure communication problems using polar codes. In Sec. IV we propose a polar coding scheme that attains the secrecy capacity (4) under the strong security assumption. Both the encoding and decoding complexity estimates of our construction are $O(N \log N)$, where N is the length of the encoding. In Sec. V-B we generalize our construction to cover the case when a part of transmitter's message is public, i.e., is designed to be conveyed both to Receivers 1 and 2. This model, called a broadcast channel

¹ A concurrent study [7], posted after the completion of this work, also contains a solution of the problems considered in this paper, including the general wiretap channel. The transmission scheme and the proof methods in [7] are different from our work. Another recent paper, [27], also devoted to the general wiretap channel, focuses on the weak security requirement. A more detailed discussion of the relation of our work and [7] appears in Sec. VI.

with confidential messages, is in fact the principal model in the founding work of Csiszár and Körner [9] on this topic.

Apart from the basic polar coding results [2], our solution of the described problems relies on the previous work on the wiretap channel [22], the polar coding scheme for the broadcast channel of [19], and the construction of polar codes for general memoryless channels in [12]. A new idea introduced in our solution is related to a stochastic encoding scheme that emulates the random coding proof of the capacity theorem in [9], whereby polarization is used for the values of the auxiliary random variable V in Theorem 1, followed by a stochastic encoding into a channel codeword. Another insight, which is particularly useful for the broadcast channel result in Sec. V, is related to a partition of the coordinates of the transmitted block that enables simultaneous decoding of different parts of the transmitted message by both receivers, whereby the decoder of polar codes is used by the receivers according to their high- and low-entropy bits. It becomes possible to show that the receivers recover the bits designed to communicate with each of them with high probability, and that the secret part of the message is not accessible to the unintended recipient.

II. PRELIMINARIES ON POLAR CODING

We begin with recalling basic notation for polar codes and then continue with the scheme for capacity-achieving communication on discrete binary-input channels.

Let W be a binary-input channel with the output alphabet \mathcal{Y} , input alphabet $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, and the conditional probability distribution $W_{Y|X}(\cdot|\cdot)$, having capacity $C(W) := \max_{P_X} I(X; Y)$. The *symmetric capacity* $I(W)$ is the value of mutual information $I(X; Y)$ when $P_X(0) = P_X(1) = 1/2$.

We say that the channel W is symmetric if $W_{Y|X}(y|1), y \in \mathcal{Y}$ can be obtained from $W_{Y|X}(y|0), y \in \mathcal{Y}$ through a permutation $\pi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\pi^2 = \text{id}$. If W is symmetric, then $I(W) = C(W)$.

Given a binary RV X and a discrete RV Y supported on \mathcal{Y} , define the Bhattacharyya parameter $Z(X|Y)$ as

$$Z(X|Y) = 2 \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_Y(y) \sqrt{P_{X|Y}(0|y)P_{X|Y}(1|y)}.$$

The value $Z(X|Y), 0 \leq Z(X|Y) \leq 1$ measures the amount of randomness in X given Y in the sense that if it is close to zero, then X is almost constant given Y , while if it is close to one, then X is almost uniform on $\{0, 1\}$ given Y . The Bhattacharyya parameter $Z(W)$ of a binary-input channel W is defined as

$$Z(W) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{W_{Y|X}(y|0)W_{Y|X}(y|1)}.$$

Clearly if $P_X(0) = P_X(1) = 1/2$, then $Z(X|Y)$ coincides with the value $Z(W)$ for the communication channel $W : X \rightarrow Y$.

For $N = 2^n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the polarizing matrix (or the Arıkan transform matrix) as $G_N = B_N F^{\otimes n}$, where $F = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, \otimes is the Kronecker product of matrices, and B_N is a ‘‘bit reversal’’ permutation matrix [2]. In [2], Arıkan

showed that given a symmetric and binary input channel W , an appropriate subset of the rows of G_N can be used as a generator matrix of a linear code that achieves the capacity of W as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

A. Symmetric Channel Coding

The material in this section and Sec. II-B is well understood, but it merits some space in the present paper because it helps us to define the terminology that is useful for the main results below. Given a symmetric binary-input channel W , define the channel W^N with input alphabet $\{0, 1\}^N$ and output alphabet \mathcal{Y}^N by the conditional distribution

$$W^N(y^N|x^N) = \prod_{i=1}^N W(y_i|x_i),$$

where $W(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the conditional distribution that defines W . Define a combined channel \widetilde{W} by the conditional distribution

$$\widetilde{W}(y^N|u^N) = W^N(y^N|u^N G_N).$$

In terms of \widetilde{W} , the channel seen by the i -th bit $U_i, i = 1, \dots, N$ (also known as the bit-channel of the i -th bit) can be written as

$$W_i(y^N, u^{i-1}|u_i) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{\tilde{u} \in \{0, 1\}^{n-i}} \widetilde{W}(y^N|(u_1^{i-1}, u_i, \tilde{u})),$$

where $u^{i-1} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{i-1})$. We see that W_i is the conditional distribution of (Y^N, U^{i-1}) given U_i provided that the channel inputs X_i are uniformly distributed for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. The bit-channels thus defined are partitioned into good channels $\mathcal{G}_N(W, \beta)$ and bad channels $\mathcal{B}_N(W, \beta)$ based on the value of their Bhattacharyya parameters. Bearing in mind our notation choices later in the paper, we denote them by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{X|Y} &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}(N) = \{i \in [N] : Z(W_i) \leq \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{H}_{X|Y} &= \mathcal{H}_{X|Y}(N) = \{i \in [N] : Z(W_i) > 1 - \delta_N\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

respectively, where $[N] = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $\delta_N \triangleq 2^{-N^\beta}, \beta \in (0, 1/2)$. As shown in [4], [14], for any symmetric binary-input channel W and any constant $\beta < 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}(N)|}{N} &= C(W) \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{H}_{X|Y}(N)|}{N} &= 1 - C(W). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Based on this equality, information can be transmitted over the good-bit channels while the remaining bits are fixed to some values known in advance to the receiver (in polar coding literature they are called *frozen bits*). The transmission scheme can be described as follows: A message of $k = |\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}|$ bits is written in the bits $u_i, i \in \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$. The remaining $N - k$ bits of u^N are set to 0. This determines the sequence u^N which is transformed into $x^N = u^N G_N$, and the vector x^N is sent over the channel. Denote by y^N the sequence received on the output. The decoder finds an estimate of u^N by computing the values $\hat{u}^i, i = 1, \dots, N$ as follows:

$$\hat{u}_i = \begin{cases} \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in \{0, 1\}} W_i(y^N, \hat{u}^{i-1}|u), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{H}_{X|Y}. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The results of [2], [4] imply the following upper bound on the error probability $P_e = \Pr(\hat{u}^N \neq u^N)$:

$$P_e \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}} Z(W_i) \leq N 2^{-N^\beta} \leq 2^{-N^{\beta'}}, \quad (10)$$

where β is any number in the interval $(0, 0.5)$ and $\beta' = \beta'(N) < \beta$.

This describes the basic construction of polar codes [2] which attains symmetric capacity $I(W)$ of the channel W with asymptotically vanishing error rate.

Remark II.1. There is a subtle point about the limit relations in (8). Even though asymptotically the bit channels are either good or bad, it is not true that $\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}^c = \mathcal{H}_{X|Y}$ because there is a nonempty subset of indices $\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}^c \setminus \mathcal{H}_{X|Y}$ of cardinality $o(N)$ that is neither good nor bad. This distinction has no import for the simple situation of transmitting over W , but leads to complications in the multi-user systems considered below; see, e.g., (18) in Sec. IV.

B. General Channel Coding

Let W be a binary-input discrete memoryless channel $W : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and let P_X be the capacity achieving distribution of W . If P_X is not uniform, then the basic scheme attains a transmission rate $I(W)$ which is less than $C(W)$. This scheme was extended by Honda and Yamamoto [12] to cover the case of arbitrary distributions P_X , attaining the rate $C(W)$ for general binary-input channels.

To explain the idea in [12], for a given block length N define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_X &= \{i \in [N] : Z(U_i|U^{i-1}) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_X &= \{i \in [N] : Z(U_i|U^{i-1}) \leq \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{H}_{X|Y} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(U_i|U^{i-1}, Y^N) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{X|Y} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(U_i|U^{i-1}, Y^N) \leq \delta_N\} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where U^N, X^N, Y^N have the same meaning as above. It can be shown [12, Theorem 1] that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{H}_X| &= H(X) \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{H}_{X|Y}| &= H(X|Y). \end{aligned}$$

Two special cases of these relations were proved earlier, see [14, Theorem 19] for uniform U^N and [4] for a fixed (small) value of δ .

We note that the set $\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$ is the set of good bit channels defined in (7). Unlike the case of uniform P_X , it is not possible to use all of these channels to transmit information over W . This is because if $i \notin \mathcal{H}_X$, then U_i cannot be used to carry information conditioned on previous bits U^{i-1} . Hence [12] argued that the set of information indices should be chosen as $\mathcal{J} \triangleq \mathcal{H}_X \cap \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$ rather than $\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$.

Since $\mathcal{H}_{X|Y} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_X$ and the number of indices that are neither in $\mathcal{H}_{X|Y}$ nor in $\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$ is $o(N)$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{J}| = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} (|\mathcal{H}_X| - |\mathcal{H}_{X|Y}|) = C(W),$$

i.e., transmitting the information using the bits $U_i, i \in \mathcal{J}$ attains the capacity of the channel W .

The code construction in [12] makes use of the following partition of the coordinate set $[N]$:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_r &= \mathcal{H}_X \cap \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}^c \\ \mathcal{F}_d &= \mathcal{H}_X^c \\ \mathcal{J} &= \mathcal{H}_X \cap \mathcal{L}_{X|Y} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (12)$$

where the superscript c refers to the complement of the subset in $[N]$. In terms of this partition, the encoding is done as follows. The information bits are stored in $\{u_i, i \in \mathcal{J}\}$. As for the bits in the subset $\{i \in \mathcal{F}_r \cup \mathcal{F}_d\}$, [12] suggested to sample their values from the distribution $P_{U_i|U^{i-1}}$. These values are shared with the receiver similarly to the ‘‘frozen bits’’ of the symmetric scheme of [2]. Once u^N is determined, the transmitter finds $x^N = u^N G_N$ and sends it over the channel.

The receiver uses the following successive decoding function: for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ let

$$\hat{u}_i = \begin{cases} \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in \{0,1\}} P_{U_i|U^{i-1}, Y^N}(u|\hat{u}^{i-1}, y^N), & i \in \mathcal{J} \\ u_i, & i \in \mathcal{F}_r \cup \mathcal{F}_d. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Note that this rule represents a MAP decoder for the i th subchannel, which for the symmetric case coincides with the ML decoder rule (9).

The probability of decoding error can be bounded above similarly to (10):

$$P_e \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} Z(U_i|U^{i-1}, Y^N) \leq N 2^{-N^\beta} \leq 2^{-N^{\beta'}} \quad (14)$$

where the parameters have the same meaning as before.

Moreover, [12] argues that there exists a set of deterministic maps $\lambda_i : \{0, 1\}^{i-1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}, i \in \mathcal{F}_r \cup \mathcal{F}_d$ such that (14) holds true, stating the decoding rule in the form

$$\hat{u}_i = \begin{cases} \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in \{0,1\}} P_{U_i|U^{i-1}, Y^N}(u|\hat{u}^{i-1}, y^N), & i \in \mathcal{J} \\ \lambda_i(\hat{u}^{i-1}), & i \in \mathcal{F}_r \cup \mathcal{F}_d. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

The mappings λ_i are shared between the transmitter and the receiver prior to communication. We shall use this form of the transmission scheme and the decoder throughout our paper.

This completes the description of the capacity-achieving transmission scheme of [12]. We will rely in part on these ideas in our construction of a coding scheme for the wiretap channel.

III. A CLOSER LOOK AT PRIOR WORKS ON POLAR CODING FOR THE WIRETAP CHANNEL

To explain our proposal we will first discuss some of the schemes available in the literature. We begin with the transmission scheme of [16] (see also [1], [15], [11]). As already remarked, these works are concerned with the special case when the channel W_2 is degraded with respect to W_1 and aim to attain the rate value (6) with weak secrecy. Let X^N be a random uniform vector over $\{0, 1\}^N$. Similarly to




Fig. 1. Block diagram of the coding scheme in [16]. Good bit channels and bad bit channels are as defined by (7).

$\mathcal{H}_{X|Y}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$ given by (11), define the following subsets of indices:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{X|Z} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(U_i|U^{i-1}, Z^N) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{X|Z} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(U_i|U^{i-1}, Z^N) \leq \delta_N\} \end{aligned}$$

where $U^N = X^N G_N$, and Z^N is the output that Receiver 2 observes when the transmitter sends X^N . Partition the set $[N]$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Z} \\ \mathcal{J} &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Y} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{X|Z} \\ \mathcal{B} &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}^c. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Note that the degradedness assumption (5) implies the inclusion $\mathcal{L}_{X|Z} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$. The coding scheme for the wiretap channel relies on the partition (16) and is summarized in Figure 1. The information is stored in the bits $u_i, i \in \mathcal{J}$. The bits in the coordinates in \mathcal{R} are chosen randomly while the bits in \mathcal{B} form a subset of the frozen bits.

Attainability of the rate (6) using this coding scheme is proved in the cited papers. An essential remark here is that the bits $u_i, i \in \mathcal{R}$ are randomly selected because fixing their values contradicts even the weak security constraint, let alone the stronger one.

We note that generally $\mathcal{H}_{X|Z}^c \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}$, and even though the number of coordinates in $\mathcal{L}_{X|Y}^c \cap \mathcal{H}_{X|Z}^c$ behaves as $o(N)$, this constitutes an obstacle to achieving strong security. To bypass it, [22] uses a different partition of the coordinates, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{J}} &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Y} \cap \mathcal{H}_{X|Z} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{B}} &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}^c \cap \mathcal{H}_{X|Z} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1 &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Y} \cap \mathcal{H}_{X|Z}^c \\ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2 &= \mathcal{L}_{X|Y}^c \cap \mathcal{H}_{X|Z}^c. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Apart from transmitting the information, the coding scheme aims to convey the bits in $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ to Receiver 1 using the good indices of Receiver 1, at the same time preserving the security requirement. This is accomplished using the ‘‘chaining’’ construction proposed in [22]² and shown in Fig. 2. As the figure suggests, the bits in $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2(j)$ contained in block j are transmitted over the channel as a part of the message of block $j - 1$, for

²The term ‘‘chaining’’ was introduced later in [19].




Fig. 2. Block diagram of the coding scheme in [22].

all $j = 2, \dots, m$. This enables Receiver 1 to recover these bits reliably as a part of the successive decoding procedure for block j , which is performed similarly to (13). At the same time, because of the inclusion $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} \subset \mathcal{H}_{X|Z}$, Receiver 2 does not have the resources for their reliable decoding, which provides the desired security.

The analysis of the transmission is performed based on m blocks of N bits as opposed to a single block. The seed for the transmission is provided by choosing $|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2| = o(N)$ random bits which are shared with Receiver 1 (more on this below). In each of the blocks 1 to m , the bits indexed by the set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ are used to send the message. Here $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ is an arbitrary subset of the set $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ of size $|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2|$ whose role is explained below.

The bits in $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_1$ are selected randomly, and the bits $u_i, i \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ are frozen, i.e., assigned arbitrarily and shared in advance with Receiver 1 (they may be also known to Receiver 2 without compromising secrecy).

The assignment of bits in the set $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ in block j depends on the block index. In block 1 these bits are set equal to the message bits of the seed block. In block $j = 2, \dots, m$ the bits indexed by the set $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ are set to be equal to the bits in the set $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ in block $j - 1$, representing the chaining procedure.

Having formed the sequence $u^N(j)$ in block $j = 1, \dots, m$, the encoder passes it through the polarizing transform and transmits the sequence $x^N = u^N G_N$ over the channel. The only remaining problem is to convey to Receiver 1 the bits of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2$ of the first block. This is done by performing the seed transmission of a block which encodes the $|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2|$ bits using some error correcting code of length N . As claimed in [22], it is possible to choose such a code to fulfill the reliability and security requirements because its rate can be made arbitrarily close to zero. The fact that the seed code needs to encode only a small number $o(N)$ of message bits follows from the degradedness assumption, which is therefore essential in this construction.

As shown in [22], this scheme satisfies both constraints (1) and (2) under the assumption that the channel to the eavesdropper is degraded with respect to the channel W_1 . The rate of communication between the transmitter and Receiver 1 can be made arbitrarily close to the value $I(W_1) - I(W_2)$ since the assumption that W_2 is degraded with respect to W_1 ensures that $|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_2| = o(N)$, i.e., there is no asymptotic loss in rate by removing the bits $\{u_i, i \in \tilde{\mathcal{E}}\}$ from the message in order to support the strong security condition.

IV. POLAR CODING FOR THE WIRETAP CHANNEL

In this section, we show that secrecy capacity for the wiretap channel given by Theorem 1 is achievable using polar codes. For this purpose, we consider the RVs V, X, Y, Z as described by Theorem 1, i.e., we assume some fixed distributions $P_V, P_{X|V}$ and the conditional distributions $P_{Y|X} = W_1, P_{Z|X} = W_2$ that satisfy the Markov condition $V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, Z$ and maximize the expression in (4). Define the RV $T^N = V^N G_N$, where V^N denotes N independent realizations of V . The transformation $V^N \rightarrow T^N$ induces conditional distributions $P_{T_i|T^{i-1}}$ derived from the corresponding distributions of the RVs V_i . Define the sets $\mathcal{H}_V, \mathcal{L}_V, \mathcal{H}_{V|Z}, \mathcal{L}_{V|Y}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_V &= \{i \in [N] : Z(T_i|T^{i-1}) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_V &= \{i \in [N] : Z(T_i|T^{i-1}) \leq \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{H}_{V|Z} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(T_i|T^{i-1}, Y^N) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{V|Y} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(T_i|T^{i-1}, Y^N) \leq \delta_N\} \end{aligned}$$

and define the sets $\mathcal{H}_{V|Z}, \mathcal{L}_{V|Z}$ analogously. The cardinalities of these sets satisfy $\frac{1}{N}|\mathcal{H}_V| \rightarrow H(V), \frac{1}{N}|\mathcal{L}_{V|Y}| \rightarrow 1 - H(V|Y), \frac{1}{N}|\mathcal{H}_{V|Z}| \rightarrow H(V|Z)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ [12, Theorem 1].

Define a partition of $[N]$ into the following sets which will be used to describe the coding scheme³

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= \mathcal{H}_V \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|Y} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|Z} \\ \mathcal{B} &= \mathcal{H}_V \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|Y}^c \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|Z} \\ \mathcal{R}_1 &= \mathcal{H}_V \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|Y} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|Z}^c \\ \mathcal{R}_2 &= \mathcal{H}_V \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|Y}^c \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|Z}^c \\ \mathcal{D} &= \mathcal{H}_V^c. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The partition of $[N]$ that thus arises is illustrated in Figure 3. It will be seen that the subsets $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{B}$ in our coding scheme play the role similar to that of the analogously denoted subsets in (17). Importantly, the cardinality of \mathcal{R}_2 is not $o(N)$ any more, which requires adjustments in the transmission scheme. Moreover, there is an extra randomness needed to determine the sequence to be transmitted, as will be seen in the encoding algorithm below.

Encoding: We build on the chaining idea of [22], connecting multiple blocks in a cluster whose performance in transmission will attain the desired goals. The cluster consists of a seed block and a number, m , of other blocks. The seed block consists of $|\mathcal{R}_2|$ random bits. Even though the cardinality of the set \mathcal{R}_2 constitutes a nonvanishing proportion of $[N]$, the rate of the seed $|\mathcal{R}_2|/mN$ can be made arbitrarily small by choosing m sufficiently large. (For example, one can set $m = N^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$, and let $N \rightarrow \infty$.)

Let us describe the encoding and decoding procedures. The transmission is accomplished using m blocks of length N each and the seed block. Every block $t^N = t^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ contains a group of almost deterministic bits, denoted by \mathcal{D} in Figure 4. The values of these bits are assigned according to

³We use the notation \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{B} in this section in the sense different from Sec. III. Since both uses are localized to their respective sections, this should not cause confusion.




Fig. 3. Partition of N coordinates of the block for transmission over the wiretap channel W ; see (18). The highlighted part of the top block represents high-entropy coordinates for the distribution P_V . Similarly, in the middle block we highlight the high-entropy coordinates of the distribution $P_{V|Z}$ and in the bottom block the low-entropy coordinates for the distribution $P_{V|Y}$.




Fig. 4. Block diagram of the wiretap coding scheme: Forming the blocks $t^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$.

a family of deterministic rules $\{\lambda_i, i \in \mathcal{D}\}$ described in (15). The bits $t_i, i \in \mathcal{B}$ in each of the m blocks are determined similarly, based on $\{\lambda_i, i \in \mathcal{B}\}$. These rules are chosen the same for each block, and are shared with Receiver 1. Even if the rate $(|\mathcal{B}| + |\mathcal{D}|)/mN$ can be made arbitrarily small similarly to $|\mathcal{R}_2|/mN$, it may be the case that such a rule sharing requires a positive rate of secure communication. As a remedy to this problem, the bits $t_i, i \in \mathcal{B}$ can be chosen randomly and be the same for each block, and shared with Receiver 1 secretly. This pre-shared randomness still allows one to maintain secrecy as shown by the results presented below. We note that [7] also relies on the same assumption for their proof of the secrecy condition.

The remaining subsets of coordinates are filled as follows. For block 1, the bits in the set \mathcal{R}_2 are assigned the value of the bits of the seed block, while for blocks $j = 2, \dots, m$ these bits are set to be equal to the bits in $\mathcal{E}(j-1)$ of block $j-1$. Here, \mathcal{E} is a subset of \mathcal{J} having the same size as \mathcal{R}_2 . The messages are stored in the bits indexed by $\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{E}$. The randomly chosen bits in \mathcal{E} are written in the coordinates that are good for Receiver 1 and contained in the bad (high-entropy) set of Receiver 2. These bits are transmitted to Receiver 1 in block j and used for the decoding of the message contained in block $j+1$, for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. Finally, the bits in \mathcal{R}_1 are assigned randomly and uniformly for each of the m blocks. The diagram of the chaining construction

for encoding is given in Figure 4. Let $\mathcal{E}(0)$ be the message sequence encoded in the seed block, let $\mathcal{E}(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ be the corresponding sequences in the other blocks (see Fig. 4), and let $r(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ the randomly chosen bits in each block. The encoding proceeds as follows: In Block 1 we put

$$t_i = \begin{cases} \lambda_i(t^{i-1}(1)) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \\ \mathcal{E}_i(0) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R}_2 \\ r_i(1) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{R}_1 \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

and in blocks $j = 2, \dots, m$ we put

$$t_i = \begin{cases} \lambda_i(t^{i-1}(j)) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \\ \mathcal{E}_i(j-1) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R}_2 \\ r_i(j) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{R}_1, \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

where the family of mappings λ_i is chosen from the ensemble $P_{\Lambda_i}[\Lambda_i(t^{i-1}) = 1] = P_{T_i|T^{i-1}}(1|t^{i-1})$ for all $t^{i-1} \in \{0, 1\}^{i-1}$.

Once the blocks $t^N(j), j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ are formed, we find m sequences $v^N(j) = t^N(j)G_N$ by using the polarizing transform. Finally, given v^N , the codeword to be sent over the wiretap channel will be chosen as x^N with probability $P_{X^N|V^N}(x^N|v^N) = \prod_{i=1}^N P_{X|V}(x_i|v_i)$, where $P_{X|V}$ is the conditional distribution induced by the joint distribution of the RVs V and X . This logic is suggested by the proof of the capacity theorem, Theorem 1, which first considers ‘‘transmitting’’ the RV V^N to the receivers, and then choosing X^N so as to satisfy the Markov chain condition in the statement.

Decoding:

Let $y^N(1), \dots, y^N(m)$ be the sequences that Receiver 1 observes on the output of the channel W_1 . The decoding rule is as follows:

$$\hat{t}_i = \begin{cases} \lambda_i(\hat{t}^{i-1}), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D} \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{t \in \{0,1\}} P_{T_i|T^{i-1}Y^N}(t|\hat{t}^{i-1}, y^N), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{R}_1 \\ \mathcal{E}_i(j-1), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R}_2 \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where $P_{T_i|T^{i-1}}$ and $P_{T_i|T^{i-1}, Y^N}$ are the conditional distributions induced by the joint distribution of the RVs V^N and Y^N (this rule is applied to each of the blocks $j = 1, \dots, m$, and j is mostly omitted from the notation).

Let us show that the described scheme attains the secrecy capacity of \mathcal{W} . Namely, the following is true.

Theorem 2. *For any $\gamma > 0, \epsilon > 0$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$ it is possible to choose m so that the transmission scheme described above attains the transmission rate R that is within γ of the secrecy capacity of \mathcal{W} (4) and the information leaked to Receiver 2 satisfies the strong secrecy condition (2).*

Proof. Throughout the proof we assume that the RVs V, X, Y, Z are as given in Theorem 1 and denote by P_{VXYZ} their joint distribution. The distribution $P_{V^N X^N Y^N Z^N} = \prod_{i=1}^N P_{VXYZ}(v_i, x_i, y_i, z_i)$ refers to N independent repetitions of the RVs.

The rate of the proposed coding scheme is

$$\frac{m(|\mathcal{J}| - |\mathcal{E}|)}{mN + |\mathcal{R}_2|} = \frac{(|\mathcal{H}_V \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|Y}| - |\mathcal{H}_V \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|Z}^c|)}{N + |\mathcal{R}_2|/m},$$

which approaches $I(V; Y) - I(V; Z)$ as $N, m \rightarrow \infty$, where the term $|\mathcal{R}_2|$ in the denominator is due to the shared seed for block 1. According to Theorem 1, this is the target rate that we want to achieve for given V and X satisfying $V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, Z$ and $P_{Y|X} = W_1, P_{Z|X} = W_2$.

Now let us prove the reliability and security conditions. Let us introduce the following RVs: Let $M^m = (M_1, M_2, \dots, M_m)$ correspond to the sequence of message bits $\{t_i, i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}$ transmitted in blocks $1, \dots, m$, and let $Z^m = (Z^N(1), \dots, Z^N(m))$ be a sequence of observations of Receiver 2 as a result of the transmission of the m blocks. Further, let E_j correspond to the bits contained in the subset $\mathcal{E}(j), j = 1, \dots, m$.

Reliability: The claim of low error probability for Receiver 1 follows from the results of [12]. Since our communication scheme is more complicated compared to [12], we give some additional details.

Since we know the distribution P_{V^N} , we can compute the distributions $P_{T_i|T^{i-1}}, i = 1, \dots, N$. Now assume that the assignments of the bits indexed by \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{D} are done randomly by sampling from the distribution $P_{T_i|T^{i-1}}$, for each of the blocks $1, \dots, m$. Let $Q_{V^N X^N Y^N Z^N}$ be the joint distribution of the corresponding sequences arising from this assignment. Denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the l_1 distance between the distributions. From the proof of Lemma 1 in [12] it follows that

$$\|P_{V^N X^N Y^N Z^N} - Q_{V^N X^N Y^N Z^N}\| \leq N2^{-N^\beta} \quad (22)$$

holds for all the m blocks of transmission. Moreover, since the message bits are entirely contained in the set of good bits for channel W_1 , the probability of error is bounded by

$$\|P_{V^N X^N Y^N} - Q_{V^N X^N Y^N}\| + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} Z(T_i|T^{i-1}, Y^N) \leq 2N2^{-N^\beta}$$

for each individual block (see [12], Eqns (59)-(60)). Therefore, there exists a family of deterministic rules $\{\lambda_i, i \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{D}\}$ such that the overall error probability for the successive decoding procedure (21) is at most $2mN2^{-N^\beta}, \beta \in (0, 1/2)$. We conclude that the probability that Receiver 1 decodes the information bits correctly approaches 1 as N tends to infinity.

Security: We will show that condition (2) is fulfilled for the sequence of m blocks of transmission. For that purpose, we will first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{J}$ be a subset of coordinates, and let $T[\mathcal{A}] = \{t_i, i \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and $T[\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}] = \{t_i, i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}\}$. Then*

$$I(T[\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}]; T[\mathcal{A}], Z^N) = O(N^3 2^{-N^\beta}). \quad (23)$$

Proof. By definition in (18) we have the inclusion $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{V|Z}$. Let us label the indices in \mathcal{J} as $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|\mathcal{J}|}$, and assume that $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|\mathcal{J}|}$. Using the inequality $Z(X|Y)^2 \leq H(X|Y)$ [3], we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} H_P(T_{a_i}|T^{a_i-1}, Z^N) &\triangleq H_P(T_{a_i}|T_1, \dots, T_{a_i-1}, Z^N) \\ &\geq 1 - 2\delta_N = 1 - 2^{-N^\beta+1} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{J}|$, where H_P refers to the entropy under the distribution $P_{V^N X^N Z^N}$. Our aim is to find an estimate on the mutual information in (23) under the distribution Q . To find an upper bound for the entropy $H(T_{a_i} | T^{a_i-1} Z^N)$ (computed under Q), we use a standard estimate (e.g., [8, Theorem 17.3.3]), and write

$$\begin{aligned} & |H(T_{a_i} | T^{a_i-1}, Z^N) - H_P(T_{a_i} | T^{a_i-1}, Z^N)| \\ & \leq -\|P_{V^N X^N Z^N} - Q_{V^N X^N Z^N}\| \\ & \quad \times \log \frac{\|P_{V^N X^N Z^N} - Q_{V^N X^N Z^N}\|}{|\mathcal{Z}|^N 2^N} \end{aligned}$$

where $|\mathcal{Z}|$ refers to the alphabet size for a single observation of the eavesdropper. Then, we get from (22) and (24) that

$$\begin{aligned} H(T_{a_i} | T^{a_i-1}, Z^N) & \geq 1 - O(N^2 2^{-N^\beta}) - O(N^{(\beta+1)} 2^{-N^\beta}) \\ & = 1 - O(N^2 2^{-N^\beta}). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Observe that (25) implies

$$\begin{aligned} H(T_{a_i} | T_{a_1}, T_{a_2}, \dots, T_{a_{i-1}}, Z^N) & \geq H(T_{a_i} | T^{a_i-1}, Z^N) \\ & \geq 1 - O(N^2 2^{-N^\beta}) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{J}$.

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H(T[\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}] | T[\mathcal{A}], Z^N) & = H(T[\mathcal{J}] | Z^N) - H(T[\mathcal{A}] | Z^N) \\ & \geq H(T[\mathcal{J}] | Z^N) - |\mathcal{A}| \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{J}|} H(T_{a_i} | T_{a_1}, T_{a_2}, \dots, T_{a_{i-1}}, Z^N) - |\mathcal{A}| \\ & \geq |\mathcal{J}|(1 - O(N^2 2^{-N^\beta})) - |\mathcal{A}| \\ & \geq |\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}| - O(N^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where (27) is due to (26). This completes the proof of (23). \square

Lemma 4. Let $M^j \triangleq (M_1, M_2, \dots, M_j)$ and $Z^j \triangleq (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_j)$. For all $j = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$I(E_j; M^j, Z^j) = O(jN^3 2^{-N^\beta}).$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on j . The base case $j = 1$ follows from Lemma 3. Now assume that the claim of the lemma is true for $j = k - 1$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} I(E_k; M^k, Z^k) & = I(E_k; M_k, Z_k) \\ & \quad + I(E_k; M^{k-1}, Z^{k-1} | M_k, Z_k). \end{aligned}$$

Using the chaining structure shown in Figure 4 we argue that the only part of the transmission that connects block $k - 1$ to block k is given by E_{k-1} . This implies that, conditional on (M_k, Z_k) , we have a Markov chain $M^{k-1} Z^{k-1} \rightarrow E_{k-1} \rightarrow E_k$, so

$$\begin{aligned} I(E_k; M^{k-1}, Z^{k-1} | M_k, Z_k) & \leq I(E_{k-1}; M^{k-1}, Z^{k-1} | M_k, Z_k) \\ & \leq I(E_{k-1}; M^{k-1}, Z^{k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to the Markov chain $M^{k-1} Z^{k-1} \rightarrow E_{k-1} \rightarrow M_k Z_k$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I(E_k; M^k, Z^k) & \leq I(E_k; M_k, Z_k) + I(E_{k-1}; M^{k-1}, Z^{k-1}) \\ & = O(N^3 2^{-N^\beta}) + O((k-1)N^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \\ & = O(kN^3 2^{-N^\beta}). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Here (28) is due to Lemma 3 and the induction hypothesis. This completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to complete the proof of the strong security condition. For this purpose, consider the following sequence of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} I(M^m; Z^m) & \leq I(M^m; Z^m, E_m) \\ & = I(M^{m-1}; Z^m, E_m) + I(M_m; Z^m, E_m | M^{m-1}) \\ & \leq I(M^{m-1}; Z^{m-1}, E_{m-1}) + I(M_m; Z^m, E_m | M^{m-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq I(M^{m-1}; Z^{m-1}, E_{m-1}) + I(M_m; Z^m E_m, M^{m-1}) \\ & = I(M^{m-1}; Z^{m-1}, E_{m-1}) + I(M_m; E_m, Z_m) \\ & \quad + I(M_m; M^{m-1}, Z^{m-1} | E_m, Z_m) \\ & \leq I(M^{m-1}; Z^{m-1}, E_{m-1}) + I(M_m; E_m, Z_m) \\ & \quad + I(E_{m-1}; M^{m-1}, Z^{m-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = I(M^{m-1}; Z^{m-1}, E_{m-1}) + O(N^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \\ & \quad + O((m-1)N^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$= I(M^{m-1}; Z^{m-1} E_{m-1}) + O(mN^3 2^{-N^\beta}), \quad (32)$$

where (29) and (30) are implied by the chaining structure in Figure 4, and (31) is due to Lemmas 3 and 4. From (32), we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(M^m; Z^m, E_m) & \leq I(M^{m-1}; Z^{m-1}, E_{m-1}) \\ & \quad + O(mN^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$I(M^m; Z^m) \leq I(M^m; Z^m E_m) = O(m^2 N^3 2^{-N^\beta}).$$

Then, recalling that $m = N^\alpha, \alpha > 0$ is sufficient to satisfy the rate constraint, we observe that $I(M^m; Z^m) = O(N^{3+2\alpha} 2^{-N^\beta}) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, as required.

We conclude that a secrecy rate of $I(V; Y) - I(V; Z)$ is achievable for any V such that $V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, Z$ holds. Therefore, the secrecy capacity C_s given by (4) is also achievable. \square

V. POLAR CODING FOR BROADCAST CHANNEL WITH CONFIDENTIAL MESSAGES

In this section we observe that ideas of the previous section together with some earlier works enable us to extend our code construction to a more general communication model introduced in [9].

A. The Model

Consider a pair of discrete memoryless channels with one transmitter X and two receivers Y, Z . As before, let $W_1 : X \rightarrow Y$ and $W_2 : X \rightarrow Z$ denote the channels and let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z} denote the input alphabet and the output alphabets. We assume that the system transmits three types of messages:

- (i) a message $s_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ from X to Y for which there are no secrecy requirements;
- (ii) a message $s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$ from X to Y which is secret from Z ;
- (iii) a message $t \in \mathcal{T}$ from X to Y and Z , called the “common message”.

Following [9], we call this communication scheme a *broadcast channel with confidential messages* (BCC).

As before, a block encoder for the BCC is a mapping $f : \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^N$. A stochastic version of the encoder is a probability matrix $f(x^N | s_1, s_2, t)$ with columns indexed by $x^N \in \mathcal{X}^N$ and rows indexed by the triples (s_1, s_2, t) . Given such a triple, the stochastic encoder samples from the conditional probability distribution on \mathcal{X}^N . In accordance with the problem statement, there are two decoders: The decoder of Receiver 1 is defined by a mapping $\phi : \mathcal{Y}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{T}$ and the decoder of Receiver 2 is a mapping $\psi : \mathcal{Z}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$.

Denote the rate of the common message t by R_0 , and denote the rates of the secret and non-secret messages to Y by R_s and R_1 , respectively. The analogs of Definitions I.1, I.2 in this case look as follows.

Definition V.1. The encoder-decoder mappings (f, ϕ, ψ) give rise to (N, ϵ) -transmission over the BCC if for every $s_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$, $s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$, $t \in \mathcal{T}$, decoder ϕ outputs the transmitted triple (s_1, s_2, t) and decoder ψ outputs the message t with probability greater than $1 - \epsilon$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x^N \in \mathcal{X}^N} f(x^N | s_1, s_2, t) P_{Y^N | X^N}(\phi(y^N) = (s_1, s_2, t) | x^N) \\ \geq 1 - \epsilon, \\ \sum_{x^N \in \mathcal{X}^N} f(x^N | s_1, s_2, t) P_{Z^N | X^N}(\psi(z^N) = t | x^N) \geq 1 - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Definition V.2. (R_1, R_s, R_0) is an achievable rate triple for the BCC if there exists a sequence of message sets $\mathcal{S}_{1,N}, \mathcal{S}_{2,N}, \mathcal{T}_N$ and encoder-decoder triples (f_N, ϕ_N, ψ_N) giving rise to (N, ϵ_N) transmission with $\epsilon_N \rightarrow 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log |\mathcal{S}_{1,N}| &= R_1 \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log |\mathcal{S}_{2,N}| &= R_s \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log |\mathcal{T}_N| &= R_0 \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} I(S_{2,N}; Z^N) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $S_{2,N}$ is the random variable that corresponds to the secret message.

Note that our definition takes into account the formulation in [10] and is slightly different from the one in [9] (where we write (R_1, R_s, R_0) , [9] has $(R_1 + R_s, R_s, R_0)$).

The following theorem gives the achievable rate region for the triple (R_1, R_s, R_0) .

Theorem 5. [9],[10, p. 414] *The capacity region of the BCC consists of those triples of nonnegative numbers (R_1, R_s, R_0) that satisfy, for some RVs $U \rightarrow V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, Z$ with $P_{Y|X} = W_1$ and $P_{Z|X} = W_2$, the inequalities*

$$R_0 \leq \min[I(U; Y), I(U; Z)] \quad (34)$$

$$R_s \leq I(V; Y|U) - I(V; Z|U) \quad (35)$$

$$R_0 + R_1 + R_s \leq I(V; Y|U) + \min[I(U; Y), I(U; Z)]. \quad (36)$$

Moreover, it may be assumed that $V = (U, V')$ and the range sizes of U and V' are at most $|X| + 3$ and $|X| + 1$.

One can define the secrecy capacity C_s in terms of the capacity region of the BCC, and then recover Theorem 1 as a particular case of Theorem 5.

B. Polar Coding for the Csiszár-Körner Region

In this section, we aim to show that the capacity region of the BCC can be achieved using polar codes. In the first two steps we design a scheme that achieves the rate pairs (R_0, R_s) in (34)-(35), and in the last step we show that for any such pair (R_0, R_s) any rate value

$$R_1 \leq I(V; Y|U) + \min[I(U; Y), I(U; Z)] - R_0 - R_s \quad (37)$$

is also achievable. Finally, the security condition in (33) will be shown in Proposition 6 below.

The overall encoding scheme is stochastic and assumes some fixed joint distribution of the RVs U, V, X, Y, Z such that the constraints of Theorem 5 are satisfied. Since the results below are valid for any such distribution, this will enable us to claim achievability of the rate region in this theorem. The encoder is formed of two stages performed in succession. At the outcome of the first stage, which deals with the common message s_2 , the encoder computes a sequence of m blocks of N bits denoted below by $q^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$. These blocks are used in the second stage to construct the data encoding that is going to be sent to both receivers. Namely, it will be seen that the transformed blocks $u^N = q^N G_N$ can at the same time encode the common message to both receivers and also encode side information for Receiver 1 to ensure reliable transmission of the confidential message. The actual sequences to be transmitted are computed in the second stage based on the sequences $u^N(j)$. This is done by first constructing sequences $t^N(j)$ using the ideas developed in Sec. IV and by using a stochastic mapping of these sequences on the codewords $x^N(j)$. Upon transmitting, these codewords are received by Receiver 1 as $y^N(j)$ and by Receiver 2 as $z^N(j)$. We will argue that the receivers can independently perform decoding procedures that recover the three desired types of messages reliably (and when appropriate, also securely).

1) *The common-message encoding:* The proof of the fact that any R_0 satisfying (34) is achievable follows from the polar coding scheme for the superposition region given in [19]. Given the RVs $U \rightarrow V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, Z$ with $P_{Y|X} = W_1$ and

$P_{Z|X} = W_2$, let U^N, V^N, X^N, Y^N, Z^N be N independent repetitions of the RVs U, V, X, Y, Z . Set

$$Q^N = U^N G_N, \quad (38)$$

where G_N is Arkan's transform. As before, lowercase letters denote realizations of these RVs.

Define the sets $\mathcal{H}_U, \mathcal{L}_{U|Y}, \mathcal{L}_{U|Z}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_U &= \{i \in [N] : Z(Q_i|Q^{i-1}) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{U|Y} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(Q_i|Q^{i-1}, Y^N) \leq \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{U|Z} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(Q_i|Q^{i-1}, Z^N) \leq \delta_N\}. \end{aligned}$$

The cardinalities of these sets, normalized by N , approach respectively $H(U), 1 - H(U|Y), 1 - H(U|Z)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Now observe that for Receiver 1 to recover q^N correctly, the indices of the information bits should be a subset of $\mathcal{J}_u^{(1)} = \mathcal{H}_U \cap \mathcal{L}_{U|Y}$. Similarly, for Receiver 2 to recover the sequence q^N correctly, the information bits should be placed only in those positions of q^N that are indexed by the set $\mathcal{J}_u^{(2)} = \mathcal{H}_U \cap \mathcal{L}_{U|Z}$. Therefore, choosing the indices of information bits as $\mathcal{J}_u = \mathcal{J}_u^{(1)} \cap \mathcal{J}_u^{(2)}$ ensures that the message embedded into q^N will be decoded correctly by both receivers. In this case, the rate of the common message is $R_0 = |\mathcal{J}_u^{(1)} \cap \mathcal{J}_u^{(2)}|/N$. Given that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{J}_u^{(1)}| &= I(U; Y) \\ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{J}_u^{(2)}| &= I(U; Z) \end{aligned}$$

we conclude the common message rate R_0 attains the value $\min[I(U; Y); I(U; Z)]$ only if either $\mathcal{J}_u^{(2)} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_u^{(1)}$ or $\mathcal{J}_u^{(1)} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_u^{(2)}$ holds starting from some N . However, generally this does not have to be the case. To overcome this problem, [19] proposed the following coding scheme. Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{(1)} &= \mathcal{J}_u^{(1)} \setminus \mathcal{J}_u^{(2)} \\ \mathcal{D}^{(2)} &= \mathcal{J}_u^{(2)} \setminus \mathcal{J}_u^{(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $I(U; Y) \leq I(U; Z)$, which implies that $|\mathcal{D}^{(2)}| \geq |\mathcal{D}^{(1)}|$ starting with some N . To describe the encoding procedure, consider m blocks of N coordinates each. In block 1, we use the positions indexed by $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ to store message bits and assign the bits indexed by $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}$ to some fixed values that are available to Receiver 1. In Block $j, j = 2, \dots, m-1$, we again use the positions indexed by $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ to store message bits and copy the part of Block $j-1$ indexed by the coordinates in $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ into the positions indexed by a subset of coordinates $\mathcal{E}^{(2)} \subset \mathcal{D}^{(2)}$ in block j (thus $|\mathcal{E}^{(2)}| = |\mathcal{D}^{(1)}|$). Fill the remaining $|\mathcal{D}^{(2)} \setminus \mathcal{E}^{(2)}|$ bits in each block $j \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$ with random and independent bits and communicate them to Receiver 1. These bits can be the same for each block as long as they are independent and uniform within the same block, so this part of the scheme has negligible impact on the overall rate. In the final block m , we assign the bits indexed by $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ to some fixed values that are available to Receiver 2 and copy the bits in $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}(m-1)$ to the positions in $\mathcal{E}^{(2)}(m)$. The remaining $|\mathcal{D}^{(2)} \setminus \mathcal{E}^{(2)}|$ coordinates in block m are filled with random bit values. The bits in $\mathcal{H}_U \cap (\mathcal{J}_u^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{J}_u^{(2)})^c$ and \mathcal{H}_U^c are chosen based on deterministic rules

λ_i similarly to Sec. IV. These bits are the same for each block and are shared with both receivers. The block diagram of the described coding scheme is shown by Figure 5.

The encoding stage described passes the sequences $u^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ to the second stage which is responsible for actual communication. Upon observing the channel outputs, both receivers perform decoding, which will be described below in Sec. V-B3.

2) *The secret-message encoding:* In this section we describe the construction of sequences x^N that are sent by transmitter X . The construction relies on the sequences $u^N(j)$ constructed by X in the first stage. These sequences can be thought of as side information that enables Receiver 1 to reconstruct the secret message.

The transmission scheme we propose to achieve the rate R_s that satisfies (35), is very similar to the scheme described for the wiretap channel problem in Sec. IV. Our solution consists of choosing the indices of information bits and random bits appropriately and using a chaining scheme quite similar to the one shown in Figure 4.

Let U^N, V^N, X^N, Y^N, Z^N be as defined in Sec. V-B1, and let $T^N = V^N G_N$. Viewing U as side information about V , we define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{V|U} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(T_i|T^{i-1}, U^N) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(T_i|T^{i-1}, U^N, Y^N) \leq \delta_N\} \\ \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z} &= \{i \in [N] : Z(T_i|T^{i-1}, U^N, Z^N) \geq 1 - \delta_N\} \end{aligned}$$

whose cardinalities, normalized by N , approach respectively the values $H(V|U), 1 - H(V|U, Y), H(V|U, Z)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

The intuition behind the construction presented below can be described as follows. First, note that the coordinates of T^N indexed by

$$\mathcal{J}^{(1)} = \mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y} \quad (39)$$

can be decoded by Receiver 1, and so they can be used to send more data in addition to the common message. Of these bits, the part indexed by $(\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y}) \setminus (\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z}^c)$ can be used to transmit the confidential message. Then, given that $\frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y}| \rightarrow I(V; Y|U)$ and $\frac{1}{N} |\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z}^c| \rightarrow I(V; Z|U)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} |(\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y}) \setminus (\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z}^c)| \\ \geq I(V; Y|U) - I(V; Z|U). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that the proposed scheme transmits the secret message at rates arbitrarily close to the rate given by (35) (provided that it also satisfies the strong security condition).

Building on this observation, we proceed to describe the coding scheme, adding some details that make the secrecy




Fig. 5. Encoding for the common-message case: The structure of the blocks $q^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$

part work. Define the sets⁴

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{J} &= \mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z} \\
 \mathcal{B} &= \mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y}^c \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z} \\
 \mathcal{R}_1 &= \mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z}^c \\
 \mathcal{R}_2 &= \mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y}^c \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z}^c \\
 \mathcal{D} &= \mathcal{H}_{V|U}^c.
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Note that the sets $\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}$ partition $[N]$. This partition is basically the same as in (18) (see also Figures 3 and IV) except for the fact that the high- and low-entropy subsets rely on entropy quantities that are additionally conditioned on U .

The transmission scheme that we propose is formed of multiple blocks joined in clusters of m blocks. Similarly to the wiretap coding scheme, there is a seed block shared between the transmitter and Receiver 1. The seed block consists of $|\mathcal{R}_2|$ random bits. Even if the set \mathcal{R}_2 constitutes a nonvanishing proportion of $[N]$, the rate of the seed $|\mathcal{R}_2|/mN$ can be made arbitrarily small by choosing m sufficiently large. (For example, one can set $m = N^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$, and let N tend to infinity.)

The encoding procedure is as follows. Our aim is to construct m blocks $t^N(j)$ which will be used to form the transmitted sequences $x^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$. Apart from the seed block, all the other blocks t^N contain a group of almost deterministic bits, denoted by \mathcal{D} in (40). For block $j, j = 1, \dots, m$, the values of these bits are assigned according to a deterministic rule λ_i (similarly to the earlier appearance of this mapping, see, e.g., Sec. IV), namely

$$t_i = \lambda_i(t^{i-1}, u^N(j))$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{D}$. The set of bits \mathcal{B} in each of the m blocks is chosen similarly based on a family of deterministic rules $\{\lambda_i, i \in \mathcal{B}\}$. These rules are chosen the same for each block, and are shared with Receiver 1 (cf. also the remark on this in Sec. IV).

The remaining subsets of coordinates in are filled as follows. For block 1, the bits in the set \mathcal{R}_2 are assigned the values of the bits of the seed block, while for block $j, j = 2, \dots, m$ these bits are set to be equal to the bits in \mathcal{E} of block $j - 1$.

⁴We again use the same notation as in (18); since the earlier notation is used only in Sec. IV, this should not cause confusion.

Here, \mathcal{E} is a subset of \mathcal{J} having the same size as \mathcal{R}_2 . The messages are stored in the bits indexed by $\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{E}$ which are good for Receiver 1 and contained in the bad (high-entropy) set of Receiver 2. The indices in the subset \mathcal{E} are still good for Receiver 1 but bad for Receiver 2. Nevertheless, they are filled with random bits that are used for decoding by Receiver 1 in the same way as was done in Sec. IV. Finally, the bits in \mathcal{R}_1 are assigned randomly and uniformly for each of the m blocks. We once again refer to Fig. IV which illustrates the described processing. Once the blocks $t^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ are formed, we compute m sequences $v^N(j) = t^N(j)G_N$ by using the polarizing transform.

Finally, the codewords to be sent by the transmitter are computed as follows. The codeword $x^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ is sampled from \mathcal{X}^N according to the distribution $P_{X^N|V^N}(x^N|v^N) = \prod_{i=1}^N P_{X|V}(x_i|v_i)$, where $P_{X|V}$ is the conditional distribution induced by the joint distribution of the RVs V and X .

3) *Decoding of the common message and the secret message:* Assume that the transmitted sequence x^N is received as y^N by Receiver 1 and as z^N by Receiver 2. Importantly, by our construction these sequences follow the conditional distributions $P_{Y|X}$ and $P_{Z|X}$ given by the channels W_1 and W_2 . We describe the decoding procedures by Receivers 1 and 2. Initially they perform similar operations aimed at recovering the common message. Once this is accomplished, Receiver 1 performs additional decoding to recover the secret message.

We begin with the common-message part. In accordance with (38), Receivers 1 and 2 decode the blocks $q^N(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ relying on an iterative procedure. As the construction suggests, Receiver 1 decodes in the forward direction, starting with block 1 and ending with block m , and Receiver 2 decodes backwards, starting with block m and ending with block 1. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
 D(j) &= \{q_i, i \in \mathcal{D}^{(1)}(j)\}, j = 1, \dots, m - 1 \\
 C(j) &= \{q_i, i \in \mathcal{E}^{(2)}(j)\}, j = 2, \dots, m
 \end{aligned}$$

denote the subblocks \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} of the corresponding blocks (see Fig. 5).

The processing by Receiver 1 is as follows. For block 1, it

computes

$$\hat{q}_i = \begin{cases} q_i & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{D}^{(2)} \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{q \in \{0,1\}} P_{Q_i|Q^{i-1}Y^N}(q|\hat{q}^{i-1}, y^N), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_u \cup \mathcal{D}^{(1)} \\ \lambda_i(\hat{q}^{i-1}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

For the remaining blocks $j = 2, \dots, m$ Receiver 1 computes the vector $(\hat{q}_i(j), i = 1, \dots, N)$ as follows:

$$\hat{q}_i(j) = \begin{cases} D_i(j-1) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{E}^{(2)} \\ q_i(j) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{D}^{(2)} \setminus \mathcal{E}^{(2)} \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{q \in \{0,1\}} P_{Q_i|Q^{i-1}Y^N}(q|\hat{q}^{i-1}(j), y^N(j)), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_u \cup \mathcal{D}^{(1)} \\ \lambda_i(\hat{q}^{i-1}(j)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

The processing by Receiver 2 is quite similar except that it starts with block m and advances “backwards” for $j = m-1, m-2, \dots, 1$. For block m the rule is as follows:

$$\hat{q}_i = \begin{cases} q_i & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{D}^{(1)} \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{q \in \{0,1\}} P_{Q_i|Q^{i-1}Z^N}(q|\hat{q}^{i-1}, z^N), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_u \cup \mathcal{D}^{(2)} \\ \lambda_i(\hat{q}^{i-1}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

For blocks $j = m-1, m-2, \dots, 1$, Receiver 2 computes its estimates of the vector $q^N(j)$ as follows:

$$\hat{q}_i(j) = \begin{cases} C_i(j+1) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{D}^{(1)} \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{q \in \{0,1\}} P_{Q_i|Q^{i-1}Z^N}(q|\hat{q}^{i-1}(j), z^N(j)), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_u \cup \mathcal{D}^{(2)} \\ \lambda_i(\hat{q}^{i-1}(j)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

(in (41)-(44) the notation is somewhat abbreviated to keep the formulas compact, e.g., no reference is made to the index of the receiver, and the block index j is sometimes omitted).

The processing described above in (41)-(42) yields the sequences $\hat{u}^N(j) = q^N(j)G_N, j = 1, \dots, m$ which are used by Receiver 1 to recover the secret messages. Denote by $\mathcal{E}(0)$ the message sequence encoded in the seed block, and let $\mathcal{E}(j), j = 1, \dots, m$ be the subblock of block j indexed by the set \mathcal{E} . For $j = 1, \dots, m$, the decoding rule is as follows:

$$\hat{t}_i(j) = \begin{cases} \lambda_i(\hat{t}^{i-1}(j), \hat{u}^N(j)) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{B} \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{t \in \{0,1\}} P_{T_i|T^{i-1}U^N Y^N}(t|\hat{t}^{i-1}(j), \hat{u}^N(j), y^N(j)), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J} \cup \mathcal{R}_1 \\ \mathcal{E}_i(j-1) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R}_2. \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

where $P_{T_i|T^{i-1}U^N Y^N}$ is the conditional distribution induced by the joint distribution of the RVs U^N, V^N and Y^N (the notation is again abbreviated similarly to (21)).

4) *Achievability of the rate region* (34)-(36): The rate of the common message achieved by the construction in Sec. V-B1 is equal to

$$R_0 = \frac{1}{mN} \left[m|\mathcal{J}_u| + (m-1)|\mathcal{D}^{(1)}| \right].$$

As N increases, we obtain

$$\frac{m-1}{m} I(U; Y) \leq R_0 \leq I(U; Y).$$

For sufficiently large m this quantity is arbitrarily close to the common-message rate value given in (34). Note that we have assumed that $I(U; Z) \geq I(U; Y)$; to handle the opposite case it suffices to interchange the roles of the pieces $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{(2)}$ in the common-message encoding and decoding procedures.

As shown in [19], both receivers can decode the common message correctly with probability of error at most $mN2^{-N^\beta}, \beta \in (0, 1/2)$. This follows because in this stage, Receivers 1 and 2 aim only at decoding the bits corresponding to the index sets $\mathcal{D}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{J}_u = \mathcal{H}_U \cap \mathcal{L}_{U|Y}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{(2)} \cup \mathcal{J}_u = \mathcal{H}_U \cap \mathcal{L}_{U|Z}$, respectively. That these bits can be recovered in a successive decoding procedure follows from the basic results on polar codes [2], [4] and [12].

For the secret-message part of the communication the properties of the scheme are characterized by the following proposition.

Proposition 6. *For any $\gamma > 0, \epsilon > 0$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$ it is possible to choose m so that the transmission scheme described above attains a secrecy rate R_s such that $R_s \geq I(V; Y|U) - I(V; Z|U) - \gamma$ and the information leaked to Receiver 2 satisfies the strong secrecy condition in Definition V.2.*

Proof. Assume that X, V, Y, Z are as given by Theorem 5. The rate of proposed coding scheme is

$$\frac{m(|\mathcal{J}| - |\mathcal{E}|)}{mN} = \frac{(|\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y}| - |\mathcal{H}_{V|U} \cap \mathcal{H}_{V|U,Z}^c|)}{N}$$

which converges to $I(V; Y|U) - I(V; Z|U)$ as N goes to infinity. Recalling Theorem 5, we note that this is the target value of the rate R_s for given U, V and X satisfying $U \rightarrow V \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, Z$ and $P_{Y|X} = W_1, P_{Z|X} = W_2$.

Introduce the following RVs: Let $M^m = (M_1, M_2, \dots, M_m)$ be a sequence of message bits $\{t_i, i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{E}\}$ sent in blocks $1, \dots, m$, and let $Z^m = (Z^N(1), \dots, Z^N(m))$ be the RVs that represent the random observations of Receiver 2 upon transmitting m blocks $X^N(j)$. Further, let E_j correspond to the bits contained in the subset $\mathcal{E}(j)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$.

Reliability: The proof of reliable decoding by Receiver 1 follows from the results of [12] and is very similar to Sec. IV. Let $P_{U^N V^N X^N Y^N Z^N}(u^N, v^N, x^N, y^N, z^N) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^N P_{U,V,X,Y,Z}(u_i, v_i, x_i, y_i, z_i)$, where P_{UVXYZ} is the joint distribution of the RVs U, V, X, Y, Z appearing in Theorem 5. Let $\tilde{P}_{U^N, V^N, X^N, Y^N, Z^N}$ be the empirical distribution induced by the transmission scheme if the deterministic rules λ_i in both stages of the encoding are replaced by random assignments such that, for $a = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(q_i = a) &= P_{Q_i|Q^{i-1}}(a|q^{i-1}) \\ \Pr(t_i = a) &= P_{T_i|T^{i-1}}(a|t^{i-1}) \end{aligned}$$

holds for the first and second stages, respectively. Here Q^N is the RV defined in (38). Then, from the proof of Lemma 1 in [12], it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{U^N} - \tilde{P}_{U^N}\| &\leq N2^{-N^\beta} \\ \|P_{V^N|U^N}(\cdot|u^N) - \tilde{P}_{V^N|U^N}(\cdot|u^N)\| &\leq N2^{-N^\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

the second estimate for every u^N . Hence, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{U^N V^N} - \tilde{P}_{U^N V^N}\| &\leq 2N2^{-N^\beta} \\ \|P_{U^N V^N X^N Y^N Z^N} - \tilde{P}_{U^N V^N X^N Y^N Z^N}\| &\leq 2N2^{-N^\beta} \end{aligned}$$

holds for all the m blocks of transmission. Moreover, since the message bits are entirely contained in the set of $\mathcal{L}_{V|U,Y}$, the successive decoding procedure (45) has the probability of error bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\|P_{U^N V^N X^N Y^N} - \tilde{P}_{U^N V^N X^N Y^N}\| \\ &+ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}} Z(T_i | T^{i-1}, U^N, Y^N) \leq 3N2^{-N^\beta} \end{aligned}$$

for each individual block. Thus, we observe that there exists a family of deterministic rules λ_i for each stage such that the overall error probability is at most $3mN2^{-N^\beta}$, $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$. We conclude that the probability that Receiver 1 decodes the information bits correctly approaches 1 as N goes to infinity.

Security: We will show that condition (2) is fulfilled for the sequence of m blocks of transmission. Note that Receiver 2 observes not only a realization of Z^m , but also estimates the RVs $U^m = (U^N(1), \dots, U^N(m))$ through procedure (43)-(44). For this reason the strong security condition to be proved takes the form

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} I(M^m; U^m, Z^m) = 0. \quad (46)$$

The proof of (46) is very similar to the proof of strong secrecy in Sec. IV. The counterparts of Lemmas 3 and 4 for the BCC are provided below. The proofs are the same as the ones in Sec. IV and will be omitted.

Lemma 7. *Let $T[\mathcal{A}] = \{t_i, i \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and $T[\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}] = \{t_i, i \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}\}$, where \mathcal{A} is any subset of \mathcal{J} . Then*

$$I(T[\mathcal{J} \setminus \mathcal{A}]; T[\mathcal{A}], U^N, Z^N) = O(N^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \quad (47)$$

Lemma 8. *Let $M^j \triangleq (M_1, M_2, \dots, M_j)$, $Z^j \triangleq (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_j)$, and $U^j \triangleq (U_1, U_2, \dots, U_j)$. Then, for all $j = 1, \dots, m$, we have*

$$I(E_j; M^j, U^j, Z^j) = O(jN^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \quad (48)$$

The rest of the proof also follows similarly to the proof in Sec. IV. Repeating the inequalities which led to (32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(M^m; U^m, Z^m) &\leq I(M^m; U^m, Z^m, E_m) \\ &\leq I(M^{m-1}; U^{m-1}, Z^{m-1}, E_{m-1}) + O(mN^3 2^{-N^\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$I(M^m; U^m, Z^m) \leq I(M^m; U^m, Z^m, E_m)$$

$$= O(m^2 N^3 2^{-N^\beta}).$$

This completes the proof of (46). \square

Let us show that the ‘‘additional-message’’ rate R_1 as given by (36) is also achievable. We have seen that any rate pair (R_0, R_s) satisfying (34)-(35) is achievable in the system. Moreover, observe that Receiver 1 decodes correctly messages at the rate of $\min[I(U; Y), I(U; Z)]$ according to (41)-(42), and additionally decodes messages at the rate of $I(V; Y|U)$ owing to the part of the encoding $\{t_i, i \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}\}$ given by (39). Since these two groups of information bits can be decoded simultaneously by Receiver 1, we conclude that it is possible to communicate to Receiver 1 an additional message at rate R_1 .

Finally, we remind the reader that generalization of the results presented in Sec. IV and Sec. V to nonbinary alphabets is possible using a multitude of methods available in the literature. For example, E. Şaşoğlu [21, Ch.4] showed that polarization phenomenon extends to all finite alphabets, proving also that the rate of polarization is 2^{-N^β} for β arbitrarily close to $1/2$. For the set of subchannels having capacity close to 0, a similar result on the rate of convergence holds [13].

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have considered the wiretap channel problem [29],[9]. We proved that the secrecy capacity C_s is achievable by polar codes under the strong security constraint, and without additional assumptions on the channel such as symmetry or degradedness. We also showed that it is possible to build on this solution by adding a second layer of encoding which enables one to attain the capacity region of the BCC introduced by Csiszár and Körner.

Our construction and the construction of [7] share some common features. In particular, the two-layer chaining construction for the BCC in our paper is equivalent to the chaining construction appearing in [7]. In addition to that, [7] includes a third layer of encoding to handle the channel prefixing issue, i.e., the transition between the auxiliary RV V and the real input X . Their construction also requires the use of pre-shared common randomness (secret seed) which has vanishing rate compared to the overall amount of communication. At the same time, [7] bypasses the existence issue of good deterministic maps of the type discussed in Sec. IIB by allowing additional secure communication between the users X and Y .

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Andersson, V. Rathi, R. Thobaben, J. Kliewer, and M. Skoglund, *Nested polar codes for wiretap and relay channels*, IEEE Communication Letters, no. 14, pp. 752–754, 2010.
- [2] E. Arıkan, *Channel polarization: a method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051–3073, 2009.
- [3] E. Arıkan, *Source polarization*, Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium on Information Theory, Austin, TX, pp. 899–903, June 2010.
- [4] E. Arıkan and E. Telatar, *On the rate of channel polarization*, Proc. IEEE Int. Sympos. Inform. Theory, Seoul, Korea, pp. 1493–1495, 2009.
- [5] M. Bellare, S. Tessaro, A. Vardy, *Semantic security for the wiretap channel* in Advances in Cryptology–CRYPTO2012, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 7417, pp. 294–311, 2012.

- [6] M. Cheraghchi, F. Didier, and A. Shokrollahi, *Invertible extractors and wiretap protocols*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 1254–1274, 2012.
- [7] R. A. Chou and M. R. Bloch, *Polar coding for the broadcast channel with confidential messages and constrained randomization*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2410–2429, 2016.
- [8] T. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*, 2nd ed., J. Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [9] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Broadcast channels with confidential messages*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 339–348, 1978.
- [10] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information theory: coding theorems for discrete memoryless systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [11] E. Hof and S. Shamai, *Secrecy-achieving polar-coding*, Proc. IEEE Information Theory Workshop, Dublin, Ireland, pp. 1–5, Sept. 2010.
- [12] J. Honda and H. Yamamoto, *Polar coding without alphabet extension for asymmetric models*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 7829–7838, 2013.
- [13] M. Karzand and E. Telatar, *Polar codes for q-ary source coding*, in Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium on Information Theory, Austin, TX, pp. 909–912, June 2010.
- [14] S. B. Korada and R. Urbanke, *Polar codes are optimal for lossy source coding*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 1751–1768, 2010.
- [15] O. O. Koyluoglu and H. El Gamal, *Polar coding for secure transmission and key agreement*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Forensics and Security, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 1472–1483, 2012.
- [16] H. Mahdaviyar and A. Vardy, *Achieving the secrecy capacity of wiretap channels using polar codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6428–6443, 2011.
- [17] U. M. Maurer, *The strong secret key rate of discrete random triples*, in Communication and Cryptography—Two Sides of One Tapestry, R. Blahut, Ed. et al., Boston, MA, pp. 271–285, 1994.
- [18] U. M. Maurer and S. Wolf, *Information-theoretic key agreement: From weak to strong secrecy for free*, in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Berlin, Germany: Springer, vol. 1807, pp. 351–368, 2000.
- [19] M. Mondelli, H. Hassani, I. Sason, and R. Urbanke, *Achieving Marton’s region for broadcast channels using polar codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 783–800, 2015.
- [20] J. M. Renes and M. M. Wilde, *Polar codes for private and quantum communication over arbitrary channels*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 3090–3103, 2014.
- [21] E. Şaşıoğlu, *Polarization and polar codes*, Now Publishers, 2012.
- [22] E. Şaşıoğlu and A. Vardy, *A new polar coding scheme for strong security on wiretap channels*. Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium on Information Theory, Istanbul, Turkey, pp. 1117–1121, July 2013.
- [23] A. Suresh, A. Subramanian, A. Thangaraj, M. Bloch, and S.W. McLaughlin, *Strong security for erasure wiretap channels*, in Proc. IEEE Information Theory Workshop, Dublin, Ireland, Sep. 2010.
- [24] J. M. Renes, R. Renner, and D. Sutter, *Efficient one-way secret-key agreement and private channel coding via polarization*, Advances in Cryptography—ASIACRYPT2013, Lect. Notes Comput. Science, vol. 8269, pp. 194–213, 2013.
- [25] A. Thangaraj, S. Dihidar, A.R. Calderbank, S.W. McLaughlin, and J. Merolla, *Applications of LDPC codes to the wiretap channel*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 2933–2945, 2007.
- [26] V. K. Wei, *Generalized Hamming weights of linear codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 1412–1418, 1991.
- [27] Y.-P. Wei and S. Ulukus, *Polar coding for the general wiretap channel*, IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Comm., vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 278–291, 2016.
- [28] M. M. Wilde and J. M. Renes, *Polar codes for private classical communication*, Proc. IEEE Int. Sympos. Inform. Theory Appl. (ISITA), pp. 745–749, 2012.
- [29] A. D. Wyner, *The wire-tap channel*, Bell Syst. Tech. J., vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1355–1387, 1975.

Alexander Barg (M’00-SM’01-F’08) received the M.Sc. degree in applied mathematics and the Ph.D. degree in electrical engineering, the latter from the Institute for Information Transmission Problems (IPPI) Moscow, Russia, in 1987. He has been a Senior Researcher at the IPPI since 1988. Since 2003 he has been a Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Institute for Systems Research, University of Maryland, College Park.

Alexander Barg was a co-recipient of the IEEE Information Theory Society Paper Award in 2015. During 1997-2000, A. Barg was an Associate Editor for Coding Theory of the IEEE Transactions on Information Theory. He was the Technical Program Co-Chair of the 2006 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory and of 2010 and 2015 IEEE ITWs. He serves on the Editorial Board of several journals including *Problems of Information Transmission*, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, and *Advances in Mathematics of Communications*.

Alexander Barg’s research interests are in coding and information theory, signal processing, and algebraic combinatorics.

Talha Cihad Gulcu (S’13) received the B.S. degree from Middle East Technical University, Ankara, in 2009, the M.S. degree from Bilkent University, Ankara, in 2011, and the Ph.D. degree from University of Maryland, College Park, MD, in 2015, all in electrical engineering. His research interests are information theory and signal processing for communications.