

The Guesswork of Ordered Statistics Decoding: Complexity and Practical Design

Chentao Yue, *Member, IEEE*, Changyang She, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Branka Vucetic, *Life Fellow, IEEE*, and Yonghui Li, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper investigates guesswork over ordered statistics and formulates the complexity of ordered statistics decoding (OSD) in binary additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channels. It first develops a new upper bound of guesswork for independent sequences, by applying the Holder’s inequity to Hamming shell-based subspaces. This upper bound is then extended to the ordered statistics, by constructing the conditionally independent sequences within the ordered statistics sequences. We leverage the established bounds to formulate the best achievable decoding complexity of OSD that ensures no loss in error performance, where OSD stops immediately when the correct codeword estimate is found. We show that the average complexity of OSD at maximum decoding order can be accurately approximated by the modified Bessel function, which increases near-exponentially with code dimension. We also identify a complexity saturation threshold, where increasing the OSD decoding order beyond this threshold improves error performance without further raising decoding complexity. Finally, the paper presents insights on applying these findings to enhance the efficiency of practical decoder implementations.

Index Terms—Ordered-statistics decoding, Guesswork, Decoding complexity

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the key requirements in 6G is the extreme ultra-reliable low-latency communications (xURLLC) [1], requiring a tenfold decrease in end-to-end transmission latency and a hundredfold increase in network reliability compared to 5G URLLC services [2]. Moreover, networks are required to maintain this service quality among varying performance demands, diverse applications, and dynamic propagation environments. Providing xURLLC services far surpasses the capabilities of 5G, and one of the key bottlenecks is channel coding and decoding. Channel coding ensures reliable transmission by protecting messages against noise. Code blocklength is the basic unit of communication latency, and decoding time dominates the receiver processing delay. Therefore, achieving xURLLC requires short blocklength codes with strong error-correction capabilities. However, the use of short blocklength codes presents a challenging trade-off between blocklength and reliability. The normal approximation (NA) bound for the finite blocklength regime [3] shows that the maximum ratio of the number of information to the number of coded bits for a given error probability over a noisy channel decreases as blocklength reduces. Thus, short blocklength codes typically

have worse block error rate (BLER) performance compared to longer block codes at the same code rate.

The diversity of 6G applications, each with vastly differing performance requirements and propagation environments, will also lead to variable channel conditions and block lengths. In these dynamic scenarios, codes with flexible rates/lengths and optimal rate-compatible (RC) codes are essential. Although several channel codes have been proposed for URLLC [4], they were mainly designed based on fixed rates and block-lengths, and achieve the flexibility and RC capabilities through puncturing, shortening, and extending. Such approaches were shown to be suboptimal in both error performance and decoding complexity at short block lengths. For example, the successive cancellation list (SCL) decoding of shortened polar codes is actually performed on a longer mother code, leading to unnecessary decoding overhead [5].

Universal decoding techniques have recently gained interest as a potential solution to these challenges. Their capacity to decode any linear block code can significantly simplify the transmitter and receiver design [6]. These decoders will enable the use of best-known linear codes (BKLC), known for their superior error performance, at any blocklength and rate tailored to application requirements. This task is challenging for code-specific decoders, as BKLCs possess distinct structures at different lengths and rates [7]. Universal decoders, on the other hand, can simplify the design and application of the optimal RC codes with bit-level granularity for incremental-redundancy hybrid automatic repeat request (IR-HARQ). These advantages also make universal decoders suitable for integration with machine learning [8], or joint design with learning-based encoders as auto-encoders [9], to further boost decoding performance and adaptability.

Ordered-statistics decoding (OSD) [10] and Guessing random additive noise decoding (GRAND) [11] are regarded as promising universal decoders for 6G. Consider a linear block code $\mathcal{C}(n, k)$ with block length n and dimension k . OSD begins by permuting the received symbols and columns of the code generator matrix in descending order of symbol reliabilities. The permuted code generator matrix is then transformed into systematic form using Gaussian elimination (GE). After that, OSD flips the k most reliable bits by XORing them with a test error pattern (TEP), and these k bits are re-encoded to recover the remaining $n - k$ bits. OSD processes a specific group of TEPs to decode one block, where each TEP is in fact a guess of transmission errors over the k most reliable bits. Compared to OSD, GRAND directly guesses transmission errors over all n received symbols, with each

C. Yue, C. She, B. Vucetic, and Y. Li are with School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia (e-mail: chentao.yue@sydney.edu.au, shechangyang@gmail.com, branka.vucetic@sydney.edu.au, yonghui.li@sydney.edu.au).

The work of Yonghui Li was supported by ARC under Grant DP210103410.

guess termed a noise query. It then subtracts each noise query from the received symbols and verifies codeword membership. In a nutshell, OSD and GRAND share similarities while also exhibiting distinct characteristics. They both decode through guessing transmission errors, but differ in their guessing ranges within a codeword. While GRAND avoids the permutation and Gaussian elimination overhead of OSD, OSD typically requires fewer guesses due to its shorter guessing range.

The design of OSD and GRAND has seen significant improvements in recent years. Key advances for OSD include introducing sufficient and necessary conditions for optimal decoding [12], [13], removing the need for Gaussian elimination [14], [15], and imposing limits on the number of processed TEPs [16]–[18]. Similarly, GRAND has been enhanced with more sophisticated noise query generation strategies using reliability ordering [19], [20], as well as leveraging code structural properties [21] to improve its efficiency. These techniques effectively reduce their decoding complexity while maintaining error performance.

In terms of theoretical completeness, GRAND is proved to achieve maximum-likelihood decoding (MLD) if the noise queries are conducted in descending order of their likelihood [22]. Its complexity, in terms of the total number of noise queries, is theoretically characterized by the Rényi entropy of the noise sequences [11]. The error performance of OSD was examined in [10], where OSD was also proved to be near MLD. The error performance analysis was revisited and simplified in [23], while [12] further explored the distance distribution in OSD to inform efficient decoder design.

Despite the efforts in [10], [12], [23], the complexity of OSD remains not fully characterized, with current understanding being largely intuitive. Given that the overhead of permutation and GE is only non-negligible at very high signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs), the number of TEPs determines the complexity of OSD [14]. Practical OSD decoders often limit the maximum Hamming weight of TEPs to a specific value m , known as the decoding order. An order- m OSD may execute up to $\sum_{i=0}^m \binom{k}{i}$ guesses (i.e., TEPs), which bounds the worst-case decoding complexity. However, determining the average complexity becomes more challenging when considering the early termination of OSD upon identifying the correct TEP. This early termination can be done by using techniques reported in [13], [18], [24], [25]. The challenge stems from the correlated ordered statistics in OSD, which complicates the probability analysis and renders the conventional guesswork theory unsuitable. Consequently, a theoretical analysis of the average complexity of OSD is still lacking.

Main Contributions:

This paper examines the *achievable complexity* of an order- m OSD, which is defined as the minimum average number of TEPs (or guesses) processed that guarantees no loss in error performance compared to the decoding with maximum complexity $\sum_{i=0}^m \binom{k}{i}$. This achievable complexity is realized by an OSD decoder that terminates early upon accurately identifying the correct TEP or correctly guessing errors in the k most reliable bits. This decoder is practical as existing OSD

stopping criteria, as proposed in [13], [18], [24], [25], can identify the correct OSD output with a satisfactory accuracy; they can be further enhanced by combining cyclic redundancy check (CRC) to achieve negligible false alarm rate. It is worth noting that one can always achieve a lower complexity than *achievable complexity* by allowing error performance loss. This occurs when discarding certain TEPs without processing them, e.g., approaches in [13], [26], [27]. However, this trade-off between complexity and error performance loss is not in the scope of this paper. Our contributions are outlined as follows.

1) *Achievable complexity of OSD*: When considering the highest order, i.e., $m = k$, OSD is strictly equivalent to an MLD since the largest decoding effort allows examining all codewords from $\mathcal{C}(n, k)$. Our result shows that the achievable complexity of order- k OSD is tightly approximated by

$$e^{-kp_e} I_0(2k\sqrt{p_e}) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi k\sqrt{p_e}}} 2^{k(2\sqrt{p_e}-p_e)\log_2(e)},$$

where $p_e \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is determined by the code rate and SNR, and I_0 is the modified Bessel function. Compared to brute-force MLD with a complexity of 2^k , OSD substantially reduces the complexity by an exponential factor of $(2\sqrt{p_e} - p_e)\log_2(e)$. For instance, when $k = 64$ and $p_e = 0.1$, the achievable complexity of an order- k OSD is only about $1/(2.7 \times 10^4)$ of that of brute-force MLD.

For a more practical order- m OSD with $m < k$, we also provides an approximation of the achievable complexity:

$$e^{-kp_e} \left(\sum_{j=0}^m \left(\frac{k^j}{j!} \right)^2 p_e^j + \frac{k^m (kp_e)^{m+1}}{m! (m+1)!} \right).$$

This instant evaluation of complexity, along with the error rate provided in [23], helps quickly assess the performance-complexity trade-offs when deploying OSD at different orders.

2) *Guesswork for ordered statistics*: The above complexity analytical results are obtained by developing the guesswork theory for ordered statistics. Let $(\tilde{X}_a^b, \tilde{Y}_a^b)$ denote pairs of random variables of length $b - a + 1$, with each pair $(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{Y}_i)$ representing the i -th ordered statistic of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) pairs (X^n, Y^n) , ordered by descending $\max \mathbb{P}(X_i|Y_i)$. The aim is to find the average number of guesses needed to accurately identify \tilde{X}_a^b when given \tilde{Y}_a^b . We tackle this problem by first developing a guesswork upper bound for i.i.d. sequences of length n . This upper bound is characterized by applying Hölder's inequality over subspaces divided based on Hamming sphere shells. Then, the bound is extended to ordered statistics by leveraging the conditional independence between ordered statistics variables. Comparisons between the derived bound and simulation results validate its tightness.

3) *Complexity-saturation threshold of OSD*: Our results on the achievable complexity of OSD provide new insights into this decoding technique. We reveal that for given k , n , and SNR, there exist a complexity-saturation threshold, $m_s = \lceil k\sqrt{p_e} \rceil$. Increasing the OSD decoding order m beyond m_s will not further increase the achievable complexity. This result echoes the findings in [10], which proved that an OSD decoder of order $m_e = \lceil d_{\min}/4 - 1 \rceil$ nearly approaches MLD for

codes with the minimum Hamming distance d_{\min} , suggesting increasing decoding order m beyond m_e will not further decrease the error probability. A widely accepted view from existing research is that OSD with early termination is efficient for both low-rate and high-rate codes, but less so for half-rate codes. Our discovery provides a straightforward rationale: low-rate codes usually have $m_s < m_e$, despite their relatively large d_{\min} , and therefore their achievable complexity with OSD is mainly governed by m_s . In contrast, high-rate codes have relatively small d_{\min} and a small decoding order $m = m_e$ suffices for MLD. Half-rate codes are more complex because neither m_s nor m_e is small.

In addition to the aforementioned results, this paper provides preliminary discussions on their applications in deploying practical universal decoders. These include a practical implementation of an OSD decoder that can reach the derived achievable complexity, the efficient design of IR-HARQ systems using OSD, and a simple method of switching between OSD and GRAND to exploit the advantages of both.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews existing guesswork theories. Section III derived a new upper bound of guesswork over i.i.d. sequences. Then, this bound is extended to ordered statistics in IV. Section V uses the new guesswork bound to characterize the achievable complexity of OSD. Section VI provides preliminary discussions on deploying practical decoders using achievable complexity. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper.

Notation: In this paper, we use a^n or A^n to denote a sequence of n scalars $a^n = [a_1, \dots, a_n]$ or n random variables $A^n = [A_1, \dots, A_n]$, respectively. A contiguous subsequence of a^n is represented as $a_i^j = [a_i, \dots, a_j]$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$. We use $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ to denote the probability of an event. $\mathbb{P}_A(\cdot)$ denotes the probability mass function (pmf) or probability density function (pdf) of A , with the subscript usually omitted when there is no ambiguity. We use $\phi(x)$ to denote the pdf of the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

II. PREVIOUS WORKS

We consider the guesswork in the context of transmission over a channel with uncertainty. Let $(X, Y) \in (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ be a pair of discrete random variables with the joint pmf $\mathbb{P}_{X,Y}$. Assume that X has M possible values. The guesswork $G(x|y)$ is defined as the number of attempts required to correctly guess $X = x$ with given $Y = y$ according to some guessing strategy. Particular interest is given to the ω_{th} moment of $G(X|Y)$; that is

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X|Y)^\omega] = \sum_x \sum_y G(x|y)^\omega \mathbb{P}_{X,Y}(x, y). \quad (1)$$

For the n -tuples (X^n, Y^n) , the corresponding moment of guesswork is

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega] = \sum_{x^n} \sum_{y^n} G(x^n|y^n)^\omega \mathbb{P}(x^n, y^n). \quad (2)$$

The moment $\mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega]$ is minimized with the optimal guessing strategy [28], which guesses possible values of X^n in decreasing order of the *a posteriori* probability $\mathbb{P}(x^n|y^n)$, given $Y^n = y^n$. We denote the optimal guesswork as

$G^*(x^n|y^n)$, and $\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n|Y^n)^\omega] \leq \mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega]$ for any guessing strategies $G(X^n|Y^n)$. However, it is challenging to directly compute the moments of $G^*(X^n|Y^n)$ or $G(X^n|Y^n)$, due to the expansive space of (X^n, Y^n) . Instead, these moments are typically estimated using bounds provided in the literature.

1) *Arikan's bounds:* A lower bound of $\mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega]$ was given by Arikan [28]. Specifically,

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega] \geq (1 + \ln(M_1 \cdots M_n))^{-\omega} \exp E_\omega(X^n|Y^n), \quad (3)$$

where

$$E_\omega(X^n|Y^n) = \ln \sum_{y^n} \left[\sum_{x^n} \mathbb{P}(x^n, y^n)^{\frac{1}{\omega+1}} \right]^{1+\omega}. \quad (4)$$

Observing the relationship between E_ω and the Rényi entropy, i.e., $E_\omega(X|Y) = \omega H_{\frac{1}{1+\omega}}(X|Y)$, the following bound is derived for i.i.d. pairs (X^n, Y^n) of length n .

Theorem 1 (Arikan's lower bound [28]).

$$\ln \mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega]^{\frac{1}{\omega}} \geq n H_{\frac{1}{1+\omega}}(X|Y) - \ln[1 + \ln(M_1 \cdots M_n)], \quad (5)$$

where $H_\alpha(X|Y)$ is the Rényi entropy at rate α , given by

$$H_\alpha(X|Y) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \ln \sum_y \left[\sum_x \mathbb{P}(x, y)^\alpha \right]^{1/\alpha}. \quad (6)$$

As an extension of Theorem 1, the optimal guesswork has an upper bound [28], given as

$$\ln \mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n|Y^n)^\omega]^{\frac{1}{\omega}} \leq n H_{\frac{1}{1+\omega}}(X|Y), \quad (7)$$

and accordingly, there is

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln (\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n|Y^n)^\omega])^{1/\omega} = H_{\frac{1}{1+\omega}}(X|Y), \quad (8)$$

which provides an asymptotic estimate of $\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n|Y^n)^\omega]$ only when the blocklength reaches infinity.

2) *Bounds for Markov Source:* Let P be an irreducible Markov on \mathcal{A} with the stochastic matrix $\mathbf{U} = [U_{ab}]$ and invariant probability $\mathbf{u} = [u_a]$ satisfying $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{u}$, so that for $\omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n+1}\} \in \mathcal{A}^{n+1}$

$$P_{n+1}(\omega) = u_{\omega_1} \prod_{i=1}^n U_{\omega_i \omega_{i+1}}, \quad (9)$$

where P_{n+1} is the restricted Markov chain on \mathcal{A}_{n+1} .

Theorem 2 (Markov Source [29]). *For such a Markov chain P , its guesswork is described by*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}[G(P_n)^\omega] = (1 + \omega) \ln(\lambda), \quad (10)$$

where λ is the Perron–Frobenius eigenvalue of the matrix with entries $U_{ab}^{1/(1+\alpha)}$.

3) *Relation to Compression:* The equivalence between the optimal guesswork and the optimal length function was shown in [30]. Given the optimal length function $L^*(X)$ for the

random variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$, there is

$$|\log_2 \mathbb{E}[G^*(X)^\omega] - \log_2 \mathbb{E}[\exp_2(\omega L^*(X))]| \leq \omega + \log_2 c, \quad (11)$$

for $c = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{i} \leq 1 + \ln |\mathcal{X}|$ and $\omega > 0$.

For the n -tuples (X^n, Y^n) , let $n \rightarrow \infty$, and then the right side of (11) vanishes with the $O(\log_2 n/n)$. Thus, the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n)^\omega] \quad (12)$$

exists if and only if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_L \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}[\exp_2\{\omega L(X^n)\}] \quad (13)$$

exists. Furthermore, these two limits are equal.

4) *Relation to Large Deviation Principle (LDP)*: As shown in [29], [30], for $\omega > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln (\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n)^\omega])$ exists if and only if the Rényi entropy rate

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\alpha(X^n) \quad (14)$$

exists. Let v_n denote the distribution of the information spectrum $-\frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{P}(X^n)$. The large deviation can immediately yield a sufficient condition of existence.

Theorem 3 (Existence of Rényi entropy rate [30]). *Let the sequence of distributions of the information spectrum $(v_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ satisfy the LDP with rate function I . Then the limiting Rényi entropy rate of order $1/(1 + \omega)$ exists for all $\omega > 0$, and equals*

$$\frac{1 + \omega}{\omega} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{\omega}{1 + \omega} t - I(t) \right\}, \quad (15)$$

According to (8), consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n)^\omega] = (1 + \omega) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{\omega}{1 + \omega} t - I(t) \right\}, \quad (16)$$

which is a scalar multiple of the Legendre-Fenchel dual of the rate function I .

The limiting guesswork itself satisfies an LDP as well.

Theorem 4 (LDP of guesswork [31]). *The sequence $\frac{1}{n} \log G^*(X^n)$ satisfies an LDP with rate function Λ^* , where*

$$\Lambda^*(x) := \begin{cases} -x - g_1, & \text{for } x \in [0, \gamma], \\ \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} \{x\alpha - \Lambda(\alpha)\}, & \text{for } x \in (\gamma, \ln M] \\ \infty, & \text{for } x \notin [0, \ln M] \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

with

$$\Lambda(\alpha) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\alpha \log G(X^n)} \right],$$

$$g_1 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(G^*(X^n) = 1),$$

$$\gamma := \lim_{\alpha \downarrow -1} \frac{d\Lambda(\alpha)}{d\alpha}$$

$\Lambda(\alpha)$ is proved to exist for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ [31].

This LDP of guesswork can result in an approximation of the probability, $\mathbb{P}(G^*(X^n) = i) \approx i^{-1} \exp(-n\Lambda^*(n^{-1} \ln i))$,




Fig. 1: The average number of guesses at different blocklength n with binary symmetric channel with error probability 0.05.

which is indeed the probability of the i_{th} most likely sequence of X^n .

Theorem 4 lays the foundation for analyzing the GRAND algorithm. For blocklength n , define the random variable N^n of the noise sequence. Then, $1/n \log G(N^n)$ satisfies the LDP with the rate function [11]

$$I^N(x) := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} \{x\alpha - \Lambda^N(\alpha)\}, \quad (18)$$

where $\Lambda^N(\alpha)$ is given by [22, Eq. (4)]. Combining the LDP from Theorem 4 and the probability of guessing a non-transmitted codeword from [22, Theorem 2] suffices to obtain the average number of guesses in GRAND to find the MLD codeword at blocklength $n \rightarrow \infty$. Note that the average number of guesses dominates the computational complexity of GRAND, so it is simply referred to as the “complexity”.

The guesswork approaches presented in Theorems 1-4 were established using asymptotic analysis, i.e., as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For example, Arian’s bounds, given in (3) and (7), are found to be loose for short blocklengths, as demonstrated by the example in Fig. 1. On the other hand, these results were mainly developed for i.i.d. pairs (X^n, Y^n) . Therefore, to characterize the complexity of OSD, a new method is required.

III. A NEW UPPER BOUND OF GUESSWORK

Consider an i.i.d sequence X^n with each element following the distribution of $X \in \mathcal{X}$. The ω_{th} moment of its guesswork can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega] = \sum_{g=1}^{|M^n|} \mathbb{P}(X^n = x_{(g)}^n) g^\omega, \quad (19)$$

where $x_{(g)}^n$ is the realization of X^n satisfying $G(x_{(g)}^n) = g$. Then, we have the following simple upper bound of $\mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega]$ from Hölder’s inequality.

Lemma 1. *For i.i.d sequence X^n , there is*

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega] \leq \left(\frac{M^{n\omega p + n}}{\omega p + 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(x)^q \right)^{\frac{n}{q}}, \quad (20)$$

for $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, $p > 1$, and $q > 1$.

Proof: Choose $a_g = \mathbb{P}(X = \mathbf{x}_{(g)})$ and $b_g = g^\omega$ in the Holder's inequality, and obtain

$$\sum_{g=1}^{M^n} a_g b_g \leq \left(\sum_{g=1}^{M^n} \mathbb{P}(X^n = x_{(g)}^n)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\sum_{g=1}^{M^n} g^{\omega p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (21)$$

Also, we have

$$\sum_{g=1}^{M^n} g^{\omega p} \leq \int_0^{M^n} g^{\omega p} dg = \frac{1}{\omega p + 1} M^{n(\omega p + 1)}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$\sum_{g=1}^{M^n} \mathbb{P}(X^n = x_{(g)}^n)^q = \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} \mathbb{P}(x^n)^q = \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(x)^q \right)^n \quad (23)$$

Substituting (22) and (23) into (21) completes the proof. \blacksquare

The bound given in (20) applies to general guesswork $G(X^n)$, and can be loose for the optimal guesswork G^* . This can be seen through the following two insights. As q approaches 1 from above, $p \rightarrow \infty$ and the bound will be no tighter than

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{M^{n\omega p + n}}{\omega p + 1} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = M^{\omega n}. \quad (24)$$

On the other hand, as $q \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_x P(x)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\mathbb{P}(x)\}^n, \quad (25)$$

and the upper bound becomes

$$\frac{1}{\omega + 1} M^{n(\omega + 1)} \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\mathbb{P}(x)\}^n. \quad (26)$$

In contrast, for any X^n and $\omega = 1$, a trivial bound is $\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n)] \leq \frac{1}{2}(M^n + 1)$, derived from assuming equiprobable X^n . This trivial bound is already tighter than (24) and (26), since $\max_x \{\mathbb{P}(x)\} \geq \frac{1}{M^n}$ for any X^n .

However, (20) is tighter than Arikan's bound (8) for some distributions. For example, with $n = 1$ and a uniform distribution X , (8) provides

$$\mathbb{E}[G^*(X)^\omega] = \mathbb{E}[G(X)^\omega] \leq M^\omega, \quad (27)$$

while (20), with $q = \omega + 1$, yields

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X)^\omega] \leq (\omega + 2)^{-\frac{\omega}{\omega + 1}} M^\omega \quad (28)$$

In this case, (28) is tighter than (27), as $(\omega + 2)^{-\frac{\omega}{\omega + 1}} < 1$ for $\omega \geq 1$.

To refine (28), we can divide \mathcal{X}^n into $n + 1$ subsets $\{\mathcal{X}_0, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n\}$. Let $\mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega | X^n \in \mathcal{X}_j]$ denote the ω th moment of the guesswork for $X^n \in \mathcal{X}_j$. Then, according to the law of total expectation, there is

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega] = \sum_{j=0}^n \mathbb{P}(X^n \in \mathcal{X}_j) \mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega | X^n \in \mathcal{X}_j]. \quad (29)$$

Applying (21) to $\mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega | X^n \in \mathcal{X}_j]$ obtains that

$$\mathbb{E}[G(X^n)^\omega] \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} G(x^n)^{\omega p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} \mathbb{P}(x^n)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \quad (30)$$

Then, selecting subsets $\{\mathcal{X}_0, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n\}$ according to the Hamming shells results in the following tighter bound with respect to $G^*(X^n)$.

Theorem 5 (Hamming subset bound). *Let $\bar{x}^n = [\bar{x}, \dots, \bar{x}]$ denote the most likely sequence of i.i.d. $X^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n)^\omega]$ is upper bounded by*

$$\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n)^\omega] \leq \sum_{j=0}^n (\gamma_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} \binom{n}{j}^{\frac{1}{q}} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\bar{x})^{n-j} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \bar{x}} \mathbb{P}(x)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad (31)$$

where $p > 1$, $q > 1$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$,

$$\gamma_j = \frac{\beta_j^{\omega p + 1} - \beta_{j-1}^{\omega p + 1}}{\omega p + 1}, \quad (32)$$

and

$$\beta_j := \sum_{i=0}^j (M - 1)^i \binom{n}{i}. \quad (33)$$

Proof: Let \bar{x}^n denote the most likely sequence in \mathcal{X}^n . Then, we propose to construct $\{\mathcal{X}_0, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n\}$ with

$$\mathcal{X}_j := \{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \mid d_H(x^n, \bar{x}^n) = j\}, \quad (34)$$

where $d_H(x^n, \bar{x}^n) = |\{i \mid x_i \neq \bar{x}_i, 1 \leq i \leq n\}|$ is the Hamming distance between $x^n = [x_0, \dots, x_n]$ and \bar{x}^n . In other words, \mathcal{X}_j represents the Hamming shell with radius j to \bar{x}^n . Then, for \mathcal{X}_j , we have

$$\left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} \mathbb{P}(x^n)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} = \binom{n}{j}^{\frac{1}{q}} \mathbb{P}(\bar{x})^{n-j} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \bar{x}} \mathbb{P}(x)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (35)$$

Consider a suboptimal guess strategy that always guesses sequences with lower Hamming distance to \bar{x}^n . Then, let β_j denote $\sum_{i=0}^j |\mathcal{X}_i| = \sum_{i=0}^j (M - 1)^i \binom{n}{i}$, and we have

$$\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} G^*(x^n)^{\omega p} \leq \frac{\beta_j^{\omega p + 1} - \beta_{j-1}^{\omega p + 1}}{\omega p + 1}, \quad (36)$$

which is obtained similarly to (22). Substituting (35) and (36) into (30) completes the proof. \blacksquare

We have the following corollary for the n -fold i.i.d. pair (X^n, Y^n) .

Corollary 1. *For i.i.d. pair (X^n, Y^n) with each following (X, Y) , the guesswork $\mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n | Y^n)^\omega]$ is upper bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n|Y^n)^\omega] \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \gamma_j \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\bar{x}|Y)^q]^{\frac{n-j}{q}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \bar{x}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(x|Y)^q] \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad (37) \end{aligned}$$

where $p, q > 1$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, and γ_j is given by (32). Here, \bar{x} is the most likely value of X given $Y = y$, i.e., $\bar{x} := \arg \max_x \mathbb{P}(x|y)$.

Proof: Eq. (30) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega] & \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} G(x^n)^{\omega p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \quad \times \sum_{y^n} \mathbb{P}(y^n) \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} \mathbb{P}(x^n|y^n)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (38) \end{aligned}$$

Let $f(x) = x^{\frac{1}{p}}$, and because $p > 1$, $f(x)$ is a concave function. Therefore, according to Jensen's inequality, there is $\mathbb{E}[f(X)] \leq f(\mathbb{E}[X])$ for the concave function $f(x) = x^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Applying Jensen's inequality to (38) obtains that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n)^\omega] & \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} G(x^n)^{\omega p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \quad \cdot \left(\sum_{y^n} \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} \mathbb{P}(x^n|y^n)^q \mathbb{P}(y^n) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ & = \sum_{j=0}^n \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} G(x^n)^{\omega p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \quad \cdot \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}_j} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(x_i|Y_i)^q] \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \quad (39) \end{aligned}$$

Then, (37) is obtained similarly to (35) and (36), with applying the Hamming sphere-based subsets $\{\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_n\}$. ■

For binary X^n , (37) is simply reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[G^*(X^n|Y^n)^\omega] \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \gamma_j \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\bar{x}|Y)^q]^{\frac{n-j}{q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(1 - \bar{x}|Y)^q]^{\frac{1}{q}}. \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

We verify the performance of the Hamming subset bound (31) in a binary AWGN (BI-AWGN) channel, as depicted in Fig. 2. The optimal guesswork and suboptimal guesswork obtained from simulations are included for comparison, where the suboptimal guesswork guesses sequences in the order of increasing Hamming distance from the most likely sequence X^n , given the received sequence $Y^n = y^n$. As shown, the Hamming subset bound is tighter than Arikan's upper bound for optimal guesswork at very short blocklengths. Moreover, it provides a tight upper bound for suboptimal guesswork, as it is derived by upscaling the required guess number in each Hamming shell, following (36).

This suggests that the Hamming subset bound will be




Fig. 2: The average number of guesses for various block lengths n in a BI-AWGN channel for the pair (X^n, Y^n) at SNR = 3 dB. The suboptimal guesswork is performed in ascending order of the Hamming distance from the most likely X^n sequence given Y^n .

suitable for characterizing the OSD complexity, as practical OSD implementations typically process TEPs in ascending order of Hamming weight [10].

IV. GUESSWORK FOR ORDERED SYMMETRIC CHANNEL

A. Binary Ordered Symmetric Channel

Consider the n -tuple pair (X^n, Y^n) , with the identical and independent transition probability $\mathbb{P}(X_i|Y_i) = \mathbb{P}(X|Y)$. Let y^n be a specific realization of Y^n . Then, (X^n, \tilde{y}^n) are ordered in descending order of $\max \mathbb{P}(X_i|y_i)$. Let $(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{y}_i)$ denote the i _{th} ordered entity, and $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{y}^n)$ satisfies

$$\max \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_1|\tilde{y}_1) \geq \max \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_2|\tilde{y}_2) \geq \dots \geq \max \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_n|\tilde{y}_n). \quad (41)$$

For binary $X_i \in \{-1, +1\}$, the ordering is equivalent to

$$\infty \geq |\tilde{\ell}_1| \geq |\tilde{\ell}_2| \geq \dots \geq |\tilde{\ell}_n| \geq 0 \quad (42)$$

where $\tilde{\ell}_i$ is the log-likelihood ratio (LLR), defined as $\log \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|\tilde{y}_i) - \log \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(-1|\tilde{y}_i)$. As auxiliary variables, let $|\tilde{\ell}_0| = \infty$ and $|\tilde{\ell}_{n+1}| = 0$.

Let us consider a binary continuous channel, and denote the random variable of \tilde{y}_i as \tilde{Y}_i . Also, we define $\ell_i := \log \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y_i) - \log \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(-1|y_i)$ as the LLR of the unordered pair (X_i, y_i) , with its random variable L_i . Then, according to the ordered statistics [32], the distribution of \tilde{Y}_i will be

$$\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{Y}_i}(y) = f_i(y) \cdot \mathbb{P}_Y(y), \quad (43)$$

with

$$f_i(y) = \frac{1}{B(i, n-i+1)} [(1-p(y))^{n-i} p(y)^i], \quad (44)$$

$$p(y) = F_{|L|}(|\log \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(0|y) - \log \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y)|), \quad (45)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{B(i, n-i+1)} = \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!}. \quad (46)$$

where $F_{|L|}(\ell)$ is the cdf of $|L_i|$. The subscript i is omitted since both $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}$ and $\{L_i\}$ are i.i.d.

If $\mathbb{P}(y|x) = \mathbb{P}_Y(-y|x)$, there will be $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{y}_i|-\tilde{x}_i) = \mathbb{P}(-\tilde{y}_i|\tilde{x}_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, because $f_i(y) = f_i(-y)$. We term the channel $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{Y}^n)$ with $\tilde{X}_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ described by $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{Y}_i|\tilde{X}_i}$ as the length- n binary ordered symmetric channel (BI-OSC)¹. In BI-OSC, $(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{Y}_i)$ and $(\tilde{X}_j, \tilde{Y}_j)$ are dependent for $i \neq j$, due to the ordering (42). Before the ordering, the original pairs (X^n, Y^n) are referred to as the original channel.

We are interested in the guesswork over a contiguous subsequence of $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{Y}^n)$ from the a_{th} ordered pair to the b_{th} ordered pair, denoted by $(\tilde{X}_a^b, \tilde{Y}_a^b)$. Nevertheless, due to the dependency between ordered variables, bounds in Theorem 1 and Theorem 5 are not directly applicable here.

B. Conditional Independence

Let us define the sets

$$\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^- := \left\{ y : e^{-|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|} + 1 \leq \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{X}|Y}^{-1}(1|y) \leq e^{-|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|} + 1 \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^+ := \left\{ y : e^{|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|} + 1 \leq \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{X}|Y}^{-1}(1|y) \leq e^{|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|} + 1 \right\},$$

and $\mathcal{Y}_{a,b} := \mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^+ \cup \mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^-$. Then, we define (\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) with the following joint density

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}, \hat{Y}}(x, y) := \frac{\mathbb{P}_{X, Y}(x, y)}{\int_{\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}} \mathbb{P}_{X, Y}(x, y') dy'} \quad (47)$$

for $\hat{X} \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $\text{supp}(\hat{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}_{a,b}$. Similarly, $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}}$ can be accordingly defined as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}}(y) := \sum_{x \in \{-1, 1\}} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{X, Y}(x, y)}{2 \int_{\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}} \mathbb{P}_{X, Y}(x, y') dy'}, \quad (48)$$

and accordingly $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(x, y) = \mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}, \hat{Y}}(x, y) / \mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}}(y)$.

Let $(\hat{X}_a^b, \hat{Y}_a^b)$ be a sequence of i.i.d. pairs following (\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) . We then demonstrate that a given guesswork for the pair $(\hat{X}_a^b, \hat{Y}_a^b)$ is equivalent to that of $(\tilde{X}_a^b, \tilde{Y}_a^b)$ under certain conditions, and thus the bound for $\mathbb{E}[G(\hat{X}_a^b | \hat{Y}_a^b)^\omega]$ suffices to bound $\mathbb{E}[G(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega]$.

Lemma 2. Given $|\tilde{L}_{a-1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|$ and $|\tilde{L}_{b+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|$, there is

$$\mathbb{E}[G(\hat{X}_a^b | \hat{Y}_a^b)^\omega] = \mathbb{E}[G(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega], \quad (49)$$

for a specific guess strategy G , where \tilde{L}_a and \tilde{L}_b are the random variable of LLRs of \tilde{Y}_a and \tilde{Y}_b , respectively.

Proof: When $|\tilde{L}_{a-1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|$ and $|\tilde{L}_{b+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|$, the pairs $(\tilde{X}_a^b, \tilde{Y}_a^b)$ satisfy

$$|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}| \geq |\tilde{L}_a| \geq \dots \geq |\tilde{L}_b| \geq |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|. \quad (50)$$

Since $\text{supp}(\hat{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}_{a,b}$. The LLR, denoted by \hat{L} , of \hat{Y} satisfies

$$\tilde{\ell}_{a-1} \geq |\hat{L}| \geq \tilde{\ell}_{b+1}. \quad (51)$$

Thus, for \hat{Y}_a^b , their LLRs, denoted by \hat{L}_a^b , satisfy

$$|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}| \geq \max\{|\hat{L}_a^b|\} \geq \min\{|\hat{L}_a^b|\} \geq |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|. \quad (52)$$

¹In [33], such a channel was also referred to as the ordered binary symmetric channel.

For a given guesswork G , we observe that $G(\hat{X}_a^b | \hat{Y}_a^b)$ is unchanged for an arbitrary permutation π that randomly interchanges the indices of a length $b - a + 1$ sequence. That is,

$$G(\hat{X}_a^b | \hat{Y}_a^b) = G(\pi(\hat{X}_a^b) | \pi(\hat{Y}_a^b)). \quad (53)$$

Based on (52), there exist one permutation π' that can make

$$\tilde{\ell}_{a-1} \geq \pi'(\hat{L}_a) \geq \dots \pi'(\hat{L}_b) \geq \tilde{\ell}_{b+1}. \quad (54)$$

Such that $(\pi'(\hat{X}_a^b), \pi'(\hat{Y}_a^b))$ and $(\tilde{X}_a^b, \tilde{Y}_a^b)$ are identically distributed. Therefore,

$$G(\hat{X}_a^b | \hat{Y}_a^b) = G(\pi'(\hat{X}_a^b) | \pi'(\hat{Y}_a^b)) = G(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b). \quad (55)$$

This proves (49). ■

We note that Lemma 2 is based on conditions $\{|\tilde{L}_{a-1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|\}$ and $\{|\tilde{L}_{b+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|\}$. They mean that the LLR levels of the $(a-1)_{\text{th}}$ and $(b+1)_{\text{th}}$ outputs of BI-OSC are known. In essence, with these two conditions, pairs of $(\tilde{X}_a^b, \tilde{Y}_a^b)$ exhibit a degree of independence, since they result from permuting independent pairs in $(\hat{X}_a^b, \hat{Y}_a^b)$.

C. An upper bound for the guesswork on BI-OSC

With Lemma 2, guesswork bounds derived for i.i.d. random variable pairs can be readily used for BI-OSC.

Corollary 2. Let $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{Y}^n)$ be the input and output of an length- n BI-OSC channel. Given $|\tilde{L}_{a-1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|$ and $|\tilde{L}_{b+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|$, $\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega]$ is upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega] \leq \sum_{j=0}^{b-a+1} (\gamma_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} \binom{b-a+1}{j} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q]^{\frac{n-j}{q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y)^q]^{\frac{j}{q}}, \quad (56)$$

where

$$\gamma_j = \frac{(\beta_j)^{\omega p + 1} - (\beta_{j-1})^{\omega p + 1}}{\omega p + 1}, \quad (57)$$

$$\beta_j = \sum_{i=0}^j \binom{b-a+1}{i}, \quad (58)$$

$\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}$ is defined as (47), and $\bar{x} := \arg \max_x \mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(x|y)$.

Proof: According to Lemma 2, $\mathbb{E}[G(\hat{X}_a^b | \hat{Y}_a^b)^\omega] = \mathbb{E}[G(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega]$. Then, (40) is applied for $(\hat{X}_a^b, \hat{Y}_a^b)$. ■

We note that (56) still presumes conditions $\{|\tilde{L}_{a-1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|\}$ and $\{|\tilde{L}_{b+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|\}$. These conditions need to be removed to obtain the unconditional upper bound of $\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega]$.

Theorem 6. Let $(\tilde{X}^n, \tilde{Y}^n)$ be the input and output of a length- n BI-OSC channel. Then, $\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_a^b | \tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega]$ is upper bounded

by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_a^b|\tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega] \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{b-a+1} (\gamma_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left[\iint_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right]^{\frac{b-a+1-j}{q}} \right. \\ & \quad \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y)^q \right]^{\frac{j}{q}} \\ & \quad \left. \cdot \mathbb{P}_{|\tilde{L}_{a-1}, \tilde{L}_{b+1}|} \left(|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|, |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}| \right) d|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}| d|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}| \right], \quad (59) \end{aligned}$$

where γ_j is given by (57), $\bar{x} := \arg \max_x \mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(x|y)$, and $\mathbb{P}_{|\tilde{L}_{a-1}, \tilde{L}_{b+1}|}$ is the joint distribution of $|\tilde{L}_{a-1}|$ and $|\tilde{L}_{b+1}|$.

Proof: Theorem 6 is obtained by removing conditions $\{|\tilde{L}_{a-1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|\}$ and $\{|\tilde{L}_{b+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|\}$ from Corollary 2. This is achieved by integrating $|\tilde{L}_{a-1}|$ and $|\tilde{L}_{b+1}|$ alongside their joint distribution. ■

We note that $|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|$ and $|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|$ are implicitly included in $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right]$ and $\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{1-\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right]$ according to the definition (47). Despite the apparent computational complexity of (59), it can be significantly simplified, as will be discussed in Section V.

D. An Example of BI-OSC from BI-AWGN

Given the known LLR distribution of the original channel (X^n, Y^n) , we can deduce the joint distribution of $|\tilde{L}_{a-1}|$ and $|\tilde{L}_{b+1}|$. As an example, let us examine the BI-AWGN (X^n, Y^n) with the noise power σ^2 , which has the following distribution of Y_i conditioning on X_i ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{Y|X}(y|x) \sim \mathcal{N}(x, \sigma^2) \quad (60)$$

for $X_i \in \{-1, 1\}$. For this scenario, the LLR of each Y_i from Y^n is described by

$$L_i = \frac{2Y_i}{\sigma^2}. \quad (61)$$

Assume that X_i is equiprobable to be -1 or 1, we have $L_i \sim 0.5\mathcal{N}(\mu_\ell, 2\mu_\ell) + 0.5\mathcal{N}(-\mu_\ell, 2\mu_\ell)$, where $\mu_\ell = 2/\sigma^2$. Then, according to the theory of ordered statistics, the distribution of $|\tilde{L}_i|$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_{|\tilde{L}_i|}(\ell) = f_i(\ell) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{|L_i|}(\ell), \quad (62)$$

where $f_i(\ell)$, which is from (44), is simplified to

$$f_i(\ell) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{B}(i, n-i+1)} [(1-F_{|L_i|}(\ell))^{n-i} F_{|L_i|}(\ell)]^i. \quad (63)$$

and $F_{|L_i|}(\ell)$ is the cdf of $|L_i|$.

The joint pdf of $|\tilde{L}_i|$ and $|\tilde{L}_j|$, $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, is given by [32]

$$\mathbb{P}_{|\tilde{L}_{i,j}|}(\ell, \tilde{h}) = f_{i,j}(\ell, \tilde{h}) \cdot \mathbb{P}_L(\ell) \cdot \mathbb{P}_L(\tilde{h}), \quad (64)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i,j}(\ell, \tilde{h}) &= \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(j-i-1)!(n-j)!} (1-F_{|L_i|}(\ell))^{i-1} \\ & \quad \cdot (F_{|L_i|}(\ell) - F_{|L_i|}(\tilde{h}))^{j-i-1} \cdot F_{|L_i|}(\tilde{h})^{n-j}. \quad (65) \end{aligned}$$

Since $L_i = \frac{2Y_i}{\sigma^2}$, sets $\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^-$ and $\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^+$ are equivalent to

$$\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^- = \left\{ y : -|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|\sigma^2/2 \leq y \leq -|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|\sigma^2/2 \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}^+ = \left\{ y : |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|\sigma^2/2 \leq y \leq |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|\sigma^2/2 \right\}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{Y}_{a,b} = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \left(\left[-|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|, -|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}| \right] \cup \left[|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|, |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}| \right] \right). \quad (66)$$

Given $\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}$, distributions regarding (\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) , including $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}, \hat{Y}}$ defined in (47), $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}$ can be obtained based on the distribution of (X, Y) over AWGN. For example, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x) &:= \int_{\mathcal{Y}_{a,b}} \mathbb{P}_{X,Y}(x, y') dy' \\ &= Q \left(\frac{-|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|}{2} - \frac{x}{\sigma^2} \right) - Q \left(\frac{-|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|}{2} - \frac{x}{\sigma^2} \right) \\ & \quad + Q \left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|}{2} - \frac{x}{\sigma^2} \right) - Q \left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|}{2} - \frac{x}{\sigma^2} \right) \quad (67) \end{aligned}$$

It can be seen $\tau(x)$ is symmetric, i.e., $\tau(x) = \tau(-x)$. Then, $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}$ is simply given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(x|y) &= \left(1 + \frac{\tau(x)}{\tau(-x)} \exp(-2xy/\sigma^2) \right)^{-1} \\ &= (1 + \exp(-2xy/\sigma^2))^{-1} \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(x|y) \quad (68) \end{aligned}$$

We can denote (67) as τ because it does not depend on the value of $x \in \{-1, 1\}$. Then, the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q]$ in (59) is simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right] &= \int_{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|}^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|} \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(-1|y)^q \mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}}(y) dy \\ & \quad + \int_{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|}^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|} \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y)^q \mathbb{P}_{\hat{Y}}(y) dy \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{2}{\tau} \int_{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}|\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|}^{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}|\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|} \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y)^q \mathbb{P}_Y(y) dy. \quad (69) \end{aligned}$$

Step (a) comes from the channel symmetry, i.e., $\mathbb{P}_Y(y) = \mathbb{P}_Y(-y)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(-1|y) = \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(+1|-y)$.

In a similar vein, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y)^q]$ can be obtained by changing $\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y)$ to $\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(-1|y)$ in (69). By substituting (64) and (69) into (59), we can compute the upper bound for $\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_a^b|\tilde{Y}_a^b)^\omega]$ over a length- n BI-OSC channel originates from the BI-AWGN channel.

We validate Theorem 6 with the BI-OSC originating from the BI-AWGN channel. For benchmarking, the Arıkan's lower and upper bounds introduced in Theorem 1 are included. The Arıkan's bounds are also extended for $(\tilde{X}_a^b, \tilde{Y}_a^b)$ leveraging Lemma 2. Specifically, they are first applied to the pair $(\hat{X}_a^b, \hat{Y}_a^b)$, and then the conditions $\{|\tilde{L}_{a-1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{a-1}|\}$ and $\{|\tilde{L}_{b+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{b+1}|\}$ are relaxed. We evaluate the average




Fig. 3: The average number of guesses at different blocklength n in a BI-OSC derived from an AWGN channel at SNR = 0 dB. The guesswork focuses on the $[n/4, n/2]$ ordered channel outputs range. The suboptimal guesswork is performed in ascending order of the Hamming distance to the most likely sequence \tilde{X}_a^b when \tilde{Y}_a^b is given.

number of guesses over sequence lengths n ranging from 8 to 150, with $a = n/4$ and $b = n/2$, i.e., the guesswork focuses on the $(n/4)$ th to $(n/2)$ th ordered channel outputs. The results are illustrated in Fig. 3. As shown in the figure, Theorem 6 provides a much tighter evaluation than Arikian's bound for both optimal and suboptimal guesswork. Simulation results for optimal guesswork are provided only for $n \leq 80$, due to the prohibitive computation cost of 2^n posterior probabilities for large n .

V. GUESSWORK AND THE COMPLEXITY OF ORDERED STATISTICS DECODING

We examine the application of the guesswork results in Section III conjecture to the decoding problem. Consider a binary linear codebook $\mathcal{C}(n, k)$ (simply \mathcal{C} for brevity) with blocklength n and information length k . A codeword \mathbf{c} of \mathcal{C} is transmitted over a memoryless channel with the BPSK modulation.

We consider a universal decoder that guesses the transmitted codeword \mathbf{c} in a specific order after receiving a noisy block from the channel. This kind of decoder is “universal” because it can decode any linear block codes independent of specific code structures. The decoder guesses vectors $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\xi_{\max}}\}$ until the maximum allowed number, ξ_{\max} , of guesses is reached or it encounters the correct transmitted codeword \mathbf{c} at the ξ th guess, i.e., $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{v}_\xi$. The number of guesses, i.e., ξ , is referred to as the decoding complexity. Although ξ does not directly measure implementation computational complexity, it quantifies the decoding effort for such decoders.

Let X_ξ denote the random variable of ξ , i.e., the number of guesses until $\mathbf{v}_\xi = \mathbf{c}$ is identified. Let $\mathbb{P}(\xi)$ denote the probability $\mathbb{P}(X_\xi = \xi)$. The ω th moment of the guess number X_ξ is denoted as

$$\mathbb{E}[X_\xi^\omega] = \sum_{i=1}^{\xi_{\max}} i^\omega \mathbb{P}(\xi), \quad (70)$$

which is bearing resemblance to (19). Note that $\mathbb{P}(\xi) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_\xi = \mathbf{c})$, because the event $\{X_\xi = \xi\}$ is equivalent to the event $\{\mathbf{v}_\xi = \mathbf{c}\}$.

Different universal decoding algorithms possess different guess sequences \mathcal{V} , and can exhibit varying complexity performance based on code parameters and channel conditions. For example, GRAND visits non-codeword vectors until the first codeword is encountered [11], while OSD visits only codewords. The remainder of this paper focuses on the complexity of OSD.

A. The complexity of OSD

We begin by assuming the existence of an infallible genie, which would promptly notify the OSD decoder whenever $\mathbf{v}_\xi = \mathbf{c}$ is encountered to terminate the decoding process. With the infallible genie, the average complexity of OSD is governed by the achievable complexity as defined in the Introduction. Practically, this termination can be effectively achieved by examining CRC or the distance from codeword to received signals [12], which will be further discussed in Section VI.

Starting the decoding, OSD re-orders the received bits in the descending order of their reliabilities. The reliability of a bit is measured by the absolute value of its LLR, i.e., a higher absolute LLR indicates a higher reliability. Denote by $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}$ the received signal, where \mathbf{x} is the BPSK symbol vector of codeword \mathbf{c} , and \mathbf{w} is the noise vector with each element following $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. The reliability of each received bit y_i is denoted by $|\ell_i|$. After the ordering, the reliability of the i th ordered bit, \tilde{y}_i , is denoted by $|\tilde{\ell}_i|$. The ordered reliabilities satisfy (42).

Let us denote this ordering with a permutation π . Accordingly, the columns of the generator matrix \mathbf{G} for \mathcal{C} are permuted by π to produce $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$. Then, $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \pi(\mathbf{c})$ is a codeword of the codebook $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ defined by $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$. Therefore, decoding to find $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$ suffices to obtain the transmitted codeword \mathbf{c} by applying the inverse permutation π^{-1} to $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$.

Assume $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ is transformed into systematic form, denoted as $\tilde{\mathbf{G}} = [\mathbf{I} \tilde{\mathbf{P}}]$, via performing Gaussian elimination². To estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$, OSD utilizes re-encoding. Specifically, it employs the relation $\mathbf{b}_\xi \tilde{\mathbf{G}} = \mathbf{v}_\xi$ to derive an estimated \mathbf{v}_ξ using the sequence \mathbf{b}_ξ of length k . In fact, \mathbf{b}_ξ is a guess of the information bits $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_1^k$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{\xi_{\max}}\}$ be the sequence of guesses for $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_1^k$. With the encoding rule, the guess sequence \mathcal{B} results in a unique guess sequence $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\xi_{\max}}\}$ of the codeword $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$. Consequently, if $\mathbf{b}_\xi = \tilde{\mathbf{c}}_1^k$ for some ξ , there is $\mathbf{v}_\xi = \tilde{\mathbf{c}}$ leading to the successful decoding.

Given $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_1^k = \{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_k\}$, the optimal decoding strategy of OSD is guessing $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_1^k$ starting from the most probable sequence. That is, \mathcal{B} is ranked in the descending order of the posterior probability $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_1^k = \mathbf{b}_\xi | \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_1^k)$, for $1 \leq \xi \leq \xi_{\max}$. Since computing $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_1^k = \mathbf{b}_\xi | \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_1^k)$ has significant overhead, a practical implementation of OSD usually processes \mathbf{b}_ξ in the increasing order of its Hamming distance to the hard-decision

²Although additional column permutations might be required to ensure that the first k columns of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ are linearly independent, these permutations are typically minor and can usually be omitted [10].

sequence of \tilde{y}_1^k , denoted by \tilde{h}_1^k . In other words, a practical implementation of OSD processes TEPs (i.e., $\mathbf{b}_\xi \oplus \tilde{h}_1^k$) in the ascending order of their Hamming weights. Henceforth, we refer to this approach as "Hamming processing", while referring to the optimal strategy of descending the posterior probabilities as the "optimal processing". As reported in [13], the Hamming processing is only slightly worse than the optimal one in terms of complexity. This is because the higher the number of simultaneous errors, the lower its probability, especially among k most reliable bits.

Let $\xi_{\max} = 2^k$, the optimal processing in OSD can be characterized by the guesswork $G^*(\tilde{X}_1^k|\tilde{Y}_1^k)$, and its moments readily upper bounded by Theorem 6 with setting $a = 1$ and $b = k$. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_1^k|\tilde{Y}_1^k)^\omega] &\leq \sum_{j=0}^k (\gamma_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} \binom{k}{j}^{1/q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right)^{\frac{k-j}{q}} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y)^q \right)^{\frac{j}{q}} \left. \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}_{k+1}}(u) du. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where

$$\gamma_j = \frac{(\beta_j)^{\omega p+1} - (\beta_{j-1})^{\omega p+1}}{\omega p + 1}, \quad (72)$$

and

$$\beta_j = \sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k}{i}. \quad (73)$$

Eq. (71) is derived from (59) by reducing the guess sequence length from n to k . Also, note that $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}_{0,k+1}}(\ell, \tilde{h})$ as given in (64) simplifies to $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{L}_{k+1}}(\tilde{h})$ as given in (62) by taking $\ell = \tilde{\ell}_0 = \infty$. According to (69), $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q]$ is given by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right] = \frac{2}{\tau} \int_{\frac{\sigma^2}{2}|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y)^q \mathbb{P}_Y(y) dy. \quad (74)$$

Similarly, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y)^q]$ is obtained by changing $\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(0|y)$ to $\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y)$ in (74). By taking $|\tilde{\ell}_0| \rightarrow \infty$, τ defined in (67) is also reduced to

$$\tau(x) = Q \left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right) + Q \left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \right). \quad (75)$$

The bound given in (71) suggests that guesswork is executed within the k -radius Hamming sphere, centered around the most probable estimate of \tilde{c}_1^k conditioning on \tilde{y}_1^k , i.e., the hard-decision \tilde{h}_1^k . However, a practical OSD will restrict the maximum number of guesses and the maximum complexity by imposing the decoding order. An order- m OSD restricts its guesses for \tilde{c}_1^k to within the Hamming sphere centered at \tilde{h}_1^k of the radius m . In other word, any $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies $d_H(\mathbf{b}, \tilde{h}_1^k) \leq m$. Consequently, the maximum number of guesses is restricted to $\xi_{\max} = \beta_m = \sum_{i=0}^m \binom{k}{i}$. In fact, (71) provides an upper bound of the achievable complexity for an order- k OSD.

Since the Hamming subset bound is derived by dividing \mathcal{X}^n according to the Hamming distance, it can be used to evaluate the complexity of an order- m OSD with slight modification,

which is detailed in the following corollary.

Corollary 3. For an order- m OSD, the ω_{th} moment of its complexity with optimal processing is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_1^k|\tilde{Y}_1^k)^\omega] &\leq \sum_{j=0}^m (\gamma_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} \binom{k}{j}^{1/q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right)^{\frac{n-j}{q}} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y)^q \right)^{\frac{j}{q}} \mathbb{P}_{|\tilde{L}_{k+1}|}(|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|) \left. \right] d|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}| \\ &\quad + (\beta_m)^\omega \sum_{j=m+1}^k \binom{k}{j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right)^{n-j} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y)^q \right)^j \mathbb{P}_{|\tilde{L}_{k+1}|}(|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|) \left. \right] d|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}| \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Proof: Similar to Theorem 5, we define the subsets of \mathcal{X}^k according to Hamming shells. Let \bar{x}^k denote the most likely sequence of \hat{X}_1^k in pairs $(\hat{X}_1^k, \hat{Y}_1^k)$, where $(\hat{X}_1^k, \hat{Y}_1^k)$ are the conditional independent pairs of $(\tilde{X}_1^k, \tilde{Y}_1^k)$ as introduced in Section IV-B. We construct subsets $\{\mathcal{X}_0, \dots, \mathcal{X}_k\}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{X}_j := \{x^k \in \mathcal{X}^k \mid d_H(x^k, \bar{x}^k) = j\}. \quad (77)$$

The order- m OSD only conducts maximum β_m guesses. Under the condition $|\tilde{L}_{k+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|$, $\mathbb{E}[G(\hat{X}_1^k|\hat{Y}_1^k)^\omega]$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}[G(\hat{X}_1^k|\hat{Y}_1^k)^\omega]$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G(\hat{X}_1^k|\hat{Y}_1^k)^\omega] &= \sum_{j=0}^m \mathbb{P}(\hat{X}^n \in \mathcal{X}_j|\hat{Y}_1^k) \cdot \mathbb{E}[G(\hat{X}^n|\hat{Y}_1^k)^\omega \mid \hat{X}^n \in \mathcal{X}_j] \\ &\quad + (\beta_m)^\omega \sum_{j=m+1}^k \mathbb{P}(\hat{X}^n \in \mathcal{X}_j|\hat{Y}_1^k). \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

This is because for any $\tilde{X}_1^k \notin \mathcal{X}_0 \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{X}_m$, the decoder makes only β_m guesses.

According to Corollary 2, (78) is directly obtained from (56) by setting the upper summation limit to m . On the other hand, applying the derivation techniques used for (35) and (39), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{X}^n \in \mathcal{X}_j|\hat{Y}_1^k) &= \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y) \right)^{n-j} \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1-\bar{x}|Y) \right)^j \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Finally, similar to Theorem 6, the proof completes by eliminating the condition $|\tilde{L}_{k+1}| = |\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|$ through the integration of $|\tilde{L}_{k+1}|$ with its distribution. ■

B. A simplified bound of the complexity of OSD

By manipulating p and q , we can significantly simplify bounds in (71) and (76). Let us take $q \downarrow 1$ and accordingly $q \rightarrow \infty$. Then, we have the following simplified upper bound

Theorem 7. The achievable complexity of an order- k OSD, characterized by $\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_1^k|\tilde{Y}_1^k)^\omega]$, is upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_1^k|\tilde{Y}_1^k)^\omega] \leq \sum_{j=0}^k (\beta_j)^\omega \cdot \mathbb{P}_E(j), \quad (80)$$

where E is defined as the random variable of the number of errors over \tilde{Y}_1^k after hard decision, and $\mathbb{P}_E(j)$ is its pmf, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_E(j) &= \binom{k}{j} \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \frac{1}{\tau^k} Q\left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^{k-j} \\ &\quad \cdot Q\left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^j \mathbb{P}_{|\tilde{L}_{k+1}|}(|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|) d|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Proof: Since

$$\lim_{q \downarrow 1} \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(x|y)^q \mathbb{P}_Y(y) = \lim_{q \downarrow 1} \frac{1}{2} \frac{[\mathbb{P}(y|x)]^q}{[\mathbb{P}(y|0) + \mathbb{P}(y|1)]^{q-1}} \quad (82)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(y|x), \quad (83)$$

there are

$$\lim_{q \downarrow 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(\bar{x}|Y)^q \right] = \frac{1}{\tau} Q\left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \quad (84)$$

and

$$\lim_{q \downarrow 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}|\hat{Y}}(1 - \bar{x}|Y)^q \right] = \frac{1}{\tau} Q\left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \quad (85)$$

It appears that these two are the average error probability and average correct probability of estimating \hat{X} based on \hat{Y} . As $(\hat{X}_1^k, \hat{Y}_1^k)$ are i.i.d. pairs under the condition $\{\tilde{L}_{k+1} = \tilde{\ell}_{k+1}\}$, the probability of there are j errors of estimating \hat{X}_1^k based on \hat{Y}_1^k is given by \hat{Y}_1^k is exactly

$$\frac{1}{\tau^k} \binom{k}{j} Q\left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^{k-j} Q\left(\frac{|\tilde{\ell}_{k+1}|}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)^j. \quad (86)$$

By relaxing the condition $\{\tilde{L}_{k+1} = \tilde{\ell}_{k+1}\}$ in (86), we can derive (81). Furthermore, there is

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_j = (\beta_j)^\omega. \quad (87)$$

This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Similarly, the bound in Corollary 3 is simplified to

$$\mathbb{E}[G^*(\tilde{X}_1^k|\tilde{Y}_1^k)^\omega] \leq \sum_{j=0}^m (\beta_j)^\omega \mathbb{P}_E(j) + (\beta_m)^\omega \sum_{j=m+1}^k \mathbb{P}_E(j), \quad (88)$$

for an order- m OSD decoder, which is obtained by taking $q \downarrow 1$ in (76)

Figure 4 compares the simplified bound (80) to the original bound (71) obtained from Theorem 6. The information length is set to $k = n/2$. As shown, (80) and (71) exhibit comparable tightness for the achievable complexity of order- k OSD with both optimal processing and Hamming processing.




Fig. 4: The average number of guesses versus blocklength n with AWGN channel at SNR = 2 dB, where $k = n/2$.

Bounds given in (80) and (88) are efficiently computed with the approximation introduced in the next subsection.

C. Approximation of Bounds and the Average Complexity

For large n and k , calculating (80) becomes complex due to the summation. We introduce a further approximation that allows instant evaluation of the average decoding complexity.

First, according to [12, Eq. (62-63)], $\mathbb{P}_E(j)$ can be approximated by the binomial distribution

$$\mathbb{P}_E(j) \approx \binom{k}{j} p_e^j (1 - p_e)^{k-j} \quad (89)$$

for $j \leq 0$, where

$$p_e = \int_0^\infty \tau Q\left(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \cdot f_{|\tilde{L}_{k+1}|}(x) dx. \quad (90)$$

Then, as reported by [12], $f_{|\tilde{L}_{k+1}|}(x)$ can be tightly approximated by a normal distribution with mean [12, Eq. (20)]

$$\mu_r = F_{|L|}^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{k+1}{n}\right) = F_{|L|}^{-1}\left(1 - r - \frac{1}{n}\right) \quad (91)$$

and variance

$$\sigma_r^2 = \frac{\pi N_0}{n} \left(1 - r - \frac{1}{n}\right) \left(r + \frac{1}{n}\right) \left(e^{-\frac{(\mu_r+1)^2}{N_0}} + e^{-\frac{(\mu_r-1)^2}{N_0}}\right)^{-2}, \quad (92)$$

where $r = k/n$ is the coding rate. Thus, p_e is approximately given by

$$p_e \approx \int_0^\infty \tau Q\left(\frac{x}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \phi\left(\frac{x - \mu_r}{\sigma_r}\right) dx. \quad (93)$$

Therefore, bounds (80) and (88) are approximately computed by exploiting (89) and (93). We note that a single evaluation of the integral in (93) suffices to deduce (80) and (88); thus these two bounds are computationally efficient.

If the block length n is not small, this approximation derives the following result for the bound of achievable complexity.

Theorem 8 (Bessel Approximation). For a fixed rate r and $\omega = 1$, the complexity bound given by (80) increases exponentially with the blocklength n (or information length $k = rn$). Specifically, it can be closely described as

$$e^{-kp_e} I_0(2k\sqrt{p_e}) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi k\sqrt{p_e}}} 2^{k(2\sqrt{p_e}-p_e) \log_2(e)} \quad (94)$$

with

$$p_e = r^{-1} Q\left(\frac{1}{2} F_{|L|}^{-1}(1-r) + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \quad (95)$$

where I_0 is the modified Bessel function.

Proof: For sufficiently large values of n , the expressions given in (91) and (92) simplify to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_r = F_{|L|}^{-1}(1-r) \quad (96)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_r^2 = 0 \quad (97)$$

respectively. This indicates that as n approaches infinity, the random variable $|\tilde{L}|_{k+1}$ tends towards μ_r . Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_e = \frac{Q\left(\frac{\mu_r}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)}{Q\left(\frac{\mu_r}{2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) + Q\left(\frac{\mu_r}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)} \quad (98)$$

$$= \frac{1}{r} Q\left(\frac{\mu_r}{2} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right), \quad (99)$$

which is only dependent on the rate r . On the other hand, when $k = nr$ is large, the binomial distribution in (89) is approximated by the Poisson distribution with parameter kp_e [34, Chapter VII], i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}_E(j) \approx \frac{(kp_e)^j e^{-kp_e}}{j!} \quad (100)$$

As a result, the bound given in (80) is approximated by

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \beta_j \cdot \mathbb{P}_E(j) \approx e^{-kp_e} \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k}{i} \frac{(kp_e)^j}{j!}. \quad (101)$$

Focusing on (101), we observe that

- The term $\frac{(kp_e)^j}{j!}$ decreases super-exponentially as j increases due to the factorial in the denominator.
- The sum $\sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k}{i}$ increases exponentially only for j values around $k/2$.

Consequently, the combined term $\sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k}{i} \frac{(kp_e)^j}{j!}$ diminishes rapidly with increasing j , and the series is predominantly supported by small j values compared to k .

Using Stirling's approximation, i.e.,

$$n! \approx \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n,$$

we can approximate $\binom{k}{j}$ as

$$\binom{k}{j} \approx \frac{e^{-j} k^j}{j!(1-\frac{j}{k})^k} \left(1 - \frac{j}{k}\right)^{j-\frac{1}{2}} \approx \frac{k^j}{j!}, \quad (102)$$

which is valid for $j \ll k$.




Fig. 5: The average number of guesses for various blocklength n with AWGN channel at SNR = 4 dB.

Therefore, (101) is further approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k}{i} \frac{(kp_e)^j}{j!} &\approx \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^j \frac{k^i (kp_e)^j}{i! j!} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\approx} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{k^j k^j (p_e)^j}{j! j!} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\frac{1}{j!}\right)^2 (k\sqrt{p_e})^{2j} \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where step (a) takes $\sum_{i=0}^j \frac{k^i}{i!} \approx \frac{k^j}{j!}$, because $\frac{k^{j-1}}{(j-1)!} \ll \frac{k^j}{j!}$ for $j \ll k$.

Eq. (103) resembles the series expansion of the modified Bessel function of the first kind of order zero; that is

$$I_0(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j! \Gamma(j+1)} \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^{2j}, \quad (104)$$

where $\Gamma(j+1) = j!$ is the Gamma function. Consequently,

$$\sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k}{i} \frac{(kp_e)^j}{j!} \approx I_0(2k\sqrt{p_e}) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi k\sqrt{p_e}}} e^{2k\sqrt{p_e}}. \quad (105)$$

The last step considers the asymptotic expansion of modified Bessel function, i.e.,

$$I_0(2k\sqrt{p_e}) = \frac{1}{4\pi k\sqrt{p_e}} e^{2k\sqrt{p_e}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{2k\sqrt{p_e}}\right)\right).$$

Substituting (105) into (101) and changing the exponential base from e to 2 complete the proof. ■

The accuracy of (94) is verified in Figs. 5-7. Only the simulation results of Hamming processing are included for comparison, and the optimal processing is omitted due to its prohibitively high complexity for simulation. As shown by Fig. 5, (94) can well approximate the average complexity bound (71), particularly when the code rate is not high. The simulated results of Hamming processing also align closely




Fig. 6: The average number of guesses for short blocklength n with AWGN channel at SNR = 3 dB.




Fig. 7: The average number of guesses for $n = 64$ and $k = 32$ with AWGN channel at various SNRs.

with the value provided by (94), despite the fact that (94) is derived from the upper bound (80). Furthermore, Fig. 6 indicates that (94) also provides a reliable prediction of the average complexity even for very short block lengths. The tightness of (71) and (94) at various SNRs are demonstrated in Fig. 7, showing that the Bessel approximation slightly loses accuracy at very low SNRs. Nevertheless, these results show that (94) can be directly used to estimate the average achievable complexity of OSD in typical scenarios.

For a general $\omega > 1$, the proof of Theorem 8, or more specifically the combination of (101) and (103), indicates that the bound of (80) can be approximated by a simple series, i.e.,

$$\sum_{j=0}^k (\beta_j)^\omega \cdot \mathbb{P}_E(j) \approx e^{-kp_e} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\frac{k^j}{j!}\right)^{\omega+1} p_e^j, \quad (106)$$

for large n , which is also computationally efficient.

For an order- m OSD ($m > kp_e$), following the similar steps




Fig. 8: The average number of guesses for different orders m with AWGN channel at SNR = 1 dB, where $k = n/2$.

of Theorem 8, the bound (88) can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^m (\beta_j)^\omega \mathbb{P}_E(j) + (\beta_m)^\omega \sum_{j=m+1}^k \mathbb{P}_E(j) \\ & \approx e^{-kp_e} \sum_{j=0}^m \left(\frac{k^j}{j!}\right)^{\omega+1} p_e^j \\ & + e^{-kp_e} \left(\frac{k^m}{m!}\right)^\omega \frac{(kp_e)^{m+1}}{(m+1)!}. \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

When deriving (107) from (88), we take

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta_m)^\omega \sum_{j=m+1}^k \mathbb{P}_E(j) & \stackrel{(a)}{\approx} \left(\frac{k^m}{m!}\right)^\omega \sum_{j=m+1}^k \frac{(kp_e)^j}{j!} e^{-kp_e} \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\approx} e^{-kp_e} \left(\frac{k^m}{m!}\right)^\omega \frac{(kp_e)^{m+1}}{(m+1)!}, \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

where step (a) follows (100) and (102), and step (b) follows $\frac{(kp_e)^j}{j!} e^{-kp_e} \gg \frac{(kp_e)^{j+1}}{(j+1)!} e^{-kp_e}$ for $j > kp_e$. We omit the detailed derivations of (106) and (107) because they directly follow the proof of Theorem 8.

If $\omega = 1$, (107) is simplified to

$$e^{-kp_e} \left(\sum_{j=0}^m \left(\frac{k^j}{j!}\right)^2 p_e^j + \frac{k^m (kp_e)^{m+1}}{m! (m+1)!} \right) \quad (109)$$

Eq. (109) provides a fast evaluation of the average complexity of order- m OSD.

We validate the performance of (109) in Fig. 8 with simulation. As shown, (109) is an accurate approximation of (71) and a good estimation of the real-case results captured in the simulations. However, the accuracy of (109) slightly diminishes for large values of k and low orders of m . This loss of accuracy is attributed to step (b) of (108).

D. Complexity Saturation threshold for OSD

In the bound described in Theorem 7, coincidentally, $\mathbb{P}_E(j)$ given in (81) describes the distribution of the number of errors in the most reliable bits in OSD, representing the probability that there are j transmission errors in the k most reliable bits.




Fig. 9: The performance gap to MLD, $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{ML}$, versus the average OSD decoding complexity evaluated by (88) for fixed block length $n = 128$ and various coding rate r . The SNR is 2 dB.




Fig. 10: The performance gap to MLD, $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{ML}$, versus the average OSD decoding complexity evaluated by (88) for fixed information length $k = 64$ and various coding rate r . The SNR is 2 dB.

On the other hand, the BLER performance of an order- m OSD algorithm is approximately given by [12]

$$\epsilon_m \approx \epsilon_{ML} + 1 - \sum_{j=0}^m \mathbb{P}_E(j) = \epsilon_{ML} + \sum_{j=m+1}^k \mathbb{P}_E(j), \quad (110)$$

where ϵ_{ML} is the error rate of the MLD of code \mathcal{C} . The term $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{ML}$ represents the performance gap between an order- m OSD and the MLD. From (88) and (110), one can infer a direct correlation between the complexity and error rate of an OSD decoder.

We investigate the relationship between the average decoding complexity and the gap $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{ML}$ at various code rates. The results of fixing $n = 128$ and $k = 64$ are depicted in Figs. 9 and 10, respectively, at the SNR of 2dB. For each specified code rate, the OSD order m is elevated from 0 to a maximum of 15. The points of $m = 3$ and $m = 5$ are highlighted with dashed grey curves, which are evaluated incrementally from low to high rates.

It was proved that the OSD of order $m_e = \lceil d_{\min}/4 - 1 \rceil$ approximates MLD at high SNR (taking $\sigma^2 \rightarrow 0$) [10],

where d_{\min} is the minimum Hamming distance of the code \mathcal{C} . This approximation is obtained by assuming the performance gap to MLD is less than the performance of MLD itself, i.e., $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{ML} < \epsilon_{ML}$. A prevalent understanding based on m_e , therefore, is that OSD is not preferred for low-rate codes with large d_{\min} , which necessitates a high decoding order resulting in a large size of \mathcal{B} , i.e., $\xi_{\max} = \sum_{i=0}^m \binom{k}{i}$. However, what we observed in Figs. 9-10 contradicts this common belief to some extent. That is, there exists a certain decoder order m_s , such that if the decoder order m exceeds m_s , the increase in decoding complexity will be negligible. For low-rate codes, it is possible that m_s is much smaller than $\lceil d_{\min}/4 - 1 \rceil$ for a certain range of SNRs.

This can be evidenced by comparing the coefficient of e^{-kp_e} in (109), i.e.,

$$\sum_{j=0}^m \left(\frac{k^j}{j!} \right)^2 p_e^j + \frac{k^m (kp_e)^{m+1}}{m! (m+1)!}, \quad (111)$$

to (103). Specifically, (111) can be regarded a truncated series of $I_0(2k\sqrt{p_e})$, by noting that $\frac{k^m (kp_e)^{m+1}}{m! (m+1)!}$ quickly vanishes to 0 as m increases. Then, the difference between (111) and (103) is characterized the summation

$$\sum_{j=m+1}^k \left(\frac{(k\sqrt{p_e})^j}{j!} \right)^2 = \sum_{j=m+1}^k s(j) \quad (112)$$

Observing (112), the gap between (111) and (103) is significant for small values of m . However, as m increases, terms $s(j)$ tends towards 0, rendering the gap negligible. Furthermore, we observe that if m is larger than $k\sqrt{p_e}$, there is

$$\frac{s(m)}{s(m-1)} = \left(\frac{k\sqrt{p_e}}{m} \right)^2 < 1, \quad (113)$$

and the gap (112) shrinks significantly as m increases. Therefore, we contend that when the order $m \geq \lceil k\sqrt{p_e} \rceil$, the average complexity approximately approaches the saturation point, and we refer to $m_s = \lceil k\sqrt{p_e} \rceil$ as the complexity saturation threshold. If k and d_{\min} are given, $m_s \leq \lceil d_{\min}/4 - 1 \rceil$ will be satisfied with small p_e , which occurs at low code rates or high SNRs according to (95).

For instance, as in Fig. 10, the average complexity of OSD decoders for the $(n = 256, k = 64)$ code ($r = \frac{1}{4}$) is generally lower than those of the higher rate codes with the same k . Furthermore, the average complexity of rate- $\frac{1}{4}$ is saturated when the order $m \geq 4$ (where $k\sqrt{p_e} = 3.4605$). However, a $(n = 256, k = 64)$ code can have the minimum distance of $d_{\min} = 65$ [7], resulting in the decoding order to achieve MLD as $m = \lceil d_{\min}/4 - 1 \rceil = 16$. This indicates that for low-rate codes satisfying $m_s < \lceil d_{\min}/4 - 1 \rceil$ at a certain SNR, one can freely increase the decoding order higher beyond m_s to approach MLD, without concern for the average complexity. Table I summarizes the values of $k\sqrt{p_e}$ for various code parameters, which can be compared with Figs. 9-10 to observe the behavior of the complexity saturation threshold.

TABLE I: The values of $k\sqrt{p_e}$ to determine the complexity saturation threshold at SNR = 2 dB.

Rate r	1/8	1/4	1/3	3/8	1/2	5/8	2/3	3/4	7/8
$k\sqrt{p_e}$ with fixed $n = 128$	0.5336	1.7672	-	3.8370	7.0191	11.7472	-	18.6604	28.5450
$k\sqrt{p_e}$ with fixed $k = 64$	2.0321	3.4605	4.5055	-	7.0191	-	10.4154	-	-

E. Complexity to achieve MLD

In practical applications, the decoding for low-rate codes typically operates at very low SNRs, in contrast to the scenarios depicted in Figs. 9-10. On the other hand, the complexity of high-rate codes is not always as high as shown in Figs. 9-10. High-rate codes usually have a small d_{\min} , and thus OSD only needs a low order to approximate MLD. For example, the (128, 78) extended BCH code ($r \approx 5/8$) has $d_{\min} = 16$, and decoding order $m = \lceil d_{\min}/4 - 1 \rceil = 3$ suffice to approach MLD. As shown by Fig. 9, the decoding complexity at $m = 3$ for this code remains reasonable.

In this part, we investigate the practical complexity of OSD approaching the MLD of a (n, k) code. For given n and k , the SNR is set to where the MLD performance of the (n, k) code matches a target BLER ϵ_b , i.e., $\epsilon_{\text{ML}} = \epsilon_b$. This SNR is obtained by the normal approximation bound of the best error probability achieved by (n, k) codes at short blocklengths [3]. Once the SNR is determined, the required OSD order is chosen such that $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{\text{ML}} < \epsilon_{\text{ML}}$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{j=m+1}^k \mathbb{P}_E(j) \leq \epsilon_{\text{ML}} = \epsilon_b, \quad (114)$$

according to (110). Then, (109) is used to evaluate the complexity of this decoder, which represents the practical decoding complexity of OSD to achieve MLD with a target BLER.

Figure 11 depicts the practical complexity of OSD approaching the MLD across a rate range from 0 to 1 with the fixed blocklength $n = 128$. As shown in the figure, OSD is efficient for both low-rate and high-rate codes, but its efficiency diminishes for codes near the half rate. The practical complexity required to achieve ϵ_b is still effectively described by the bound given in (80), particularly for extremely low values of ϵ_b . We note that for $\epsilon_b = 10^{-4}$ and 10^{-5} , there are significant gaps between the practical complexity and (80) for high-rate codes, since the required decoding order m to satisfy (114) remains lower than the complexity saturation threshold m_s .

In Fig. 12, we present the complexity of OSD estimated by (109) across a blocklength range from 100 to 1000 with the fixed information length $k = 64$, while the order m is chosen to satisfy (114) for a given target BLER ϵ_b . As depicted, the complexity increases with increasing blocklength. Generally, the practical complexity required to achieve ϵ_b is still close to the bound given in (80) for the highest decoding order $m = k$, especially when ϵ_b is small. This is largely because a smaller ϵ_b necessitates a higher OSD order to achieve MLD performance, as indicated by (114). This required order often exceeds the complexity saturation threshold $m_s = \lceil k\sqrt{p_e} \rceil$. Increasing the decoding order beyond m_s will not further increase the decoding complexity.




Fig. 11: The average OSD decoding complexity v.s. the code rate for fixed block length $n = 128$, when the gap to MLD is comparable to the performance of MLD, i.e., $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_b < \epsilon_b$. The dashed curves are obtained with Eq. (80), representing the complexity of the highest decoding order $m = k$.




Fig. 12: The average OSD decoding complexity v.s. blocklength for fixed information length $k = 64$, when the gap to MLD is comparable to the performance of MLD, i.e., $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_b < \epsilon_b$. The dashed curves are obtained with (80), representing the complexity of the highest decoding order $m = k$.

VI. DISCUSSIONS ON THE PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVERSAL DECODERS

This section presents discussions to illustrate the application of complexity bounds and approximations from Section V, as inspirations for future work.

A. OSD with Correct Codeword Identification

Section V assumes that the decoder is terminated if it encounters the transmitted codeword \mathbf{c} at the ξ_{th} guess \mathbf{v}_ξ , with the help of an infallible genie. However, in a practical

scenario, this becomes challenging since OSD cannot know the transmitted \mathbf{c} . One of the solutions is the use of CRC, serving as an extra parity check for the information bits. The decoder can run an efficient CRC-check during decoding to determine if it has encountered the transmitted codeword. However, short CRCs, typically compounded with short block codes, have a non-negligible false positive rate. This rate becomes especially critical in URLLC scenarios that have stringent BLER requirements. Moreover, executing a CRC check for every guess introduces extra complexity.

Apart from CRC, there were probability-based or syndrome-based approaches for OSD to identify the correct guess (codeword). For example, [25] computes a syndrome related to a guess and compares the weight of the syndrome with a threshold. If the weight is higher than the threshold, then the guess is regarded as correct. In [13], the posterior correct probability of a guess is estimated. If the posterior correct probability is higher than a predetermined threshold, then the guess is considered correct. These techniques estimate the presence of the correct codeword by leveraging metrics such as the distance to the received signal and syndrome. Typically, the threshold can balance the trade-off between complexity and BLER. A strict threshold might be applied to avoid the degradation of BLER, which could, however, make the identifier potentially miss the correct codeword.

One can simply combine these approaches [13], [25] with CRC, which can improve the accuracy of identifying the correct guess while maintaining the near-optimal BLER performance. We next show that this approach can meet the achievable complexity performance specified by the bound (88) and the approximation (109) for an order- m OSD. We provide a concise overview of this method in Algorithm 1, where $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_i)$ is computed by [13, Eq. (3)]. Within the algorithm, 'Preprocessing' encompasses tasks such as sorting and Gaussian elimination. Each guess \mathbf{b}_i is retrieved according to the Hamming processing strategy, and the codeword estimate \mathbf{v}_i is derived from \mathbf{b}_i by performing re-encoding. If no \mathbf{v}_i is returned, the decoder simply selects the guess (i.e., codeword candidate) with the minimum Euclidean distance to the received signal \mathbf{r} . These specific procedures are omitted from Algorithm 1 for brevity.

Algorithm 1 OSD with Correct Codeword Identification

Require: Received signal \mathbf{r} , Threshold parameter λ

Ensure: Decoded result $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$

- 1: Preprocessing for OSD
 - 2: **for** $\xi = 1$ to ξ_{\max} **do**
 - 3: Retrieve the guess sequence \mathbf{b}_i
 - 4: Determine the corresponding guess \mathbf{v}_i of the transmitted codeword
 - 5: Calculate the posterior probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_i)$ using [13]
 - 6: **if** $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{v}_i) \geq \lambda$ **then**
 - 7: **if** CRC check for \mathbf{v}_i is valid **then**
 - 8: **return** \mathbf{v}_i
-

We compare the complexity of Algorithm 1 with $\lambda = 0.5$ to the bound (76) and the approximation (109) in Fig. 13. Algorithm 1 is used to decode (128, 64) extended BCH code




Fig. 13: The average OSD decoding complexity for achieving MLD for IR-HARQ with $k = 64$.

with various decoding orders m , and CRC-6 is used to provide additional parity checks for the information bits. As shown, Algorithm 1 can reach the complexity outlined in (76) and (109), which means that it can efficiently stop once the correct guess is encountered. On the other hand, Algorithm 1 can effectively maintain the BLER performance, achieving a BLER of 10^{-4} at the SNR of 3 dB with order-4 decoding via simulation. This is nearly the same as the ML decoding performance for this code. The detailed BLER results for each SNR are omitted here for brevity.

We note that many OSD algorithms, for example, [13], [26], [35], [36], exhibit lower complexity than Algorithm 1 at low-to-moderate SNRs. Besides terminating the decoding process early, these methods also discard unpromising guesses from \mathcal{B} , by leveraging the intrinsic relationships among the guesses $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{\xi_{\max}}\}$. Since even less likely guesses can occasionally be correct, discarding them can compromise the BLER performance of the decoder to some extent. This paper will not delve into the performance of this kind of technique. Instead, (76) and (109) provide the achievable complexity of an OSD decoder that can early terminate without compromising BLER performance.

From an implementation perspective, the preparation stage of OSD, including permutation and Gaussian elimination, also requires computational effort. While this factor is generally negligible in the overall decoding complexity, it can become significant at very high SNRs. This issue was discussed and partially addressed in our previous work [14].

B. Efficient Design of HARQ

OSD is regarded as a promising decoder for rate-compatible (RC) codes [6], [37]. Codes are referred to as rate-compatible if they have the same information block length k and their $k \times n$ generator matrices are nested, meaning that the generator matrix of a higher-rate code is a submatrix of the generator matrix of a lower-rate code. OSD can decode RC codes in HARQ systems without compromising performance and latency, as it directly deals with the code generator matrix.

As shown by Fig. 11, OSD is efficient for low-rate and high-rate codes. This fact indicates when designing a HARQ




Fig. 14: The average OSD decoding complexity for achieving MLD for RC codes in IR-HARQ with $k = 64$.

system using OSD at the receiver, the code parameters for each retransmission can be carefully selected to minimize the overall decoding latency. We show this by examining the decoding complexity of OSD achieving MLD at specific SNRs and various code rates. Given k , n , and SNR, the normal approximation bound is used to determine the best BLER achieved by (n, k) codes, denoted by ϵ_{ML} . The OSD order is then selected to ensure $\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{\text{ML}} < \epsilon_{\text{ML}}$. Then, (109) is used to evaluate the complexity. We consider the information blocklength $k = 64$, and incrementally increase the code blocklength from 80 to 220. As shown in Fig. 14, the complexity of OSD initially rises with the increase in block length but subsequently decreases. Thus, in designing such a HARQ system, it is efficient to start with transmissions at low rates and reserve the final transmission rounds for higher rates.

The complexity for the highest order $m = k$, as evaluated by (80), is also depicted in Fig. 14. This highest order complexity quickly decreases with the increase in block length and then acts as the asymptotic curve for the complexity of achieving MLD at larger block lengths (i.e., lower rates). This behavior is explained by the complexity saturation threshold m_s , which can be lower than the MLD-achieving order at low rates.

It should be noted that the complexity of OSD achieving MLD in Fig. 14 displays a jagged pattern. This occurs because general OSD settings permit only integer decoding orders. Each point of jaggedness represents a change in the decoding order approaching MLD prompted by a change in the code rate. One can select the maximum code blocklength before the decoding order changes to achieve the best trade-off between BLER performance and complexity.

C. Switch Between Universal Decoders

As reported in [6], two universal decoders, GRAND and OSD, offer distinct advantages in various scenarios. Specifically, GRAND is particularly efficient for high-rate codes or operating at high SNRs. In contrast, OSD is efficient for low-to-moderate codes at low SNRs, compared to GRAND. To achieve a universal decoding scheme with superior performance, one can devise a switch that can adaptively select OSD

or GRAND in response to the received signal. The bounds and approximations developed in this paper can serve as the foundation of such a scheme.

We provide a preliminary design to demonstrate the potential of this approach. At the beginning of decoding, we use (109) to find the expected complexity of OSD, where p_e is estimated based on the received signal. According to (90), p_e in fact represents the average error probability of the first k most reliable bits, which therefore is estimated as

$$p_e \approx \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{1 + \exp(|\tilde{\ell}_i|)}, \quad (115)$$

based on the ordered LLRs of received symbols. Plugging this p_e into (109), we calculate the result as ξ_{OSD} , representing estimated number of guesses in OSD.

For the complexity of GRAND, one can employ Arikan's lower bound (5). Specifically, given $Y^n = y^n$, there is

$$\ln \mathbb{E}[G(X^n|Y^n = y^n)] \geq \sum_{i=1}^n H_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_i|Y_i = y_i) - \ln[1 + \ln(2^n)], \quad (116)$$

The Renyi entropy $H_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_i|Y_i = y_i)$ is estimated from ℓ_i ; specifically,

$$H_{\frac{1}{2}}(X_i|Y_i = y_i) = \ln \left(\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y_i)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(-1|y_i)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^2. \quad (117)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(-1|y_i) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y_i)$, and $\mathbb{P}_{X|Y}(1|y_i)$ is obtained by

$$\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1|y_i) = \frac{\exp(\ell_i)}{1 + \exp(\ell_i)} \quad (118)$$

with given LLR ℓ_i of y_i . Using (116), we can estimate the number of guesses in GRAND, denoted by ξ_{GRAND} . We note that (116) only provides a somewhat rough estimation for two reasons: 1) it represents a lower bound of the actual number of guesses, and 2) it overlooks instances of early termination in GRAND when a valid but incorrect codeword is encountered. One can refine the estimation methods by using the results from literature [11], [22]. Nevertheless, we will show that (116) provides fair enough performance in switching between universal decoders.

We denote the estimated computational complexity of GRAND and OSD as C_{GRAND} and C_{OSD} , respectively. Note that C_{GRAND} and C_{OSD} represent the practical complexity rather than the achievable complexity discussed earlier. Then C_{GRAND} and C_{OSD} are easily estimated from ξ_{GRAND} and ξ_{OSD} . Specifically, C_{OSD} is calculated by accounting for the number of operations involved in ordering and performing Gaussian elimination on the (n, k) code, in addition to the re-encoding operation after each guess [10]. C_{GRAND} is derived by considering the parity check operation conducted after each guess to determine if the guess is a valid codeword [22].

Note that C_{GRAND} and C_{OSD} are the estimated complexity before the actual decoding. Thus, it is helpful to leverage C_{GRAND} and C_{OSD} to switch between OSD and GRAND to minimize the decoding latency across various scenarios, such as different SNRs and code rates.




Fig. 15: The complexity in switching between decoders for (64, 51) eBCH code at various SNRs.

We explore a simple example of decoding the (64, 51) eBCH code at different SNRs, as depicted in Fig. 15. The receiver implements both the ordered reliability bits GRAND (ORB-GRAND) [19] and OSD as outlined in Algorithm 1. Upon receiving a block from the channel, the receiver calculates ξ_{GRAND} and ξ_{OSD} , and accordingly estimates C_{GRAND} and C_{OSD} . It then selects the decoder with the lower predicted complexity adapting to received blocks. We use the average time of decoding one block to measure the practical computational complexity, which is obtained by measuring and averaging the decoding time of 50000 blocks.

As can be seen from the figure, switching between these two decoders can fully exploit their respective advantages. OSD is efficient at low SNRs, but it shows a “complexity floor” at high SNRs due to Gaussian elimination operation. Conversely, while GRAND requires numerous guesses at low SNRs, its complexity is very low at high SNRs. Adaptive switching between decoders achieves low complexity at both low and high SNR ranges. Note that the switching scheme results in slightly higher decoding times compared to using OSD or GRAND alone at very low or high SNRs, as shown in Fig. 15. This additional complexity arises from the computation of ξ_{GRAND} and ξ_{OSD} .

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of the achievable complexity of ordered statistics decoding (OSD) in binary additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channels. By developing new tight upper bounds of guesswork for ordered statistics, we formulate the achievable decoding complexity of OSD that ensures no loss in error performance. The analysis reveals that the achievable complexity of order- k OSD is tightly approximated by a modified Bessel function, which increases near-exponentially with code blocklength. Furthermore, we identify a complexity-saturation threshold, beyond which increasing the OSD decoding order improves error performance without raising decoding complexity.

The results presented in this paper offer valuable insights into the design and deployment of universal decoders for 6G

systems. The derived achievable complexity enables a quick assessment of the performance-complexity trade-offs when deploying OSD at different orders. For example, one can develop a system that can adaptively switch between OSD and GRAND, leveraging the benefits of both decoders and minimising the decoding latency.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. She, C. Pan, T. Q. Duong, T. Q. S. Quek, R. Schober, M. Simsek, and P. Zhu, “Guest editorial xURLLC in 6G: Next generation ultra-reliable and low-latency communications,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 1963–1968, 2023.
- [2] H. Tataria, M. Shafi, A. F. Molisch, M. Dohler, H. Sjöland, and F. Tufvesson, “6G wireless systems: Vision, requirements, challenges, insights, and opportunities,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 109, no. 7, pp. 1166–1199, 2021.
- [3] T. Erseghe, “Coding in the finite-blocklength regime: Bounds based on laplace integrals and their asymptotic approximations,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 6854–6883, 2016.
- [4] M. Shirvanimoghaddam, M. S. Mohammadi, R. Abbas, A. Minja, C. Yue, B. Matuz, G. Han, Z. Lin, W. Liu, Y. Li, S. Johnson, and B. Vucetic, “Short block-length codes for ultra-reliable low latency communications,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 130–137, February 2019.
- [5] “5G NR Multiplexing and channel coding,” GPP TS 38.212 version 16.2.0 Release 16, Tech. Rep., Jul. 2020.
- [6] C. Yue, V. Miloslavskaya, M. Shirvanimoghaddam, B. Vucetic, and Y. Li, “Efficient decoders for short block length codes in 6G URLLC,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 84–90, 2023.
- [7] M. Grassl, “Bounds on the minimum distance of linear codes and quantum codes,” Online available at <http://www.codetables.de> (Accessed: Dec. 22, 2022).
- [8] B. Cavarec, H. B. Celebi, M. Bengtsson, and M. Skoglund, “A learning-based approach to address complexity-reliability tradeoff in OS decoders,” in *2020 54th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 689–692.
- [9] G. Larue, L.-A. Dufrene, Q. Lampin, H. Ghauch, and G. R.-B. Othman, “Neural belief propagation auto-encoder for linear block code design,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 70, no. 11, pp. 7250–7264, 2022.
- [10] M. P. C. Fossorier and S. Lin, “Soft-decision decoding of linear block codes based on ordered statistics,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 1379–1396, Sep 1995.
- [11] K. R. Duffy, M. Médard, and W. An, “Guessing random additive noise decoding with symbol reliability information (SRGRAND),” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, 2021.
- [12] C. Yue, M. Shirvanimoghaddam, B. Vucetic, and Y. Li, “A revisit to ordered statistics decoding: Distance distribution and decoding rules,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 4288–4337, 2021.
- [13] C. Yue, M. Shirvanimoghaddam, G. Park, O.-S. Park, B. Vucetic, and Y. Li, “Probability-based ordered-statistics decoding for short block codes,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1791–1795, 2021.
- [14] C. Yue, M. Shirvanimoghaddam, B. Vucetic, and Y. Li, “Ordered-statistics decoding with adaptive Gaussian elimination reduction for short codes,” in *2022 IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 492–497.
- [15] C. Choi and J. Jeong, “Fast and scalable soft decision decoding of linear block codes,” *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 1753–1756, 2019.
- [16] F. Wang, J. Jiao, K. Zhang, S. Wu, Y. Li, and Q. Zhang, “Efficient ordered statistics decoder for ultra-reliable low latency communications,” in *ICC 2021-IEEE International Conference on Communications*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [17] C. Yue, M. Shirvanimoghaddam, G. Park, O.-S. Park, B. Vucetic, and Y. Li, “Linear-equation ordered-statistics decoding,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 11, pp. 7105–7123, 2022.
- [18] Y. Wang, J. Liang, and X. Ma, “Local constraint-based ordered statistics decoding for short block codes,” in *2022 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2022, pp. 107–112.
- [19] K. R. Duffy, “Ordered reliability bits guessing random additive noise decoding,” in *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 8268–8272.

- [20] M. Rowshan and J. Yuan, "Low-complexity grand by segmentation," in *GLOBECOM 2023 - 2023 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2023, pp. 6145–6151.
- [21] J. Xiao, Y. Zhou, S. Song, and Z. Wang, "A low-latency and area-efficient orbgrand decoder for polar codes," in *2023 4th Information Communication Technologies Conference (ICTC)*, 2023, pp. 10–15.
- [22] K. R. Duffy, J. Li, and M. Médard, "Guessing noise, not code-words," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 671–675.
- [23] P. Dhakal, R. Garello, S. K. Sharma, S. Chatzinotas, and B. Ottersten, "On the error performance bound of ordered statistics decoding of linear block codes," in *2016 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [24] Y. Wu and C. N. Hadjicostis, "Soft-decision decoding of linear block codes using preprocessing and diversification," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 378–393, 2007.
- [25] W. Jin and M. Fossorier, "Probabilistic sufficient conditions on optimality for reliability based decoding of linear block codes," in *2006 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2006, pp. 2235–2239.
- [26] C. Yue, M. Shirvanimoghaddam, Y. Li, and B. Vucetic, "Segmentation-discarding ordered-statistic decoding for linear block codes," in *2019 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [27] F. Wang, J. Jiao, K. Zhang, S. Wu, Y. Li, and Q. Zhang, "Self-adaptive ordered statistics decoder for finite block length raptor codes toward URLLC," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 3282–3297, 2021.
- [28] E. Arikan, "An inequality on guessing and its application to sequential decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 99–105, 1996.
- [29] D. Malone and W. G. Sullivan, "Guesswork and entropy," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 525–526, 2004.
- [30] M. K. Hanawal and R. Sundaresan, "Guessing revisited: A large deviations approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 70–78, 2010.
- [31] M. M. Christiansen and K. R. Duffy, "Guesswork, large deviations, and shannon entropy," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 796–802, 2012.
- [32] N. Balakrishnan and A. C. Cohen, *Order statistics & inference: estimation methods*. Elsevier, 2014.
- [33] M. P. Fossorier and S. Lin, "First-order approximation of the ordered binary-symmetric channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1381–1387, 1996.
- [34] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, 3rd ed. John Wiley & Sons, 1968, vol. 1.
- [35] Y. Wu and C. N. Hadjicostis, "Soft-decision decoding using ordered recodings on the most reliable basis," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 829–836, 2007.
- [36] C. Choi and J. Jeong, "Fast soft decision decoding algorithm for linear block codes using permuted generator matrices," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 3775–3779, 2021.
- [37] M. Shirvanimoghaddam, "Primitive rateless codes," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 10, pp. 6395–6408, 2021.