

Identification via Binary Uniform Permutation Channel

Abhishek Sarkar and Bikash Kumar Dey

Department of Electrical Engineering

Indian Institute of Technology Bombay

{absarkar, bikash}@ee.iitb.ac.in

Abstract—We study message identification over the binary uniform permutation channels. For DMCs, the number of identifiable messages grows doubly exponentially. Identification capacity, the maximum second-order exponent, is known to be the same as the Shannon capacity of a DMC. We consider a binary uniform permutation channel where the transmitted vector is permuted by a permutation chosen uniformly at random. Permutation channels support reliable communication of only polynomially many messages. While this implies a zero second-order identification rate, we prove a “soft” converse result showing that even non-zero first-order identification rates are not achievable with a power-law decay of error probability for identification over binary uniform permutation channels. To prove the converse, we use a sequence of steps to construct a new identification code with a simpler structure and then use a lower bound on the normalized maximum pairwise intersection of a set system on $\{0, \dots, n\}$. We provide generalizations for arbitrary alphabet size.

I. INTRODUCTION

In reliable communication over a channel, the message is encoded into a vector of transmit symbols, and the decoder outputs a message based on the received vector. The maximum possible exponential rate of transmission under an arbitrarily low probability of error is known as the Shannon capacity (C) of the channel.

We consider a binary uniform permutation channel, where the components of the transmitted n -length binary vector \mathbf{x} are permuted by the channel using a permutation chosen uniformly at random from S_n , the set of permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Since the equal-weight transmit vectors are not distinguishable, it is easy to show that the maximum number of messages M that can be reliably transmitted is $(n + 1)$. Thus the Shannon capacity is zero.

Ahlsweide and Dueck [2] introduced the problem of message identification, where the decoder is interested in knowing whether a particular message, which is unknown to the encoder, was transmitted. It needs to be ensured that both the false positive and false negative error probabilities should be small. Message identification is a weaker requirement than decoding, and here the decision regions for different messages are allowed to overlap. It was proved that by using stochastic encoding, a doubly exponential number of messages can be identified for DMCs. The identification capacity, defined as the maximum achievable second order rate, $\frac{1}{n} \log \log M$, was proved to be the same as the Shannon capacity C of the DMC.

A “soft” converse was proved. Later, the strong converse was proved by Han and Verdu [10], [11] (also see Steinberg [27]).

Proposition 1 (a version of Gilbert’s bound) in [2] guarantees the existence of set systems with bounded pairwise intersection, and this played a key role in the proof of their achievability result.

Proposition 1. [2, Proposition 1] For any finite set \mathcal{Z} , $\lambda \in (0, 0.5)$, and $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\lambda \log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - 1 \right) > 2 \text{ and } \epsilon < \frac{1}{6}, \quad (1)$$

there exist M subsets $\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$, each of size $\epsilon|\mathcal{Z}|$, such that $|\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j| \leq \lambda\epsilon|\mathcal{Z}| \forall i \neq j$ and

$$M \geq |\mathcal{Z}|^{-1} 2^{\epsilon|\mathcal{Z}|-1}. \quad (2)$$

In the achievability proof in [2], the set \mathcal{Z} was taken to be the set of about 2^{n^C} messages, which can be communicated reliably. Since $\log(n+1)$ bits can be reliably communicated over the binary uniform permutation channel, one may expect that an exponential number of messages ($2^{\epsilon 2^{\log(n+1)}} = 2^{\epsilon(n+1)}$) may be identified, i.e., non-zero first order rate may be achieved for identification. However, condition (1) implies that for the probability of error λ_n of a sequence of codes to go to 0, ϵ_n must also go to 0. This, in turn, results in a vanishing rate. Hence the proposition does not provide a tool to achieve a non-zero first-order rate for identification over the binary uniform permutation channel. We prove a soft converse in this paper in support of the claim that no non-zero first-order rate is achievable. The result easily generalizes for uniform permutation channels with bigger alphabets.

The soft converse in [2] showed that there is no sequence of identification codes of a rate higher than the Shannon capacity for DMC such that the probability of error vanishes exponentially as a function of n . Through a sequence of steps, the authors constructed new “canonical ID codes” from given ID codes and then argued the converse based on these derived codes. Proving the converse based on the derived codes requires that these derived codes have vanishing probability of error. However, their first step, that of deriving a code with uniform encoder distributions, resulted in an exponential increase in the probability of error. Hence the converse argument works only if the original code sequence has exponentially decaying probability of error.

We prove a soft zero-rate converse for identification over binary uniform permutation channels. Given a sequence of ID codes of a non-zero first-order rate, we also use a sequence of steps to derive a sequence of ID codes with a simple structure, and then prove the zero-rate converse for such a sequence of codes. However, one of these steps is to reduce the encoder distributions to uniform distributions, in a similar manner as in [2]. This step increases the probability of error by a (arbitrarily small) power of n . As a result, our converse argument works if the original sequence of codes has a probability of error decaying at least as fast as $n^{-\mu}$ for some $\mu > 0$. Note that the strong converse results of [10], [11] only imply a zero second-order rate (since the Shannon capacity is zero). We prove a stronger result that even non-zero first-order identification rates are not achievable for permutation channels, albeit the weakness mentioned above. While we believe that a strong zero rate (first-order) converse also holds, we have so far been unable to prove it.

After the identification problem was introduced in [2], it has been studied in various setups. We now give a glimpse of such works, without being exhaustive. Identification over DMCs with noisy feedback under both deterministic and stochastic encoding was studied in [4], while identification over wiretap channels was studied in [26], [19], [4]. Identification over broadcast channels was investigated in [6], [20], while identification in the presence of feedback over multiple-access channels and broadcast channels was studied in [3]. Identification was studied over Gaussian channels in [22], [15]; over additive noise channels under average and peak power constraints in [30]; over compound channels and arbitrarily varying channels in [1]. Deterministic identification over DMCs with and without input constraints was studied in [21].

The permutation channel is relevant in DNA-based storage systems, multipath routing of packets in communication networks, and diffusion-based molecular communication [17]. In multipath routed networks, in the absence of any packet id in the packets, the out-of-order arrival of packets due to varying delay or changing topologies may be thought to be due to random permutations [9], [29]. The study by [14], [13] examined coding in channels with random permutations and other impairments such as insertion, deletion and substitution. See [5] and [18] for a comprehensive survey of molecular communication systems and the role of the permutation channel in diffusion-based communication systems. An overview of coding challenges for DNA-based storage is presented in [25], while [24] presents an optimal code construction for correcting multiple errors in unordered string-based data encoding within DNA storage systems. See [23] for a comprehensive study of DNA-based storage systems. [16], [7] examined coding for permutation channels with restricted movements. Noisy permutation channels have been studied in [17] and [28]. To the best of our knowledge, identification over permutation channels has not been studied before.

In Sec. II, we present the problem setup and the main results. In Sec. III, we give a series of constructions through

which we derive a new ‘canonical’ code from a given identification code. In Sec. IV, we prove a bound on the intersection of a set system. The proof of the soft converse is presented in Sec. V. Generalizations of the soft converse and achievability are presented for uniform permutation channels with general alphabet size q in Sec. VI.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND MAIN RESULT

We denote $[n] := \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. For any finite set \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ denotes the set of all probability mass functions over \mathcal{A} . For two finite sets \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , we denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B})$ the set of all conditional distributions $P_{X|Y}$ where $X \in \mathcal{A}, Y \in \mathcal{B}$. For an $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $wt(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the Hamming weight of \mathbf{x} . We denote the set of all vectors of Hamming weight i as $\mathcal{T}_i \subset \{0, 1\}^n$, for $i \in [n]$.

A channel with input alphabet \mathcal{A} and output alphabet \mathcal{B} , both finite sets, are specified by a conditional probability distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$. The “noiseless channel” with input and output alphabets \mathcal{A} , where the output is the same as the input, is denoted by $\text{NL}_{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular, $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ denotes the noiseless channel with input and output alphabets $[n]$. The n -block binary uniform permutation channel Π_n is defined as the channel with input and output alphabets $\{0, 1\}^n$ and transition probability

$$P(y^n|x^n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \mathbb{1}(y_i = x_{\sigma(i)}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}),$$

for all $y^n, x^n \in \{0, 1\}^n$. We will refer to the sequence of channels $\{\Pi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as the binary uniform permutation channel and denote it by Π . For every $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we define

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}) := \{\sigma\mathbf{x} | \sigma \in S_n\}$$

as the ball around \mathbf{x} under S_n . In other words, this is the orbit of \mathbf{x} under the action of S_n on $\{0, 1\}^n$. It is easy to check that if \mathbf{x} is transmitted and a permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ is chosen uniformly at random, then the output $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ is uniformly distributed in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x})$. Clearly, $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x})$ is the typeclass $\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}$ of \mathbf{x} , that contains all n -length vectors of the same Hamming weight.

Definition 1. An M -ary identification (ID) code with deterministic decoders for any channel $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$ is a set

$$\{(Q_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$$

of pairs with $Q_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, and $\mathcal{D}_i \subset \mathcal{B}$, for $i = 1, \dots, M$. For such a code, a message i is encoded to a symbol $x \in \mathcal{A}$ with probability $Q_i(x)$, and the decoder for message i outputs 1 (“Accept”) if and only if the received symbol $y \in \mathcal{D}_i$. If the encoding distributions Q_i are uniform distributions over some support sets \mathcal{A}_i , then the ID code is specified by $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$.

Definition 2. An M -ary identification (ID) code with stochastic decoders for any channel $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$ is a set of pairs

$$\{(Q_i, P_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$$

with $Q_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, and $P_i \in \mathcal{P}(\{0, 1\}|\mathcal{B})$, for $i = 1, \dots, M$. For such a code, the decision rule P_i for the message i outputs 1 with probability $P_i(1|y)$ for received symbol $y \in \mathcal{B}$. Deterministic decoders are a special case with $P_i(1|y) := \mathbb{1}_{\{y \in \mathcal{D}_i\}}$.

For a stochastic ID code, the probability that a message $j \neq i$ is accepted when i is encoded is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} &:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{B}} Q_i(x) P(y|x) P_j(1|y) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(x) P(y|x) \quad (\text{for deterministic decoders}) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Similarly, the missed detection probability for message i , i.e. the probability that the decoder rejects message i while i was encoded, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} &:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{B}} Q_i(x) P(y|x) P_i(0|y) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{D}_i^c} Q_i(x) P(y|x) \quad (\text{for deterministic decoders}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We define the Type-I and Type-II probability of errors of the code as respectively

$$\lambda_1 := \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i}, \text{ and } \lambda_2 := \max_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq M} \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}. \quad (5)$$

The probability of error for an ID code is defined as

$$\lambda := \max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}. \quad (6)$$

We refer to an M -ary (i.e. with M messages) ID code for Π_n as an (n, M) ID code for the binary uniform permutation channel Π_n , and similarly, an M -ary ID code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ is referred as an (n, M) ID code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$. When relevant, we will also specify the error probabilities and refer to such a code as an $(n, M, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ or (n, M, λ) code. The identification (ID) rate of an (n, M) ID code for Π_n is defined as

$$R := \frac{\log M}{n}. \quad (7)$$

Note that in this study, the ID rate is defined as the first-order exponent of the message size, whereas the ID rate is defined as $\frac{1}{n} \log \log M$ for identification over DMCs [2]. This is because achievable message size for identification is known to grow doubly exponentially for DMCs. On the other hand, the number of messages for communication grows linearly with n for Π , and hence we anticipate at most an exponential growth of message size for identification. Unless otherwise specified, an ID code will refer to one with deterministic decoders throughout the paper. It is easy to check that if \mathbf{x} is transmitted and a permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ is chosen uniformly at random, then the output $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ is uniformly distributed in $\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}$. For an (n, M) ID code with deterministic decoders for Π , the probability of errors are given by

$$\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} := \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n} Q_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})} \cap \mathcal{D}_j|}{|\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}|}, \quad (8)$$

$$\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} := \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n} Q_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})} \cap \mathcal{D}_i^c|}{|\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}|}. \quad (9)$$

Definition 3. An asymptotic identification rate R is said to be achievable for the binary uniform permutation channel Π if there exists a sequence of $(n_i, 2^{n_i R})$ ID codes with probability of errors λ_{n_i} such that $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n_i} = 0$.

We now present our zero-rate *soft-converse* for such code sequences.

Theorem 1 (Soft converse). *For any given $\mu, R > 0$, there does not exist a sequence of $(n_i, 2^{n_i R}, \lambda_i)$ ID codes for the binary uniform permutation channel Π with $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ and probability of errors $\lambda_i < n_i^{-\mu}$ for all i .*

The following theorem shows that any ‘sub-exponential’ message size can be identified over Π .

Theorem 2 (Achievability). *For any $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, there exists a sequence of $(n, 2^{\epsilon_n n}, 0, \lambda_n)$ ID codes for Π with $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$. In particular, for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, 2^{n^α} messages can be identified reliably.*

The proof of Theorem 2 follows easily from Proposition 1 with $\epsilon = \epsilon_n + \frac{\log n}{n}$ and $\lambda = \frac{4}{-\log_2(\epsilon_n + \frac{\log n}{n})}$, and is omitted.

III. MODIFICATIONS OF ID CODES

Towards proving Theorem 1, in this section, we provide five simple modification steps through which, given an ID code for Π_n , we construct a code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with uniform encoder distributions with equal sized supports.

A. *From a ID code with deterministic decoders for Π_n to a ID code with stochastic decoders for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$*

For every (n, M) ID code with deterministic decoders for Π_n we present a construction of an (n, M) ID code with stochastic decoders for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with the same probability of error.

Lemma 1. *Given an ID code with deterministic decoders $\{(Q_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ for Π_n , there exists an ID code with stochastic decoders for the noiseless channel $\text{NL}_{[n]}$, having the same probability of errors $\{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} | 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M\}$ and $\{\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} | i = 1, \dots, M\}$.*

Proof: We will prove by constructing an ID code $\{(Q'_i, P_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with stochastic decoders for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$. For every $i = 1, \dots, M$, $k \in [n]$, we define

$$Q'_i(k) := Q_i(\mathcal{T}_k) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_k} Q_i(\mathbf{x}), \text{ and } P_i(1|k) := \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{T}_k|}{|\mathcal{T}_k|}.$$

The probability of errors for the new code are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} &:= \sum_{k \in [n]} Q'_i(k) P_j(1|k) \\ &= \sum_{k \in [n]} Q'_i(k) \frac{|\mathcal{D}_j \cap \mathcal{T}_k|}{|\mathcal{T}_k|} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n} Q_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{D}_j \cap \mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}|}{|\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}|} = \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} &:= \sum_{k \in [n]} Q'_i(k) P_i(0|k) \\ &= \sum_{k \in [n]} Q'_i(k) \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i^c \cap \mathcal{T}_k|}{|\mathcal{T}_k|} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^n} Q_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i^c \cap \mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}|}{|\mathcal{T}_{wt(\mathbf{x})}|} = \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. \blacksquare

B. From ID codes with stochastic decoders to ID codes with deterministic decoders

In this subsection, we present a construction for an ID code with deterministic decoding for $NL_{[n]}$ from an ID code with stochastic decoding for $NL_{[n]}$. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Given an (n, M) ID code with stochastic decoders $\{(Q_i, P_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ for $NL_{[n]}$, with error probabilities $\{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} | 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M\}$ and $\{\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} | i = 1, \dots, M\}$, there exists $\mathcal{D}_i \subset [n]$, for $i = 1, \dots, M$, such that the (n, M) ID code $\{(Q_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with deterministic decoders for $NL_{[n]}$ has error probabilities bounded as*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} &\leq \sqrt{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j}}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} &\leq \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} + \sqrt{\lambda_2}, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, M,\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_2 := \max_{i \neq j} \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}$.

Proof: We fix $0 < \alpha < 1$. Let us define, for each i , $\mathcal{D}_i := \{k \in [n] | P_i(1|k) > \alpha\}$. Then the probability of errors of the original code can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} &= \sum_{k \in [n]} Q_i(k) P_i(0|k) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) P_i(0|k) + \sum_{k \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) P_i(0|k) \\ &\geq 0 + \sum_{k \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) (1 - \alpha) \\ &= \sum_{k \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) - \alpha \sum_{k \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) \\ &\geq \tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} - \alpha \cdot 1\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} \leq \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} + \alpha.$$

On the other hand, we have, for $j \neq i$,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} &= \sum_{k \in [n]} Q_i(k) P_j(1|k) \\ &\geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(k) P_j(1|k) \\ &\geq \alpha \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(k) = \alpha \tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} \leq \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} / \alpha. \quad (12)$$

The lemma follows by taking $\alpha = \sqrt{\lambda_2}$. \blacksquare

C. From non-uniform encoding distributions to uniform encoding distributions

Let $\{(Q_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ be an (n, M) ID code with deterministic decoders designed for the channel $NL_{[n]}$. We now give a construction of a new code where the encoding distributions are uniform. The result is summarized in the following lemma. The construction and the lemma are adapted from [2, Lemma 4], which was used to prove the soft converse for second order identification rates over DMCs.

Lemma 3. *Given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and an (n, M) ID code with deterministic decoders $\{(Q_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ for $NL_{[n]}$, with error probabilities $\{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} | 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M\}$ and $\{\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} | i = 1, \dots, M\}$, there exist sets $\mathcal{A}_i \subset [n]$ for $i = 1, \dots, M$ such that the ID code $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with uniform encoding distributions has error probabilities*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} \leq \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} \times \frac{(1 + 2\gamma)n^\gamma}{\gamma(1 - 2n^{-\gamma})}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M,$$

and

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} \leq \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} \times \frac{(1 + 2\gamma)n^\gamma}{\gamma(1 - 2n^{-\gamma})}, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, M.$$

Proof: We define $\kappa = \lceil \frac{1}{\gamma} \rceil + 1$. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and $l = 1, \dots, \kappa$, we define

$$\mathcal{B}(l, i) := \{k \in [n] | n^{-\gamma l} < Q_i(k) \leq n^{-\gamma(l-1)}\}.$$

Then

$$Q_i(\{[n] \setminus \cup_{l=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{B}(l, i)\}) \leq (n+1) \cdot n^{-\gamma \kappa} \leq 2n^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)},$$

and hence

$$Q_i(\cup_{l=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{B}(l, i)) \geq (1 - 2n^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)}). \quad (13)$$

Choose $l_i^* := \arg\max_{l=1, \dots, \kappa} Q_i(\mathcal{B}(l, i))$ and define

$$\mathcal{A}_i := \mathcal{B}(l_i^*, i). \quad (14)$$

(10) Combining (13) and (14), we can write

$$Q_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq \frac{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})}{\kappa}. \quad (15)$$

(11) Now let $Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(\cdot)$ denote the uniform distribution on \mathcal{A}_i , i.e.,

$$Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_i|}, & \text{if } k \in \mathcal{A}_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using (15), we can write, for $k \in \mathcal{A}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(k) &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_i|} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_i|} \times \frac{Q_i(\mathcal{A}_i) \kappa}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})}.\end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For every $k, \hat{k} \in \mathcal{A}_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i(\hat{k}) &\leq n^{-\gamma(l_i^*-1)} \\ &= n^\gamma \cdot n^{-\gamma l_i^*} \\ &\leq n^\gamma Q_i(k). \end{aligned}$$

and summing both side over $\hat{k} \in \mathcal{A}_i$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i(\mathcal{A}_i) &= \sum_{\hat{k} \in \mathcal{A}_i} Q_i(\hat{k}) \leq \sum_{\hat{k} \in \mathcal{A}_i} n^\gamma Q_i(k) \\ &= |\mathcal{A}_i| n^\gamma Q_i(k). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Combining (16) and (17), we can write, for every $k \in \mathcal{A}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(k) &\leq \frac{Q_i(\mathcal{A}_i)}{|\mathcal{A}_i|} \times \frac{\kappa}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \\ &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{A}_i| n^\gamma Q_i(k)}{|\mathcal{A}_i|} \times \frac{\kappa}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \\ &= Q_i(k) \frac{\kappa n^\gamma}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Since $Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(k) = 0$ for all $k \notin \mathcal{A}_i$, it follows that, for all $k \in [n]$,

$$Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(k) \leq Q_i(k) \frac{\kappa n^\gamma}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})}. \quad (19)$$

We now bound the error probabilities for the ID code $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with uniform encoding distributions. For $j \neq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(k) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\kappa n^\gamma}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(k) \\ &= \frac{\kappa n^\gamma}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \times \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

For any i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_i^c} Q_{\mathcal{A}_i}(k) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\kappa n^\gamma}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_i^c} Q_i(k) \\ &= \frac{\kappa n^\gamma}{(1 - 2n^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \times \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The lemma follows from the bounds $\kappa \leq \frac{1+2\gamma}{\gamma}$ for the numerators, and $\kappa > \frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma}$ for the denominators in (20) and (21). ■

Note that, since $(1 - 2n^{-\gamma}) > 1/2$ for large enough n , the error probability bounds in Lemma 3 may be further upper bounded by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} \leq \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} \times \frac{6n^\gamma}{\gamma}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M, \quad (22)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} \leq \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} \times \frac{6n^\gamma}{\gamma}, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, M. \quad (23)$$

D. ID codes with decoding sets same as support of the encoding distributions

Given an (n, M) ID code $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with deterministic decoders for $NL_{[n]}$, we now give a construction of an ID code with deterministic decoders where the support of the uniform input distributions are same as the corresponding decoding regions, i.e., with $\mathcal{A}_i = \mathcal{D}_i$, $\forall i$.

Lemma 4. *Given an (n, M) ID code $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{D}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with deterministic decoders and uniform encoder distributions for $NL_{[n]}$, with error probabilities $\{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} | 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M\}$ and $\{\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} | i = 1, \dots, M\}$, the code given by $\{(\mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{G}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$, where $\mathcal{G}_i := \mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_i$, has error probabilities satisfying $\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} = 0$ for all i , and*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} \leq \frac{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j}}{1 - \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i}}, \quad \forall j \neq i. \quad (24)$$

Proof: Since the encoding distributions of the new code have the same supports as the corresponding decoding regions, clearly $\tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} = 0$ for all i . For $j \neq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} &= \frac{|\mathcal{G}_i \cap \mathcal{G}_j|}{|\mathcal{G}_i|} \\ &= \frac{|\mathcal{G}_i \cap \mathcal{G}_j|}{|\mathcal{A}_i|} \times \frac{|\mathcal{A}_i|}{|\mathcal{G}_i|} \\ &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{D}_j|}{|\mathcal{A}_i|} \times \frac{|\mathcal{A}_i|}{|\mathcal{G}_i|} \\ &= \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. ■

E. ID codes with equal size support

Given an ID code with decoding sets same as the encoder supports, we now give a construction of a similar code where the size of all the supports are equal.

Lemma 5. *Given an (n, M) ID code $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with uniform encoder distributions, deterministic decoders, and type-I/II error probabilities λ_1, λ_2 , there exists an (n, M') ID code equal size supports \mathcal{A}_i , having type-I and type-II error probabilities $\tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq \lambda_1$, $\tilde{\lambda}_2 \leq \lambda_2$, and $M' \geq \frac{M}{n+1}$.*

IV. WELL SEPARATED SET SYSTEM

For $n, M \geq 1$ and $\Delta < \Gamma < M$, a (Γ, Δ) set system over $[n]$ is a collection $\mathcal{U} := \{\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M\}$ of distinct subsets of $[n]$ with $|\mathcal{U}_i| = \Gamma$, $\forall i$, and maximum pairwise intersection size

$$\Delta := \max_{i \neq j} |\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j|.$$

Note that, if the sets in a (Γ, Δ) set system are used as encoding/decoding sets for an identification codes, then the probability of error of the code is $\lambda = \frac{\Delta}{\Gamma}$. Suppose, $\Gamma > \frac{n+1}{2}$. Consider the collection of complement subsets $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} :=$

$\{\mathcal{U}_1^c, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M^c\}$ with set-sizes $\Gamma' = n + 1 - \Gamma$ and maximum size of pairwise intersections Δ' . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{U}_i^c \cap \mathcal{U}_j^c| &= |(\mathcal{U}_i \cup \mathcal{U}_j)^c| \\ &= n + 1 - |\mathcal{U}_i \cup \mathcal{U}_j| \\ &= n + 1 - (2\Gamma - |\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j|) \\ &= n + 1 - 2\Gamma + |\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j| \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\Delta' = n + 1 - 2\Gamma + \Delta$$

This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta'}{\Gamma'} &= \frac{n + 1 - 2\Gamma + \Delta}{n + 1 - \Gamma} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\Gamma - \Delta}{n + 1 - \Gamma} \\ &< 1 - \frac{\Gamma - \Delta}{\Gamma} \quad \text{since } \Gamma > \frac{n + 1}{2} \\ &= \frac{\Delta}{\Gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for a given set system \mathcal{U} with $\Gamma > \frac{n+1}{2}$, the complementary set system \mathcal{U}' has sets of size $\Gamma' \leq \frac{n+1}{2}$ and normalized intersection size $\frac{\Delta'}{\Gamma'} < \frac{\Delta}{\Gamma}$.

Proposition 2. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let $n \geq 1$ and $M > 1 + \frac{n+1}{\alpha}$ be integers. Let $\mathcal{U} := \{\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M\}$ be a (Γ, Δ) set system. Then

$$\frac{\Delta}{\Gamma} \geq (1 - \alpha)h_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\log M}{n + 1}\right), \quad (25)$$

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

Proof: For $\Gamma > (n + 1)/2$, we have seen above (before the proposition) that the normalized maximum pairwise-intersection ($\frac{\Delta'}{\Gamma'}$) of the collection of complement subsets is upper bounded by that of the given collection. Hence, without loss of generality, we assume that $1 \leq \Gamma \leq (n + 1)/2$.

We now use two lemmas. In the following, $\mathbb{1}$ is the $(n + 1)$ -length vector of all ones. For a subset $A \subseteq [n]$, the characteristic vector $\mathbb{1}_A$ is an $(n + 1)$ -length vector with the i -th component 1 if and only if $i \in A$.

Lemma 6. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Associated with any subset $\mathcal{U} \subseteq [n]$ with $|\mathcal{U}| = \epsilon(n + 1)$, we define an $(n + 1)$ -length vector

$$\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}} := \left(\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}} - \epsilon \mathbb{1}}{\sqrt{(n + 1)\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)}} \right) \quad (26)$$

For any two subsets $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2 \subseteq [n]$ with $|\mathcal{U}_1| = |\mathcal{U}_2| = \epsilon(n + 1)$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_1}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \rangle = \frac{1}{(n + 1)\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)} (|\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2| - (n + 1)\epsilon^2).$$

Proof of Lemma 6:

Note that

$$|\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2| = \langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_1}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \rangle. \quad (27)$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_1}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \rangle &= \frac{1}{(n + 1)\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)} (\langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_1} - \epsilon \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_2} - \epsilon \mathbb{1} \rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{(n + 1)\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)} (\langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_1}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \rangle \\ &\quad - \epsilon |\mathcal{U}_1| - \epsilon |\mathcal{U}_2| + (n + 1)\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{(n + 1)\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)} (|\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2| - (n + 1)\epsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma can be shown (see Appendix) using Johnson's bound for binary constant weight codes, though we give a different proof using Lemma 6.

Lemma 7. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and n be fixed. Consider a collection of subsets of $[n]$, $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M\}$ with set sizes $(n + 1)\epsilon$ and maximum pairwise intersection $(n + 1)\delta$. If $M > 1 + \frac{n+1}{\alpha}$ then $\delta > (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$.

Proof of Lemma 7: We denote, for $i = 1, \dots, M$, $\mathbf{u}_i := \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_i}$. We will prove by contradiction, that if $\delta \leq (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$, then $M \leq 1 + \frac{n+1}{\alpha}$. Lemma 6 implies that, for all $i \neq j$,

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \leq -\frac{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)}{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)}.$$

Since $\delta \leq (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$ and $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{n+1}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{u}_i \right\|_2^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^M \langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_i \|\mathbf{u}_i\|^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} \langle \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j \rangle \\ &\leq M - M(M - 1) \frac{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)}{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} M &\leq 1 + \frac{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)}{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{(\epsilon^2 - (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2)} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon\alpha} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 1 + \frac{n + 1}{\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Here (a) follows because $\delta \leq (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$, (b) follows because $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{n+1}$. This is a contradiction, hence the lemma is proved. \blacksquare

We now continue the proof of the proposition. As there are $\binom{n+1}{(n+1)\epsilon}$ number of distinct subsets of $[n]$ of size $(n + 1)\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M &\leq \binom{n + 1}{(n + 1)\epsilon} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n + 1)\pi\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)}} 2^{(n+1)h_2(\epsilon)} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Here (a) follows from [8, (17.41)]. As $1/(n+1) \leq \epsilon \leq 1/2$, we can upper bound the term

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{(n+1)\pi\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \leq 1. \quad (30)$$

Therefore

$$M \leq 2^{(n+1)h_2(\epsilon)}, \quad (31)$$

i.e.

$$\epsilon \geq h_2^{-1} \left(\frac{\log M}{n+1} \right). \quad (32)$$

It is given in the proposition that $M > 1 + \frac{n+1}{\alpha}$. Therefore, by lemma 7 and (32) we have

$$\frac{\Delta}{\Gamma} = \frac{\delta}{\epsilon} > (1-\alpha)\epsilon \geq (1-\alpha)h_2^{-1} \left(\frac{\log M}{n+1} \right). \quad (33)$$

This proves the proposition. \blacksquare

V. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Consider a given a sequence of $(n_i, 2^{n_i R})$ ID codes for Π with $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ and probability of errors $\lambda_{n_i} < n_i^{-\mu}$ for all i . through a series of modification steps, we will prove the existence of a sequence of ID codes for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with uniform encoding distributions, decoding regions same as the support of the corresponding encoding distributions, and vanishing error probability. We will then show using Proposition 2 that for such a sequence of codes to exist, the rate R must be 0.

Step 0: We start with any $(n, 2^{nR}, \lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n})$ ID code in the sequence for $n = n_i$ and $\lambda_{1,n}, \lambda_{2,n} \leq n^{-\mu}$.

Step 1: From the given code in Step 0, using Lemma 1, we construct an $(n, 2^{nR}, n^{-\mu}, n^{-\mu})$ ID code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with stochastic decoders.

Step 2: From the given code in Step 1, we use Lemma 2 to construct an $(n, 2^{nR}, 2^{n\mu/2}, n^{-\mu/2})$ ID code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with deterministic decoders.

Step 3: From the given code in Step 2, we use Lemma 3 (see (22) and (23)) with $\gamma = \mu/4$, to construct an $(n, 2^{nR}, \frac{48}{\mu}n^{-\mu/4}, \frac{24}{\mu}n^{-\mu/4})$ ID code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with deterministic decoders and uniform encoding distributions.

Step 4: From the given code in Step 3, we use Lemma 4 to construct an $(n, 2^{nR}, 0, \frac{48}{\mu}n^{-\mu/4})$ ID Code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with deterministic decoders, and decoding regions same as the support of corresponding uniform encoder distributions. We assume n to be large enough s.t. $\frac{48}{\mu}n^{-\mu/4} < 1/2$.

Step 5: From the given code in Step 4, we use Lemma 5 to construct an $(n, 2^{nR}, 0, \frac{48}{\mu}n^{-\mu/4})$ ID code for $\text{NL}_{[n]}$ with deterministic decoders and equal size supports. Here R_n satisfies $R_n \geq R - \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}$.

Final argument: The sequence of codes obtained in Step 5 from the original sequence of codes for Π gives a sequence of set systems with $M_{n_i} = 2^{n_i R_{n_i}}$, and $\frac{\Delta_{n_i}}{\Gamma_{n_i}} \leq \frac{48}{\mu}n_i^{-\mu/4}$. Hence

$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta_{n_i}}{\Gamma_{n_i}} = 0$. On the other hand, by Proposition 2, for $\alpha = 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta_{n_i}}{\Gamma_{n_i}} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} h_2^{-1} \left(\frac{R_{n_i}}{1 + 1/n_i} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} h_2^{-1} \left(\frac{R - \frac{\log(n_i+1)}{n_i}}{1 + 1/n_i} \right) \\ &= \frac{h_2^{-1}(R)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives a contradiction if $R > 0$. Hence, any $R > 0$ is not achievable. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

VI. NON-BINARY ALPHABET

Our soft converse and achievability results generalize to general alphabets. Consider an alphabet of size q .

Theorem 3 (Soft converse). *For any given $\mu, R > 0$, there does not exist a sequence of $(n_i, 2^{Rn_i^{q-1}})$ ID codes for the q -ary uniform permutation channel Π with $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ and probability of errors $\lambda_i < n_i^{-\mu}$ for all i .*

The following theorem gives the achievability result.

Theorem 4 (Achievability). *For any $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, there exists a sequence of $(n, 2^{\epsilon_n n^{q-1}}, 0, \lambda_n)$ ID codes for Π with $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$.*

The proof of Theorem 4 follows easily from Proposition 1 with

$$\epsilon = (q-1)! \left(\epsilon_n + \frac{\log N}{n^{q-1}} \right), \quad (34)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{4}{-\log \left((q-1)! \left(\epsilon_n + \frac{\log N}{n^{q-1}} \right) \right)}, \quad (35)$$

where N is the number of types of n -length q -ary vectors.

The proof of Theorem 3 follows using the same steps as that of Theorem 1. The number of types of q -ary vectors of length n is given by $N = \binom{n+q-1}{q-1}$. N can be bounded as

$$\frac{n^{(q-1)}}{(q-1)!} \leq N \leq \frac{n^{(q-1)}}{(q-1)!} \left(1 + \frac{q-1}{n} \right)^{q-1}.$$

We start with a $(n, 2^{Rn^{q-1}}, n^{-\mu}, n^{-\mu})$ ID code for the permutation channel. In step 1, we will now get a $(N, 2^{Rn^{q-1}}, n^{-\mu}, n^{-\mu})$ ID code with stochastic decoders for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$. Step 2 gives a $(N, 2^{Rn^{q-1}}, 2^{n\mu/2}, n^{-\mu/2})$ ID code with deterministic decoders for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$. In Step 3, we now take $\gamma = \frac{\mu}{4(q-1)}$ to get a $(N, 2^{Rn^{q-1}}, Kn^{-\mu/4}, Kn^{-\mu/4})$ ID code with uniform encoding distributions. Here K is some constant which depends on q and μ . The rest of the arguments also follow along similar lines as in the proof of Theorem 1.

VII. CONCLUSION

We showed that non-zero first-order identification rates are not achievable via the binary uniform permutation channel under power-law decay of the probability of error, whereas any sub-exponential message size can be reliably identified. For a uniform permutation channel over a general alphabet of size

q , the same proof technique shows that identification message size $2^{Rn^{q-1}}$ cannot be achieved under power-law decay of the probability of error.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work was supported in part by the Bharti Centre for Communication at IIT Bombay.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rudolf Ahlswede and Ning Cai. Identification without randomization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(7):2636–2642, 1999.
- [2] Rudolf Ahlswede and Gunter Dueck. Identification via channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 35(1):15–29, 1989.
- [3] Rudolf Ahlswede and Bart Verboven. On identification via multiway channels with feedback. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 37(6):1519–1526, 1991.
- [4] Rudolf Ahlswede and Zhen Zhang. New directions in the theory of identification via channels. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 41(4):1040–1050, 1995.
- [5] Ozgur B Akan, Hamideh Ramezani, Tooba Khan, Naveed A Abbasi, and Murat Kuscü. Fundamentals of molecular information and communication science. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 105(2):306–318, 2016.
- [6] Annina Bracher and Amos Lapidoth. Identification via the broadcast channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(6):3480–3501, 2017.
- [7] Yeow Meng Chee, Han Mao Kiah, San Ling, Tuan Thanh Nguyen, Xiande Zhang, et al. String concatenation construction for chebyshev permutation channel codes. In *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2824–2828. IEEE, 2016.
- [8] Thomas M Cover. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [9] Maximilien Gadouleau and Alban Goupil. Binary codes for packet error and packet loss correction in store and forward. In *2010 International ITG Conference on Source and Channel Coding (SCC)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2010.
- [10] Te Sun Han and Sergio Verdu. New results in the theory of identification via channels. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 38(1):14–25, 1992.
- [11] Te Sun Han and Sergio Verdú. Approximation theory of output statistics. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 39(3):752–772, 1993.
- [12] W Cary Huffman and Vera Pless. *Fundamentals of error-correcting codes*. Cambridge university press, 2010.
- [13] Mladen Kovačević and Vincent YF Tan. Codes in the space of multisets—coding for permutation channels with impairments. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(7):5156–5169, 2018.
- [14] Mladen Kovačević and Dejan Vukobratović. Perfect codes in the discrete simplex. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 75:81–95, 2015.
- [15] Wafa Labidi, Holger Boche, Christian Deppe, and Moritz Wiese. Identification over the gaussian channel in the presence of feedback. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 278–283. IEEE, 2021.
- [16] Michael Langberg, Moshe Schwartz, and Eitan Yaakobi. Coding for the l_∞ -limited permutation channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(12):7676–7686, 2017.
- [17] Anuran Makur. Coding theorems for noisy permutation channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(11):6723–6748, 2020.
- [18] Massimiliano Pierobon, Ian F Akyildiz, et al. Fundamentals of diffusion-based molecular communication in nanonetworks. *Foundations and Trends® in Networking*, 8(1-2):1–147, 2014.
- [19] Johannes Rosenberger, Abdalla Ibrahim, Boulat A Bash, Christian Deppe, Roberto Ferrara, and Uzi Pereg. Capacity bounds for identification with effective secrecy. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1202–1207. IEEE, 2023.
- [20] Johannes Rosenberger, Uzi Pereg, and Christian Deppe. Identification over compound multiple-input multiple-output broadcast channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2023.
- [21] Mohammad J Salarisiddigh, Uzi Pereg, Holger Boche, and Christian Deppe. Deterministic identification over channels with power constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(1):1–24, 2021.
- [22] Mohammad J Salarisiddigh, Uzi Pereg, Holger Boche, and Christian Deppe. Deterministic identification over fading channels. In *2020 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2021.
- [23] Ilan Shomorony, Reinhard Heckel, et al. Information-theoretic foundations of dna data storage. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 19(1):1–106, 2022.
- [24] Jin Sima, Netanel Raviv, and Jehoshua Bruck. Robust indexing for the sliced channel: Almost optimal codes for substitutions and deletions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07793*, 2023.
- [25] Jin Sima, Netanel Raviv, Moshe Schwartz, and Jehoshua Bruck. Error correction for dna storage. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.01729, 2023.
- [26] Mattia Spandri, Roberto Ferrara, Christian Deppe, Moritz Wiese, and Holger Boche. Information-theoretically secret reed-muller identification with affine designs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16217*, 2023.
- [27] Yossef Steinberg. New converses in the theory of identification via channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(3):984–998, 1998.
- [28] Jennifer Tang and Yuri Polyanskiy. Capacity of noisy permutation channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2023.
- [29] John MacLaren Walsh, Steven Weber, and Ciira wa Maina. Optimal rate–delay tradeoffs and delay mitigating codes for multipath routed and network coded networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(12):5491–5510, 2009.
- [30] Moritz Wiese, Wafa Labidi, Christian Deppe, and Holger Boche. Identification over additive noise channels in the presence of feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2022.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 7

We present an alternate proof of Lemma 7 using the Johnson’s bound.

Lemma 7 (restated). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and n be fixed. Consider a collection of subsets of $[n]$, $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M\}$ with set sizes $(n+1)\epsilon$ and maximum pairwise intersection $(n+1)\delta$. If $M > \frac{(n+1)}{\alpha}$ then $\delta > (1-\alpha)\epsilon^2$.*

Proof: We will prove by contradiction, that if $\delta \leq (1-\alpha)\epsilon^2$, then $M \leq \frac{n+1}{\alpha}$. Let $A_2(n, d, w)$ be the maximum number of codewords of a binary code of length n , minimum Hamming distance d , and constant codeword weight w . Johnson bound [12] gives that if $2w^2 - 2nw + nd > 0$, then

$$A_2(n, d, w) \leq \frac{nd}{2w^2 - 2nw + nd}. \quad (36)$$

For a subset $A \subseteq [n]$, the characteristic vector $\mathbb{1}_A$ is a binary $(n+1)$ -length vector with the i -th component 1 if and only if $i \in A$. So the characteristic vectors of the collection of subsets \mathcal{U} form an $(n+1)$ length constant weight binary code with

$$\begin{aligned} d &= 2(n+1)(\epsilon - \delta), \\ w &= (n+1)\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta \leq (1-\alpha)\epsilon^2$, this implies $\epsilon^2 > \delta$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &2w^2 - 2(n+1)w + (n+1)d \\ &= 2(n+1)^2\epsilon^2 - 2(n+1)^2\epsilon + 2(n+1)^2(\epsilon - \delta) \\ &= 2(n+1)^2(\epsilon^2 - \delta) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Johnson's bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
M &\leq \frac{(n+1)d}{2w^2 - 2(n+1)w + (n+1)d} \\
&\leq \frac{2(n+1)^2(\epsilon - \delta)}{2(n+1)^2(\epsilon^2 - \delta)} \\
&= \frac{\epsilon - \delta}{\epsilon^2 - \delta} \\
&\leq \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 - \delta} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 - (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha\epsilon} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{n+1}{\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here (a) follows because $\delta \leq (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$, (b) follows because $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{n+1}$. This is a contradiction, hence the lemma is proved. \blacksquare