

On Universal Decoding over Discrete Additive Channels by Noise Guessing

Henrique K. Miyamoto and Sheng Yang
Laboratoire des Signaux et Systèmes (L2S)
Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, CentraleSupélec
Gif-sur-Yvette, France

Email: {henrique.miyamoto, sheng.yang}@centralesupelec.fr

Abstract—We study universal decoding over parametric discrete additive channels. Our decoders are variants of noise guessing decoders that use estimators for the probability of a noise sequence, when the actual channel law is unknown. A deterministic version produces noise sequences in a fixed order, and a randomised one draws them at random; noise sequences are then queried whether they result in a valid codeword when subtracted from the received sequence. In all cases, we give sufficient conditions on the family of parametric channels for the decoding strategies to be random-coding strongly universal, and we derive non-asymptotic upper bounds for the complexity of such strategies. We give examples of families in which our results hold, and a numerical example illustrates this performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Universal decoders are those that, despite not knowing the specific probability law of the channel in use (but only the family to which it belongs), have a random-coding error exponent that is asymptotically the same as that of the optimal maximum likelihood (ML) decoder tuned for the channel in question [1]. This is of practical interest, since, in reality, one does not know the statistics of the channel over which communication takes place, and the usual estimate-and-decode strategy comes with an inherent trade-off between error rate and communication rate [2]. This problem has been studied in a variety of scenarios, see [2]–[14] and references therein. One of the key difficulties in practically implementing universal decoders, however, lies in their complexity, as they generally require evaluating a decoding ‘metric’ for every codeword, which, although being the same complexity of brute-force ML decoding, becomes prohibitive for large codebooks—an exception are the modified stack algorithms used with convolutional codes over unknown channels [5], [15].

An alternative implementation of ML decoding in discrete additive channels, based on noise guessing, was proposed in [16], under the acronym GRAND¹. The idea is to sequentially query noise sequences until finding one that, subtracted from the received sequence, corresponds to a valid codeword. An advantage of this approach is to have an average complexity that can be much lower than that of ML decoding. The optimal order to query noise sequences is that of decreasing

probability according to the channel law, which the original works on GRAND assume to be known or estimated [16], [17]. On the other hand, a version that does not require knowledge of the channel and can achieve the Gallager’s error exponent in memoryless channels has been recently studied in [18]. Here we follow that direction and take some steps further.

Specifically, we consider universal decoders based on two estimators for the probability of a sequence, when the actual channel distribution is unknown. We analyse decoding by *deterministic noise guessing*, in which noise sequences are queried in a fixed order, and by *randomised noise guessing*, in which noise sequences are randomly drawn according to some probability distribution, in the same spirit as randomised guessing [19], and somewhat analogously to a stochastic decoder [20], [21]. In all cases, we give sufficient conditions on the general family of parametric channels for the decoders to be random-coding strongly universal (cf. Section II-A), and derive upper bounds on the average complexity (number of guesses needed to find a codeword), which turn out to match the asymptotic complexity of GRAND with known channel law [16]. In particular, our results establish that decoding by randomised noise guessing has both error probability and complexity exponents that are asymptotically the same as those of the deterministic counterpart, with potential advantages in practical implementation. We emphasise that our results are non-asymptotic, in that the bounds hold for any blocklength $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and mention that they are obtained primarily with the method of types [22].

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Universal Decoding

Consider a discrete additive channel over alphabet $\mathcal{A} := \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|\}$. Upon n uses, the transmitter sends $\mathbf{X} := X_1^n := X_1 \cdots X_n \in \mathcal{A}^n$ and the receiver observes $\mathbf{Y} := Y_1^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$, given by $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Z}$, where addition is modulo- $|\mathcal{A}|$, and $\mathbf{Z} := Z_1^n \in \mathcal{A}^n$ is a noise sequence independent of \mathbf{X} . Let $\mathcal{F} := \{P_\theta : \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d\}$ be a parametric family of random processes over \mathcal{A} . The distribution $P_{\mathbf{Z}} := P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}$ of \mathbf{Z} is the restriction of $P_\theta \in \mathcal{F}$ to n -length sequences, and we denote $\mathcal{F}_n := \{P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta} : \theta \in \Theta\}$. The channel law is then $P_{\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$.

¹In some contexts, GRAND is referred to as ‘universal’ for not being code-dependent. Here, we follow the established nomenclature in the information theory literature and reserve the expression ‘universal decoder’ for a decoder that is essentially optimal without knowing of the channel law.

To send message $m \in \mathcal{M} := \{1, \dots, M\}$, the transmitter uses a codebook $\mathcal{C} := \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^n$ of rate² $R := (\log M)/n$. The decoder implements a decoding rule (deterministic or randomised) $\varphi: \mathcal{A}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ to recover the transmitted message. We assume equiprobable messages, for which the optimal decoding rule is the ML rule $\varphi_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}} P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_m)$, with ties resolved at random among codewords realising the maximum.

In our random coding arguments, codewords are chosen independently and uniformly over \mathcal{A}^n . We denote $P_{\theta, \varphi(\text{error})}$ the average probability of error (over messages and random codes) of decoder φ when used in channel θ . With some abuse, we call *redundancy* of a decoder $\varphi_n: \mathcal{A}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ the difference in the random-coding error exponent in comparison to the optimal ML decoder for channel θ , that is, $R_n(\varphi_n, \theta) := \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\frac{P_{\theta, \varphi_n(\text{error})}}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \right)$. Following [2, Def. 3], we say that a sequence of decoders $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is *random-coding strongly universal* for the family $\mathcal{F} = \{P_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} R_n(\varphi_n, \theta) = 0$.

B. Method of Types

We use the general definition for the type of a sequence [22]. Given the parametric family of distributions (for length n) $\mathcal{F}_n = \{P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta} : \theta \in \Theta\}$, consider the equivalence relation $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathbf{z}' \iff \forall \theta \in \Theta, P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z}) = P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z}')$ between sequences $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n$. If $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathbf{z}'$, then \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{z}' are said to have the same *type* (with respect to \mathcal{F}_n). Each type induces a distribution, namely, the one parametrised by the maximum likelihood estimator³ (MLE) $\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}}(\mathbf{z}) = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z})$, and we denote $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} := P_{\hat{\theta}_{\text{MLE}}(\mathbf{z})}$. Denote $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A}) := \{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n\}$ the set of all such distributions, and $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) := \{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : \mathbf{z} \sim \mathbf{z}'\}$ the equivalence class (*type class*) of $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$. We further denote $\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) := -\frac{1}{n} \log \hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})$ the ‘empirical entropy’ of a type distribution, and $\tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}) := \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})}{P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z})}$ the ‘empirical divergence’ from $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}$ to $P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta} \in \mathcal{F}_n$, where \mathbf{z} is any sequence in the type class $\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})$. Consider the following hypotheses regarding the partitioning of type classes.

- (H1) There exists a sequence $(\zeta(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $\zeta(n) \rightarrow 0$, such that $|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})| \leq 2^{n\zeta(n)}$.
- (H2) There exists a sequence $(\delta(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $\delta(n) \rightarrow 0$, such that $|\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})| \geq 2^{n(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) - \delta(n))}$, $\forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$.

While (H1) and (H2) have to be verified for a given family, it is always true that $|\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})| \leq 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})}$, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$, for

$$1 \geq P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})) = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})} P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{z}) = |\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})| 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})}.$$

C. Maximising and Weighting

When the actual distribution $P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}$ is unknown, but we want to estimate the probability of a given sequence $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$, we

²All logarithms are to base 2.

³Although we index the MLE by \mathbf{z} , note that sequences of the same type induce the same estimator.

will assess two strategies, in an analogous fashion to universal compression [23]. Note that none of the estimators depend on the parameter θ of the actual distribution $P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}$. The first strategy is *maximising*:

$$P_m(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z})}{\sum_{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z}')} = \frac{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})}{\sum_{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n} \hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}'}(\mathbf{z}')}, \quad (1)$$

which corresponds to Shtarkov’s normalised maximum likelihood (NML) distribution. The second is *weighting*:

$$P_w(\mathbf{z}) := \mathbb{E}_\theta [P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z})] = \int_{\Theta} P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z}) d\pi(\theta), \quad (2)$$

that is, a Bayesian mixture with respect to some prior distribution $\pi(\theta)$ on Θ . We state a hypothesis regarding P_w .

- (H3) There exists a sequence $(\epsilon(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $\epsilon(n) \rightarrow 0$, such that $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z}) \leq 2^{n\epsilon(n)} P_w(\mathbf{z})$, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$.

D. Entropy Rates

For $P_\theta \in \mathcal{F}$, denote $\bar{H}(P_\theta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta})$ the entropy rate, $\bar{D}(P_\theta \| P_{\theta'}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \bar{D}(P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta'})$ the ‘divergence rate’ [24], and $\bar{H}_\alpha(P_\theta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \left(\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n} P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z})^\alpha \right)$ the Rényi entropy rate of order $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \neq 1$. We assume the following.

- (H4) For every $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$, the empirical entropy (resp. divergence) is an entropy rate (resp. divergence rate); specifically, $\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) = \bar{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})$ and $\tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}) = \bar{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_\theta)$. Moreover, the Rényi entropy rate exists and can be written as $\bar{H}_\alpha(P_\theta) = \max_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\bar{H}(Q) - \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \bar{D}(Q \| P_\theta) \right)$.

This is indeed the case for many families [24]–[27].

III. DECODING BY DETERMINISTIC NOISE GUESSING

Instead of decoding by direct evaluation of each possible codeword, another possible strategy is decoding by deterministic noise guessing, also known as guessing random additive noise decoding (GRAND) in [16] (see also [18]). The idea is to rank noise sequences $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$, and query whether $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C}$, in the ranking order, until a codeword is found (or another stopping condition is met). We denote $G_u: \mathcal{A}^n \rightarrow \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|^n\}$ a *ranking function*, that is, a bijection that ranks sequences according to function $u: \mathcal{A}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e. such that $G_u(\mathbf{z}) < G_u(\mathbf{z}') \implies u(\mathbf{z}) \geq u(\mathbf{z}')$. Denote $P_{\theta, G_u}(\text{error})$ the average probability of error of decoding by deterministic noise guessing with G_u . Note that, adopting G_{u^*} with $u^*(\mathbf{z}) = P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{z})$, this scheme becomes equivalent to ML decoding [16].

In the following, we consider *maximising deterministic guessing decoding* with the guessing functions G_m , based on the function $u_m(\mathbf{z}) = P_m(\mathbf{z})$, and *weighting deterministic guessing decoding*, with the guessing function G_w , based on the function $u_w(\mathbf{z}) = P_w(\mathbf{z})$.

A. Universality

Theorem 1: If (H1) and (H2) hold, then the maximising deterministic guessing decoder is random-coding strongly universal, with

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{P_{\theta, G_m}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq \frac{1}{n} + \zeta(n) + \delta(n). \quad (3)$$

If (H2) and (H3) hold, then the weighting deterministic guessing decoder is random-coding strongly universal, with

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{P_{\theta, G_w}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq \frac{1}{n} + \epsilon(n) + \delta(n). \quad (4)$$

Proof sketch: $\frac{P_{\theta, G_m}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq \max_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|} + 1$ is obtained from [2, Eq. (25)], where $\mathcal{E}_{\varphi_u}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}') \geq u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})\}$. We use it with $|\mathcal{E}_{G_m}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| < G_m(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \leq 2^{n(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}}) + \zeta(n))}$, obtained by extending the arguments of [18, Lem. 1], and $|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \geq 2^{n(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}} - \delta(n)))}$, derived in a similar fashion to [5, Lem. 1]. A similar technique applies to G_w . ■

The first part of Theorem 1, when specialised to memoryless additive channels (cf. Section V), strengthens the result of [18, Eq. (42)], which shows that a universal version of GRAND (equivalent to maximising guessing decoder with G_m) can asymptotically achieve Gallager's random coding exponent for memoryless channels. Our result refines that by giving an upper bound on the decoder redundancy, and extends it to the weighting decoder and to any family of additive channels in which (H1)–(H3) are satisfied.

Remark 1: This approach is equivalent (up to ties) to decoding with $\varphi_u(\mathbf{y}) = \arg \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_m)$ so that the results of Theorems 1 also apply to the corresponding decoders φ_{u_m} and φ_{u_w} . These results, when particularised to memoryless additive channels, are analogous to [5, Lem. 1] and [14, Thm. 1], respectively, which state that decoders based on the *conditional* maximising and weighting distributions are universal for (not necessarily additive) memoryless channels.

B. Complexity

A direct implementation of the decoder φ_u (cf. previous remark) which evaluates $u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_m)$ for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$ would require $O(Mn)$ computations and $O(Mn)$ storage⁴. As $M = 2^{nR}$, for a fixed rate R , the exponential scaling with n becomes prohibitive.

Decoding by deterministic noise guessing involves two main steps [16]. The analysis of step 1 follows that of [19, Sec. IV].

1) *Generate the guesses:* If $u(\mathbf{z})$ only depends on the type of \mathbf{z} , this can be done by going through the types in decreasing order of u -value; for each type, sequentially generate, i.e. enumerate, the sequences in that type class, for which one would like to have an efficient enumeration algorithm. Computing the u -values for all types requires $O(|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})|)$ computations and $O(|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})|)$ storage, and additional $O(|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})| \log |\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})|)$ computations and $O(1)$ storage to sort them.

⁴But if the code is structured, e.g. linear, the storage requirement can be alleviated.

2) *Query the sequences:* Upon observing \mathbf{y} , the decoder should generate noise sequences \mathbf{z} (cf. step 1), and query whether $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}$ is a codeword until a positive answer is found. Checking whether $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}$ is a codeword could require a search among the codewords of an unstructured code (complexity $O(M)$), but if the code is linear, for instance, this can be done with a matrix multiplication (complexity $O(n^2)$) [16].

The number of queries needed in step 2 is a random variable and controls the complexity of the decoding scheme. We estimate its mean value in the following. Since the messages are equiprobable, it is without loss of generality to consider that message $m = 1$ was sent. The algorithm stops when either the correct codeword \mathbf{x}_1 , or an incorrect one $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M$ is found. The average number of queries (over random codes and noise realisations) when using strategy G_u in channel θ is then

$$Q_{\theta, G_u}(n) := \mathbb{E} \left[\min \left\{ G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_1), \min_{m' \neq 1} G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'}) \right\} \right] \\ \leq \min \left\{ \mathbb{E} [G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_1)], \mathbb{E} \left[\min_{m' \neq 1} G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'}) \right] \right\}.$$

Since $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{z}$, the first term inside the minimum is $\mathbb{E} [G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_1)] = \mathbb{E} [G_u(\mathbf{z})]$. For a given \mathbf{y} , due to random coding, each $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'}$ is uniformly distributed in \mathcal{A}^n . Thus $K_{m'} := G(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})$ is uniformly distributed in $\{1, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|^n\}$ and independent of \mathbf{y} . Denoting $K := \min_{m' \neq 1} K_{m'}$, the second term becomes $\mathbb{E} [\min_{m' \neq 1} G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})] = \mathbb{E} [K]$. Combining these results yields

$$Q_{\theta, G_u}(n) \leq \min \left\{ \mathbb{E} [G_u(\mathbf{z})], \mathbb{E} [K] \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Theorem 2: If (H1), (H2) and (H4) hold, then, for the maximising deterministic guessing decoder, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \log Q_{\theta, G_m}(n) \\ \leq \min \left\{ \bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + 2\zeta(n), \log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \frac{1}{n} \right\}. \quad (6)$$

If (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4) hold, then, for the deterministic guessing decoder, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \log Q_{\theta, G_w}(n) \\ \leq \min \left\{ \bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + \zeta(n) + \epsilon(n), \log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \frac{1}{n} \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Proof sketch: Again extending the arguments of [18, Lem. 1], one can show that $\mathbb{E} [G_m(\mathbf{z})] \leq 2^{n(\bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + 2\zeta(n))}$, and an analogue technique applies to G_w . One can also show that $\mathbb{E} [K] \leq 2 \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^n}{M}$. Then, apply these results to (5). ■

Theorem 2 partially recovers the result of [16, Prop. 2], which gives the exact asymptotics of the complexity exponent of GRAND as $\min\{\bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta), \log |\mathcal{A}| - R\}$, when guessing with the exact channel statistics. Our results, in turn, provide a non-asymptotic upper bound on that exponent, for guessing based on the maximising and weighting estimators under unknown channel law, which asymptotically matched the former.

IV. DECODING BY RANDOMISED NOISE GUESSING

An alternative to the deterministic guessing, in which the order of the guesses is fixed, is randomised guessing [19]. Decoding by randomised noise guessing can be seen as the guessing decoding analogue of the stochastic decoder [20], [21]. Specifically, the idea is that, given \mathbf{y} , one sequentially draws samples $\mathbf{z} \sim \tilde{P}_Z$ and query whether $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C}$ until a codeword is found. Denote $P_{\theta, \tilde{P}_Z}(\text{error})$ the average probability of error of this scheme.

Codeword \mathbf{x}_m will be selected whenever it is the first valid one encountered by randomly drawing noise sequences \mathbf{z} and subtracting those from \mathbf{y} . Say this happens at the k -th trial; this means that all previous $k - 1$ noise sequences that were tested do not correspond to any codeword at all. We can thus write the probability of selecting \mathbf{x}_m as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_m | \mathbf{y}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \sum_{m'=1}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'}) \right)^{k-1} \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_m) \\ &= \frac{\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_m)}{\sum_{m'=1}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Since the messages are equiprobable, we can again assume that $m = 1$, without loss of generality. If \mathbf{x}_1 was transmitted and \mathbf{y} received, correct decoding occurs if and only if $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_1$ is chosen. The probability of error is the probability of the complementary event. Taking the averages (over random codes and noise realisations), we get

$$P_{\theta, \tilde{P}_Z}(\text{error}) = \mathbb{E} \left[1 - \frac{\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_1)}{\sum_{m'=1}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})} \right]. \quad (9)$$

We shall study *maximising randomised guessing decoding* based on the maximising distribution $\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{z}) = P_m(\mathbf{z})$, and *weighting randomised guessing decoding* based on the weighting distribution $\tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{z}) = P_w(\mathbf{z})$.

A. Universality

Theorem 3: If (H1) and (H2) hold, then the maximising randomised guessing decoder is random-coding strongly universal, with

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{P_{\theta, \tilde{P}_m}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq \frac{2}{n} + \zeta(n) + \delta(n). \quad (10)$$

If (H2) and (H3) hold, then the weighting randomised guessing decoder is random-coding strongly universal, with

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{P_{\theta, \tilde{P}_w}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq \frac{2}{n} + \epsilon(n) + \delta(n). \quad (11)$$

Proof sketch: Using [20, Thm. 1] and [28, Thm. 1], one can show that $\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}[\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})]}{\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \cdot 2^{n\Delta}$ is a sufficient condition for $\frac{P_{\theta, \tilde{P}_Z}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq 4 \cdot 2^{n\Delta}$. Proving that $\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}[\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})]}{\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}})} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \cdot 2^{n(\zeta(n) + \delta(n))}$ only uses the method of types; an analogous result can be derived for \tilde{P}_w . ■

Note that (9) coincides with the probability of error of a stochastic decoder [20], [21] that chooses codewords according to (8). In this sense, the first part of Theorem 3, specialised to memoryless additive channels, is somewhat analogous to the result of [21, p. 5043] stating that on (not necessarily additive) memoryless channels, a stochastic decoder based on a *conditional* maximising distribution is universal. Moreover, note that the results of Theorem 3 are nearly the same as those of Theorem 1, except by replacing $\frac{1}{n}$ by $\frac{2}{n}$; in particular, this implies that there is no loss in universality by using randomised guessing instead of deterministic guessing.

B. Complexity

As in Section III-B, here too there are two main steps.

1) *Sample the guesses:* Different strategies are possible; the first two of them are based on [19, Sec. IV]: (i) If $\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{z})$ only depends on the type of \mathbf{z} , sampling can be done in two steps: first draw a type, according to \tilde{P}_Z , and then uniformly draw a sequence from that type (draw an index from 1 to $|\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_Z)|$ and use an enumeration algorithm to get the corresponding sequence). Computing the \tilde{P}_Z -probabilities of all types requires $O(|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})|)$ computations and $O(|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})|)$ storage. (ii) The structure of the weighting distribution P_w might allow sequential sampling of the noise sequences \mathbf{z} , thereby reducing the complexity of this step to $O(n)$, and bypassing the need for enumeration. (iii) As P_w is a mixture distribution, a two-step procedure can be applied: first draw a parameter $\theta \sim \pi(\theta)$, and then draw a sequence \mathbf{z} according to P_θ . The complexity of this is typically $O(n)$, and this can be done even when P_w does not have a closed form.

2) *Query the sequences:* Same as step 2 from Section III-B.

We now turn to characterising the average number of guesses needed to find a codeword. For codewords $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M$, this number follows a geometric distribution with success probability $\sum_{m'=1}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})$; the average number of queries (with respect to the randomised sampling) is thus $\left(\sum_{m'=1}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'}) \right)^{-1}$. Again assuming that message $m = 1$ was sent, we can write the average number of queries (with respect to random codes and noise realisations) as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\theta, \tilde{P}_Z}(n) &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_1) + \sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})} \right] \\ &\leq \min \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{z})} \right], \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})} \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

since $\tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_1) \geq 0$ and $\sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_Z(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'}) \geq 0$.

Theorem 4: If (H1), (H2) and (H4) hold, then, for the maximising randomised guessing decoder, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log Q_{\theta, \tilde{P}_m}(n) &\leq \\ &\min \left\{ \bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + 2\zeta(n), \log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \zeta(n) + \gamma(n) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\gamma(n) := \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2^{nR}}{2^{nR-1}} \rightarrow 0$.

If (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4) hold, then, for the weighting randomised guessing decoder, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \log Q_{\theta, \tilde{P}_w}(n) \leq \min \left\{ \bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + \zeta(n) + \epsilon(n), \log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \epsilon(n) + \gamma(n) \right\}. \quad (14)$$

Proof sketch: $\mathbb{E} \left[(\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{z}))^{-1} \right] \leq 2^{n(\bar{H}_{1/2}(Z) + 2\zeta(n))}$ is first obtained by extending [19, Thm. 1]. Then, to show that $\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'}) \right)^{-1} \right] \leq 2^{n(\log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \zeta(n) + \gamma(n))}$, one can use similar arguments to those in [19, Thm. 1] and the harmonic mean–arithmetic mean inequality. Then, apply those results to (12). A similar argument applies to \tilde{P}_w . ■

Similarly to Theorem 2, Theorem 4 provides non-asymptotic upper bounds on the complexity exponent of randomised guessing strategies. Comparing them, we see that the upper bounds are essentially the same for decoding with either deterministic or randomised guessing, a result that mimics the fact that universal randomised guessing is possible [19].

While randomised noise guessing typically requires more queries than deterministic guessing, it may have practical advantages. First, drawing sequences sequentially (which has linear complexity) bypasses the need to sort the types of noise sequences (complexity $O(|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})|)$, typically polynomial). Moreover, the randomised strategy is highly parallelisable, as the module that produces the guesses can be replicated without need for coordination between them, as in [19].

V. EXAMPLES

We give examples of families of channels for which hypotheses (H1)–(H4) hold, and thus so do all previous results.

A. Memoryless Channels

The family of memoryless additive channels over \mathcal{A} is described by $P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_Z(z_i) = \prod_{z \in \mathcal{A}} (\xi_z)^{a_{\mathbf{z}}(z)}$, where $\theta = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{|\mathcal{A}|})$ is a p.m.f. and $a_{\mathbf{z}}(z) := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{z\}}(z_i)$, for $z \in \mathcal{A}$. The types are determined by the counts $(a_{\mathbf{z}}(z))_{z \in \mathcal{A}}$ and correspond to the familiar notion of memoryless types [4, Ch. 2]. Well-known results imply that (H1) and (H2) are satisfied with $\zeta(n) = \delta(n) = |\mathcal{A}| \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}$. Weighting memoryless distributions with Dirichlet priors yields the Krichevsky–Trofimov (KT) distribution $P_{\text{KT}}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2}) \prod_{z \in \mathcal{A}} \Gamma(a_{\mathbf{z}}(z) + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})^{|\mathcal{A}|} \Gamma(n + \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2})}$ [23, Prop. 2.15], for which (H3) is satisfied with $\epsilon(n) = \frac{|\mathcal{A}|-1}{2} \frac{\log n}{n} + \frac{2}{n}$ [23, Thm. 2.16]. The KT distribution admits the conditional expression $P_{\text{KT}}(z_{i+1}|z_1^i) = \frac{a_{z_1^i}(z) + \frac{1}{2}}{n + \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2}}$, which allows sequential sampling of $\mathbf{z} \sim P_{\text{KT}}$ with complexity $O(|\mathcal{A}|n)$ computations and $O(|\mathcal{A}| \log n)$ storage [19]. Finally, the fact that (H4) holds was shown in [24], [25], and an efficient enumeration algorithm exists [29].




Fig. 1: Block error rate (BLER) and average number of queries to find one codeword as function of parameter p on Markov channels.

B. Markov Channels

The family of Markov channels of order D over alphabet \mathcal{A} is described by $P_{\mathbf{Z}, \theta}(\mathbf{z}|s_0) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_Z(z_i|z_{i-D}^{i-1}) = \prod_{s \in \mathcal{A}^D} \prod_{z \in \mathcal{A}} \xi_s(z)^{a_{\mathbf{z}}(z, s)}$, where $s_0 \in \mathcal{A}^D$ is the initial state, $\theta = (\xi_s(z))_{z \in \mathcal{A}, s \in \mathcal{A}^D}$ is a stochastic matrix and $a_{\mathbf{z}}(z, s) := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{(z, s)\}}((z_i, z_{i-D}^{i-1}))$, for $z \in \mathcal{A}$, $s \in \mathcal{A}^D$. The relevant notion is that of Markov types [22], for which (H1) is satisfied with $\zeta(n) = |\mathcal{A}|^{D+1} \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}$ and (H2) with $\delta(n) = O(\frac{\log n}{n})$ [30]. Weighting with independent Dirichlet priors on each conditional distribution yields the Markov KT distribution

$$P_{\text{KT}}(\mathbf{z}|s_0) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2})^{|\mathcal{A}|^D} \prod_{s \in \mathcal{A}^D} \prod_{z \in \mathcal{A}} \Gamma(a_{\mathbf{z}}(z, s) + \frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})^{|\mathcal{A}|^{D+1}} \Gamma(n + \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2})},$$

which satisfies (H3) with $\epsilon(n) = \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^{D+1}}{2} \frac{\log n}{n} + \frac{2|\mathcal{A}|^D}{n}$ [23, Prop. 2.18]. Sequential sampling can be similarly done; (H4) holds thanks to [24], [26]; and enumeration of Markov types can be done as in [29].

Fig. 1 compares different decoders in a toy example: a modified Golay code ($n = 24$), cf. [14, Sec. IV], is used in a binary channel. The distribution of the additive noise sequence \mathbf{z} follows a Markov process of order 1 with stochastic matrix $\begin{pmatrix} p & 1-p \\ 1-2p & 2p \end{pmatrix}$, for $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Due to its simple implementation, we focus on decoding by randomised noise guessing, with $\tilde{P}_Z = P_\theta$ (matching channel distribution) and $\tilde{P}_Z = P_w$ (weighting distribution). For the latter, a ‘list decoding’ variation is allowed: noise sequences are queried until L candidate codewords are found; these are then compared, and the one with highest ‘metric’ is chosen. Note that, despite not knowing the channel, the universal decoder with P_w and $L = 5$ has an error rate that approaches that of ML, for low values of p ; and its average number of queries can be much less than the number of codewords $M = 2046$ (which corresponds to the number of evaluations in brute-force ML decoding).

VI. FINAL REMARKS

We have studied universal decoding on discrete additive channels with noise guessing strategies. By having reduced complexity, these strategies could lead to practical universal decoding. Sufficient conditions for our bounds on redundancy and average complexity to hold were given. Future directions include extending the present results to more sophisticated families of channels.

APPENDIX A
PROOFS FOR SECTION III

A. Universality

Consider decoders of the form $\varphi_u(\mathbf{y}) = \arg \max_{m \in \mathcal{M}} u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$. The error rate of such a decoder can be quantified in terms of the size of the equivocation set $\mathcal{E}_u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}') \geq u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})\}$. The next result from [2, Eq. (25)] shows how to compare two decoders in terms of these sets.

Lemma 5 ([2, Eq. (25)]): We have

$$\frac{P_{\theta, u}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq \max_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{A}^n \times \mathcal{A}^n} \left\{ \frac{|\mathcal{E}_u(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}, 1 \right\}. \quad (15)$$

The following result is analogous to [5, Lem. 1].

Lemma 6: If (H2) is verified, then, for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| \geq 2^n (\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}}) - \delta(n)). \quad (16)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| &= \left| \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}') \geq P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})\} \right| \\ &\geq \left| \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}') = P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})\} \right| \\ &\geq \left| \{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : \hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}'} = \hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}}\} \right| \\ &\geq |\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}})| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} 2^n (\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}}) - \delta(n)), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (H2). \blacksquare

In decoding by deterministic noise guessing, when codeword \mathbf{x} is transmitted and sequence \mathbf{y} is received, a decoding error occurs only if the codebook contains a codeword \mathbf{x}' such that $G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}') < G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$. Under this strategy, the equivocation set for G_u is $\mathcal{E}_{G_u}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}') < G_u(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})\}$, from which we immediately have $|\mathcal{E}_{G_u}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| < G_u(\mathbf{z})$. The next result extends [18, Lem. 1].

Lemma 7: If (H1) holds, then, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$G_m(\mathbf{z}) \leq 2^n (\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) + \zeta(n)). \quad (17)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned} G_m(\mathbf{z}) &\leq \left| \{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : P_m(\mathbf{z}') \geq P_m(\mathbf{z})\} \right| \\ &= \left| \{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : \tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}'}) \leq \tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})\} \right| \\ &= \sum_{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A}) : \tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) \leq \tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})} |\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2^{n\zeta(n)} 2^{\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (H1). \blacksquare

Lemma 8: If (H3) holds, then, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$G_w(\mathbf{z}) \leq 2^n (\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon(n)). \quad (18)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned} G_w(\mathbf{z}) &\leq \left| \{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n : P_w(\mathbf{z}') \geq P_w(\mathbf{z})\} \right| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{P_w(\mathbf{z})} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{2^{n\epsilon(n)}}{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z})} \\ &= 2^n (\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon(n)), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows for $1 = \sum_{\mathbf{z}' \in \mathcal{A}^n} P_w(\mathbf{z}') \geq \sum_{\mathbf{z}' : P_w(\mathbf{z}') \geq P_w(\mathbf{z})} P_w(\mathbf{z}') \geq \left| \{\mathbf{z}' : P_w(\mathbf{z}') \geq P_w(\mathbf{z})\} \right| P_w(\mathbf{z})$, and (b) from (H3). \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 1: The first part directly follows from Lemmas 5, 6 and 7, with $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$; the second one, from Lemmas 5, 6 and 8, with $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$. \blacksquare

B. Complexity

Lemma 9: Let $K_{m'} \sim \mathcal{U}(\{1, \dots, |\mathcal{A}|^n\})$, for $2 \leq m' \leq M = 2^{nR}$ and $K := \min_{m'} K_{m'}$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[K] < 2^{n(\log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \frac{1}{n})}. \quad (19)$$

Proof: To study the statistics of $K = \min_{m'} K_{m'}$, we first write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(K \geq k) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{m' \in \{2, \dots, M\}} K_{m'} \geq k\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{m'=2}^M \{K_{m'} \geq k\}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{|\mathcal{A}|^n - k + 1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n}\right)^{M-1}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(K = k) &= \mathbb{P}(K \geq k) - \mathbb{P}(K \geq k+1) \\ &= \frac{(|\mathcal{A}|^n - k + 1)^{M-1} - (|\mathcal{A}|^n - k)^{M-1}}{|\mathcal{A}|^{n(M-1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

The expectation is then

$$\mathbb{E}[K] = \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|^n} k \cdot \mathbb{P}(K = k) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^{n(M-1)}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|^n} k^{M-1}.$$

Using Faulhaber's formula for sum of powers, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[K] &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^{n(M-1)}} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{r=0}^{M-1} \binom{M}{r} B_r |\mathcal{A}|^{n(M-r)} \\ &= \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^n}{M} \sum_{r=0}^{M-1} \binom{M}{r} \frac{B_r}{|\mathcal{A}|^{nr}}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where B_r are the Bernoulli numbers, with the convention $B_1 = +\frac{1}{2}$. Note that we can bound

$$\sum_{r=0}^{M-1} \binom{M}{r} \frac{B_r}{|\mathcal{A}|^{nr}} \leq \left| \sum_{r=0}^{M-1} \binom{M}{r} \frac{B_r}{|\mathcal{A}|^{nr}} \right| \leq \sum_{r=0}^{M-1} \frac{|B_r|}{r!},$$

where we used the triangle inequality, that $\binom{M}{r} \leq \frac{M^r}{r!}$, and that $M \leq |\mathcal{A}|^n$. Denote $a_r := \frac{|B_r|}{r!}$. We have $a_0 = \frac{|B_0|}{0!} = 1$ and $a_1 = \frac{|B_1|}{1!} = \frac{1}{2}$. The next odd terms are zero (due to zero Bernoulli numbers [31, 23.1.19, p. 805]), and for the even terms, we can use the estimation $|B_{2k}| \leq \frac{2(2k)!}{(2\pi)^{2k}(1-2^{1-2k})}$, $k \geq 1$ [31, 23.1.15, p. 805] to get

$$a_{2k} = \frac{|B_{2k}|}{(2k)!} \leq \frac{2}{(2\pi)^{2k}(1-2^{1-2k})} \leq \frac{4}{(2\pi)^{2k}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=0}^{M-1} \binom{M}{r} \frac{B_r}{|\mathcal{A}|^{nr}} &\leq a_0 + a_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{2k} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2} + 4 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{4\pi^2}\right)^k \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4}{4\pi^2 - 1} \approx 1.604, \end{aligned}$$

Replacing that in (20), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[K] < 2 \cdot \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^n}{2^{nR}} = 2^{n(\log|\mathcal{A}| - R + \frac{1}{n})}.$$

■

The next result is an extension of [18, Lem. 1].

Lemma 10: If (H1), (H2) and (H4) hold, then we have, for $\rho > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[G_m(\mathbf{z})^\rho] \leq 2^{n\left(\rho\tilde{H}_{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}(P_\theta) + (1+\rho)\zeta(n)\right)}. \quad (21)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G_m(\mathbf{z})^\rho] &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n} P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{z}) G_m(\mathbf{z})^\rho \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} \left| \mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) \right| 2^{-n(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) + \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}))} \\ &\quad \cdot 2^{n\rho(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) + \zeta(n))} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} 2^{n(\rho\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}) + \rho\zeta(n))} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})| 2^{n \max_{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} (\rho\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}) + \rho\zeta(n))} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})| 2^{n \max_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} (\rho\tilde{H}(Q) - \tilde{D}(Q \| P_\theta) + \rho\zeta(n))} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2^{n\left(\rho\tilde{H}_{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}(P_\theta) + (1+\rho)\zeta(n)\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we used Lemma 7, in (b) we used $|\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})| \leq 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})}$, and in (c) we used (H1) and (H4) with $\alpha = \frac{1}{1+\rho}$. ■

Lemma 11: If (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4) hold, then we have, for $\rho > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[G_w(\mathbf{z})^\rho] \leq 2^{n\rho\left(\tilde{H}_{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}(P_\theta) + \zeta(n) + \rho\epsilon(n)\right)}. \quad (22)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[G_w(\mathbf{z})^\rho] &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n} P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{z}) G_w(\mathbf{z})^\rho \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} \left| \mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) \right| 2^{-n(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) + \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}))} \\ &\quad \cdot 2^{n\rho(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) + \epsilon(n))} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} 2^{n(\rho\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}) + \rho\epsilon(n))} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})| 2^{n \max_{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} (\rho\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}}) - \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}) + \rho\epsilon(n))} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})| 2^{n \max_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} (\rho\tilde{H}(Q) - \tilde{D}(Q \| P_\theta) + \rho\epsilon(n))} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2^{n\rho\left(\tilde{H}_{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}(P_\theta) + \zeta(n) + \rho\epsilon(n)\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we used Lemma 8, in (b) we used $|\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})| \leq 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})}$, and in (c) we used (H1) and (H4) with $\alpha = \frac{1}{1+\rho}$. ■

Proof of Theorem 2: The first part follows directly from (5), and Lemmas 9 and 10, with $\rho = 1$; the second one, from (5), and Lemmas 9 and 11, with $\rho = 1$. ■

APPENDIX B PROOFS FOR SECTION IV

A. Universality

Lemma 12: If

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \left[\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \right]}{\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \cdot 2^{n\Delta}, \quad (23)$$

then

$$\frac{P_{\theta, \tilde{P}_{\mathbf{Z}}}(\text{error})}{P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error})} \leq 4 \cdot 2^{n\Delta}. \quad (24)$$

Proof: From [20, Thm. 1] with $s = 1$, we have

$$P_{\theta, \tilde{P}_{\mathbf{Z}}}(\text{error}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} \left[\min \left\{ 1, (M-1) \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \left[\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \right]}{\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} \right\} \right].$$

From [28, Thm. 1] and using that, under uniform random coding over \mathcal{A}^n , $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} [P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \geq P_{\mathbf{Z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] = \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n}$, we have

$$P_{\theta, \text{ML}}(\text{error}) \geq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} \left[\min \left\{ 1, (M-1) \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \right\} \right].$$

Combining these inequalities yields the desired result. ■

Lemma 13: If (H1), (H2) hold, then, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \left[\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \right]}{\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \cdot 2^{n(\zeta(n) + \delta(n))}. \quad (25)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \left[\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right]}{\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \left[\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right]}{\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}})}}{2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}})}} \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \frac{\sum_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} |\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_Z)| 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z)}}{2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}})}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \frac{\sum_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z)} 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z)}}{2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}})}} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} 2^{n\zeta(n)} 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}})} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} 2^{n(\zeta(n) + \delta(n))},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) we used (H1), and in (b) we used Lemma 6, which requires (H2). ■

Lemma 14: If (H2) and (H3) hold, then, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \left[\tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right]}{\tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \cdot 2^{n(\epsilon(n) + \delta(n))}. \quad (26)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}} \left[\tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \right]}{\tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} &= \frac{\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} P_w(\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{x}})}{P_w(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} \frac{1}{P_w(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} 2^{n\epsilon(n)} 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}})} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|}{|\mathcal{A}|^n} 2^{n(\epsilon(n) + \delta(n))}.
\end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we used (H3), and in (b) Lemma 6, which requires (H2). ■

Proof of Theorem 3: The first part follows directly from Lemmas 12 and 13; the second one, from Lemmas 12 and 14. ■

B. Complexity

The following result is an extension of [19, Thm. 1].

Lemma 15: If (H1), (H2) and (H4) hold, then, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{z})} \right] \leq 2^{n(\bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + 2\zeta(n))}. \quad (27)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{z})} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}})}}{2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})}} \right] \\
&= \left(\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}})} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}})} &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} P_{Z, \theta}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) \\
&= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} \sup_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} \hat{P}_Z(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} \sum_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} \hat{P}_Z(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) \\
&= \sum_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} \underbrace{\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} \hat{P}_Z(\bar{\mathbf{z}})}_{=1} \\
&= |\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})| \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2^{n\zeta(n)}, \quad (30)$$

where we used (H1) in (a). For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})} \right] &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n} P_Z(\mathbf{z}) 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})} \\
&= \sum_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} \left| \mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_Z) \right| 2^{-n(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z) + \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_Z \| P_Z))} 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z)} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} 2^{n(\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z) - \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_Z \| P_Z))} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2^{n\zeta(n)} 2^{n \max_{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{A})} (\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z) - \tilde{D}(\hat{P}_Z \| P_Z))} \\
&\leq 2^{n\zeta(n)} 2^{n \max_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} (\tilde{H}(Q) - \tilde{D}(Q \| P_Z))} \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{=} 2^{n(\bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + \zeta(n))},
\end{aligned}$$

where in (b) we used $|\mathcal{T}_n(\hat{P}_Z)| \leq 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_Z)}$, in (c) we used (H1), and in (d) we used (H4) with $\alpha = 1/2$. Combining both upper bounds yields the desired result. ■

Accordingly, next result extends [19, Cor. 1].

Lemma 16: If (H1), (H2), (H3) and (H4) hold, then, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{z})} \right] \leq 2^{n(\bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + \zeta(n) + \epsilon(n))}. \quad (31)$$

Proof: We have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{z})} \right] \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{2^{n\epsilon(n)}}{2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})}} \right] = 2^{n\epsilon(n)} \mathbb{E} \left[2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})} \right],$$

where in (a) we used (H3). The expectation term can be bounded the same way as in the previous result, using (H1), (H2) and (H4) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{z}})} \right] \leq 2^{n(\bar{H}_{1/2}(P_\theta) + \zeta(n))}.$$

Lemma 17: If (H1) holds, then, for any $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})} \right] \leq 2^{n(\log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \zeta(n) + \gamma(n))}, \quad (32)$$

with $\gamma(n) := \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2^{nR}}{2^{nR} - 1} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_m(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})} \right] \\
&= \left(\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{A}^n} 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}})} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{m'}})}} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 2^{n\zeta(n)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{m'}})}} \right], \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is the same as (30), using (H1). Now, recall the inequality $\frac{n}{\frac{1}{x_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{x_n}} \leq \frac{x_1 + \dots + x_n}{n}$ relating the harmonic mean to the arithmetic mean [32, Eq. (3.5)]. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{m'}})}} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{m'=2}^M 2^{n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{m'}})}}{(M-1)^2} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sum_{m'=2}^M 2^{n \log |\mathcal{A}|}}{(M-1)^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{2^{n \log |\mathcal{A}|}}{M-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude, note that $M-1 = 2^{n(R-\gamma(n))}$, with $\gamma(n) := \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2^{nR}}{2^{nR}-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Combining the previous results yields the desired result. ■

Lemma 18: If (H1) and (H3) hold, then, for any $\mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})} \right] \leq 2^{n(\log |\mathcal{A}| - R + \epsilon(n) + \gamma(n))}, \tag{34}$$

with $\gamma(n) := \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2^{nR}}{2^{nR}-1} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: First, using (H3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M \tilde{P}_w(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}_{m'})} \right] \\
&\leq 2^{n\epsilon(n)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{m'}})}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we have, as in (33), which uses (H1),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{m'=2}^M 2^{-n\tilde{H}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}_{m'}})}} \right] \leq \frac{2^{n \log |\mathcal{A}|}}{M-1} = \frac{2^{n \log |\mathcal{A}|}}{2^{n(R-\gamma(n))}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4: The first part follows from (12), and Lemmas 15 and 17; the second one, from (12), and Lemmas 16 and 18. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Lapidoth and P. Narayan, "Reliable communication under channel uncertainty," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 2148–2177, 1998.
- [2] M. Feder and A. Lapidoth, "Universal decoding for channels with memory," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1726–1745, 1998.
- [3] V. D. Goppa, "Nonprobabilistic mutual information with memory," *Problems Control Inf. Theory*, vol. 4, pp. 97–102, 1975.
- [4] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011.
- [5] J. Ziv, "Universal decoding for finite-state channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 453–460, 1985.
- [6] N. Merhav, "Universal decoding for memoryless Gaussian channels with a deterministic interference," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1261–1269, 1993.
- [7] A. Lapidoth and J. Ziv, "On the universality of the LZ-based decoding algorithm," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1746–1755, 1998.
- [8] M. Feder and N. Merhav, "Universal composite hypothesis testing: a competitive minimax approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1504–1517, 2002.
- [9] O. Shayevitz and M. Feder, "Universal decoding for frequency-selective fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 2770–2790, 2005.
- [10] N. Merhav, "Universal decoding for arbitrary channels relative to a given class of decoding metrics," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 5566–5576, 2013.
- [11] W. Huleihel and N. Merhav, "Universal decoding for Gaussian intersymbol interference channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1606–1618, 2015.
- [12] R. Averbuch and N. Merhav, "Exact random coding exponents and universal decoders for the asymmetric broadcast channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 5070–5086, 2018.
- [13] R. Tamir and N. Merhav, "Universal decoding for the typical random code and for the expurgated code," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2156–2168, 2022.
- [14] H. K. Miyamoto and S. Yang, "On universal decoding over memoryless channels with the Krichevsky–Trofimov estimator," in *Proc. 2024 IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2024, pp. 1498–1503.
- [15] A. Lapidoth and J. Ziv, "On the decoding of convolutional codes on an unknown channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 2321–2332, 1999.
- [16] K. R. Duffy, J. Li, and M. Médard, "Capacity-achieving guessing random additive noise decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 4023–4040, 2019.
- [17] W. An, M. Médard, and K. R. Duffy, "Keep the bursts and ditch the interleavers," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 3655–3667, 2022.
- [18] H. Joudeh, "On guessing random additive noise decoding," in *Proc. 2024 IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2024, pp. 1291–1296.
- [19] N. Merhav and A. Cohen, "Universal randomized guessing with application to asynchronous decentralized brute-force attacks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 114–129, 2020.
- [20] J. Scarlett, A. Martínez, and A. Guillén i Fàbregas, "The likelihood decoder: Error exponents and mismatch," in *Proc. 2015 IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 86–90.
- [21] N. Merhav, "The generalized stochastic likelihood decoder: Random coding and expurgated bounds," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 5039–5051, 2017.
- [22] I. Csiszár, "The method of types [information theory]," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 2505–2523, 1998.
- [23] E. Gassiat, *Universal Coding and Order Identification by Model Selection Methods*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.
- [24] M. K. Hanawal and R. Sundaresan, "Guessing revisited: A large deviations approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 70–78, 2011.
- [25] E. Arikan, "An inequality on guessing and its application to sequential decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 99–105, 1996.
- [26] D. Malone and W. Sullivan, "Guesswork and entropy," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 525–526, 2004.
- [27] C. Pfister and W. Sullivan, "Rényi entropy, guesswork moments, and large deviations," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 11, pp. 2794–2800, 2004.
- [28] J. Scarlett, A. Martínez, and A. Guillén i Fàbregas, "Mismatched decoding: Error exponents, second-order rates and saddlepoint approximations," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2647–2666, 2014.
- [29] T. Cover, "Enumerative source encoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 73–77, 1973.
- [30] A. Martín, G. Seroussi, and M. J. Weinberger, "Type classes of context trees," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 4077–4093, 2012.
- [31] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions With Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. New York, NY, USA: Dover, 1972.
- [32] H. Sedrakyan and N. Sedrakyan, *Algebraic Inequalities*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.