

# A Derivation of the Asymptotic Random-Coding Prefactor

Jonathan Scarlett  
University of Cambridge  
jms265@cam.ac.uk

Alfonso Martinez  
Universitat Pompeu Fabra  
alfonso.martinez@ieee.org

Albert Guillén i Fàbregas  
ICREA & Universitat Pompeu Fabra  
University of Cambridge  
guillen@ieee.org

**Abstract**—This paper studies the subexponential prefactor to the random-coding bound for a given rate. Using a refinement of Gallager’s bounding techniques, an alternative proof of a recent result by Altuğ and Wagner is given, and the result is extended to the setting of mismatched decoding.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Error exponents are a widely-studied tool in information theory for characterizing the performance of coded communication systems. Early works on error exponents for discrete memoryless channels (DMCs) include those of Fano [1, Ch. 9], Gallager [2, Ch. 5] and Shannon *et al.* [3]. The achievable exponent of [1], [2] was obtained using i.i.d. random coding, and coincides with the sphere-packing exponent given in [3] for rates above a threshold called the critical rate.

Denoting the exponent of [1], [2] by  $E_r(R)$ , we have the following: For all  $(n, R)$ , there exists a code of rate  $R$  and block length  $n$  such that the error probability  $p_e$  satisfies  $p_e \leq \alpha(n, R)e^{-nE_r(R)}$ , where  $\alpha(n, R)$  is a subexponential prefactor. In both [1] and [2], the prefactor is  $O(1)$ . In particular, Gallager showed that one can achieve  $\alpha(n, R) = 1$ .

Early works on improving the  $O(1)$  prefactor for certain channels and rates include those of Elias [4], Dobrushin [5] and Gallager [6]. These results were recently generalized by Altuğ and Wagner [7]–[9], who obtained prefactors to the random-coding bound at all rates below capacity, as well as converse results above the critical rate. The bounds in [7], [8] were obtained using i.i.d. random coding, and the behavior of the prefactor varies depending on whether the rate is above or below the critical rate, and whether a regularity condition is satisfied (see Section II).

In this paper, we give an alternative proof of the main result of [7], [8], as well as a generalization to the setting of mismatched decoding [10]–[14], where the decoding rule is fixed and possibly suboptimal (e.g. due to channel uncertainty or implementation constraints). The analysis of [7], [8] can be considered a refinement of that of Fano [1, Ch. 9], whereas the analysis in this paper can be considered a refinement of that of Gallager [2, Ch. 5]. Our techniques can also be used

to derive Gallager’s expurgated exponent [2, Ch. 5.7] with an  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$  prefactor under some technical conditions [15], thus improving on Gallager’s  $O(1)$  prefactor.

## A. Notation

Vectors are written using bold symbols (e.g.  $\mathbf{x}$ ), and the corresponding  $i$ -th entry is written with a subscript (e.g.  $x_i$ ). For two sequences  $f_n$  and  $g_n$ , we write  $f_n = O(g_n)$  if  $|f_n| \leq c|g_n|$  for some  $c$  and sufficiently large  $n$ , and  $f_n = o(g_n)$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_n}{g_n} = 0$ . The indicator function is denoted by  $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ .

The marginals of a joint distribution  $P_{XY}(x, y)$  are denoted by  $P_X(x)$  and  $P_Y(y)$ . Expectation with respect to a joint distribution  $P_{XY}(x, y)$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{E}_P[\cdot]$ , or simply  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  when the probability distribution is understood from the context. Given a distribution  $Q(x)$  and conditional distribution  $W(y|x)$ , we write  $Q \times W$  to denote the joint distribution defined by  $Q(x)W(y|x)$ . The set of all empirical distributions on a vector in  $\mathcal{X}^n$  (i.e. types [16, Sec. 2], [17]) is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ . The type of a vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is denoted by  $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ . For a given  $Q \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$ , the type class  $T^n(Q)$  is defined to be the set of sequences in  $\mathcal{X}^n$  with type  $Q$ .

## II. STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULT

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  denote the input and output alphabets respectively. The probability of receiving a given output sequence  $\mathbf{y}$  given that  $\mathbf{x}$  is transmitted is given by  $W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n W(y_i|x_i)$ . A codebook  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(M)}\}$  is known at both the encoder and decoder. The encoder receives as input a message  $m$  uniformly distributed on the set  $\{1, \dots, M\}$ , and transmits the corresponding codeword  $\mathbf{x}^{(m)}$ . Given  $\mathbf{y}$ , the decoder forms the estimate

$$\hat{m} = \arg \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, M\}} q^n(\mathbf{x}^{(j)}, \mathbf{y}), \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  is the block length, and  $q^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n q(x_i, y_i)$ . The function  $q(x, y)$  is called the *decoding metric*, and is assumed to be non-negative and such that

$$q(x, y) = 0 \iff W(y|x) = 0. \quad (2)$$

In the case of a tie, a random codeword achieving the maximum in (1) is selected. In the case that  $q(x, y) = W(y|x)$ , i.e. maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding, the decoding rule in (1) is optimal. Otherwise, this setting is that of *mismatched decoding* [10]–[14].

This work has been funded in part by the European Research Council under ERC grant agreement 259663, by the European Union’s 7th Framework Programme (PEOPLE-2011-CIG) under grant agreement 303633 and by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness under grants RYC-2011-08150 and TEC2012-38800-C03-03.

We study the random-coding error probability under i.i.d. random coding, where the  $M = e^{nR}$  codewords are generated independently according to

$$P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = Q^n(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n Q(x_i), \quad (3)$$

and where  $Q$  is an arbitrary input distribution. The random-coding error probability is denoted by  $\bar{p}_e$ .

It was shown in [12] that  $\bar{p}_e \leq e^{-nE_r(Q,R)}$ , where

$$E_r(Q, R) \triangleq \max_{\rho \in [0,1]} E_0(Q, \rho) - \rho R \quad (4)$$

$$E_0(Q, \rho) \triangleq \sup_{s \geq 0} -\log \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[q(\bar{X}, Y)^s | Y]}{q(X, Y)^s} \right)^\rho \right] \quad (5)$$

with  $(X, Y, \bar{X}) \sim Q(x)W(y|x)Q(\bar{x})$ . We showed in [18] that this exponent is tight with respect to the ensemble average for i.i.d. random coding, i.e.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \bar{p}_e = E_r$ . The corresponding achievable rate is given by

$$I_{\text{GMI}}(Q) \triangleq \sup_{s \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \frac{q(X, Y)^s}{\mathbb{E}[q(\bar{X}, Y)^s | Y]} \right], \quad (6)$$

which is commonly referred to as the generalized mutual information (GMI) [12]. Under ML decoding, i.e.  $q(x, y) = W(y|x)$ ,  $E_r$  equals the exponent of Fano and Gallager [1], [2], and  $I_{\text{GMI}}(Q)$  equals the mutual information. The corresponding optimal choices of  $s$  in (5)–(6) are respectively given by  $s = \frac{1}{1+\rho}$  and  $s = 1$ .

We define  $\hat{\rho}(Q, R)$  to be the value of  $\rho$  achieving the maximum in (4) at rate  $R$ . From the analysis of Gallager [2, Sec. 5.6], we know that  $\hat{\rho}$  equals one for all rates between 0 and some critical rate,

$$R_{\text{cr}}(Q) \triangleq \max \{R : \hat{\rho}(Q, R) = 1\}, \quad (7)$$

and is strictly decreasing for all rates between  $R_{\text{cr}}(Q)$  and  $I_{\text{GMI}}(Q)$ .

Similarly to [7], we define the following notion of regularity. We introduce the set

$$\mathcal{Y}_1 \triangleq \left\{ y : q(x, y) \neq q(\bar{x}, y) \text{ for some } x, \bar{x} \text{ such that } Q(x)Q(\bar{x})W(y|x)W(y|\bar{x}) > 0 \right\} \quad (8)$$

and define  $(W, q, Q)$  to be *regular* if

$$\mathcal{Y}_1 \neq \emptyset. \quad (9)$$

When  $q(x, y) = W(y|x)$ , this is the *feasibility decoding is suboptimal* (FDIS) condition of [7]. We say that  $(W, q, Q)$  is *irregular* if it is not regular. A notable example of the irregular case is the binary erasure channel (BEC) under ML decoding.

**Theorem 1.** *Fix any  $(W, q)$  satisfying (2), input distribution  $Q$  and rate  $R < I_{\text{GMI}}(Q)$ . The random-coding error probability for the i.i.d. ensemble in (3) satisfies*

$$\bar{p}_e \leq \alpha(n, R) e^{-nE_r(Q,R)} \quad (10)$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ , where  $\alpha(n, R)$  is defined as follows. If  $(W, q, Q)$  is regular, then

$$\alpha(n, R) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{K}{n^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\hat{\rho}(Q,R))}} & R \in (R_{\text{cr}}(Q), I_{\text{GMI}}(Q)) \\ \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} & R \in [0, R_{\text{cr}}(Q)], \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and if  $(W, q, Q)$  is irregular, then

$$\alpha(n, R) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}} & R \in (R_{\text{cr}}(Q), I_{\text{GMI}}(Q)) \\ 1 & R \in [0, R_{\text{cr}}(Q)], \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where  $K$  is a constant depending only on  $W, q, Q$  and  $R$ .

*Proof:* See Section III. ■

In the case of ML decoding, Theorem 1 coincides with the main results of Altuğ and Wagner [7], [8] in both the regular and irregular case. Neither [7], [8] nor the present paper attempt to explicitly characterize or bound the constant  $K$  in (11)–(12). Asymptotic bounds with the constant factor specified are derived in [14] using saddlepoint approximations; see also [6] for rates below the critical rate, and [5] for strongly symmetric channels.<sup>1</sup>

### III. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

For a fixed value of  $s \geq 0$ , we define the *generalized information density* [18], [19]

$$i_s(x, y) \triangleq \log \frac{q(x, y)^s}{\sum_{\bar{x}} Q(\bar{x})q(\bar{x}, y)^s} \quad (13)$$

and its multi-letter extension

$$i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n i_s(x_i, y_i). \quad (14)$$

Our analysis is based on the random-coding union (RCU) bound for mismatched decoding, given by [18], [19]

$$\bar{p}_e \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \min \left\{ 1, (M-1) \times \mathbb{P} \left[ i_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{Y}) \geq i_s^n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \right] \right\} \right], \quad (15)$$

where  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \bar{\mathbf{X}}) \sim P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})P_{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ . Furthermore, we will make use of the identity

$$E_0(Q, \rho) = \sup_{s \geq 0} -\log \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\rho i_s(X, Y)} \right] \quad (16)$$

with  $(X, Y) \sim Q \times W$ , which follows from (5) and (13).

We provide a number of preliminary results in Section III-A. The proof of Theorem 1 for the regular case is given in Section III-B, and the changes required to handle the irregular case are given in Section III-C.

<sup>1</sup>The English translation of [5] incorrectly states that the prefactor is  $O(n^{-\frac{1}{2(1+\hat{\rho}(R))}})$  for the regular case with  $R > R_{\text{cr}}$  (see (1.28)–(1.32) therein), but this error is not present in the original Russian version.

### A. Preliminary Results

The main tool used in the proof of Theorem 1 is the following lemma by Polyanskiy *et al.* [19], which can be proved using the Berry-Esseen theorem.

**Lemma 1.** [19, Lemma 47] *Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  be independent random variables with  $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[Z_i] > 0$  and  $T = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i]|^3] < \infty$ . Then for any  $t$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( - \sum_i Z_i \right) \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_i Z_i > t \right\} \right] \\ & \leq 2 \left( \frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{12T}{\sigma^2} \right) \frac{1}{\sigma} \exp(-t). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The following lemma shows that under the assumption (2), we do not need to consider  $s$  growing unbounded in (5).

**Lemma 2.** *For any  $(W, q)$  satisfying (2), and any  $\rho \in [0, 1]$ , the supremum in (5) is achieved (possibly non-uniquely) by some finite  $s \geq 0$ .*

*Proof:* We treat the regular and irregular cases separately. In the regular case, let  $(x, \bar{x}, y)$  satisfy the condition in the definition of  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  in (8), and assume without loss of generality that  $q(\bar{x}, y) > q(x, y)$ . We can upper bound the objective in (5) by

$$- \log Q(x)W(y|x) \left( Q(\bar{x}) \left( \frac{q(\bar{x}, y)}{q(x, y)} \right)^s \right)^\rho, \quad (18)$$

which tends to  $-\infty$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows that the supremum is achieved by a finite value of  $s$ .

In the irregular case, we have  $q(x, y) = q(\bar{x}, y)$  wherever  $Q(x)Q(\bar{x})W(y|x)q(\bar{x}, y) > 0$ , where the replacement of  $W(y|\bar{x})$  by  $q(\bar{x}, y)$  in the latter condition follows from (2). In this case, writing the objective in (5) as

$$- \log \sum_{x,y} Q(x)W(y|x) \left( \sum_{\bar{x}} Q(\bar{x}) \left( \frac{q(\bar{x}, y)}{q(x, y)} \right)^s \right)^\rho, \quad (19)$$

we see that all choices of  $s > 0$  are equivalent, since the argument to  $(\cdot)^s$  equals one for all  $(x, \bar{x}, y)$  yielding non-zero terms in the summations. ■

The following lemma is somewhat more technical, and ensures the existence of a sufficiently high probability set in which Lemma 1 can be applied to the inner probability in (29) with a value of  $\sigma$  having  $\sqrt{n}$  growth. We make use of the conditional distributions

$$V_s(x|y) \triangleq \frac{Q(x)q(x, y)^s}{\sum_{\bar{x}} Q(\bar{x})q(\bar{x}, y)^s} \quad (20)$$

$$V_s^n(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n V_s(x_i|y_i), \quad (21)$$

which yield  $i_s(x, y) = \log \frac{V_s(x|y)}{Q(x)}$  and  $i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \log \frac{V_s^n(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{y})}{Q^n(\mathbf{x})}$  (see (13)–(14)). Furthermore, we define the random variables

$$\begin{aligned} (X, Y, \bar{X}, X_s) & \sim Q(x)W(y|x)Q(\bar{x})V_s(x_s|y) \\ (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \bar{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{X}_s) & \sim Q^n(\mathbf{x})W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})Q^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}})V_s^n(\mathbf{x}_s|\mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and we write the empirical distribution of  $\mathbf{y}$  as  $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}}(\cdot)$ .

**Lemma 3.** *If  $(W, q, Q)$  is regular and (2) holds, then the set*

$$\mathcal{F}_{n,\delta} \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{y} : \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_1} \hat{P}_{\mathbf{y}}(y) > \delta \right\} \quad (23)$$

satisfies the following properties:

1) *For any  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$ , we have*

$$\text{Var}[i_s^n(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{Y}) | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}] \geq n\delta v_s, \quad (24)$$

where

$$v_s \triangleq \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_1} \text{Var}[i_s(X_s, Y) | Y = y]. \quad (25)$$

Furthermore,  $v_s > 0$  for all  $s > 0$ .

2) *For all  $R < I_{\text{GMI}}(Q)$ , there exists a choice of  $\delta > 0$  such that under i.i.d. random coding,*

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{error} \cap \mathbf{Y} \notin \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}] \leq e^{-n(E_r'(Q, R) + o(1))} \quad (26)$$

for some  $E_r'(Q, R) > E_r(Q, R)$ .

*Proof:* See the Appendix. ■

### B. Proof for the Regular Case

Using the second part of Lemma 3 with the suitably chosen value of  $\delta$ , and using the fact that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \bar{p}_e = E_r$  [18], we can write the random-coding error probability as

$$\bar{p}_e = \mathbb{P}[\text{error} \cap \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}] + \mathbb{P}[\text{error} \cap \mathbf{Y} \notin \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}] \quad (27)$$

$$= (1 + o(1)) \mathbb{P}[\text{error} \cap \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}]. \quad (28)$$

Writing  $K_1$  in place of  $1 + o(1)$  and modifying the RCU bound in (15) to include the condition  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$  in (28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{p}_e & \leq K_1 \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x})W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \\ & \quad \times \min \left\{ 1, M \mathbb{P}[i_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}) \geq i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The value of  $s \geq 0$  in (29) is arbitrary, and we choose it to achieve the supremum in (5) at  $\rho = \hat{\rho}(Q, R)$ , in accordance with Lemma 2. We can assume that  $s > 0$ , since  $s = 0$  yields an objective of zero in (5), contradicting the assumption that  $R < I_{\text{GMI}}$ .

In order to make the inner probability in (29) more amenable to an application of Lemma 1, we follow [20, Sec. 3.4.5] and write

$$Q^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = Q^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \frac{V_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y})}{V_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y})} \quad (30)$$

$$= V_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}|\mathbf{y}) \exp(-i_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y})). \quad (31)$$

For a fixed sequence  $\mathbf{y}$  and a constant  $t$ , summing both sides of (31) over all  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  such that  $i_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{y}) \geq t$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}[i_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}) \geq t] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp(-i_s^n(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{Y})) \mathbb{1} \{ i_s^n(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{Y}) \geq t \} \mid \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

under the joint distribution in (22). Applying Lemma 1 to (32) and using the first part of Lemma 3, we obtain for all  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$  that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -i_s^n(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{Y}) \right) \mathbb{1} \left\{ i_s^n(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{Y}) \geq t \right\} \middle| \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y} \right] \leq \frac{K_2}{\sqrt{n}} e^{-t} \quad (33)$$

for some constant  $K_2$ . Here we have used the fact that  $T$  in (17) grows linearly in  $n$ , which follows from the fact that we are considering finite alphabets [19, Lemma 46]. Substituting (33) into (29), we obtain

$$\bar{p}_e \leq K_1 \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}} P_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \quad (34)$$

$$\times \min \left\{ 1, \frac{MK_2}{\sqrt{n}} e^{-i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \right\} \quad (35)$$

$$\leq K_1 \mathbb{E} \left[ \min \left\{ 1, \frac{MK_2}{\sqrt{n}} e^{-i_s^n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})} \right\} \right] \quad (36)$$

$$\leq K_3 \mathbb{E} \left[ \min \left\{ 1, \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} e^{-i_s^n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})} \right\} \right] \quad (37)$$

where (36) follows by upper bounding the summation over  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$  by a summation over all  $\mathbf{y}$ , and (37) follows by defining  $K_3 \triangleq K_1 \max\{1, K_2\}$ .

We immediately obtain the desired result for rates below the critical rate by upper bounding the  $\min\{1, \cdot\}$  term in (37) by one and using (16) (with  $\rho = 1$ ) and the definition of  $i_s^n$ . In the remainder of the subsection, we focus on rates above the critical rate.

For any non-negative random variable  $A$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\min\{1, A\}] = \mathbb{P}[A \geq U]$ , where  $U$  is uniform on  $(0, 1)$  and independent of  $A$ . We can thus write (37) as

$$\bar{p}_e \leq K_3 \mathbb{P} \left[ \frac{M}{\sqrt{n}} e^{-i_s^n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})} \geq U \right] \quad (38)$$

$$= K_3 \mathbb{P} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (R - i_s(X_i, Y_i)) \geq \log(U\sqrt{n}) \right]. \quad (39)$$

Let  $F(t)$  denote the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of  $R - i_s(X, Y)$  with  $(X, Y) \sim Q \times W$ , and let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  be i.i.d. according to the tilted CDF

$$F_Z(z) = e^{E_r(Q, R)} \int_{-\infty}^z e^{\hat{\rho}t} dF(t), \quad (40)$$

where  $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}(Q, R)$ . It is easily seen that this is indeed a CDF by writing

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\hat{\rho}t} dF(t) = \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\hat{\rho}(R - i_s(X, Y))} \right] = e^{-E_r(Q, R)}, \quad (41)$$

where the last equality follows from (16) and since we have assumed that  $s$  is chosen optimally.

Similarly to [21, Lemma 2], we can use (40) to write the probability in (39) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (R - i_s(X_i, Y_i)) \geq \log(U\sqrt{n}) \right] \\ &= \int \cdots \int_{\sum_i t_i \geq \log(u\sqrt{n})} dF(t_1) \cdots dF(t_n) dF_U(u) \quad (42) \\ &= e^{-nE_r(Q, R)} \int \cdots \int_{\sum_i z_i \geq \log(u\sqrt{n})} e^{-\hat{\rho} \sum_i z_i} \\ & \quad \times dF_Z(z_1) \cdots dF_Z(z_n) dF_U(u), \quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

where  $F_U(u)$  denotes the CDF of  $U$ . Substituting (43) into (39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{p}_e &\leq K_3 e^{-nE_r(Q, R)} \\ &\times \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\hat{\rho} \sum_i Z_i} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \hat{\rho} \sum_i Z_i \geq \hat{\rho} \log(U\sqrt{n}) \right\} \right]. \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

Let  $E_0(Q, \rho, s)$  be defined as in (5) with a fixed value of  $s$  in place of the supremum. The moment generating function (MGF) of  $Z$  is given by

$$M_Z(\tau) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\tau Z}] \quad (45)$$

$$= e^{E_r(Q, R)} \mathbb{E}[e^{(\hat{\rho} + \tau)(R - i_s(X, Y))}] \quad (46)$$

$$= e^{E_0(Q, \hat{\rho}, s)} e^{-(E_0(Q, \hat{\rho} + \tau, s) - \tau R)}, \quad (47)$$

where (46) follows from (40), and (47) follows from (4) and (16). Using the identities  $\mathbb{E}[Z] = \left. \frac{dM_Z}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0}$  and  $\text{Var}[Z] = \left. \frac{d^2 M_Z}{d\tau^2} \right|_{\tau=0}$ , we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = R - \left. \frac{\partial E_0(Q, \rho, s)}{\partial \rho} \right|_{\rho=\hat{\rho}} = 0 \quad (48)$$

$$\text{Var}[Z] = - \left. \frac{\partial^2 E_0(Q, \rho, s)}{\partial \rho^2} \right|_{\rho=\hat{\rho}} > 0, \quad (49)$$

where the second equality in (48) and the inequality in (49) hold since  $R \in (R_{\text{cr}}(Q), I_{\text{GMI}}(Q))$  and hence  $\hat{\rho} \in (0, 1)$  (e.g. see [2, pp. 142-143]). Writing the expectation in (44) as a nested expectation given  $U$  and applying Lemma 1, it follows that

$$\bar{p}_e \leq K_4 e^{-nE_r(Q, R)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} e^{-\hat{\rho} \log(U\sqrt{n})} \right] \quad (50)$$

$$= K_4 e^{-nE_r(Q, R)} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left( \frac{1}{U\sqrt{n}} \right)^{\hat{\rho}} \right] \quad (51)$$

$$= \frac{K_4}{n^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\hat{\rho})}} e^{-nE_r(Q, R)} \mathbb{E}[U^{-\hat{\rho}}] \quad (52)$$

$$= \frac{K_5}{n^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\hat{\rho})}} e^{-nE_r(Q, R)}, \quad (53)$$

where  $K_4$  and  $K_5 = K_4 \mathbb{E}[U^{-\hat{\rho}}]$  are constants. This concludes the proof.

### C. Proof for the Irregular Case

The upper bound of one at rates below the critical rate in (12) was given by Kaplan and Shamai [12], so we focus on rates above the critical rate. The proof for the regular case used two applications of Lemma 1; see (33) and (50). The former leads to a multiplicative  $n^{-\frac{\hat{\rho}(R)}{2}}$  term in the final expression, and the second leads to a multiplicative  $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  term. In the irregular case, we only perform the latter application of Lemma 1. The proof is otherwise essentially identical. Applying Markov's inequality to the RCU bound in (15), we obtain

$$\bar{p}_e \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \min \left\{ 1, M e^{-i_s^n(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})} \right\} \right]. \quad (54)$$

Repeating the analysis of the regular case starting from (37), we obtain the desired result.

#### APPENDIX

Here we provide the proof of Lemma 3. The first property is easily proved by writing

$$\text{Var}[i_s^n(\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{Y}) | \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}] \quad (55)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}[i_s(X_{s,i}, Y_i) | Y_i = y_i] \quad (56)$$

$$\geq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_1} n \hat{P}_y(y) \text{Var}[i_s(X_s, Y) | Y = y]. \quad (57)$$

Substituting the bound on  $\hat{P}_y(y)$  in (23) and the definition of  $v_s$  in (25), we obtain (24). To prove that  $v_s > 0$ , we note that the variance of a random variable is zero if and only if the variable is deterministic, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[i_s(X_s, Y) | Y = y] = 0 \\ \iff \log \frac{V_s(x|y)}{Q(x)} \text{ is independent of } \\ x \text{ wherever } V_s(x|y) > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \iff \frac{q(x, y)^s}{\sum_{\bar{x}} Q(\bar{x}) q(\bar{x}, y)^s} \text{ is independent of } \\ x \text{ wherever } Q(x) q(x, y)^s > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \iff q(x, y) \text{ is independent of } \\ x \text{ wherever } Q(x) q(x, y) > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

$$\iff y \notin \mathcal{Y}_1, \quad (61)$$

where (59) follows from the definition of  $V_s$  in (20), (60) follows from the assumption  $s > 0$ , and (61) follows from (2) and the definition of  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  in (8).

We now turn to the proof of the second property. Modifying the RCU bound in (15) to include the condition  $\mathbf{Y} \notin \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$

in (26), we have for any  $s \geq 0$  that

$$\mathbb{P}[\text{error} \cap \mathbf{Y} \notin \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}] \quad (62)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}} Q^n(\mathbf{x}) W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \\ \times \min \left\{ 1, M \mathbb{P}[i_s^n(\bar{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{y}) \geq i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}} Q^n(\mathbf{x}) W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \left( M e^{-i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \right)^\rho \quad (64)$$

where (64) follows from Markov's inequality and since  $\min\{1, \alpha\} \leq \alpha^\rho$  ( $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ ). We henceforth choose  $\rho$  and  $s$  to achieve the maximum and supremum in (4) and (5) respectively, in accordance with Lemma 2. With these choices, we have similarly to (16) that

$$e^{-nE_r(Q,R)} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} Q^n(\mathbf{x}) W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) \left( M e^{-i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \right)^\rho. \quad (65)$$

Hence, we will complete the proof by showing that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \notin \mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}} Q^n(\mathbf{x}) W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) e^{-\rho i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \quad (66)$$

has a strictly larger exponential rate of decay than

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} Q^n(\mathbf{x}) W^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) e^{-\rho i_s^n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} \quad (67)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . By performing an expansion in terms of types, (67) is equal to

$$\sum_{P_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})} \mathbb{P}[(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \in T^n(P_{XY})] e^{-n\rho \mathbb{E}_P[i_s(X, Y)]} \quad (68)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = \max_{P_{XY}} \exp \left( -n(D(P_{XY} \| Q \times W) \right. \\ \left. + \rho \mathbb{E}_P[i_s(X, Y)] + o(1)) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where (69) follows from the property of types in [17, Eq. (12)] and the fact that the number of joint types is polynomial in  $n$ . Substituting the definitions of divergence and  $i_s$  (see (13)) into (69), we see that the exponent of (67) equals

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{P_{XY}} \sum_{x, y} P_{XY}(x, y) \\ \times \log \left( \frac{P_{XY}(x, y)}{Q(x) W(y|x)} \left( \frac{q(x, y)^s}{\sum_{\bar{x}} Q(\bar{x}) q(\bar{x}, y)^s} \right)^\rho \right). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Similarly, and from the definition of  $\mathcal{F}_{n,\delta}$  in (23), (66) has an exponent equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{P_{XY} : \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}_1} P_Y(y) \leq \delta} \sum_{x, y} P_{XY}(x, y) \\ \times \log \left( \frac{P_{XY}(x, y)}{Q(x) W(y|x)} \left( \frac{q(x, y)^s}{\sum_{\bar{x}} Q(\bar{x}) q(\bar{x}, y)^s} \right)^\rho \right). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

A straightforward evaluation of the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions [22, Sec. 5.5.3] yields that (70) is uniquely minimized by

$$P_{XY}^*(x, y) = \frac{Q(x)W(y|x) \left( \frac{\sum_{\bar{x}} Q(\bar{x})q(\bar{x}, y)^s}{q(x, y)^s} \right)^\rho}{\sum_{x', y'} Q(x')W(y'|x') \left( \frac{\sum_{\bar{x}'} Q(\bar{x}')q(\bar{x}', y')^s}{q(x', y')^s} \right)^\rho}. \quad (72)$$

From the assumptions in (2) and (9), we can find a symbol  $y^* \in \mathcal{Y}_1$  such that  $P_Y^*(y^*) > 0$ . Choosing  $\delta < P_Y^*(y^*)$ , it follows that  $P_{XY}^*$  fails to satisfy the constraint in (71), and thus (71) is strictly greater than (70).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. Fano, *Transmission of information: A statistical theory of communications*. MIT Press, 1961.
- [2] R. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*. John Wiley & Sons, 1968.
- [3] C. E. Shannon, R. Gallager, and E. Berlekamp, "Lower bounds to error probability for coding on discrete memoryless channels. I," *Information and Control*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 65–103, 1967.
- [4] P. Elias, "Coding for two noisy channels," in *Third London Symp. Inf. Theory*, 1955.
- [5] R. L. Dobrushin, "Asymptotic estimates of the probability of error for transmission of messages over a discrete memoryless communication channel with a symmetric transition probability matrix," *Theory Prob. Appl.*, vol. 7, no. e, pp. 270–300, 1962.
- [6] R. Gallager, "The random coding bound is tight for the average code," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 244–246, March 1973.
- [7] Y. Altuğ and A. B. Wagner, "A refinement of the random coding bound," in *50th Allerton Conf. on Comm., Control and Comp.*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 2012.
- [8] —, "Refinement of the random coding bound," in *Int. Zurich. Sem. Comms.*, Zurich, Feb. 2012.
- [9] —, "Refinement of the sphere-packing bound," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2012, pp. 2949–2953.
- [10] I. Csiszár and P. Narayan, "Channel capacity for a given decoding metric," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 35–43, Jan. 1995.
- [11] N. Merhav, G. Kaplan, A. Lapidoth, and S. Shamai, "On information rates for mismatched decoders," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1953–1967, Nov. 1994.
- [12] G. Kaplan and S. Shamai, "Information rates and error exponents of compound channels with application to antipodal signaling in a fading environment," *Arch. Elek. Über.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 228–239, 1993.
- [13] A. Ganti, A. Lapidoth, and E. Telatar, "Mismatched decoding revisited: General alphabets, channels with memory, and the wide-band limit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 2315–2328, Nov. 2000.
- [14] J. Scarlett, A. Martinez, and A. Guillén i Fàbregas, "Mismatched decoding: Finite-length bounds, error exponents and approximations," submitted to *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* [Online: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.6166>].
- [15] J. Scarlett, L. Peng, N. Merhav, A. Martinez, and A. Guillén i Fàbregas, "Expurgated random-coding ensembles: Exponents, refinements and connections," submitted To *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* [Online: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.6679>].
- [16] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [17] R. Gallager, "Fixed composition arguments and lower bounds to error probability," <http://web.mit.edu/gallager/www/notes/notes5.pdf>.
- [18] J. Scarlett, A. Martinez, and A. Guillén i Fàbregas, "Ensemble-tight error exponents for mismatched decoders," in *Allerton Conf. on Comm., Control and Comp.*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 2012.
- [19] Y. Polyanskiy, V. Poor, and S. Verdú, "Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2307–2359, May 2010.
- [20] Y. Polyanskiy, "Channel coding: Non-asymptotic fundamental limits," Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 2010.
- [21] R. Bahadur and R. Ranga Rao, "On deviations of the sample mean," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 31, pp. 1015–1027, Dec. 1960.
- [22] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.