

# Channel Polarization Through the Lens of Blackwell Measures

Naveen Goela, *Member, IEEE* and Maxim Raginsky, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Each memoryless binary-input channel (BIC) can be uniquely described by its Blackwell measure, which is a probability distribution on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  with mean  $1/2$ . Conversely, any such probability distribution defines a BIC. The evolution of the Blackwell measure under Arıkan’s polar transform is derived for general BICs, and is analogous to density evolution as cited in the literature. The present analysis emphasizes functional equations. Consequently, the evolution of a variety of channel functionals is characterized, including the symmetric capacity, Bhattacharyya parameter, moments of information density, Hellinger affinity, Gallager’s reliability function, the Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi maximal correlation, and the Bayesian information gain. The evolution of measure is specialized for symmetric BICs according to their decomposition into binary symmetric (sub)-channels (BSCs), which simplifies iterative computations and the construction of polar codes. It is verified that, as a consequence of the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem, all channel functionals  $I_f$  that can be expressed as an expectation of a convex function  $f$  with respect to the Blackwell measure of a channel polarize in each iteration due to the polar transformation on the class of symmetric BICs. Moreover, for  $f$  either convex or non-convex, a necessary and sufficient condition is established to determine whether the random process associated with each  $I_f$  is a martingale, submartingale, or supermartingale. Represented via functional inequalities in terms of  $f$ , this condition is numerically verifiable for all  $I_f$ , and can generate analytical proofs. To exhibit one such proof, it is shown that the random process associated with the squared maximal correlation parameter is a supermartingale, and converges almost surely on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ .

**Index Terms**—Channel polarization, polar transform, Blackwell measure, random process, martingale, channel functional, functional inequality.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**I**NTRODUCED in a seminal paper by E. Arıkan [1], polar codes are a structured family of codes that provably achieve the capacity of symmetric, memoryless, binary-input channels (BICs) with low encoding and decoding complexity. The polar code transforms  $N := 2^n$  independent copies of a symmetric BIC  $W$  into  $N$  polarized channels whose individual capacities

This work was presented in part at the *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, Barcelona, Spain on July 12, 2016, and at the *Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, Illinois, USA on Sept. 28, 2016. This work was supported in part by the Center for Science of Information (CSoI), an NSF Science and Technology Center, under grant agreement CCF-0939370.

Maxim Raginsky is with the Coordinated Science Laboratory and with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL 61801, USA. E-mail: maxim@illinois.edu.

N. Goela is a scientist at Tanium in Emeryville, CA. He was formerly with the Artificial Intelligence Lab at Technicolor, Palo Alto, CA, 94306, USA and the University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720-1770, USA. E-mail: ngoela@alum.mit.edu.

approach either 0 or 1 with increasing block length  $N$ . The fraction of perfect channels among the  $N$  transformed channels approaches  $I(W)$ , the symmetric capacity of  $W$ .

The original work of Arıkan establishes that the random process associated with  $I(W)$  is a martingale, and that the random process associated with the Bhattacharyya parameter  $Z(W)$  is a supermartingale [1]. A central objective of the present paper is to analyze random processes associated with a broad class of channel functionals  $I_f(W)$  for BICs, including  $I(W)$  and  $Z(W)$ , that can be expressed as an expectation of a function  $f$  with respect to the Blackwell measure of  $W$ . Each channel  $W$  is viewed through the lens of its Blackwell measure, which is a representation that originates in the work of Blackwell conducted in 1951 on the comparison of statistical experiments [2], [3] (see also [4] for a modern synthesis).

### A. Overview of contributions

The Blackwell measure is defined for memoryless BICs in Sec. II. Due to the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem [2], [3], [5], [6], each memoryless BIC is uniquely specified by its Blackwell measure, which is a probability distribution on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  with mean  $1/2$ . Conversely, any such measure defines a memoryless BIC. We discuss the relation of the Blackwell measure to other representations of channels, including the information density,  $D$ -distributions defined in the theory of density evolution [7], and Neyman–Pearson regions defined in the theory of binary hypothesis testing (see e.g., [8, Sec. 12.1 and 12.2]). The following list provides an overview of our main contributions:

- Sec. III presents the fact that any measurable function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  induces a functional  $I_f(W)$  of the channel  $W$  through its Blackwell measure. Listed in Table I, several channel parameters can be expressed as  $I_f(W)$  for a particular choice of  $f$ . Non-trivial examples include the Hellinger affinity, moments of information density, Gallager’s reliability function, the Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi maximal correlation, and the Bayesian information gain.
- Sec. IV develops the concept of channel decompositions for symmetric BICs, as introduced by Land and Huber [9]. Each symmetric BIC  $W$  is equivalent to a compound channel, consisting of elementary subchannels that are BSCs [9]. The Blackwell measure of a channel  $W$  may be written in terms of the Blackwell measures of its subchannels. Consequently, the functional  $I_f(W)$  of  $W$  may be computed in terms of the functionals of elementary subchannels of  $W$ .

- In Sec. V, Arıkan’s polar transform is defined [1]. The polar transform is applied to two BICs  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ , and yields two transformed channels, denoted by  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  and  $W_1 \otimes W_2$ . The Blackwell measures of  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  and  $W_1 \otimes W_2$  are derived in terms of the Blackwell measures of  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ . While analogous to density evolution for polar codes [10], our analysis emphasizes functional equations in proofs, and is applicable to asymmetric channels. For symmetric BICs, the Blackwell measures of  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  and  $W_1 \otimes W_2$  are derived explicitly by exploiting the fact that  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  are compound channels consisting of elementary subchannels (i.e., BSCs). In Sec. VI, iterative computations are simplified to construct polar codes for arbitrary symmetric BICs.
- In Sec. VII-A, it is verified that, as a consequence of the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem [2], [3], [5], [6], all channel functionals  $I_f(W)$  that can be expressed as an expectation of a convex function  $f$  with respect to the Blackwell measure of  $W$  polarize in each iteration of the polar transform on the class of symmetric BICs. This type of result has been independently discovered in the modern literature in both [7, Ch. 4] and [11, Ch. 6].
- Sec. VIII analyzes bounded random processes associated with channel functionals  $I_f(W)$  for symmetric BICs  $W$ , where  $f$  may be either convex or non-convex. A necessary and sufficient condition is established to determine whether the random process associated with each  $I_f(W)$  is a martingale, submartingale, or supermartingale. Represented via functional inequalities in terms of  $f$ , this condition is numerically verifiable for all channel functionals  $I_f(W)$ . Moreover, as we demonstrate, it provides a method for analytical proofs. Applying this method in Sec. IX, we prove that the random process associated with the squared maximal correlation parameter is a supermartingale, and converges almost surely on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ .

### B. Relation to prior work

Beyond the symmetric capacity  $I(W)$  and Bhattacharyya parameter  $Z(W)$ , more complex channel functionals have been studied. Alsan and Telatar prove that the random process corresponding to Gallager’s reliability function  $E_0$  [12, Ch. 5.6], which is related to various error exponents and cutoff rates [13], is a submartingale [14, Theorem 2] [11, Theorem 4.7]). Channel combining and splitting by iteratively applying Arıkan’s polar transform increases and improves  $E_0$ . In [15, Theorem 1], Arıkan characterizes the evolution of the variance of the information density, called “varentropy” generally, or “channel dispersion” in the case of uniform input distribution to the channel. Arıkan proved that the varentropy decreases after each iteration of the polar transform. In the present paper, we prove that both Gallager’s reliability function and the second moment of information density related to channel dispersion are induced functionals  $I_f(W)$  of  $W$  for particular choices of  $f$ . As explained in Sec. VIII of the present paper (see e.g., Theorem 6 and Corollary 4), it is feasible to verify and replicate these prior results, both numerically and analytically.

While the convergence of bounded martingales is well-known in mathematics, alternative methods exist to prove the convergence of random processes. For instance, it may be possible to relate one random process to an auxiliary random process whose convergence is rigorously established. Auxiliary processes were studied in [1]. In more recent work, the authors of [16] provide a simple proof of channel polarization that bypasses the explicit use of martingales. On a related topic, going beyond the concept of real-valued random processes, one can define a framework for *channel-valued* random processes. Convergence in distribution, also called the “weak convergence” of channel densities, is defined for channels in the context of density evolution [7, Ch. 4]. Subsequent to our work, [17] provides evidence for the convergence of Arıkan’s *channel-valued* random process in a topological space.

Since Arıkan’s discovery of polarization, significant advances in theory have been made including: (i) multilevel and  $q$ -ary polarization [18], [19]; (ii) generalized  $\ell \times \ell$  polarization matrices and algebraic constructions [20], [21]; (iii) refinements to the rate of polarization, scaling laws, and asymptotic analysis of polar codes [22]–[27]. Prior work focuses primarily on Arıkan’s martingale corresponding to  $I(W)$  and mutual information.

Beyond their application to point-to-point channels, polar codes have also been invented for several multi-user channels such as multiple-access channels [28], broadcast channels [29], and wiretap channels [30]. If the notions of symmetry and information combining [9] could be extended to multi-user channels, a corresponding measure-theoretic framework of polarization could be developed.

### C. Frequently used notation

The following mathematical notations are adopted in the sequel. For  $p, q \in [0, 1]$ , we let  $\bar{p} := 1 - p$  (for  $p \in \{0, 1\}$ , this is the Boolean NOT) and  $p * q := p\bar{q} + \bar{p}q$ . For  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a \wedge b := \min(a, b)$  and  $a \vee b := \max(a, b)$ . The closure of a set  $S$  is denoted by  $\text{cl}\{S\}$ . For a random variable  $X$  defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ , the probability law of  $X$  is the induced measure of  $X$  under  $P$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  [31, Ch. 2]. We will denote by  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  the probability law of  $X$ . The notation  $\delta_x$  denotes the Dirac measure centered on a fixed point  $x$  in a measurable space. The binary entropy function is denoted by  $h_2(x) := -x \log_2(x) - \bar{x} \log_2 \bar{x}$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ . More generally, we also define  $\psi_r(x) := x(1 + \log_2 x)^r + \bar{x}(1 + \log_2 \bar{x})^r$  for  $r$  a positive integer, and  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

## II. REPRESENTATIONS OF BICs

In this work, we focus on discrete, memoryless BICs with finite output alphabets:

**Definition 1** (Discrete, memoryless, binary-input channel (BIC)). *A discrete, memoryless, binary-input channel (BIC) is a pair  $(Y, W)$ , where  $Y$  is the finite output alphabet and  $W = (W(\cdot|0), W(\cdot|1))$  is a pair of probability distributions on  $Y$ . For  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $W(\cdot|x)$  is the probability distribution of the channel output when the channel input is equal to  $x$ .*

The *channel transition matrix* is the most familiar representation of a BIC:

**Definition 2** (Channel transition matrix). For a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , let  $T_W$  denote the  $2 \times |Y|$  matrix whose elements are  $W(y|x)$  for  $(x, y) \in \{0, 1\} \times Y$ .

**Example 1** (Binary erasure channel  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)$ ). The binary erasure channel with erasure probability  $\varepsilon$  is a BIC  $(Y, W)$  with  $Y = \{0, 1, e\}$ ,  $W(\cdot|0) = \bar{\varepsilon}\delta_0 + \varepsilon\delta_e$ , and  $W(\cdot|1) = \bar{\varepsilon}\delta_1 + \varepsilon\delta_e$ . The transition matrix is

$$T_{\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \varepsilon & 0 & \varepsilon \\ 0 & 1 - \varepsilon & \varepsilon \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Example 2** (Binary symmetric channel  $\text{BSC}(p)$ ). The binary symmetric channel with bit-flip probability  $p$  is a BIC  $(Y, W)$  with  $Y = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $W(\cdot|0) = \text{Bern}(p)$ , and  $W(\cdot|1) = \text{Bern}(\bar{p})$ . The transition matrix is

$$T_{\text{BSC}(p)} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 - p & p \\ p & 1 - p \end{bmatrix}.$$

In the remainder of this section, we describe a number of alternative representations of BICs that will be used in the sequel.

### A. The Blackwell measure

The Blackwell measure [2]–[4] particularized to BICs is defined as the distribution of the posterior probability of the binary input being 0, assuming a uniform input distribution to the channel:

**Definition 3** (Blackwell measure of a BIC). Given a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , let  $(X, Y)$  be a random couple on  $\{0, 1\} \times Y$  with  $P_X = \text{Bern}(1/2)$  and  $P_{Y|X} = W$ . Define the function

$$\Lambda_W(y) := \frac{W(y|0)}{W(y|0) + W(y|1)}. \quad (1)$$

The random variable  $S = \Lambda_W(Y)$ , which is equal to the posterior probability of  $X = 0$  given  $Y$ , takes values in the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  and has mean  $1/2$ . The Blackwell measure of  $W$ , which we will denote by  $m_W$ , is the probability law of random variable  $S$  (see [31, Ch. 2] for the definition of probability law).

**Example 3** (Blackwell measures for  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)$  and  $\text{BSC}(p)$ ). The Blackwell measures for the  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)$  and  $\text{BSC}(p)$  are

$$m_{\text{BSC}(p)} = \frac{1}{2}\delta_p + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\bar{p}}, \quad (2)$$

$$m_{\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)} = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{2}\delta_0 + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{2}\delta_1 + \varepsilon\delta_{1/2}. \quad (3)$$

Given two BICs  $(Y, W)$  and  $(Y', W')$ , we say that  $W$  dominates  $W'$  (or is more informative than  $W'$ ) in the sense of Blackwell [2]–[4] if there exists a random transformation  $K$  from  $Y$  to  $Y'$ , such that  $W' = K \circ W$ , i.e., for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  and all  $y' \in Y$ ,

$$W'(y'|x) = \sum_{y \in Y} K(y'|y)W(y|x),$$

In other words,  $W$  dominates  $W'$  exactly when it is stochastically degraded with respect to  $W$ . In that case, we write  $W \succeq W'$ . We say that  $W$  and  $W'$  are equivalent if  $W \succeq W'$  and  $W' \succeq W$ . In that case, we write  $W \equiv W'$ . The

fundamental nature of the Blackwell measure is evident from the following theorem:

**Theorem 1** (Blackwell–Sherman–Stein [2], [3], [5], [6]). Consider two BICs  $W$  and  $W'$ . Then:

- 1)  $W \equiv W'$  if and only if  $m_W = m_{W'}$  (that is, the Blackwell measure specifies the channel uniquely up to equivalence). Moreover, let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the collection of all Borel probability measures on  $[0, 1]$  with mean  $1/2$ . Then for any  $m \in \mathcal{M}$  there exists a BIC  $W$ , unique up to equivalence, such that  $m = m_W$ .<sup>12</sup>
- 2)  $W \succeq W'$  if and only if

$$\int_{[0,1]} f d m_W \geq \int_{[0,1]} f d m_{W'}$$

for every convex  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Remark 1.** There are one-to-one correspondences between the Blackwell measure  $m_W$  and other probabilistic objects associated to the BIC  $W$ , such as its  $L$ - and  $D$ -distributions [7, Ch. 4]. The Blackwell measure is also a special case of the so-called  $\alpha$ -representation [15].

### B. $D$ -distributions and density evolution

Recall the following definition of the  $D$ -distribution:

**Definition 4** ( $D$ -distribution [7]). Given a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , let  $(X, Y)$  be a random couple on  $\{0, 1\} \times Y$  with  $P_X = \text{Bern}(1/2)$  and  $P_{Y|X} = W$ . Define the function

$$\Delta_W(y) := P_{X|Y}(0|y) - P_{X|Y}(1|y), \quad (4)$$

and let  $D = \Delta_W(Y)$ . Then, the  $D$ -distribution is the cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) of  $D$  conditioned on the event  $X = 0$  [7, Ch. 4].

It follows from Eqn. (1) and Eqn. (4) that for arbitrary  $y \in Y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_W(y) &= \frac{W(y|0) - W(y|1)}{W(y|0) + W(y|1)} \\ &\equiv 2\Lambda_W(y) - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Thus, the probability law of  $\Delta_W(Y) = 2S - 1$  also specifies  $W$  uniquely up to Blackwell equivalence. Moreover,  $\Delta_W(Y)$  takes values in  $[-1, 1]$ , has mean zero, and is symmetric, i.e.,  $\Delta_W(Y)$  and  $-\Delta_W(Y)$  have the same probability law.

### C. Information density

Information density furnishes another useful description of BICs. Let  $(X, Y)$  be a random couple taking values in a finite product space  $X \times Y$ . The information density is defined as

$$i(x; y) := \log_2 \frac{P_{Y|X}(y|x)}{P_Y(y)}, \quad (6)$$

<sup>1</sup>The BIC  $W$  has a finite output alphabet if and only if  $m_W$  has finite support. This is precisely the setting of this paper.

<sup>2</sup>The Blackwell measure is also defined in the context of hidden Markov models [32].

where  $P_Y(y) = \sum_{x \in X} P_X(x)P_{Y|X}(y|x)$ . The expectation and the variance of the information density are the mutual information and the information variance:

$$\begin{aligned} I(X; Y) &= \mathbf{E} [i(X; Y)], \\ V(X; Y) &= \mathbf{E} [i^2(X; Y)] - (I(X; Y))^2. \end{aligned}$$

We particularize this to BICs with equiprobable inputs:

**Definition 5** (Information density for a BIC). *Given a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , let  $(X, Y)$  be a random couple on  $\{0, 1\} \times Y$  with  $P_X = \text{Bern}(1/2)$  and  $P_{Y|X} = W$ . The information density of  $(X, Y)$  is given by*

$$i_W(x; y) = \log_2 \frac{W(y|x)}{\frac{1}{2}W(y|0) + \frac{1}{2}W(y|1)}. \quad (7)$$

The expectation and variance of  $i_W(X; Y)$  with  $X \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$  are known as the symmetric capacity  $I(W)$  and symmetric dispersion  $V(W)$ , respectively. To express these parameters succinctly, we introduce the  $r$ th moment of the information density:

$$M_r(W) := \mathbf{E}[i_W(X; Y)^r]. \quad (8)$$

Then  $I(W) = M_1(W)$  and  $V(W) = M_2(W) - I^2(W)$ . From Eqn. (1) and Eqn. (7), it follows that

$$i_W(x; y) = \begin{cases} 1 + \log_2 \Lambda_W(y) & \text{if } x = 0; \\ 1 + \log_2(1 - \Lambda_W(y)) & \text{if } x = 1; \end{cases}$$

for arbitrary  $y \in Y$ . Therefore, the information density specifies  $W$  uniquely up to Blackwell equivalence.

#### D. The Neyman–Pearson region

Another useful representation of BICs arises from the theory of binary hypothesis testing (see [8, Sec. 12.1 and 12.2]).

**Definition 6** (Neyman–Pearson region). *For a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , the Neyman–Pearson region  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{NP}}(W)$  is a subset of  $[0, 1]^2$  consisting of all points  $(\xi, \eta)$ , for which there exists some  $f : Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , such that*

$$\xi = \sum_{y \in Y} f(y)W(y|0), \quad (9)$$

$$\text{and } \eta = \sum_{y \in Y} f(y)W(y|1). \quad (10)$$

The Neyman–Pearson region has the following properties:

- i) It is a closed and convex subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ .
- ii) It contains the diagonal  $\mathcal{D} := \{(\xi, \xi) : \xi \in [0, 1]\}$ .
- iii) It is equal to the closed convex hull of all points  $(\xi, \eta)$ , where  $\xi$  has the form (9) and  $\eta$  has the form (10), with  $f$  taking values in  $\{0, 1\}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\text{NP}}(W) &= \text{cl} \left\{ \text{conv} \left\{ (W(A|0), W(A|1)) : A \subseteq Y \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $W(A|x) := \sum_{y \in A} W(y|x)$ .

The following fundamental result is a consequence of the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem:

**Theorem 2** (Neyman–Pearson criterion for Blackwell dominance). *Consider two BICs  $W$  and  $W'$ . The Neyman–Pearson criterion for Blackwell dominance is given by,*

$$W \succeq W' \iff \mathcal{R}_{\text{NP}}(W) \supseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{NP}}(W').$$

For example, one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\text{NP}}(\text{BSC}(p)) &= \text{cl} \left\{ \text{conv} \left\{ (0, 0), (p, \bar{p}), (\bar{p}, p), (1, 1) \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{NP}}(\text{BSC}(0)) = [0, 1]^2$ , and  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{NP}}(\text{BSC}(1/2)) = \mathcal{D}$ .

### III. FUNCTIONALS OF BICs

Any measurable function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  induces a functional  $I_f$  on the collection of all BICs via

$$I_f(W) := \int_{[0,1]} f dm_W = \mathbf{E}[f(S)], \quad (11)$$

where  $S \sim m_W$ . As summarized in Table I and explained in detail in this section, a variety of channel characteristics can be expressed in this way.

#### A. Symmetric capacity $I(W)$

With  $f(s) = 1 - h_2(s)$ , where  $h_2(\cdot)$  is the binary entropy function,  $I_f(W)$  is equal to the symmetric capacity  $I(W)$  of  $W$  [1], i.e., the mutual information of  $W$  with uniform input distribution. Indeed, let  $(X, Y)$  be a random couple with  $X \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$  and  $P_{Y|X} = W$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(W) &= 1 - \mathbf{E}[h_2(S)] \\ &= 1 + \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{W(Y|x)}{2P_Y(Y)} \log_2 \frac{W(Y|x)}{2P_Y(Y)} \right] \\ &= 1 + \mathbf{E} \left[ \mathbf{E} \left[ \log_2 \frac{W(Y|X)}{2P_Y(Y)} \middle| X \right] \right] \\ &= D(P_{Y|X} \| P_Y | P_X) \\ &\equiv I(W). \end{aligned}$$

#### B. The $r$ th moment of information density $M_r(W)$

Let  $r$  be a positive integer. If we take

$$f(s) = \psi_r(s) := s(1 + \log_2 s)^r + \bar{s}(1 + \log_2 \bar{s})^r,$$

TABLE I  
REAL-VALUED FUNCTIONALS OF BICs

Measurable Function	Induced Functional	English Description
$f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$	$I_f(W)$	
$f(s) = 1 - h_2(s)$	$I(W)$	Mutual Information
$f(s) = s(1 + \log_2 s)^r + \bar{s}(1 + \log_2 \bar{s})^r, r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$	$M_r(W)$	Moments of Information Density
$f(s) = 2\sqrt{s(1-s)}$	$Z(W)$	Bhattacharyya Parameter
$f(s) = 2s^\alpha(1-s)^{1-\alpha}, \alpha \in (0, 1)$	$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(W)$	Hellinger Affinity
$f(s) = 2^{-\rho} \left( s^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + (1-s)^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} \right)^{1+\rho}, \rho \geq 0$	$\exp(-E_0(\rho, W))$	Gallager's Function $E_0(\rho, W)$
$f(s) = \bar{\lambda} \wedge \lambda - (2\bar{\lambda}s) \wedge (2\lambda\bar{s}), \lambda \in [0, 1]$	$B_\lambda(W)$	Bayesian Information Gain
$f(s) =  2s - 1 $	$1 - 2P_{e,ML}(W)$	Maximum Likelihood Decoding Error $P_{e,ML}(W)$
$f(s) = (2s - 1)^2$	$\rho_{\max}^2(W)$	Squared Maximal Correlation

then  $I_f(W)$  is equal to the  $r$ -th moment of the information density  $M_r(W)$ , assuming uniform input distribution, as defined in Eqn. (8). The following equalities establish our claim:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_r(W) &:= \mathbf{E}[(i_W(X; Y))^r] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[ \left( \log_2 \frac{2W(Y|X)}{W(Y|0) + W(Y|1)} \right)^r \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[ \left( 1 + \log_2 \frac{W(Y|X)}{W(Y|0) + W(Y|1)} \right)^r \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[ P_{X|Y}(0|Y) \left( 1 + \log_2 \frac{W(Y|0)}{W(Y|0) + W(Y|1)} \right)^r \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbf{E} \left[ P_{X|Y}(1|Y) \left( 1 + \log_2 \frac{W(Y|1)}{W(Y|0) + W(Y|1)} \right)^r \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}[\Lambda_W(Y) (1 + \log_2 \Lambda_W(Y))^r] \\
&\quad + \mathbf{E}[(1 - \Lambda_W(Y)) (1 + \log_2(1 - \Lambda_W(Y)))^r] \\
&= \mathbf{E}[S(1 + \log_2 S)^r + \bar{S}(1 + \log_2 \bar{S})^r] \\
&= \mathbf{E}[\psi_r(S)] \\
&\equiv I_f(W).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\psi_1(s) = 1 - h_2(s)$  and  $M_1(W) = I(W)$ . The channel dispersion parameter  $V(W)$  is defined as the variance of the information density,  $V(W) := M_2(W) - (I(W))^2$ , assuming a uniform input distribution. While the dispersion  $V(W)$  cannot be expressed explicitly as an induced functional of the form  $I_f(W)$  for any  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we can use the variational representation of the variance as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
V(W) &= \text{Var}[i(X; Y)] \\
&= \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{E}[(i(X; Y) - c)^2] \\
&= \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{E}[(1 - h_2(S) - c)^2] \\
&= \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{E}[(h_2(S) - c)^2].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we consider the family of functions  $f_c(s) := (h_2(s) - c)^2$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , we see that  $V(W)$  can be expressed as

$$V(W) = \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} I_{f_c}(W).$$

### C. Hellinger affinity $\mathcal{H}_\alpha(W)$

If we select  $f(s) = 2s^\alpha(1-s)^{1-\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , then  $I_f(W)$  is equal to the *Hellinger affinity* of order  $\alpha$ :

$$\mathcal{H}_\alpha(W) := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W(y|0)^\alpha W(y|1)^{1-\alpha}.$$

Indeed, one can write,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_f(W) &= 2 \mathbf{E}[S^\alpha(1-S)^{1-\alpha}] \\
&= 2 \mathbf{E} \left[ \left( \frac{W(Y|0)}{2P_Y(Y)} \right)^\alpha \left( \frac{W(Y|1)}{2P_Y(Y)} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right] \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{1}{P_Y(Y)} W(Y|0)^\alpha W(Y|1)^{1-\alpha} \right] \\
&= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W(y|0)^\alpha W(y|1)^{1-\alpha} \\
&\equiv \mathcal{H}_\alpha(W).
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if we set  $\alpha = 1/2$ , then we recover the *Bhattacharyya parameter* [1],

$$\mathcal{H}_{1/2}(W) = Z(W) := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{W(y|0)W(y|1)}.$$

### D. Gallager's function $E_0(\rho, W)$

Gallager's  $E_0$  function of a BIC  $(Y, W)$  with input distribution  $P_X$  is defined as follows [12, Ch. 5.6],

$$E_0(\rho, P_X, W) := -\ln \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} \left[ P_X(x) W(y|x)^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} \right]^{1+\rho},$$

for any  $\rho \geq 0$ . In particular, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
E_0(\rho, W) &:= E_0(\rho, \text{Bern}(1/2), W) \\
&= -\ln \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left( \frac{1}{2} W(y|0)^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + \frac{1}{2} W(y|1)^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} \right)^{1+\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $f$  as

$$f(s) = 2^{-\rho} \left( s^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + (1-s)^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} \right)^{1+\rho}$$

yields an induced functional

$$I_f(W) = \exp(-E_0(\rho, W)).$$

To see this, consider the following chain of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(W) &:= \mathbf{E}[f(S)] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[2^{-\rho} \left(S^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + (1-S)^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}\right)^{1+\rho}\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[2^{-\rho} \left((\Lambda_W(Y))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + (1-\Lambda_W(Y))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}\right)^{1+\rho}\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[2^{-\rho} \left(\frac{(W(Y|0))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + (W(Y|1))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}}{(W(Y|0) + W(Y|1))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}}\right)^{1+\rho}\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[2^{-\rho} \frac{\left((W(Y|0))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + (W(Y|1))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}\right)^{1+\rho}}{W(Y|0) + W(Y|1)}\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{\left(\frac{1}{2}(W(Y|0))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + \frac{1}{2}(W(Y|1))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}\right)^{1+\rho}}{\frac{1}{2}W(Y|0) + \frac{1}{2}W(Y|1)}\right] \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left(\frac{1}{2}(W(y|0))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}} + \frac{1}{2}(W(y|1))^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}\right)^{1+\rho} \\ &\equiv \exp(-E_0(\rho, W)). \end{aligned}$$

#### E. Bayesian information gain $B_\lambda(W)$

Given a BIC  $(Y, W)$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , consider a random couple  $(X, Y)$  with  $X \sim \text{Bern}(\lambda)$  and  $P_{Y|X} = W$ . Define the minimum Bayes risk

$$\begin{aligned} b_\lambda(W) &:= \min_{g: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0,1\}} \mathbf{P}[g(Y) \neq X] \\ &= \min_{g: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0,1\}} \left( \bar{\lambda} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W(y|0) \mathbf{1}_{\{g(y)=1\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} W(y|1) \mathbf{1}_{\{g(y)=0\}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

where the minimum is over all deterministic decoders  $g: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . The *Bayesian information gain* is defined as

$$B_\lambda(W) := b_\lambda(\text{BSC}(1/2)) - b_\lambda(W).$$

We claim that

$$B_\lambda(W) = I_{f_\lambda}(W), \quad (12)$$

with  $f_\lambda(s) := \bar{\lambda} \wedge \lambda - (2\bar{\lambda}s) \wedge (2\lambda\bar{s})$ . The proof of this claim is given in Appendix A. Moreover, since any convex  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  can be approximated by a positive affine combination of such  $f_\lambda$ 's [4], it follows that  $W \succeq W'$  if and only if  $B_\lambda(W) \geq B_\lambda(W')$  for all  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ .

#### F. Squared maximal correlation $\rho_{\max}^2(W)$

Given jointly distributed, real-valued random variables  $(X, Y)$ , the Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi maximal correlation is defined as follows [33]–[35]:

$$\rho_{\max}(X, Y) := \sup_{(g(X), h(Y)) \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{E}[g(X)h(Y)], \quad (13)$$

where  $g, h$  are real-valued functions, and  $\mathcal{S}$  is the collection of pairs of real-valued random variables  $(g(X), h(Y))$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[g(X)] = \mathbf{E}[h(Y)] &= 0, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{E}[g^2(X)] = \mathbf{E}[h^2(Y)] &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The maximal correlation is bounded:  $0 \leq \rho_{\max}(X, Y) \leq 1$ . Moreover,  $\rho_{\max}(X, Y) = 0$  if and only if  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, and  $\rho_{\max}(X, Y) = 1$  if there exist functions  $g, h$  such that  $g(X) = h(Y)$  almost surely. For  $X$  a binary random variable (see e.g., [36]):

$$\rho_{\max}^2(X, Y) = \left[ \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}, y} \frac{(P_{X,Y}(x, y))^2}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)} \right] - 1.$$

Given a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , consider a random couple  $(X, Y)$  with  $X \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$  and  $P_{Y|X} = W$ . In this case, we adopt the abbreviated notation  $\rho_{\max}^2(W) := \rho_{\max}^2(X, Y)$ . This is the squared maximal correlation parameter of  $W$ , assuming a uniform input distribution. If we take

$$f(s) = (2s - 1)^2,$$

then evidently  $I_f(W) = \rho_{\max}^2(W)$ . The following equalities establish this claim, with  $P_X(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\max}^2(W) &:= \left[ \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}, y} \frac{(P_{X,Y}(x, y))^2}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)} \right] - 1 \\ &= \left[ \sum_y 2P_Y(y) [(P_{X|Y}(0|y))^2 + (P_{X|Y}(1|y))^2] \right] - 1 \\ &= \mathbf{E}[2(\Lambda_W(Y))^2 + 2(1 - \Lambda_W(Y))^2 - 1] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[2S^2 + 2(1 - S)^2 - 1] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[(2S - 1)^2] \\ &\equiv I_f(W). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 2.** Consider functions  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\varphi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\varphi \circ f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $I_f(W) = \mathbf{E}[f(S)]$  and  $I_{\varphi \circ f}(W) = \mathbf{E}[\varphi(f(S))]$ . We note that  $I_{\varphi \circ f}(W) \neq \varphi(I_f(W))$  in general. For example, if  $\varphi(x) = x^2$ , then clearly  $\mathbf{E}[(f(S))^2] \neq \mathbf{E}[f(S)]\mathbf{E}[f(S)]$  in general. Examining the last two rows of Table I,  $(1 - 2P_{e, \text{ML}}(W))^2 \neq \rho_{\max}^2(W)$  for arbitrary BICs, even though this is true for the special case that  $W \equiv \text{BSC}(p)$ . Overall, the maximal correlation is a non-trivial, distinct parameter.

#### IV. OUTPUT-SYMMETRIC BICs

In his original pioneering work [1], Arıkan analyzed BICs having the property of output symmetry:

**Definition 7** (Output-symmetric BIC). A BIC  $(Y, W)$  is *output-symmetric* if there exists a bijection  $\pi: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ , such that  $\pi^{-1} = \pi$  and  $W(\pi(y)|0) = W(y|1)$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

The phrases ‘‘symmetric BIC’’ and ‘‘output-symmetric BIC’’ will be used interchangeably.

### A. Structural decomposition of symmetric BICs

Let us first recall the following definition:

**Definition 8** (Compound channel). *Let  $(Y_i, W_i)$ ,  $i \in [m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$ , be a collection of BICs, and let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$  be a probability distribution on  $[m]$ . A compound channel with subchannels  $\{W_i\}$  and mixing distribution  $\lambda$  is a BIC  $W$  defined by transition probabilities*

$$W(i, y|x) = \lambda_i W_i(y|x),$$

for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $i \in [m]$ , and  $y \in Y_i$ . A compound channel will be denoted as  $W = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i W_i$ .

The following structural result proved in [9, Theorem 2.1] establishes that any symmetric BIC is a compound channel which consists of elementary subchannels that are BSCs:

**Theorem 3** (Channel decomposition [9]). *Let the  $\oplus$ -operator applied to channels in Definition 8 define a compound channel. For any symmetric BIC  $W$ , there exist a positive integer  $m$ , a probability vector  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ , and error parameters  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in [0, 1]$ , such that*

$$W \equiv \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \text{BSC}(p_i). \quad (14)$$

### B. Blackwell measures of symmetric BICs

It is not difficult to show that the Blackwell measure of a compound channel is given by the mixture of the Blackwell measures of the constituent subchannels:

$$\mathfrak{m}_W = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \mathfrak{m}_{W_i}.$$

Thus, Theorem 3 shows that the Blackwell measure of any symmetric BIC is a mixture of Blackwell measures of BSCs. In particular, if  $W \equiv \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \text{BSC}(p_i)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}_W &= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p_i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{2} \delta_{p_i} + \frac{\lambda_i}{2} \delta_{\bar{p}_i} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, any symmetric BIC  $W$  that admits the decomposition (14) is specified, up to Blackwell equivalence, by the set

$$\mathcal{C}_W := \{(\lambda_i, p_i) : i \in [m]\}. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, if  $S \sim \mathfrak{m}_W$ , then  $\bar{S} = 1 - S \sim \mathfrak{m}_W$  as well.

For two symmetric BICs  $W$  and  $W'$ , the Blackwell ordering is equivalent to the *symmetric convex ordering* introduced by Alsan [11, Ch. 6], according to which  $W$  dominates  $W'$  if and only if

$$\mathbf{E}[f(\Delta_W(Y))] \geq \mathbf{E}[f(\Delta_{W'}(Y'))]$$

for all convex and even functions  $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $(X, Y)$  is a random couple,  $P_X = \text{Bern}(1/2)$ ,  $P_{Y|X} = W$ , and  $P_{Y'|X} = W'$ . The function  $\Delta_W(\cdot)$  was defined in Eqn. (4).

### C. Examples of properties of symmetric BICs

Theorem 3 also has implications for the computation of functionals of channels. Indeed, it follows directly from Eqn. (2) and Eqn. (11) that, for any  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$I_f(\text{BSC}(p)) = \frac{1}{2}f(p) + \frac{1}{2}f(\bar{p}).$$

Then, for a symmetric BIC  $W$  with decomposition (14),

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(W) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i I_f(\text{BSC}(p_i)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i}{2} (f(p_i) + f(\bar{p}_i)). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$(17)$$

Consequently, for any symmetric BIC  $(Y, W)$ , an induced functional of the form  $I_f(W)$  given in Table I, such as  $I(W)$ ,  $Z(W)$ ,  $B_\lambda(W)$ ,  $\rho_{\max}^2(W)$ , etc., may be computed in terms of the functionals of elementary BSC subchannels. The channel dispersion  $V(W)$  is not an induced functional, but may be derived from the induced functionals  $M_2(W)$  and  $I(W)$ .

**Example 4** (Channel dispersion of  $\text{BSC}(p)$  and  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)$ ). The channel dispersions of the  $\text{BSC}(p)$  for  $p \notin \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ , and of the  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)$  are given by (cf. [37, Theorem 52 and Theorem 53]):

$$V(\text{BSC}(p)) = p\bar{p} \left( \log_2 \frac{\bar{p}}{p} \right)^2, \quad (18)$$

$$V(\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)) = \varepsilon\bar{\varepsilon}. \quad (19)$$

For  $p \in \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ ,  $V(\text{BSC}(p))$  approaches the limit of 0. Eqn. (18) can be derived from Eqn. (17). The second moment  $M_2(\text{BSC}(p))$  is computed by selecting  $f(s) = \psi_2(s)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} M_2(\text{BSC}(p)) &= \frac{f(p)}{2} + \frac{f(\bar{p})}{2} \\ &= p(1 + \log_2 p)^2 + \bar{p}(1 + \log_2 \bar{p})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The dispersion parameter is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} V(\text{BSC}(p)) &:= M_2(\text{BSC}(p)) - (I(\text{BSC}(p)))^2 \\ &= p\bar{p} [(\log_2 p)^2 + (\log_2 \bar{p})^2 - 2 \log_2 p \log_2 \bar{p}], \end{aligned}$$

which is verified to be equivalent to Eqn. (18). By observing that  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon) \equiv \varepsilon \text{BSC}(0) \oplus \varepsilon \text{BSC}(1/2)$ , it is straightforward to verify Eqn. (19).

The calculation of a variety of channel parameters, e.g., the channel dispersion, for symmetric BICs is greatly simplified due to channel decompositions:

**Lemma 1** (Channel dispersion of an arbitrary symmetric BIC). *Consider a symmetric BIC  $(Y, W)$  with decomposition  $W \equiv \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \text{BSC}(p_i)$ . The channel capacity  $I(W)$  and channel dispersion  $V(W)$  may be written in terms of the capacities and dispersions of the subchannels:*

$$I(W) = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i I(\text{BSC}(p_i)), \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V(W) &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i V(\text{BSC}(p_i)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i (I(\text{BSC}(p_i)) - I(W))^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* Omitted.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** Eqn. (21) is also discussed in [9, Eqn. 2.7], which cites Gallager’s approach for computing the capacity of symmetric channels [12, Ch. 4]. In a similar manner, it is straightforward to derive Eqn. (22) from first principles by exploiting channel decompositions.

#### D. Mutual information profile

The mutual information profile (MIP) (see [9, Ch. 2] for a detailed presentation) is based on the structural decomposition of symmetric BICs:

**Definition 9** (Mutual Information Profile). *A symmetric BIC  $(Y, W)$  with structural decomposition  $W \equiv \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \text{BSC}(p_i)$  as in Theorem 3 is uniquely characterized by a random variable  $\Phi$  that takes values in the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  according to the probability law*

$$m_W^\Phi := \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \delta_{I(\text{BSC}(p_i))}. \quad (23)$$

The probability law  $m_W^\Phi$  is called the mutual information profile (MIP) of the channel  $W$ .

Similar to the Blackwell measure which uniquely specifies an arbitrary BIC up to Blackwell equivalence, the MIP uniquely specifies BICs with the property of output symmetry. In fact, it is easy to see from Eqn (23) that the MIP  $m_W^\Phi$  is simply the probability law of  $1 - h_2(S)$  when  $S \sim m_W$ .

### V. THE POLAR TRANSFORM

The polar transform maps a pair of BICs to another pair of transformed BICs via a Boolean XOR of the binary inputs of the original channels [1]. The Boolean XOR creates dependence between the random variables associated to the inputs and outputs of the transformed BICs.

#### A. The polar transform

**Definition 10** (The polar transform [1]). *The polar transform maps a pair of BICs  $(Y_1, W_1)$  and  $(Y_2, W_2)$  into another pair of BICs  $(Y_1 \times Y_2, W_1 \boxtimes W_2)$  and  $(Y_1 \times Y_2 \times \{0, 1\}, W_1 \circledast W_2)$  as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|x) \\ := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in \{0,1\}} W_1(y_1|u \oplus x) W_2(y_2|u) \end{aligned} \quad (24a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (W_1 \circledast W_2)(y_1, y_2, u|x) \\ := \frac{1}{2} W_1(y_1|u \oplus x) W_2(y_2|x) \end{aligned} \quad (24b)$$

for all  $x, u \in \{0, 1\}$  and all  $(y_1, y_2) \in Y_1 \times Y_2$ , where  $\oplus$  is the Boolean XOR.

The transformed channel  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  is “weaker” than both  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  as will be clarified in subsequent analysis. The transformed channel  $W_1 \circledast W_2$  is improved because it is equivalent to decoding based on two independent noisy versions of the binary input. A parallel broadcast of the binary input is formalized as follows:

**Definition 11** (Product BIC  $W_1 \times W_2$ ). *Given two BICs  $(Y_1, W_1)$  and  $(Y_2, W_2)$ , we define the product BIC  $(Y_1 \times Y_2, W_1 \times W_2)$  by*

$$(W_1 \times W_2)(y_1, y_2|x) := W_1(y_1|x) W_2(y_2|x)$$

for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}$  and all  $(y_1, y_2) \in Y_1 \times Y_2$ . In other words,  $W_1 \times W_2$  is the parallel broadcast channel formed by  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  [38].

#### B. Blackwell measures of one-step polarized BICs

Consider two Blackwell measures  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ . The following operations  $\boxtimes$  and  $\circledast$  on a pair of Blackwell measures yield two additional probability measures  $m_1 \boxtimes m_2$  and  $m_1 \circledast m_2$  on  $[0, 1]$ .

**Definition 12.** *Let  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}$  where  $\mathcal{M}$  is the space of probability measures as defined in Theorem 1. Let  $S_1 \sim m_1$  and  $S_2 \sim m_2$  be two independent random variables. The probability measures  $m_1 \boxtimes m_2$  and  $m_1 \circledast m_2$  are defined as follows: For any continuous bounded  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let*

$$\int_{[0,1]} f d(m_1 \boxtimes m_2) = \mathbf{E}[f(1 - S_1 \star S_2)] \quad (25)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} f d(m_1 \circledast m_2) = \mathbf{E} \left[ (1 - S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{S_1 S_2}{1 - S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right. \\ \left. + (S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{\bar{S}_1 S_2}{S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

**Lemma 2.** *The probability measures  $m_1 \boxtimes m_2$  and  $m_1 \circledast m_2$  are also Blackwell measures.*

*Proof.* Setting  $f(s) = s$  in Eqs. (25) and (26), and recalling that  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are independent and both have mean  $\frac{1}{2}$ , we get  $\int_{[0,1]} s d(m_1 \boxtimes m_2)(ds) = \mathbf{E}[1 - S_1 \star S_2] = \frac{1}{2}$ . Similarly,  $\int_{[0,1]} s d(m_1 \circledast m_2)(ds) = \mathbf{E}[S_2] = \frac{1}{2}$ . Thus, both  $m_1 \boxtimes m_2$  and  $m_1 \circledast m_2$  are in  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $\square$

Regarding the following theorem, one can also refer to density evolution for polar codes [10]. The Blackwell measures of one-step polarized channels  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  and  $W_1 \circledast W_2$  can be written in terms of the Blackwell measures of  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ :

**Theorem 4** (Evolution of Blackwell measures under Arıkan’s polar transform). *The Blackwell measures of the one-step polarized BICs  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  and  $W_1 \circledast W_2$  introduced in Definition 10 are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} m_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2} &= m_{W_1} \boxtimes m_{W_2}, \\ m_{W_1 \circledast W_2} &= m_{W_1} \circledast m_{W_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the operations  $\boxtimes$  and  $\circledast$  on Blackwell measures were defined in Definition 12.

*Proof.* We first establish the formula for  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$ . Let  $(X_i, Y_i)$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , where  $(X_1, Y_1)$  and  $(X_2, Y_2)$  are independent,  $P_{X_1} = P_{X_2} = \text{Bern}(1/2)$ , and  $P_{Y_i|X_i} = W_i$ .



Then, recalling the definition of  $\Lambda_W$  in (1), and using an abbreviated notation  $\bar{\Lambda}_W = 1 - \Lambda_W$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (W_1(y_1|0)W_2(y_2|0) + W_1(y_1|1)W_2(y_2|1)) \\ &= 2P_{Y_1}(y_1)P_{Y_2}(y_2) (\Lambda_{W_1}(y_1)\Lambda_{W_2}(y_2) + \bar{\Lambda}_{W_1}(y_1)\bar{\Lambda}_{W_2}(y_2)) \\ &= 2P_{Y_1}(y_1)P_{Y_2}(y_2) \cdot (1 - \Lambda_{W_1}(y_1) \star \Lambda_{W_2}(y_2)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (W_1(y_1|1)W_2(y_2|0) + W_1(y_1|0)W_2(y_2|1)) \\ &= 2P_{Y_1}(y_1)P_{Y_2}(y_2) (\bar{\Lambda}_{W_1}(y_1)\Lambda_{W_2}(y_2) + \Lambda_{W_1}(y_1)\bar{\Lambda}_{W_2}(y_2)) \\ &= 2P_{Y_1}(y_1)P_{Y_2}(y_2) \cdot (\Lambda_{W_1}(y_1) \star \Lambda_{W_2}(y_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining the above two equations,

$$\begin{aligned} & (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|0) + (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|1) \\ &= 2P_{Y_1}(y_1)P_{Y_2}(y_2). \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \Lambda_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2}(y_1, y_2) \\ &= \frac{(W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|0)}{(W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|0) + (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2|1)} \\ &= 1 - \Lambda_{W_1}(y_1) \star \Lambda_{W_2}(y_2). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $S = \Lambda_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2}(Y_1, Y_2) = 1 - S_1 \star S_2$ , where  $S_1 = \Lambda_{W_1}(Y_1)$  and  $S_2 = \Lambda_{W_2}(Y_2)$  are independent. Thus, for any continuous  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{[0,1]} f d\mathbf{m}_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2}(ds) = \mathbf{E}[f(S)] \quad (27)$$

$$= \mathbf{E}[f(1 - S_1 \star S_2)] \quad (28)$$

$$= \int_{[0,1]} f d(\mathbf{m}_{W_1} \boxtimes \mathbf{m}_{W_2}). \quad (29)$$

We turn to  $W_1 \otimes W_2$ . Let the  $\oplus$ -operator applied to channels in Definition 8 define a compound channel. From the definition of the polar transform given in Eqn. (24), it follows that

$$W_1 \otimes W_2 \equiv \frac{1}{2}W^{(0)} \oplus \frac{1}{2}W^{(1)} \quad (30)$$

with  $W^{(0)} := W_1 \times W_2$  and  $W^{(1)} := \bar{W}_1 \times W_2$ , where  $\bar{W}_1$  is the BIC related to  $W_1$  via  $\bar{W}_1(\cdot|x) = W_1(\cdot|\bar{x})$ . Then the random variables  $S^{(0)} \sim \mathbf{m}_{W^{(0)}}$  and  $S^{(1)} \sim \mathbf{m}_{W^{(1)}}$  evidently satisfy

$$\mathbf{E}[f(S^{(0)})] = 2 \mathbf{E} \left[ (1 - S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{S_1 S_2}{1 - S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right]$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}[f(S^{(1)})] = 2 \mathbf{E} \left[ (S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{\bar{S}_1 \bar{S}_2}{S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right]$$

for every continuous  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Combining this result with (30) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} f d\mathbf{m}_{W_1 \otimes W_2} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}[f(S^{(0)})] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}[f(S^{(1)})] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[ (1 - S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{S_1 S_2}{1 - S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{\bar{S}_1 \bar{S}_2}{S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right] \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} f d(\mathbf{m}_{W_1} \otimes \mathbf{m}_{W_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f$  is arbitrary, we obtain the formula for  $\mathbf{m}_{W_1 \otimes W_2}$ .  $\square$

### C. Blackwell measures of one-step polarized BSCs

Although Theorem 4 fully characterizes the Blackwell measure of one-step transformed BICs, further specialization is possible if the original BICs have the property of symmetry. Symmetric BICs are composed of elementary subchannels (i.e., BSCs) as established in Theorem 3. Thus, the essential aspect of polarization for symmetric BICs is the interaction of subchannels that are BSCs which may have *different* probabilities of error. The following lemmas provide complementary descriptions of the effect of the polar transform on a pair of BSCs:

**Lemma 3** (One-step polarization of BSCs — transition matrices). *Let  $(p, q) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ . Consider the channels  $\text{BSC}(p)$  and  $\text{BSC}(q)$ . As defined in Definition 10, let  $\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)$  and  $\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)$  represent the transformed channels. The corresponding transition matrices have the following structure:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= T_{\text{BSC}(p \star q)} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 - p \star q & p \star q \\ p \star q & 1 - p \star q \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= T_{\text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \bar{p}\bar{q} & p\bar{q} & p\bar{q} & \bar{p}\bar{q} \\ p\bar{q} & \bar{p}\bar{q} & \bar{p}\bar{q} & p\bar{q} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where  $\tilde{T}_W$  represents the transition matrix  $T_W$  with a reduced number of columns due to aggregating (i.e., grouping) output symbols of BIC  $W$ .

*Proof.* Provided in Appendix B.  $\square$

**Lemma 4** (One-step polarization of BSCs — structural decomposition). *Let  $(p, q) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Assume  $(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$  so that  $(p \star q) \neq 0$ . Consider the channels  $\text{BSC}(p)$  and  $\text{BSC}(q)$  as in Lemma 3, and define the following parameters:*

$$\alpha := \frac{pq}{1 - p \star q}, \quad (33)$$

$$\beta := \frac{\bar{p}\bar{q}}{p \star q}, \quad (34)$$




Fig. 1. The mutual information profiles of one-step polarized channels as a weighted sum of Dirac measures (see Definition 9). The vertical axis depicts weights in the interval  $[0, 1]$  assigned to the Dirac measures. The horizontal axis depicts the location in the interval  $[0, 1]$  of the Dirac measures in the profile.

where  $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  and  $(\beta \wedge \bar{\beta}) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Then the one-step polarized channels satisfy the following equivalences.

$$\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q) \equiv \text{BSC}(p \star q), \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q) &\equiv \text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q) \\ &\equiv (1 - p \star q) \text{BSC}(\alpha) \oplus (p \star q) \text{BSC}(\beta \wedge \bar{\beta}). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* Provided in Appendix C.  $\square$

Lemmas 3 and 4 precisely characterize the interaction of a  $\text{BSC}(p)$  with a  $\text{BSC}(q)$  after one step of polarization. The equivalences are based on equivalences between corresponding transition matrices. In a more general approach based on Blackwell measures, the equivalences may be derived directly from Theorem 4 as a corollary:

**Corollary 1** (One-step polarization of BSCs — Blackwell measures). *Let  $(p, q) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Consider the channels  $\text{BSC}(p)$  and  $\text{BSC}(q)$ . Then the Blackwell measures of the transformed channels  $\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)$  and  $\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)$  are given as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= m_{\text{BSC}(p)} \boxtimes m_{\text{BSC}(q)} \\ &= m_{\text{BSC}(p \star q)}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= m_{\text{BSC}(p)} \otimes m_{\text{BSC}(q)} \\ &= m_{\text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

In addition, consider the parameters  $\alpha := \frac{pq}{1-p \star q}$  and  $\beta := \frac{\bar{p}q}{p \star q}$  as defined in Lemma 4. Then for  $(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$ , the paral-

lel broadcast channel  $\text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)$  has the following representation in terms of Blackwell measure:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)} &= (1 - p \star q) m_{\text{BSC}(\alpha)} + (p \star q) m_{\text{BSC}(\beta \wedge \bar{\beta})}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

*Proof.* Provided in Appendix D.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** The lower-half panel of Figure 1 depicts the polar transformation applied to two BSCs. The channel  $\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)$  is a BSC with probability of error  $p \star q$ , which is larger than both  $p$  and  $q$ . The channel  $\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)$  is a more complex channel. More precisely, it is a compound channel, as defined in Definition 8, which consists of two elementary subchannels that are BSCs.

#### D. Blackwell measures of one-step polarized symmetric BICs

Building upon Corollary 1, it is possible to characterize the image of a pair of arbitrary symmetric BICs under the polar transformation. The one-step polarization of symmetric BICs is characterized entirely by the interaction of elementary subchannels that are BSCs.

**Corollary 2** (One-step polarization of symmetric BICs — Blackwell measures). *Consider two symmetric BICs  $(Y_1, W_1)$  and  $(Y_2, W_2)$ . As established by Theorem 3, there exist positive integers  $m, k$ , probability vectors  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ ,*

$\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ , and parameters  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in [0, 1]$ ,  $q_1, \dots, q_k \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$W_1 \equiv \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \text{BSC}(p_i),$$

$$W_2 \equiv \bigoplus_{j=1}^k \mu_j \text{BSC}(q_j).$$

Then the transformed channels  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  and  $W_1 \otimes W_2$  have the following Blackwell measures which illustrate their structural decompositions:

$$m_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j m_{\text{BSC}(p_i \star q_j)}. \quad (40)$$

$$m_{W_1 \otimes W_2} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j m_{\text{BSC}(p_i) \times \text{BSC}(q_j)}. \quad (41)$$

*Proof.* Provided in Appendix E.  $\square$

As an illustration of Corollary 2, we give an alternative derivation of the fact that the image of a pair of BECs under the polar transform is another pair of BECs [1, Prop. 6].

**Example 5** (One-step polarization of BECs — Blackwell measures). Consider two erasure channels,  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)$  and  $\text{BEC}(\tau)$ , with erasure probabilities  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$  and  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ . The upper-half panel of Figure 1 depicts that  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon) \boxtimes \text{BEC}(\tau) \equiv \text{BEC}(1 - \varepsilon\bar{\tau})$  and  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon) \otimes \text{BEC}(\tau) \equiv \text{BEC}(\varepsilon\tau)$ . We give a proof of the second equivalence here, and the proof of the first equivalence follows from nearly identical steps. Applying Eqn. (41) of Corollary 2, the channel  $\text{BEC}(\varepsilon) \otimes \text{BEC}(\tau)$  has the following Blackwell measure:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{BEC}(\varepsilon) \otimes \text{BEC}(\tau)} &= m_{\text{BEC}(\varepsilon)} \otimes m_{\text{BEC}(\tau)} \\ &= (\bar{\varepsilon} m_{\text{BSC}(0)} + \varepsilon m_{\text{BSC}(1/2)}) \otimes (\bar{\tau} m_{\text{BSC}(0)} + \tau m_{\text{BSC}(1/2)}) \\ &= \bar{\varepsilon}\bar{\tau} m_{\text{BSC}(0) \times \text{BSC}(0)} + \bar{\varepsilon}\tau m_{\text{BSC}(0) \times \text{BSC}(1/2)} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon\bar{\tau} m_{\text{BSC}(1/2) \times \text{BSC}(0)} + \varepsilon\tau m_{\text{BSC}(1/2) \times \text{BSC}(1/2)} \\ &= \bar{\varepsilon}\bar{\tau} m_{\text{BSC}(0)} + \bar{\varepsilon}\tau m_{\text{BSC}(0)} + \varepsilon\bar{\tau} m_{\text{BSC}(0)} + \varepsilon\tau m_{\text{BSC}(1/2)} \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon\tau) m_{\text{BSC}(0)} + \varepsilon\tau m_{\text{BSC}(1/2)} \\ &= m_{\text{BEC}(\varepsilon\tau)}. \end{aligned}$$

## VI. THE CONSTRUCTION OF POLAR CODES

For a given BIC  $(Y, W)$ , the polar transforms defined in Definition 10 may be applied iteratively [1]. Polarizing the original channel  $W$  successively over  $n$  iterations results in one of  $2^n$  possible channels.

**Definition 13** (Successive channel polarization). Consider a BIC  $(Y, W)$ . Let  $b = (b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$  be a binary vector,  $b \in \{0, 1\}^{n+1}$ . The channel  $W_b$  is obtained by iterative polarization:

$$W_b = W_{(b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)}$$

$$:= \begin{cases} W_{(b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})} \boxtimes W_{(b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})}, & \text{if } b_n = 0, \\ W_{(b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})} \otimes W_{(b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})}, & \text{if } b_n = 1. \end{cases}$$

for all integers  $n > 0$ . The base case is given by  $W_{(b_0)} \equiv W$ .

Polarization of a Hybrid Output-Symmetric BIC:  $I(W) \approx 0.6280$ .




Fig. 2. Experimental results for the polarization of a hybrid output-symmetric BIC with parameters  $\varepsilon_0 = 0.12$  and  $\gamma_0 = 0.05$ , with capacity  $I(W) = (1 - \varepsilon_0)(1 - h_2(\gamma_0)) \approx 0.6280$ . Polar codes of block lengths  $2^n$  were constructed for  $n = 10, 11, 12$ .

### A. Polar code construction: symmetric BICs

Based on Theorem 4, Corollary 1 and Corollary 2 are specialized for the class of symmetric BICs. Channel decompositions greatly simplify iterative computations and the construction of polar codes. A simple algorithm constructs all  $2^n$  channels, as defined in Definition 13, over  $n$  iterations of the polar transform.

Consider two symmetric BICs  $(Y_1, W_1)$  and  $(Y_2, W_2)$ . Due to Theorem 3, there exist positive integers  $m, k$ , probability vectors  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ ,  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ , and parameters  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ ,  $q_1, \dots, q_k \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  such that  $W_1 \equiv \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \text{BSC}(p_i)$  and  $W_2 \equiv \bigoplus_{j=1}^k \mu_j \text{BSC}(q_j)$ . In addition, we define the following parameters from Corollary 1 and Corollary 2:

$$\alpha_{ij} := \frac{p_i q_j}{1 - p_i \star q_j},$$

$$\beta_{ij} := \frac{\bar{p}_i q_j}{p_i \star q_j},$$

where we define  $(\alpha_{ij}, \beta_{ij}) := (0, 0)$  if  $(p_i, q_j) = (0, 0)$  in the degenerate case. Consider the sets  $\mathcal{C}_{W_1}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{W_2}$  defined in Eqn. (15):

$$\mathcal{C}_{W_1} = \{(\lambda_i, p_i) : i \in [m]\},$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{W_2} = \{(\mu_j, q_j) : j \in [k]\}.$$

After one iteration of polarization,  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  and  $W_1 \otimes W_2$  have corresponding sets:

$$\mathcal{C}_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2} = \{(\lambda_i \mu_j, p_i \star q_j) : i \in [m], j \in [k]\}. \quad (42)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{W_1 \otimes W_2} = \left\{ (\lambda_i \mu_j (1 - p_i \star q_j), \alpha_{ij}) : i \in [m], j \in [k] \right\} \cup \left\{ (\lambda_i \mu_j (p_i \star q_j), \beta_{ij} \wedge \bar{\beta}_{ij}) : i \in [m], j \in [k] \right\}. \quad (43)$$

By iteratively applying Eqn. (42) and Eqn. (43), the polar transforms may be applied successively to obtain the representation  $\mathcal{C}_{W_b}$  for any transformed output-symmetric BIC  $W_b$  defined in Definition 13, where binary vector  $b \in \{0, 1\}^{n+1}$ . Eqn. (42) and Eqn. (43) constitute an exact algorithm.

**Remark 5.** Since the size of the output alphabet of transformed discrete channels increases exponentially with the number of iterations  $n$ , the above algorithm must be modified slightly to maintain computational tractability. One approach is to shift and merge the probability masses corresponding to the Dirac measures of transformed channels. The merge operation combines point masses located within the same interval of quantization. We refer to the literature which provides detailed analyses of channel approximation methods for constructing polar codes [39], [40]. Furthermore, as shown in [41], the construction of polar codes is even attainable with sub-linear complexity.

### B. Experimental results

To corroborate Eqn. (42) and Eqn. (43), experimental evidence is provided herein regarding the successive quantization and polarization of a hybrid output-symmetric BIC. The hybrid BIC is a combination of BSC and BEC channels.

**Example 6** (Successive polarization of a hybrid output-symmetric BIC). Consider a BIC  $(Y, W)$  with output alphabet  $Y = \{0, 1, e\}$ , and channel transition probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} W(e|0) &= W(e|1) = \varepsilon_0, \\ W(0|0) &= W(1|1) = (1 - \varepsilon_0)(1 - p_0), \\ W(1|0) &= W(0|1) = (1 - \varepsilon_0)p_0. \end{aligned}$$

For  $\varepsilon_0 = 0.12$ ,  $p_0 = 0.05$ , the capacity  $I(W) = (1 - \varepsilon_0)(1 - h_2(p_0)) \approx 0.6280$ . Figure 2 depicts the mutual information values of transformed channels sorted in descending order after  $n = 10, 11, 12$  levels of successive polarization. Channel quantization was applied to maintain computational tractability. Point masses corresponding to the Dirac measures of transformed channels were merged within dyadic intervals of length  $2^{-L}$  with  $L = 14$ .

## VII. ONE-STEP POLARIZATION OF CHANNEL FUNCTIONALS $I_f$

Informally speaking, the polar transform (24) replaces the original pair of BICs  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  with another pair, where  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  is “worse” than both  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ , and  $W_1 \circledast W_2$  is “better” than both  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ . The following definition makes precise the notion of one-step polarization of real-valued functionals for a class of channels.

**Definition 14** (One-step polarization of real-valued functionals). Let  $\mathcal{W}$  denote a class of BICs. A channel functional  $\Psi$  associates a real number  $\Psi(W)$  to every  $W \in \mathcal{W}$ . The functional  $\Psi$  polarizes in one iteration on  $\mathcal{W}$  due to Arikan’s polar transform if, for any two BICs  $W_1, W_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(W_1 \boxtimes W_2) &\leq \Psi(W_1) \wedge \Psi(W_2) \\ &\leq \Psi(W_1) \vee \Psi(W_2) \leq \Psi(W_1 \circledast W_2). \end{aligned}$$

This definition assumes that both  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2 \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $W_1 \circledast W_2 \in \mathcal{W}$ .

### A. One-step polarization of real-valued channel functionals

In this section, we provide a direct proof from first principles, verifying that one-step polarization as defined in Definition 14 holds for many real-valued channel functionals on the class of symmetric BICs. As we detail in subsequent remarks, the following theorem has been rediscovered several times in the modern literature. Aside from its direct proof, it also follows as a consequence of the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem.

**Theorem 5** (One-step polarization of real-valued functionals). All channel functionals  $I_f$  with a convex  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  polarize in each iteration of the polar transform on the class of symmetric BICs. That is, if  $W_1, W_2$  are two symmetric BICs, then

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(W_1 \boxtimes W_2) &\leq I_f(W_1) \wedge I_f(W_2) \\ &\leq I_f(W_1) \vee I_f(W_2) \leq I_f(W_1 \circledast W_2). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $S_1 \sim m_{W_1}$  and  $S_2 \sim m_{W_2}$  be independent. Then, using Theorem 4, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(W_1 \boxtimes W_2) &= \int_{[0,1]} f d m_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2} \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} f d (m_{W_1} \boxtimes m_{W_2}) \\ &= \mathbf{E}[f(S_1 S_2 + (1 - S_1)(1 - S_2))] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[f(S_1 S_2 + (1 - S_1)(1 - S_2)) | S_2]] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[S_2 f(S_1) + (1 - S_2)f(1 - S_1) | S_2]] \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}[f(S_1)] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}[f(1 - S_1)] \quad (45)$$

$$= I_f(W_1), \quad (46)$$

where (44) is by Jensen’s inequality, (45) follows from the fact that  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are independent with  $\mathbf{E}[S_1] = \mathbf{E}[S_2] = \frac{1}{2}$ , and (46) follows from the symmetry of  $W_1$ , which is equivalent to  $\mathcal{L}(S_1) = \mathcal{L}(1 - S_1)$ . This shows that  $I_f(W_1 \boxtimes W_2) \leq I_f(W_1)$ . Conditioning on  $S_1$  instead of  $S_2$ , we prove that  $I_f(W_1 \boxtimes W_2) \leq I_f(W_2)$ .

Using Theorem 4 and Jensen’s inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_f(W_1 \circledast W_2) &= \int_{[0,1]} f d m_{W_1 \circledast W_2} \\ &= \int_{[0,1]} f d (m_{W_1} \circledast m_{W_2}) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[ (1 - S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{S_1 S_2}{1 - S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{\bar{S}_1 S_2}{S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{E}[f(S_2)] \\ &= I_f(W_2). \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry,  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2 \equiv W_2 \boxtimes W_1$ , so we also have  $I_f(W_1 \boxtimes W_2) \geq I_f(W_1)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3** (Blackwell ordering of channels). *If  $W_1, W_2$  are two symmetric BICs, then*

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 \boxtimes W_2 &\preceq_B W_1 \preceq_B W_1 \boxtimes W_2, \\ W_1 \boxtimes W_2 &\preceq_B W_2 \preceq_B W_1 \boxtimes W_2. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Corollary 3 follows as a direct consequence of Theorem 5 by invoking the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem (Theorem 1).  $\square$

**Remark 6** (Alternative proof of Theorem 5). Theorem 5 is established via a direct proof. Alternatively, as noted during the review of the present paper, one could observe that the Blackwell ordering of Corollary 3 holds for all symmetric BICs. Theorem 5 then follows as a direct consequence of the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem. This is true due to the presence of the “if and only if” statement (see Theorem 1).

**Remark 7** (Special cases of Theorem 5). From the induced functionals listed in Table I, the capacity  $I_f(W) = I(W)$  with  $f(s) = 1 - h_2(s)$  was shown by Arıkan to exhibit the property of one-step polarization [1]. An analogous result was shown for the Bhattacharyya parameter  $I_f(W) = -Z(W)$  with  $f(s) = -2\sqrt{s(1-s)}$  in [1], and for Gallager’s  $E_0(\rho, W)$  parameter in [11, Lemma 4.5]. Prior results emerge as special cases of Theorem 5. Moreover, Theorem 5 implies that the property of one-step polarization holds for the Bayes error functionals  $B_\lambda(W)$  and the squared maximal correlation  $\rho_{\max}^2(W)$  described in Sec. III. To the best of our knowledge, such results have not been discussed previously.

**Remark 8** (Related proofs in modern literature). Related proofs linking the stochastic dominance and ordering of channels to the one-step polarization of functionals  $I_f$  for convex  $f$  appear in [7, Ch. 4] and [11, Lemma 6.16]. As also described in Sec. IV-B, it is known that the Blackwell ordering is equivalent to the *symmetric convex ordering* as introduced by Alsan in [11, Ch. 6]. These independently-discovered results do not invoke the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem.

### B. One-step polarization of $I_f$ : convex vs non-convex $f$

All channel functionals  $I_f$  for convex  $f$  in Table I polarize in each iteration on the class of output-symmetric BICs. This phenomenon is not guaranteed for non-convex  $f$ . Consider  $f(s) = \psi_r(s)$ , and  $I_f(W) = M_r(W)$ , which represents the higher-order moments of the information density. As defined in Sec. III,  $\psi_r(s) := s(1 + \log_2 s)^r + \bar{s}(1 + \log_2 \bar{s})^r$ . Figure 3 depicts that  $\psi_1(s) = 1 - h_2(s)$  is convex on  $[0, 1]$ , and  $\psi_2(s) = s(1 + \log_2 s)^2 + \bar{s}(1 + \log_2 \bar{s})^2$  is non-convex on  $[0, 1]$ . In the following example, it is shown that  $M_2(W)$  does not polarize under Arıkan’s transform, as according to Definition 14.




Fig. 3. Functions  $\psi_1(s)$  and  $\psi_2(s)$  for  $s \in [0, 1]$ .

**Example 7** (Counter-example for one-step polarization for non-convex  $f$ ). Let  $W = \text{BSC}(p)$  and consider the channels  $W \boxtimes W$  and  $W \boxplus W$ . Applying Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(p) &\equiv \text{BSC}(p \star p), \\ \text{BSC}(p) \boxplus \text{BSC}(p) &\equiv (1 - p \star p) \text{BSC}\left(\frac{p^2}{1 - p \star p}\right) \\ &\quad \oplus (p \star p) \text{BSC}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Due to Corollary 3, the Blackwell ordering holds:  $W \boxtimes W \preceq_B W \preceq_B W \boxplus W$ . However, the second moments  $M_2(W)$ ,  $M_2(W \boxtimes W)$ , and  $M_2(W \boxplus W)$  do not satisfy Definition 14 for polarization. The following values are computed via Eqn. (16), and also Eqn. (20). For  $p = 0.05$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} M_2(\text{BSC}(0.05)) &= 1.3664, \\ M_2(\text{BSC}(0.05) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(0.05)) &= 1.2085, \\ M_2(\text{BSC}(0.05) \boxplus \text{BSC}(0.05)) &= 1.0359. \end{aligned}$$

It is evident that  $M_2(W \boxplus W)$  is not greater than  $M_2(W)$ . The functional  $I_f(W) = M_2(W)$  does not exhibit one-step polarization, due to the non-convexity of  $f(s) = \psi_2(s)$ .

## VIII. PROPERTIES OF THE POLARIZATION PROCESS

An important method of analyzing the successive polarization of channels is through a certain random process referred to as the *polarization process*. Starting from a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , one level of polarization yields either  $W \boxtimes W$  or  $W \boxplus W$ . As noted by Arıkan [1], a random path over  $n$  levels of polarization leads to randomly selecting a channel  $W_b$  where  $b \in \{0, 1\}^{n+1}$  in Definition 13:

**Definition 15** (Channel polarization — random processes). *Consider a BIC  $(Y, W)$ . Let  $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of i.i.d. Bern(1/2) random variables. Let  $W_0 = W$ , and*

$$W_n = \begin{cases} W_{n-1} \boxtimes W_{n-1}, & \text{if } B_n = 0 \\ W_{n-1} \boxplus W_{n-1}, & \text{if } B_n = 1 \end{cases}$$

for  $n > 0$ . Define the random processes  $\{I_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  and  $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  via  $I_n = I(W_n)$  and  $Z_n = Z(W_n)$ . In general, a random process  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is obtained for any induced functional listed in Table I.

**Example 8** (Properties of  $\{I_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  and  $\{Z_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ ). As shown in [1], for the class of output-symmetric BICs,  $\{I_n\}$  is a nonnegative martingale, while  $\{Z_n\}$  is a nonnegative supermartingale, both with respect to the natural filtration generated by  $\{B_n\}$ . More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[I_{n+1} | B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n] &= I_n, \\ \mathbf{E}[Z_{n+1} | B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n] &\leq Z_n. \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove the above properties, consider any two BICs  $(Y, W)$  and  $(Y', W')$  from the class of output-symmetric BICs. As first noted by [1],

$$\begin{aligned} I(W \boxtimes W') + I(W \otimes W') &= I(W) + I(W'), \\ Z(W \boxtimes W') + Z(W \otimes W') &\leq Z(W) + Z(W'). \end{aligned}$$

The first relation is due to the conservation of mutual information. The second relation is due to the fact that  $Z(W \boxtimes W') \leq Z(W) + Z(W') - Z(W)Z(W')$  and  $Z(W \otimes W') = Z(W)Z(W')$ , a result first observed by Arkan [1, Prop. 5].

#### A. The random processes $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$

As detailed in Definition 15, a random polarization process  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is defined for any induced functional  $I_f$ . In order to analyze the properties of the random process, the following relations are introduced:

**Definition 16** ( $f$ -relations). Consider two arbitrary BICs  $(Y, W)$  and  $(Y', W')$  from a given class  $\mathcal{W}$  of BICs. Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be closed under the polar transform operations; i.e., both  $W \boxtimes W' \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $W \otimes W' \in \mathcal{W}$ . Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function. We say that the polarization process on the class  $\mathcal{W}$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} &f\text{-preserving if for all } W, W' \in \mathcal{W}, \\ &I_f(W \boxtimes W') + I_f(W \otimes W') = I_f(W) + I_f(W'); \quad (47) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &f\text{-improving if for all } W, W' \in \mathcal{W}, \\ &I_f(W \boxtimes W') + I_f(W \otimes W') \geq I_f(W) + I_f(W'); \quad (48) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &f\text{-decreasing if for all } W, W' \in \mathcal{W}, \\ &I_f(W \boxtimes W') + I_f(W \otimes W') \leq I_f(W) + I_f(W'). \quad (49) \end{aligned}$$

Consider the above conditions and bounded random processes. If (47) holds for all  $W, W' \in \mathcal{W}$ , then the random process  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is a martingale. If (48) holds,  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is a submartingale. Similarly, if (49) holds,  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is a supermartingale. If  $\mathcal{W}$  is the class of all output-symmetric BICs, the following theorem shows that it suffices to verify the  $f$ -relations only on the subclass consisting of BSCs:

**Theorem 6** ( $f$ -relations for all symmetric BICs). The polarization process is  $f$ -preserving,  $f$ -improving, or  $f$ -decreasing as defined in Definition 16 on the class of output-symmetric BICs if and only if (47), (48), or (49) holds respectively for all pairs  $(W, W') = (\text{BSC}(p), \text{BSC}(q))$ ,  $(p, q) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}] \times [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

*Proof.* Consider the  $f$ -improving relation for a class of BICs and induced functional  $I_f(\cdot)$ . If (48) holds for all symmetric BICs, then it holds for all BSCs. To prove the converse, fix two symmetric BICs  $W, W'$ . By Theorem 3, the following channel decompositions exist:

$$\begin{aligned} W &\equiv \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \text{BSC}(p_i), \\ W' &\equiv \bigoplus_{j=1}^k \mu_j \text{BSC}(q_j). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 2, the Blackwell measures of the transformed channels  $W \boxtimes W'$  and  $W \otimes W'$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_{W \boxtimes W'} &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j \mathbf{m}_{\text{BSC}(p_i \star q_j)}, \\ \mathbf{m}_{W \otimes W'} &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j \mathbf{m}_{\text{BSC}(p_i) \times \text{BSC}(q_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using the definitions for induced functionals in Sec. III, and the assumption that (48) holds for all BSCs, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &I_f(W \boxtimes W') + I_f(W \otimes W') \\ &= \int f d\mathbf{m}_{W \boxtimes W'} + \int f d\mathbf{m}_{W \otimes W'} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j \int f (d\mathbf{m}_{\text{BSC}(p_i \star q_j)} + d\mathbf{m}_{\text{BSC}(p_i) \times \text{BSC}(q_j)}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j (I_f(\text{BSC}(p_i \star q_j)) + I_f(\text{BSC}(p_i) \times \text{BSC}(q_j))) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j (I_f(\text{BSC}(p_i)) + I_f(\text{BSC}(q_j))) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i I_f(\text{BSC}(p_i)) + \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j I_f(\text{BSC}(q_j)) \\ &= I_f(W) + I_f(W'). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6 is established in an identical manner for the  $f$ -preserving and  $f$ -decreasing relations.  $\square$

The following corollary follows directly from Theorem 6 and Lemma 4. Consider if  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ . Then  $I_f(\text{BSC}(p)) = f(p)$ , and Theorem 6 may be presented in a simplified form via functional inequalities. We note that Theorem 6 can still be written via functional inequalities without assuming  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ .

**Corollary 4** (Functional inequalities). Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function. Define the following gap function for a particular  $f$ , and  $p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GAP}_f(p, q) &:= I_f(\text{BSC}(p)) + I_f(\text{BSC}(q)) \\ &\quad - I_f(\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)) \\ &\quad - I_f(\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)). \quad (50) \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 4. The Neyman-Pearson regions considered in Example 9 in the case  $W \equiv W' \equiv \text{BSC}(1/4)$ .

As a corollary to Theorem 6, the following criterion correspond to Eqns. (47), (48), and (49). Over the class of symmetric BICs, the polarization process is:

$$f\text{-preserving if and only if for all } p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \quad \text{GAP}_f(p, q) = 0; \quad (51)$$

$$f\text{-improving if and only if for all } p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \quad \text{GAP}_f(p, q) \leq 0; \quad (52)$$

$$f\text{-decreasing if and only if for all } p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \quad \text{GAP}_f(p, q) \geq 0. \quad (53)$$

If  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ , then Eqn. (50) simplifies to:

$$\text{GAP}_f(p, q) = f(p) + f(q) - f(p \star q) - (1 - p \star q)f(\alpha) - (p \star q)f(\beta). \quad (54)$$

The parameters  $\alpha := \frac{pq}{1-p \star q}$  and  $\beta := \frac{pq}{p \star q}$  were defined in Lemma 4, where  $(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$  in the degenerate case. Recall that  $p \star q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ ,  $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  and  $\beta \wedge \bar{\beta} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Note that if  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ , then  $f(\beta) = f(\bar{\beta}) = f(\beta \wedge \bar{\beta})$ .

### B. $f$ -relations: The case of convex $f$

It is tempting to conjecture that an  $f$ -relation such as the  $f$ -improving relation given in Eqn. (48) holds for all convex  $f$  on the class of output-symmetric BICs. However, the following counter-example proves that this conjecture is false. Similarly, it is tempting to think that the convexity of  $f$  would greatly simplify the functional inequalities in Corollary 4. However, this is not the case. Whether  $f$  is convex (or non-convex) does not directly imply an  $f$ -relation.

**Example 9** (Counter-argument for conjecture). Suppose that the  $f$ -improving relation in Eqn. (48) were true for all convex  $f$ . More precisely, assume that  $\frac{1}{2}\text{I}_f(W \boxtimes W') + \frac{1}{2}\text{I}_f(W \otimes W') \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{I}_f(W) + \frac{1}{2}\text{I}_f(W')$  for all convex  $f$ . According to Theorem 1, the Blackwell–Sherman–Stein theorem, the channel  $\frac{1}{2}(W \boxtimes W') \oplus \frac{1}{2}(W \otimes W')$  would dominate the channel  $\frac{1}{2}W \oplus \frac{1}{2}W'$ . However, this conjecture turns out to be false. Figure 4 shows the Neyman–Pearson regions of

$\frac{1}{2}(W \boxtimes W') \oplus \frac{1}{2}(W \otimes W')$  and  $\frac{1}{2}W \oplus \frac{1}{2}W'$  when  $W \equiv W' \equiv \text{BSC}(1/4)$ . It is evident that the latter is not a subset of the former. By Theorem 2, the Neyman–Pearson criterion for Blackwell dominance, we arrive at a contradiction.

**Example 10** (Counter-example for convex  $f$ ). Consider  $f_\lambda(s) = \bar{\lambda} \wedge \lambda - (2\bar{\lambda}s) \wedge (2\lambda\bar{s})$  for  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ . Specifically, consider  $\lambda = \frac{1}{3}$ , and  $f \equiv f_{1/3}(s)$ . In this case,  $f(s)$  is convex, and  $f(s) \neq f(\bar{s})$ . Define the following real-valued function for two BICs  $W$  and  $W'$ :

$$\zeta(W, W') := \text{I}_f(W) + \text{I}_f(W') - \text{I}_f(W \boxtimes W') - \text{I}_f(W \otimes W').$$

A straightforward calculation yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\text{BSC}(1/4), \text{BSC}(1/4)) &> 0, \\ \zeta(\text{BSC}(3/8), \text{BSC}(3/8)) &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, as summarized by Eqn. (50),  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q) > 0$  for  $p = q = \frac{1}{4}$ , but  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q) < 0$  for  $p = q = \frac{3}{8}$ . Thus, although  $f_{1/3}(s)$  is a convex function, the  $f$ -relations of Definition 16 do not hold consistently for all BSC pairs. According to Theorem 6, the random process  $\{\text{I}_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$  is not a martingale, submartingale, or supermartingale for the class of symmetric BICs.

### C. $f$ -relations: The case of non-convex $f$

Consider  $f \equiv \psi_2(s)$  where  $\psi_2(s) := s(1 + \log_2(s))^2 + \bar{s}(1 + \log_2(\bar{s}))^2$ . As plotted in Figure 3,  $f$  is a non-convex function, and  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ . As proven in Sec. III-B,  $\text{I}_f(W) = M_2(W)$ , which is the second moment of information density. The following example shows numerically that the corresponding polarization process satisfies the  $f$ -decreasing relation of Eqn. (49) for all symmetric BICs.

**Example 11** (Polarization process for  $M_2(W)$ ). Consider  $f \equiv \psi_2(s)$ . In order to prove the  $f$ -decreasing property of Eqn. (49), the following must hold for all pairs of symmetric BICs  $(Y, W)$  and  $(Y', W')$ :

$$M_2(W \boxtimes W') + M_2(W \otimes W') \leq M_2(W) + M_2(W').$$

According to Theorem 6, it suffices to consider the space of BSCs. Therefore, consider  $W \equiv \text{BSC}(p)$  and  $W' \equiv \text{BSC}(q)$  for all  $p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  where  $(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$ . Then Eqn. (50) takes the following form for  $f \equiv \psi_2(s)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GAP}_f(p, q) &= M_2(\text{BSC}(p)) + M_2(\text{BSC}(q)) \\ &\quad - M_2(\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)) \\ &\quad - M_2(\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)). \end{aligned}$$

For  $f \equiv \psi_2(s)$ ,  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ , and Corollary 4 is applicable. It remains to prove the functional inequality of Eqn. (53) given in Corollary 4. The gap function simplifies to Eqn. (54), which is written as follows for  $f \equiv \psi_2(s)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GAP}_f(p, q) &= \psi_2(p) + \psi_2(q) - \psi_2(p \star q) \\ &\quad - (1 - p \star q)\psi_2(\alpha) - (p \star q)\psi_2(\beta). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

The parameters  $\alpha := \frac{pq}{1-p \star q}$  and  $\beta := \frac{\bar{p}q}{p \star q}$  were defined in Lemma 4. Note that  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q) = \text{GAP}_f(q, p)$ . In addition, along the boundaries,  $\text{GAP}_f(p, 0) = 0$ ,  $\text{GAP}_f(0, q) = 0$ ,  $\text{GAP}_f(p, \frac{1}{2}) = 0$ , and  $\text{GAP}_f(\frac{1}{2}, q) = 0$ . Figure 5 provides numerical evidence that  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q) \geq 0$  for all BSC pairs. Theorem 6 and Corollary 4 imply the same result holds for all symmetric BICs.

**Remark 9.** Theorem 6 and Corollary 4 provide a feasible numerical approach to analyze all channel functionals  $I_f$  listed in Table I, as well as additional functionals not listed. While Example 11 shows numerically that  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q) \geq 0$ , in this particular example, the exact analytical proof of the inequality requires a lengthy analysis. We refer the reader to the analytical proofs by Arıkan dedicated to the following result that is closely related [15, Theorem 1]:

$$V(W \boxtimes W') + V(W \otimes W') \leq V(W) + V(W'). \quad (56)$$

The channel dispersion  $V(W) := M_2(W) - (I(W))^2$  assumes a uniform input distribution. The result by Arıkan in [15] for *varentropy* applies more generally to so-called *binary data elements* incorporating the input distribution as well as each channel's conditional distribution.

## IX. A NEW SUPERMARTINGALE

The necessary and sufficient condition given in Theorem 6 provides a helpful reduction from the space of symmetric BICs to the space of BSCs, in order to prove the existence of new submartingales and supermartingales. Deriving one of the functional inequalities of Corollary 4 is a method of proof. Using this method, we prove that the polarization process associated with the squared Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi maximal correlation parameter  $\rho_{\max}^2(W)$  is a supermartingale.

**Theorem 7** (Supermartingale associated with  $\rho_{\max}^2(W)$ ). *Consider  $f \equiv f(s) = (2s - 1)^2$ . As proven in Sec. III-F, for a BIC  $(Y, W)$ , the induced functional  $I_f(W) = \rho_{\max}^2(W)$ . For the class of symmetric BICs, the polarization process  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  defined in Definition 15 is a supermartingale, and converges almost surely on the interval  $[0, 1]$ .*




Fig. 5. The symmetric gap function  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q)$  with  $f \equiv \psi_2(s)$ , as detailed in Eqn. (55) of Example 11.

*Proof.* In order to prove that  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is a supermartingale, the  $f$ -decreasing property must hold for all pairs of symmetric BICs  $(Y, W)$  and  $(Y', W')$ :

$$\rho_{\max}^2(W \boxtimes W') + \rho_{\max}^2(W \otimes W') \leq \rho_{\max}^2(W) + \rho_{\max}^2(W').$$

According to Theorem 6, it suffices to consider the space of BSCs. Along these lines, consider  $W \equiv \text{BSC}(p)$  and  $W' \equiv \text{BSC}(q)$  for all  $p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  where  $(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$ . Then Eqn. (50) takes the following form for  $f \equiv f(s) = (2s - 1)^2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GAP}_f(p, q) &= \rho_{\max}^2(\text{BSC}(p)) + \rho_{\max}^2(\text{BSC}(q)) \\ &\quad - \rho_{\max}^2(\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)) \\ &\quad - \rho_{\max}^2(\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove the functional inequality of Eqn. (53) given in Corollary 4. It is evident that  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ . Hence, the gap function simplifies to Eqn. (54), which is written as follows for  $f \equiv f(s) = (2s - 1)^2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GAP}_f(p, q) &= f(p) + f(q) - f(p \star q) \\ &\quad - (1 - p \star q)f(\alpha) - (p \star q)f(\beta). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The parameters  $\alpha := \frac{pq}{1-p \star q}$  and  $\beta := \frac{\bar{p}q}{p \star q}$  were defined in Lemma 4. After a series of algebraic simplifications provided in Appendix F, it can be shown that

$$\text{GAP}_f(p, q) = \frac{4pq\bar{p}\bar{q}(2p - 1)^2(2q - 1)^2}{(1 - p \star q)(p \star q)}. \quad (58)$$

Both the numerator and denominator of Eqn. (58) are positive quantities. Hence,  $\text{GAP}(p, q) \geq 0$  for all  $p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Since the squared maximal correlation parameter is bounded in the interval  $[0, 1]$ , by standard arguments for the convergence of supermartingales, the polarization process  $\{I_f(W_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  converges almost surely on  $[0, 1]$ .  $\square$

**Remark 10** (Alternative methods to prove convergence). As discussed in Sec. I-B, the martingale conditions are not required to prove the convergence of random processes. The authors of [16] provide a simple proof of polarization that avoids the explicit use of martingales.



**Remark 11** (Maximal correlations). By applying alternative methods, the first author of the present paper showed in [42] that the polarization process associated with  $\rho_{\max}^2(W)$  converges almost surely on  $[0, 1]$  to the endpoints of the interval. However, the supermartingale property of the random process as given in Theorem 7 was not established in prior work.

**Remark 12** (Asymptotic Analysis). The Bhattacharyya parameter  $Z(W)$  has been instrumental to the analysis of the rate of polarization and scaling laws [22]–[26]. Potentially, tracking the second-order moment  $M_2(W)$  or channel dispersion  $V(W)$  could lead to a refined asymptotic analysis. Further research is also necessary to determine whether  $\rho_{\max}^2(W)$  plays a role in the asymptotic analysis of multi-level polarization or polarization of correlated random variables.

**Remark 13** (Channel-valued random processes). As discussed in Sec. I-B, a general approach considers *channel-valued* polarization processes. Following our work, [17] discusses the convergence of *channel-valued* random processes for which a suitable topological space must be defined.

## X. CONCLUSION

The mathematical results of Theorem 6, Corollary 4 and Theorem 7 reflect both the algebraic and probabilistic foundation of channel polarization. For the broad class of symmetric BICs, we have shown that the random processes associated with  $I_f(W)$  for various choices of  $f$  satisfy the martingale conditions for convergence if and only if specific *functional inequalities* hold. The inequalities hold for specific convex and non-convex  $f$ . As summarized in Table I, we have developed a framework relying on the Blackwell representation of channels to analyze a variety of channel functionals, and their associated real-valued random processes. Further analysis is warranted to study *channel-valued* random processes.

### APPENDIX A PROOF OF EQN. (12)

To prove the claim, we first write down a closed-form expression for  $B_\lambda(W)$ . For any decoder  $g$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}[g(Y) \neq X] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{g(Y) \neq X\}} | Y]] \\ &= \mathbf{E} [P_{X|Y}(0|Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{g(Y)=1\}} + P_{X|Y}(1|Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{g(Y)=0\}}] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{\bar{\lambda}W(Y|0)}{\bar{\lambda}W(Y|0) + \lambda W(Y|1)} \mathbf{1}_{\{g(Y)=1\}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{\lambda W(Y|1)}{\bar{\lambda}W(Y|0) + \lambda W(Y|1)} \mathbf{1}_{\{g(Y)=0\}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\bar{\lambda}W(y|0)\mathbf{1}_{\{g(y)=1\}} + \lambda W(y|1)\mathbf{1}_{\{g(y)=0\}}), \end{aligned}$$

and the minimum over all  $g$  is evidently achieved by

$$g^*(y) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \lambda W(y|1) \geq \bar{\lambda}W(y|0) \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda W(y|1) < \bar{\lambda}W(y|0) \end{cases}. \quad (59)$$

This yields

$$b_\lambda(W) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\bar{\lambda}W(y|0) \wedge (\lambda W(y|1))). \quad (60)$$

In particular,  $b_\lambda(\text{BSC}(1/2)) = \bar{\lambda} \wedge \lambda$ . Moreover, using the identity  $a \wedge b = \frac{1}{2}(a + b - |a - b|)$ , we can write

$$\begin{aligned} B_\lambda(W) &= \bar{\lambda} \wedge \lambda - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\bar{\lambda}W(y|0) \wedge (\lambda W(y|1))) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - |1 - 2\lambda| - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\bar{\lambda}W(y|0) + \lambda W(y|1) - |\bar{\lambda}W(y|0) - \lambda W(y|1)|) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\bar{\lambda}W(y|0) - \lambda W(y|1)| - \frac{1}{2}|1 - 2\lambda|. \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove the claim that  $B_\lambda(W) = I_{f_\lambda}(W)$ . To that end, consider a random couple  $(X, Y)$  with  $X \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$  and  $P_{Y|X} = W$  and let  $S = \Lambda_W(Y)$ . Then, using the fact that  $\mathbf{E}[S] = 1/2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{f_\lambda}(W) &= \mathbf{E}[f_\lambda(S)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - |1 - 2\lambda|) - \mathbf{E}[|\bar{\lambda}S + \lambda\bar{S} - |\bar{\lambda}S - \lambda\bar{S}||] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[|\bar{\lambda}S - \lambda\bar{S}|] - \frac{1}{2}|1 - 2\lambda| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{1}{P_Y(Y)} |\bar{\lambda}W(Y|0) - \lambda W(Y|1)| \right] - \frac{1}{2}|1 - 2\lambda| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\bar{\lambda}W(y|0) - \lambda W(y|1)| - \frac{1}{2}|1 - 2\lambda| \\ &\equiv B_\lambda(W). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, when  $\lambda = 1/2$ , the optimal decoder in (59) reduces to the maximum-likelihood (ML) rule, and the Bayesian information gain may be written in simplified form as follows,

$$B_{1/2}(W) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |W(y|0) - W(y|1)|.$$

In that case,  $f_{1/2}(s) = \frac{1}{2} - s \wedge \bar{s} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}(1 - |2s - 1|) = \frac{1}{2}|2s - 1|$ , and therefore

$$B_{1/2}(W) = \frac{1}{2} - P_{e,\text{ML}}(W),$$

where  $P_{e,\text{ML}}(W)$  denotes the probability of error of maximum-likelihood decoding of a single equiprobable bit sent through the channel  $W$  [11, Eqn. 1.9, Ch. 5]. This, in turn, shows that  $1 - 2P_{e,\text{ML}}(W) = I_f(W)$  with  $f(s) = |2s - 1|$ .

### APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Consider the two original channels  $W_1 \equiv \text{BSC}(p)$  and  $W_2 \equiv \text{BSC}(q)$ . The polar transform yields  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2 \equiv \text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)$  and  $W_1 \circledast W_2 \equiv \text{BSC}(p) \circledast \text{BSC}(q)$ .

The output alphabet of  $W_1 \boxtimes W_2$  is  $\{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$  with conditional distribution  $(W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(y_1, y_2 | u_1)$ . The conditional probabilities given an input  $u_1 = 0$  are as follows:  $(W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(0, 0|0) = (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(1, 1|0) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - p \star q)$ ;  $(W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(0, 1|0) = (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(1, 0|0) = \frac{1}{2}(p \star q)$ . Similarly, the conditional probabilities for a binary input  $u_1 = 1$  are as follows:  $(W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(0, 0|1) = (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(1, 1|1) = \frac{1}{2}(p \star q)$ ;  $(W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(0, 1|1) = (W_1 \boxtimes W_2)(1, 0|1) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - p \star q)$ . Consider the following *disjoint* sets of output pairs,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^- &= \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}, \\ \mathcal{T}^- &= \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The union  $\mathcal{S}^- \cup \mathcal{T}^-$  contains all 4 output pairs. Viewing all output pairs grouped in each set  $\mathcal{S}^-$  and  $\mathcal{T}^-$  as super-symbols, the transition matrix  $\tilde{T}_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2}$  is as claimed.

The proof regarding  $W_1 \otimes W_2$  follows in an identical manner. The output alphabet of  $W_1 \otimes W_2$  is  $\{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$  with conditional distribution  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(y_1, y_2, u_1 | u_2)$ . The conditional probabilities for a binary input  $u_2 = 0$  are as follows:  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 0, 0|0) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 0, 1|0) = \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 1, 1|0) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 1, 0|0) = \frac{1}{2}p\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 0, 1|0) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 0, 0|0) = \frac{1}{2}p\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 1, 0|0) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 1, 1|0) = \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}q$ . Similarly, the conditional probabilities for a binary input  $u_2 = 1$  are given by:  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 0, 0|1) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 0, 1|1) = \frac{1}{2}p\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 1, 1|1) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 1, 0|1) = \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 0, 1|1) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 0, 0|1) = \frac{1}{2}\bar{p}q$ ;  $(W_1 \otimes W_2)(0, 1, 0|1) = (W_1 \otimes W_2)(1, 1, 1|1) = \frac{1}{2}p\bar{q}$ . Consider the following *disjoint* sets of output pairs,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^+ &= \{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1)\}, \\ \mathcal{T}^+ &= \{(0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 0)\}, \\ \mathcal{B}^+ &= \{(0, 0, 1), (1, 0, 0)\}, \\ \mathcal{G}^+ &= \{(0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The union  $\mathcal{S}^+ \cup \mathcal{T}^+ \cup \mathcal{B}^+ \cup \mathcal{G}^+$  contains all 8 output pairs. Viewing all output pairs in the sets  $\mathcal{S}^+$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^+$ ,  $\mathcal{B}^+$  and  $\mathcal{G}^+$  as super-symbols, the transition matrix  $\tilde{T}_{W_1 \otimes W_2}$  is as claimed.

The parallel broadcast channel  $W_1 \times W_2 \equiv \text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)$  has an output alphabet  $\{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$  with conditional distribution denoted as  $(W_1 \times W_2)(y_1, y_2 | x)$ . The conditional probabilities for binary input  $x = 0$  are as follows:  $(W_1 \times W_2)(0, 0|0) = \bar{p}\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \times W_2)(0, 1|0) = \bar{p}q$ ;  $(W_1 \times W_2)(1, 0|0) = p\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \times W_2)(1, 1|0) = pq$ . Similarly the conditional probabilities for binary input  $x = 1$  are as follows:  $(W_1 \times W_2)(0, 0|1) = pq$ ;  $(W_1 \times W_2)(0, 1|1) = p\bar{q}$ ;  $(W_1 \times W_2)(1, 0|1) = \bar{p}q$ ;  $(W_1 \times W_2)(1, 1|1) = \bar{p}\bar{q}$ . By comparing the transition probabilities, it is evident that  $T_{\text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)} = \tilde{T}_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)}$  as claimed.

#### APPENDIX C PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Eqn. (35) follows directly from the transition matrix Eqn. (31) of Lemma 3. To see why Eqn. (36) holds, consider the transition matrix of Eqn. (32). Assume  $(p \star q) \neq 0$ . Let error

probabilities  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be defined as in Eqn. 33 and Eqn. 34 respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T}_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= T_{\text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \bar{p}\bar{q} & p\bar{q} & p\bar{q} & \bar{p}q \\ p\bar{q} & \bar{p}\bar{q} & \bar{p}q & p\bar{q} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (1-p \star q)\bar{\alpha} & (1-p \star q)\alpha \\ (1-p \star q)\alpha & (1-p \star q)\bar{\alpha} \\ (p \star q)\bar{\beta} & (p \star q)\beta \\ (p \star q)\beta & (p \star q)\bar{\beta} \end{bmatrix}^T. \end{aligned}$$

The above transition matrix for  $\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)$  reveals the structural decomposition of the one-step polarized channel as established by Theorem 3. More precisely,  $\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)$  is a  $\text{BSC}(\alpha)$  with probability  $(1 - p \star q)$  and a  $\text{BSC}(\beta \wedge \bar{\beta})$  with probability  $(p \star q)$ . The transformed error probabilities are specified so that  $\alpha \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  and  $(\beta \wedge \bar{\beta}) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

#### APPENDIX D PROOF OF COROLLARY 1

The corollary holds for  $(p, q) = (0, 0)$  trivially as a degenerate case. Therefore, assume  $(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$  so that  $p \star q \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . From Theorem 4,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p)} \boxtimes \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(q)}, \\ \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p)} \otimes \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(q)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the operations  $\boxtimes$  and  $\otimes$  on Blackwell measures were defined in Definition 12. Thus, consider two independent random variables  $S_1 \sim \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p)}$  and  $S_2 \sim \mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(q)}$ . The random variable  $S_1$  takes two equiprobable values  $p$  and  $\bar{p}$ , and  $S_2$  takes two equiprobable values  $q$  and  $\bar{q}$ .

To prove Eqn. (37), consider Eqn. (25) of Definition 12. The random variable  $1 - S_1 \star S_2$  takes two equiprobable values,  $p \star q$  and  $1 - p \star q$ . The integral of Eqn. (25) may be evaluated for any continuous  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$\int_{[0,1]} f d\mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)} = \frac{1}{2}f(p \star q) + \frac{1}{2}f(1 - p \star q).$$

The corresponding Blackwell measure of  $\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)$  written as a weighted sum of Dirac measures is,

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p) \boxtimes \text{BSC}(q)} = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{p \star q} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{1 - p \star q}.$$

To prove Eqn. (38), consider Eqn. (26) of Definition 12. The integral of Eqn. (26) may be evaluated for any continuous  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} f d\mathfrak{m}_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= \left( \frac{1}{2}(1 - p \star q)f\left(\frac{pq}{1 - p \star q}\right) \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(1 - p \star q)f\left(\frac{\bar{p}\bar{q}}{1 - p \star q}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(p \star q)f\left(\frac{p\bar{q}}{p \star q}\right) \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}(p \star q)f\left(\frac{\bar{p}q}{p \star q}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding Blackwell measure of  $\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)$  written as a weighted sum of Dirac measures is

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)} &= (1 - p \star q) \left( \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\frac{pq}{1-p \star q}} + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\frac{\bar{p}\bar{q}}{1-p \star q}} \right) \\ &\quad + (p \star q) \left( \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\frac{p\bar{q}}{p \star q}} + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\frac{\bar{p}q}{p \star q}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

As shown in the proof of Lemma 3 by direct computation, the above probability measure  $m_{\text{BSC}(p) \otimes \text{BSC}(q)}$  is equivalent to the probability measure  $m_{\text{BSC}(p) \times \text{BSC}(q)}$ . In addition, Eqn. (39) follows from Eqn. (36) of Lemma 4.

#### APPENDIX E PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

From Theorem 3, there exists a structural decomposition for output-symmetric BICs  $W_1$  and  $W_2$ . The Blackwell measures of  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  may be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{W_1} &= \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i m_{\text{BSC}(p_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda_i (\delta_{p_i} + \delta_{\bar{p}_i})}{2}, \\ m_{W_2} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_j m_{\text{BSC}(q_j)} = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\mu_j (\delta_{q_j} + \delta_{\bar{q}_j})}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

for some choices of parameters  $(m, \lambda, p)$  and  $(k, \mu, q)$ . Therefore, for two independent r.v.'s  $S_1 \sim m_{W_1}$  and  $S_2 \sim m_{W_2}$  and for any continuous  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} f dm_{W_1 \boxtimes W_2} &= \mathbf{E}[f(1 - S_1 \star S_2)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j \left( \frac{1}{2} f(p_i \star q_j) + \frac{1}{2} f(1 - p_i \star q_j) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} f dm_{W_1 \otimes W_2} &= \mathbf{E} \left[ (1 - S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{S_1 S_2}{1 - S_1 \star S_2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (S_1 \star S_2) f \left( \frac{\bar{S}_1 \bar{S}_2}{\bar{S}_1 \star \bar{S}_2} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_i \mu_j \left( \frac{1}{2} (1 - p_i \star q_j) f \left( \frac{p_i q_j}{1 - p_i \star q_j} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (1 - p_i \star q_j) f \left( \frac{\bar{p}_i \bar{q}_j}{1 - p_i \star q_j} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (p_i \star q_j) f \left( \frac{p_i \bar{q}_j}{p_i \star q_j} \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} (p_i \star q_j) f \left( \frac{\bar{p}_i q_j}{p_i \star q_j} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Corollary 1, we obtain Eqns. (40) and (41).

#### APPENDIX F PROOF OF THEOREM 7

We prove the functional inequality by expanding and simplifying the gap function  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q)$  where  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is

chosen to be the polynomial function  $f(s) = (2s - 1)^2$ . The terms given in Eqn. (57) are expanded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f(p) &= 4p^2 - 4p + 1. \\ f(q) &= 4q^2 - 4q + 1. \\ f(p \star q) &= 16pq\bar{p}\bar{q} + 4p^2 + 4q^2 - 4p - 4q + 1. \\ (1 - p \star q)f(\alpha) &= \frac{4p^2 q^2}{1 - p \star q} - 4pq + (1 - p \star q). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

$$(p \star q)f(\beta) = \frac{4\bar{p}^2 \bar{q}^2}{p \star q} - 4\bar{p}\bar{q} + (p \star q). \quad (62)$$

To compute Eqn. (61) and Eqn. (62), recall that the parameters  $\alpha := \frac{pq}{1-p \star q}$  and  $\beta := \frac{\bar{p}\bar{q}}{p \star q}$  were defined in Lemma 4. Since  $f(s) = f(\bar{s})$ , the gap function is given by Eqn. (54). After a series of algebraic simplifications,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GAP}_f(p, q) &= f(p) + f(q) - f(p \star q) \\ &\quad - (1 - p \star q)f(\alpha) - (p \star q)f(\beta) \\ &= -16pq\bar{p}\bar{q} - \frac{4p^2 q^2}{1 - p \star q} - \frac{4\bar{p}^2 \bar{q}^2}{p \star q} + 4q \\ &= -16pq\bar{p}\bar{q} - \frac{4p^2 q^2}{1 - p \star q} + \frac{4pq(1 - pq)}{p \star q} \\ &= -16pq\bar{p}\bar{q} + \frac{4pq\bar{p}\bar{q}}{(1 - p \star q)(p \star q)} \\ &= \frac{4pq\bar{p}\bar{q}(2p - 1)^2(2q - 1)^2}{(1 - p \star q)(p \star q)}. \end{aligned}$$

For all  $p, q \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ ,  $(p, q) \neq (0, 0)$ ,  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q) = \text{GAP}_f(q, p)$ , and  $\text{GAP}_f(p, q) \geq 0$ . This concludes the verification of Eqn. (58) in the proof of Theorem 7.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Dr. Mine Alsan, Prof. Venkat Anantharam, and Prof. Erdal Arıkan for helpful discussions. The authors also thank the associate editor and four anonymous reviewers whose valuable comments helped improve this manuscript.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E. Arıkan, "Channel polarization: A method for constructing capacity-achieving codes for symmetric binary-input memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051–3073, July 2009.
- [2] D. Blackwell, "Comparison of experiments," in *Proc. 2nd Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob.*, 1951, pp. 93–102.
- [3] —, "Equivalent comparisons of experiments," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 24, pp. 265–272, 1953.
- [4] E. Torgersen, *Comparison of Statistical Experiments*, ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [5] S. Sherman, "On a theorem of Hardy, Littlewood, Polya, and Blackwell," *Proc. of the Natl. Acad. of Sci. of the United States of America*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 826–831, 1951.
- [6] C. Stein, *Notes on a Seminar on Theoretical Statistics. I. Comparison of Experiments*. Univ. of Chicago, 1951.
- [7] T. Richardson and R. Urbanke, *Modern Coding Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [8] Y. Polyanskiy and Y. Wu, *Lecture notes on information theory*, ser. Lecture Notes for ECE563 (UIUC) and 6.441 (MIT), 2012–2017.
- [9] I. Land and J. Huber, "Information combining," *Foundations and Trends® in Commun. and Inf. Theory*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 227–330, 2006.
- [10] R. Mori and T. Tanaka, "Performance of polar codes with the construction using density evolution," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 519–521, July 2009.

- [11] M. Alsan, "Re-proving channel polarization theorems: An extremality and robustness analysis," Ph.D. dissertation, School of Computer and Communication Sciences, EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland, 2014.
- [12] R. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.
- [13] E. Arkan, "Channel combining and splitting for cutoff rate improvement," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 628–639, Feb 2006.
- [14] M. Alsan and E. Telatar, "Polarization improves  $E_0$ ," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2714–2719, May 2014.
- [15] E. Arkan, "Varentropy decreases under the polar transform," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3390–3400, June 2016.
- [16] M. Alsan and E. Telatar, "A simple proof of polarization and polarization for non-stationary memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 4873–4878, Sep. 2016.
- [17] R. Nasser, "On the convergence of the polarization process in the noisiness/weak- $\times$  topology," in *IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, July 2019, pp. 2099–2103.
- [18] W. Park and A. Barg, "Polar codes for q-ary channels,  $q = 2^r$ ," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 955–969, Feb 2013.
- [19] A. G. Sahebi and S. S. Pradhan, "Multilevel channel polarization for arbitrary discrete memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 7839–7857, Dec 2013.
- [20] S. B. Korada, E. Sasoglu, and R. Urbanke, "Polar codes: Characterization of exponent, bounds, and constructions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 12, pp. 6253–6264, Dec 2010.
- [21] R. Mori and T. Tanaka, "Source and channel polarization over finite fields and reed-solomon matrices," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2720–2736, May 2014.
- [22] E. Arkan and E. Telatar, "On the rate of channel polarization," in *IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, 2009, pp. 1493–1495.
- [23] S. H. Hassani, R. Mori, T. Tanaka, and R. L. Urbanke, "Rate-dependent analysis of the asymptotic behavior of channel polarization," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 2267–2276, 2013.
- [24] S. H. Hassani, K. Alishahi, and R. L. Urbanke, "Finite-length scaling for polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5875–5898, Oct 2014.
- [25] V. Guruswami and P. Xia, "Polar codes: Speed of polarization and polynomial gap to capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 3–16, Jan 2015.
- [26] M. Mondelli, S. H. Hassani, and R. L. Urbanke, "Unified scaling of polar codes: Error exponent, scaling exponent, moderate deviations, and error floors," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 6698–6712, Dec 2016.
- [27] J. Blasiok, V. Guruswami, P. Nakkiran, A. Rudra, and M. Sudan, "General strong polarization," in *50th Annual ACM Symp. on the Theory of Computing (STOC 2018)*, 2018.
- [28] E. Abbe and E. Telatar, "Polar codes for the  $m$ -user multiple access channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 5437–5448, Aug 2012.
- [29] N. Goela, E. Abbe, and M. Gastpar, "Polar codes for broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 758–782, Feb 2015.
- [30] H. Mahdaviifar and A. Vardy, "Achieving the secrecy capacity of wiretap channels using polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6428–6443, Oct 2011.
- [31] K. B. Athreya and S. N. Lahiri, *Measure Theory and Probability Theory (Springer Texts in Statistics)*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [32] D. Blackwell, "The entropy of functions of finite-state markov chains," *Matematika.*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 143–150, 1959, Trans. of the First Prague Conference on Inf. Theory, Czechoslovak Acad. of Sci., 1957, 1320.
- [33] H. O. Hirschfeld, "A connection between correlation and contingency," *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, vol. 31, no. 4, p. 520524, 1935.
- [34] H. Gebelein, "Das statistische problem der korrelation als variations- und eigenwertproblem und sein zusammenhang mit der ausgleichsrechnung," *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics / Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 364–379, 1941.
- [35] A. Rényi, "On measures of dependence," *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. 441451, 1959.
- [36] H. S. Witsenhausen, "On sequences of pairs of dependent random variables," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 100–113, 1975.
- [37] Y. Polyanskiy, H. 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.
- [38] I. Sutskever, S. Shamaï, and J. Ziv, "Extremes of information combining," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 1313–1325, April 2005.
- [39] R. Pedarsani, S. Hassani, I. Tal, and I. Telatar, "On the construction of polar codes," in *IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, July 2011, pp. 11–15.
- [40] I. Tal and A. Vardy, "How to construct polar codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 6562–6582, October 2013.
- [41] M. Mondelli, S. H. Hassani, and R. L. Urbanke, "Construction of polar codes with sublinear complexity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2782–2791, May 2019.
- [42] N. Goela, "Polarized random variables: maximal correlations and common information," in *IEEE Int. Symp. on Inf. Theory*, June 2014, pp. 1643–1647.