

Achievability Bounds on Unequal Error Protection Codes

Liuquan Yao^{*†}, Shuai Yuan^{*†}, Yuan Li[‡], Huazi Zhang[‡], Jun Wang[‡], Guiying Yan^{*†} and Zhiming Ma^{*†}

^{*}University of Chinese Academy and Sciences, Beijing, China

[†]Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, CAS, Beijing, China

[‡]Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd., China

Email: yaoliuquan20@mails.ucas.ac.cn, yuanshuai2020@amss.ac.cn,

{liyuan299, zhanghuazi, justin.wangjun}@huawei.com, yangy@amss.ac.cn, mazm@amt.ac.cn

Abstract—Unequal error protection (UEP) codes can facilitate the transmission of messages with different protection levels. In this paper, we study the achievability bounds on UEP by the generalization of Gilbert-Varshamov (GV) bound. For the first time, we show that under certain conditions, UEP enhances the code rate comparing with time-sharing (TS) strategies asymptotically.

Index Terms—Unequal Error Protection, GV Bound, Code Distance.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Unequal Error Protection

In modern communication systems, simultaneous encoding of messages with disparate protection needs is essential. For example, in certain 5G communication scenarios, it is necessary to transmit messages simultaneously for both Ultra-Reliable Low-Latency Communication (URLLC) and Enhanced Mobile Broadband (eMBB). A straightforward yet efficient strategy for achieving various error protection is time-sharing (TS). This approach involves independently encoding messages according to their required protection levels [1], [2], [3] *etc.* Alternatively, the unequal error protection (UEP) technique encodes different messages as a whole, offering a distinct method for handling diverse reliability requirements.

The investigation on UEP codes can be categorized into two areas. The first pertains to the unequal protection of code bits [4], [5]. In this paper, we are motivated by the need to transmit different types of messages and therefore focus on the other aspect: the unequal protection of information bits. The UEP for information bits was originally introduced in [6], which centered on the linear unequal error protection (LUEP) codes. [7] provided a converse bound on the protection level for information bits of LUEP codes over the finite field \mathbb{F}_q subsequently, which was proved to be achieved by Reed-Solomon codes. [7] also proposed several practical strategies to enhance the protection capability, including code iterative and direct product. These methods, together with direct sum and parity, were summarized in [8]. [9] derived achievability bounds and identified the minimum code length when the information bits are less than 14. However, calculating these

bounds for longer codes is challenging. [10] investigated the UEP for two different messages with minimum distance $2t+1$ and 3, respectively. They found the optimal non-binary LUEP solution in the sense of achieving the Hamming bound based on Reed-Solomon code.

The general UEP, including nonlinear codes, has been conducted after 1990. Supposing the code length n approaches infinity, several researches demonstrated that UEP codes do not achieve a higher error exponent compared to TS [11], [12]. Despite this, [13] gave an asymptotic converse bound for the minimum distance of UEP codes that exceeds the minimum distance achieved by TS. In the context of finite-length regime, [3] introduced a strategy involving the partitioning of signal constellations into subsets. The critical data is encoded to specify which subset is selected, while the less important determines the exact signal in this subset. The underlying principle is that the distance between subsets is larger, hence the important data obtain more powerful protection. Several examples were also shown in [3] to enhance the minimum distance comparing with TS. However, these examples lack a corresponding theoretical result to validate the improvement in error protection. Additionally, [14] presented a converse bound for two-level distance requirements.

Recent advancements in UEP codes led to the development of several new techniques that enhance the protection capabilities. One such technique is based on the use of polar codes and the relations between information bits and coded bits [15], [16], [17], [18] *etc.* Furthermore, deep learning has also been explored to construct UEP codes [19].

In this paper, we generalize the GV bound for binary UEP codes under multi-level protection requirement, which is the first achievability bound that can be computed efficiently under arbitrary code lengths. In addition, for UEP codes with two-level protection, we propose improved achievability bounds which better rate-distance trade-off. Based on the proposed bounds, we provide several sufficient conditions to guarantee a non-vanishing rate improvement over TS. Note that although our results are proved for the binary UEP codes, one can easily extend the binary case to general q -ary codes under similar arguments.

Throughout this paper, we use bold font $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ to represent vector, and abbreviate $(a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j)$ by \mathbf{a}_i^j . We

use $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ to denote the maximum between a and b . The binary vector space is denoted by \mathbb{F}_2^n and the Hamming distance is denoted by $d_H(\cdot, \cdot)$. We use $d_H(D_1, D_2)$ to denote the Hamming distance between two sets D_1 and D_2 , i.e., $d_H(D_1, D_2) := \min_{c_1 \in D_1, c_2 \in D_2} d_H(c_1, c_2)$. The Hamming ball in \mathbb{F}_2^n centered at x with radius r is denoted by $B(x, r)$, and its volume is denoted by $V(n, r) := \sum_{k=0}^r \binom{n}{k}$. The volume of the intersection of two Hamming balls with radius r and center distance d is denoted by $T(n, d, r) := \sum_{(s,t) \in O} \binom{d}{s} \binom{n-d}{t}$, where $O = \{s, t \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : s + t \leq r, t + d - s \leq r, s \leq d, t \leq n - d\}$. The binary entropy function is denoted by $h(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1-x) \log_2 (1-x)$.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The definitions of UEP codes and GV bound are introduced in Section II, while the main theorem for UEP codes is provided in Section III. Section IV establishes the comparison between TS and UEP codes, and simulation results are presented in Section V. We draw the conclusion in Section VI.

II. PRELIMINARIES

We first define the (binary) UEP codes with different distance requirement.

Definition 2.1: Given m message sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m$ with $|\mathcal{A}_i| = A_i, i = 1, \dots, m$. An (A_1^m, d_1^m) unequal error protection code on \mathbb{F}_2^n is a map

$$C: \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n, \quad (1)$$

$$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m) \mapsto c \in \mathbb{F}_2^n,$$

such that for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$,

$$d_i = \min\{d_H(c, c') : c, c' \in C, (C^{-1}(c))_i \neq (C^{-1}(c'))_i\}, \quad (2)$$

where we still use alphabet C to denote the code book of map C . We call A_i the size of code for message set \mathcal{A}_i and d_i the minimum distance for the message set \mathcal{A}_i .

Remark 2.1: Let $m = n$ and $\mathcal{A}_i = \{0, 1\}, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, then Definition 2.1 is coincided with the UEP codes defined in [7], [9] and [3] etc. Further, the vector $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ is called the separate vector or information distance profiles, which implies the protection levels of information bits [6], [7], [20].

The classic GV bound provides an achievable size of message given the code length and minimum distance.

Lemma 2.1 (GV bound): There exists a binary code C with length n , minimum distance d and size $|C| \geq \frac{2^n}{V(n, d-1)}$. By considering the intersection of Hamming balls, [21] derived an improved GV bound as follows.

Lemma 2.2 (Improved GV bound [21]): There exists a binary code C with length n , minimum distance d and size

$$|C| \geq \frac{2^n - T(n, d, d-1)}{V(n, d-1) - T(n, d, d-1)} := G(n, d). \quad (3)$$

The enhancement stems from considering the intersection of the balls. Specifically, Lemma 2.1 is from the **union bound**

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^M B(c_i, d-1) \right| \leq MV(n, d-1), \quad (4)$$




Fig. 1. Intersection Bound

while Lemma 2.2 suggests to construct codewords c_1, c_2, \dots, c_M with code distance exactly d , i.e., for any $c_i, i > 1$, there exists $c_j, j < i$ s.t

$$d_H(c_i, c_j) = d. \quad (5)$$

Considering the intersection of $B(c_i, d-1)$ and $B(c_j, d-1)$, we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^M B(c_i, d-1) \right| \leq MV(n, d-1) - (M-1)T(n, d, d-1), \quad (6)$$

which is tighter than (4).

In the next section, we generalize the GV bounds to UEP codes with multi-level protection capabilities.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In section III-A we generalize the GV bound to get an achievability bound for multi-level protection UEP codes (Theorem 3.1). An improved achievability bound for two-level protection UEP codes (Theorem 3.2) is derived in Section III-B, in which Proposition 3.1 introduces the intersection bounds for estimating volume of union balls, and Proposition 3.2 provides a more relaxed sufficient condition for Proposition 3.1. In section III-C we consider another way to improve the achievability bound for two-level protection UEP codes, called the enlargement bound (Theorem 3.3).

A. GV Bound for UEP Codes

We utilize the union bound (4) and a greedy strategy to select codewords to establish an achievability bound for UEP codes in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1: Given m message sets $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m$ with $|\mathcal{A}_i| = A_i$, and $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_m$. Suppose a subset $W \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n$ satisfies $|W| > S(n, m, A_1^m, d_1^m)$, where

$$S(n, m, A_1^m, d_1^m) := \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\prod_{j>i} A_j \right) (A_i - 1) V(n, d_i - 1), \quad (7)$$

then there exists an (A_1^m, d_1^m) UEP code C of message $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_m$ such that $C \subset W$.

Proof: We prove Theorem 3.1 via induction on m . If $m = 1$, then the statement is true due to the classic GV bound. For the induction step $m-1 \rightarrow m$, take $a \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and split the message set into $\mathcal{M}_1 := \{a\} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_{m-1} \times \mathcal{A}_m$, $\mathcal{M}_2 := (\mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \{a\}) \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_{m-1} \times \mathcal{A}_m$. The codewords are greedily selected as follows.

- 1) We first choose codewords for $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{M_2}\}$. Take arbitrary $c_1 \in W$ as the codeword for m_1 .

- 2) Suppose we have encoded $\{m_1, \dots, m_i\}$ into $\{c_1, \dots, c_i\}$ for some $1 \leq i < M_2 = (A_1 - 1)(\prod_{k=2}^m A_k)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} |W| - (i+1)V(n, d_1 - 1) &> |W| - (M_2 + 1)V(n, d_1 - 1) \\ &> |W| - S(n, m, A_1^m, d_1^m) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

we can choose a codeword $c_{i+1} \in W$ for m_{i+1} such that $d_H(c_i, c_j) \geq d_1, \forall j < i+1$. Continue this procedure until the whole \mathcal{M}_2 are encoded into $\bar{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{M_2}\}$. Note that $d_1 \geq d_i$ for all $i > 1$, which implies \bar{C} is an $((A_1 - 1, A_2^m), d_1^m)$ UEP code for \mathcal{M}_2 .

- 3) Next we select codewords for messages in \mathcal{M}_1 . Let $C_1 := W \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{M_2} B(c_i, d_1 - 1)$. By union bound (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |C_1| &\geq |W| - \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{M_2} B(c_i, d_1 - 1) \right| \\ &\geq |W| - \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} A_i \right) (A_m - 1) V(n, d_m - 1) \\ &> S(n, m, A_1^m, d_1^m) - \left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} A_i \right) (A_m - 1) V(n, d_m - 1) \\ &= S(n, m - 1, A_2^m, d_2^m), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and thus by induction assumption, we can find an (A_2^m, d_2^m) UEP code $\tilde{C} \subset C_1$ for \mathcal{M}_1 , since this is code for $m-1$ message sets.

- 4) Let $C = \tilde{C} \cup \bar{C}$. According to the construction of C_1 we know that C is an (A_1^m, d_1^m) UEP code, and this completes the proof. ■

Remark 3.1: If $d_1 = d_2 = \dots, d_m$, then Theorem 3.1 coincides with the standard GV bound 2.1.

The applicability of Theorem 3.1 extends beyond the binary field to \mathbb{F}_q . The method outlined in Theorem 3.1 serves as a foundational concept that can be further enhanced and refined in the next section.

B. Improved Bound for Two-level Protection

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{m_1^A, m_2^A, \dots, m_A^A\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{m_1^B, m_2^B, \dots, m_B^B\}$ be two message sets with $|\mathcal{A}| = A$ and $|\mathcal{B}| = B$. Consider a two-level protection UEP code of length n with minimum distance d_A and d_B for \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , respectively, and the rates of message \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are defined as $R_A := \frac{\log_2 A}{n}$ and $R_B := \frac{\log_2 B}{n}$. For convenience, we denote such code by (n, A, B, d_A, d_B) -UEP code. We assume that $d_A > d_B$, i.e., the message set \mathcal{A} requires stronger error protection ability than \mathcal{B} . By Theorem 3.1, we obtain the following achievable size of \mathcal{A} with given n, B, d_A, d_B .

Corollary 3.1: There exists an (n, A, B, d_A, d_B) -UEP code for the message set $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ with

$$A \geq \frac{2^n - (B-1)V(n, d_B - 1)}{BV(n, d_A - 1)}. \quad (9)$$

Remark 3.2: Following the line of proof demonstrating that the GV bound can be attained by linear binary codes [22], we can similarly establish that the size specified in Corollary 3.1 can be achieved by LUEP codes, see details in Appendix A.

When $d_B \ll d_A$, the achievability bound provided by Corollary 3.1 is not tight. This is primarily due to the inefficiency of the union bound. In fact, if we gather the codewords c_i with code distance d_B , the volume of the intersection of the balls $B(c_i, d_A - 1)$ will be large, but the union bound does not take this into account, which results in a less efficient utilization of the space. In view of the above analysis, we provide an improved GV bound for the two-level protection UEP codes by deriving a tighter estimation, which is a generalization version of (6) by changing $d-1$ to arbitrary $r \geq 0$.

Proposition 3.1: Let $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_N\}$ be a code such that for any $i = 2, 3, \dots, N$, there exists $j < i$ s.t. $d_H(c_i, c_j) = d$. Then

$$\left| \bigcup_{k=1}^N B(c_k, r) \right| \leq NV(n, r) - (N-1)T(n, d, r) := I(n, N, d, r). \quad (10)$$

Proof: Denote $B_k = B(c_k, r)$ and $\tilde{B}_k = B_k \setminus (\bigcup_{i < k} B_i)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$, then $|\bigcup_{k=1}^N B(c_k, r)| = |\bigcup_{k=1}^N \tilde{B}_k| = \sum_{k=1}^N |\tilde{B}_k|$. For each $k \geq 2$, let $j(k)$ be the index such that $d_H(c_{j(k)}, c_k) = d$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N |\tilde{B}_k| &\leq |B_1| + \sum_{k=2}^N |B_k \setminus B_{j(k)}| \\ &= V(n, r) + (N-1)(V(n, r) - T(n, d, r)). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We call (10) the **intersection bound** and Fig.1 exhibits an example with $d = d_B, r = d_A - 1$. To ensure the existence of the code satisfying the conditions in Proposition 3.1, in the following we introduce the concept of connected set.

Definition 3.1 (Connected Set): Let $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, a path of length t between x and y is $t+1$ ordered points $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t\} \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n$ such that $x_0 = x, x_t = y$ and $d_H(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1, i = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$. A subset $D \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is called a connected set if for any $x, y \in D$, there exists a path $\{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t\}, t \geq 0$ between x and y where all $x_i \in D, i = 0, 1, \dots, t$.

The next proposition shows that we can construct codewords on a connected set to satisfy the condition in Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 3.2: Let $D \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a connected set with $|D| > (B-1)V(n, d_B - 1)$, then there exists a code $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_B\} \subset D$ with size B and minimum distance d_B such that

$$\forall i \leq B, \exists j < i, \text{ s.t. } d_H(c_i, c_j) = d_B. \quad (12)$$

Proof: Take $c_1 \in D$ arbitrarily. Suppose we have selected j codewords $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_j\}$ for some $1 \leq j < B$. Let $W = \bigcup_{i=1}^j B(c_i, d_B - 1)$, then $D \setminus W$ is non-empty since $|D| > jV(n, d_B - 1) - (j-1)T(n, d_B, d_B - 1) \geq |W|$, according to Proposition 3.1. For $x, y \in D$, let $\ell(x, y)$ be the length of the shortest path between x and y . Define

$$r = \min_{x \in D \setminus W, y \in W} \ell(x, y), \quad (13)$$

and suppose r is achieved by $x' \in D \setminus W$ and $y' \in W$. We claim that $r = 1$. In fact, let $\{x' = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}, x_r = y'\} \subset D$

be the shortest path between x' and y' . If $r > 1$, then there would be a contradiction that neither x_1 can belong to $D \setminus W$ or we would find a shorter path $\{x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}, y'\}$ connecting $D \setminus W$ and W , nor it can belong to W otherwise it would be possible to find another shorter path $\{x', x_1\}$. Now it follows that $d_H(x', y') \leq \ell(x', y') = r = 1$, since Hamming distance between two points is equal to the length of the shortest path that connects them in \mathbb{F}_2^n . Take c_i such that $d_H(c_i, y') \leq d_B - 1$, then

$$d_H(c_i, x') \leq d_H(c_i, y') + d_H(y', x') \leq d_B. \quad (14)$$

On the other hand we have $d_H(c_i, x') \geq d_B$ because $x' \in D \setminus V$. This implies $d_H(c_i, x') = d_B$, and we can take $c_{j+1} = x'$ as the $j+1$ -th selected codeword. Clearly the codewords selected by the above procedure satisfy the desired property. ■

Given n, B, d_A, d_B , define $\mathcal{D}(n, B, d_A, d_B)$ to be the collection of all subsets families $\{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_M\}$ where $D_i \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ such that

- 1) D_i is a connected set, $\forall i$.
- 2) $|D_i| > (B-1)V(n, d_B - 1), \forall i$.
- 3) $d_H(D_i, D_j) \geq d_A, \forall j \neq i$.

Suppose $\{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_M\} \in \mathcal{D}(n, B, d_A, d_B)$. For each D_i , we can associate $m_i^A \times \mathcal{B}$ with B codewords $\{c_{ij}\}_{j=1}^B$ in D_i with minimum distance d_B satisfying (12) by code map C_i . And 3) allows us to guarantee the distance between codewords in $C_i(m_i^A \times \mathcal{B}) \subset D_i$ and $C_j(m_j^A \times \mathcal{B}) \subset D_j$ with $i \neq j$ is larger than d_A . Let $\bar{C} = \{c_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq M, 1 \leq j \leq B\}$ and $B_U = \bigcup_{i,j} B(c_{ij}, d_A - 1)$. Taking $W = \mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus B_U$ and $m = 2$. By Theorem 3.1 we know that there exists an (n, A', B, d_A, d_B) -UEP code $\bar{C} \subset W$ if $|W| > S(n, 2, (A', B), (d_A, d_B)) = B(A' - 1)V(n, d_A - 1) + (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1)$. Or equivalently, we can find such code with

$$A' \geq \frac{|W| - (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1)}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \vee 0. \quad (15)$$

Let $C = \bar{C} \cup \tilde{C}$, then clearly C is an (n, A, B, d_A, d_B) -UEP code with

$$\begin{aligned} A &= A' + M \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} M + \frac{2^n - (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1) - MI}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \vee 0, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where (a) follows from the estimation of $|W|$ using Proposition 3.1 and (10), $I = I(n, B, d_B, d_A - 1)$. (16) provides a tighter achievability bound compared with Corollary 3.1, which is summarized in the next theorem.

Theorem 3.2: Let

$$M^* = \sup\{M : \exists \{D_1, \dots, D_M\} \in \mathcal{D}(n, B, d_A, d_B)\}, \quad (17)$$

then there exists an (n, A, B, d_A, d_B) -UEP code such that

$$A \geq M^* + \frac{2^n - (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1) - M^*I}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \vee 0, \quad (18)$$

where $I = I(n, B, d_B, d_A - 1)$.

The analysis of M^* is challenging. However, we can take a specific choice of $\{D_1, \dots, D_M\} \in \mathcal{D}(n, B, d_A, d_B)$ to obtain a lower bound on M^* .




Fig. 2. Enlargement Bound

One natural choice of D_i s is cubes, which implies that the achievable size in Theorem 3.2 is always better than TS (see details in Section IV-B). Another choice of D_i s is the Hamming balls with radius $r_V = \min\{r : V(n, r) > (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1)\}$. In order to ensure the distance of D_i s to be not less than d_A , we pack the larger disjoint Hamming balls B_i with radius $r_S = r_V + \lceil \frac{d_A}{2} \rceil$ in \mathbb{F}_2^n , and select the concentric balls of B_i with radius r_V as D_i .

Let M_S be the maximum number of disjoint Hamming balls with radius r_S , using the classic GV bound and Hamming bound, we have

$$\frac{2^n}{V(n, 2r_S)} \leq M_S \leq \frac{2^n}{V(n, r_S)}. \quad (19)$$

Consequently, $M^* \geq M_S \geq 2^n/V(n, 2r_S)$, which provides a computable lower bound on M^* .

C. Enlargement Union Bound

If we choose D_i s as balls, another volume estimation of the union ball can be built as follows,

$$\left| \bigcup_{k=1}^B B(c_k, d_A - 1) \right| \leq V(n, r_V + d_A - 1), \quad (20)$$

where c_1, c_2, \dots, c_B belong to a ball with radius r_V , as shown in Fig.2. We call (20) the **enlargement bound**. The intersection bound (10) only considers the intersection between two balls, which is loose when the balls are dense. The enlargement bound considers the intersections of all the balls, which is beneficial when $d_B \ll d_A$.

Since the total space \mathbb{F}_2^n is connected, we can find disjoint balls D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{M_S} with centers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{M_S} with radius $r_V (< r_S)$ satisfying

$$\forall i \leq M_S, \exists j < i, \text{ s.t. } d_H(a_i, a_j) = 2r_S + 1, \quad (21)$$

by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3: If \mathbb{F}_2^n can obtain M disjoint balls with radius r , then there exists disjoint balls D_1, D_2, \dots, D_M with centers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_M and radius r satisfying

$$\forall i \leq M, \exists j < i, \text{ s.t. } d_H(a_i, a_j) = 2r + 1. \quad (22)$$

Proof: We denote the set of M disjoint balls in \mathbb{F}_2^n with radius r as E_0 , and do the following steps.

- 1) Choose one ball in E_0 arbitrarily and denote it as D_1 with center c_1 . Denote $\{D_1\} = F$, $E = E_0 \setminus F$.
- 2) If the distances between all centers of balls in F and all centers of balls in E are larger than $2r + 1$, then by triangle inequality,

$$d_H(F, E) > 1. \quad (23)$$

Find $x \in F, y \in E$ such that $d_H(x, y) = d_H(F, E)$ and find the shortest path between x and y as $\{x, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t, y\}$, obviously, $t = d_H(F, E) - 1$, and $d_H(x_i, x) = i$. Then we define

$$G = F + (x_t - x) := \{z \in \mathbb{F}_2^n : z - (x_t - x) \in F\}, \quad (24)$$

and change D_i s to $D_i + (x_t - x)$ s and still denote them as D_i s. Clearly $d_H(G, y') \geq 1, \forall y' \in E$ otherwise there exists contradiction for the definition of (x, y) , and $d_H(G, y) = 1$. Since y belongs to a ball $\bar{D} \in E$ with center \bar{c} , and x belongs to a ball $\hat{D} \in G$ with center \hat{c} , by triangle inequality we conclude that

$$d_H(\hat{c}, \bar{c}) = 2r + 1. \quad (25)$$

- 3) If there exists a ball in E and a ball in F such that their centers have distance $2r + 1$, then we take $G = F$ directly.
- 4) Find all balls in E such that their centers have distance $2r + 1$ with one of the center of the balls in G , and denote them as E^i . Give the numbers for balls in E^i as $D_{|G|+1}, \dots, D_{|G|+|E^i|}$, and do assignments $E_0 \leftarrow E, F \leftarrow G \cup E^i, E \leftarrow E_0 \setminus E^i$.
- 5) Do step 2-4 until $E_0 = E^i$.

Clearly, the balls in final G satisfy the requirements. ■

Therefore, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq M_S, 1 \leq j \leq B} B(c_{ij}, d_A - 1) \right| \leq \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{M_S} B(a_i, r_V + d_A - 1) \right| \\ & \leq I(n, M_S, 2r_S + 1, r_V + d_A - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\{c_{ij}, 1 \leq j \leq B\} \subset D_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, M_S$. Clearly, another achievability bound of UEP is obtained as follows.

Corollary 3.2: There exists an (n, A, B, d_A, d_B) -UEP code for the message set $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ with

$$A \geq M_S + \frac{2^n - I - (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1)}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \vee 0, \quad (27)$$

where $I = I(n, M_S, 2r_S + 1, r_V + d_A - 1)$.

The following theorem describes the gains of code size A from union bound to enlargement bound.

Theorem 3.3: Given n, B, d_A, d_B satisfying

$$d_B < d_A, \quad BV(n, d_A) \leq 2^n. \quad (28)$$

Denote the achievable sizes (9) and (27) as A^{union} and $A^{enlarge}$ respectively. If

$$h\left(\frac{d_A}{n} + h^{-1}\left(R_B + h\left(\frac{d_B}{n}\right)\right)\right) < R_B + h\left(\frac{d_A}{n}\right), \quad (29)$$

where $R_B = \frac{\log_2 B}{n}$, then there exists $\gamma = \gamma(B, d_A, d_B) \in (0, 1)$ s.t.

$$A^{enlarge} - A^{union} \geq M_S(1 - O(\gamma^n)). \quad (30)$$

If we further suppose that

$$h\left(\frac{d_A}{n} + 2h^{-1}\left(R_B + h\left(\frac{d_B}{n}\right)\right)\right) < R_B + h\left(\frac{d_A}{n}\right), \quad (31)$$

then there exists $\Gamma = \Gamma(B, d_A, d_B) > 1$ s.t.

$$\frac{A^{enlarge}}{A^{union}} = O(\Gamma^n). \quad (32)$$

Proof: Since we assume $BV(n, d_A) < 2^n$, conditions (29) and (31) ensure all volume of balls in the remaining proof can be approximated by the following well-known estimation (e.g., see [23]):

$$\frac{1}{n+1} 2^{nh(r/n)} \leq V(n, r) \leq 2^{nh(r/n)}, \quad \forall r \leq \frac{n}{2}. \quad (33)$$

Now we prove (30) and (32). The symbol \approx is employed denote that the values on both sides of “ \approx ” are sufficiently closed when the code length is large enough.

First we estimate r_V by

$$h\left(\frac{r_V}{n}\right) \approx R_B + h\left(\frac{d_B}{n}\right) \quad (34)$$

when n is large and thus $\frac{r_V}{n} \approx h^{-1}(R_B + h(\frac{d_B}{n})) := \eta$, then

$$A^{enlarge} - A^{union} = M_S - \frac{I(n, M_S, 2r_S + 1, r_V + d_A - 1)}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \quad (35)$$

$$\geq M_S \left(1 - \frac{V(n, r_V + d_A - 1)}{BV(n, d_A - 1)}\right) \approx M_S \left(1 - \frac{V(n, r_V + d_A)}{BV(n, d_A)}\right) \quad (36)$$

$$\geq M_S \left(1 - \frac{(n+1)2^{nh(\frac{r_V + d_A}{n})}}{2^{n(R_B + h(\frac{d_A}{n}))}}\right) \quad (37)$$

$$\approx M_S \left(1 - (n+1)2^{-n(R_B + h(\frac{d_A}{n})) - h(\frac{d_A}{n} + \eta)}\right). \quad (38)$$

According to the above proof, we have

$$\frac{A^{enlarge}}{A^{union}} \approx \frac{M_S}{2^n / (BV(n, d_A))} \quad (39)$$

$$\geq \frac{2^{n(R_B + h(\frac{d_A}{n}))}}{2^n h(\frac{2r_V + d_A}{n})} \quad (40)$$

$$\approx \frac{2^{n(R_B + h(\frac{d_A}{n}))}}{2^n h(2h^{-1}(R_B + h(\frac{d_B}{n})) + \frac{d_A}{n})} \quad (41)$$

$$= \left(2^{[R_B + h(\frac{d_A}{n}) - h(2h^{-1}(R_B + h(\frac{d_B}{n})) + \frac{d_A}{n})]}\right)^n. \quad (42)$$

The proof completes. ■




Fig. 3. Comparison of the Volume Bounds of the Union of Balls

Remark 3.3: (29) holds when

$$g\left(h^{-1}(R_B), \frac{d_A}{n}\right) \geq h\left(\frac{d_B}{n}\right). \quad (43)$$

where $g(x, y) := h(x) + h(y) - h(x + y)$. Since $g(x, y) > 0$ (see Appendix B), the condition (29) can be satisfied if $\frac{d_B}{n}$ is small enough, and the ascension of code size A generated by enlargement bound is exponential as n increases, comparing with the one by the union bound. Under (31), the enlargement bound is able to provide non-vanishing rate improvement asymptotically. Several examples satisfying (31) are shown in the following:

- 1) $\frac{d_B}{n} = 0.001, B = 2^{0.7n}, \frac{d_A}{n} \in [0.051, 0.053]$.
- 2) $\frac{d_B}{n} = 0.01, B = 2^{0.5n}, \frac{d_A}{n} \in [0.094, 0.110]$.

We show a comparison between union bound (4), intersection bound (10) and enlargement bound (20) in Fig. 3. Apparently, when $d_B \ll d_A$, the enlargement bound is significantly tighter compared to other bounds.

IV. COMPARISON BETWEEN UEP AND TIME-SHARING

A. Time-sharing codes

The TS codes are the simplest UEP codes, and we consider two message sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} with size A^{TS} and B^{TS} , respectively. Define the $(n_A, n_B, A^{TS}, B^{TS}, d_A, d_B)$ TS code as the combination of two codes

$$C_{TS}^A : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow F_2^{n_A}, \quad C_{TS}^B : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow F_2^{n_B}, \quad (44)$$

where the minimum distance of C_{TS}^A and C_{TS}^B are d_A and d_B , respectively. In other word, the TS codes encode the message sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} independently using C_{TS}^A and C_{TS}^B , respectively. The following bounds for TS codes can be easily obtained by the classic GV bound.

Lemma 4.1 (GV bound for TS codes): There exists an $(n_A, n_B, A^{TS}, B^{TS}, d_A, d_B)$ TS code such that

$$A^{TS} = G(n_A, d_A) := A_G^{TS}, \quad B^{TS} = G(n_B, d_B) := B_G^{TS}, \quad (45)$$

where $G(n, d)$ is defined in (3).

Due to the absence of a concise formula for the parameters of the optimal TS codes, in the following we employ the size provided by the GV bounds, A_G^{TS} and B_G^{TS} , for theoretical comparison with UEP codes. Note that although codes achieving GV bound are not necessarily optimal, they exhibit asymptotic optimality and can be comparable with the optimal codes [24], [25].

B. Theoretical comparison of UEP and TS

Throughout this section, we always assume $n = n_A + n_B$ and compare the (n, A, B, d_A, d_B) -UEP code with $(n_A, n_B, A^{TS}, B, d_A, d_B)$ -TS code, *i.e.* we care about the increment in size $|\mathcal{A}|$ while keeping all other parameters coincident.

According to the improved GV bound for UEP stated in Theorem 3.2, we claim that there always exists a UEP codes with larger size $|\mathcal{A}|$ than the TS codes with size given by the GV bounds A_G^{TS} and B_G^{TS} in (45). In fact, the ‘‘cubes’’ $\{D_i := C_{TS}^A(m_i^A) \times F_2^{n_B} : i = 1, 2, \dots, A_G^{TS}\} \in \mathcal{D}(n, B, d_A, d_B)$. Therefore, we know that there exists an $(n, A, B_G^{TS}, d_A, d_B)$ -UEP code with

$$A \geq A_G^{TS}. \quad (46)$$

The improvement comes from that Theorem 3.2 constructs part of the codewords in a centralized way, and then fills in the remaining gaps as much as possible, while TS does not execute the second step.

In the following, we show that under certain conditions, the asymptotic rate gain of UEP over TS is non-vanishing. For TS code, we take the optimal length allocation n_A, n_B according to GV bound (45) when $B_G^{TS} = B$, *i.e.*, $n_B := \min\{m : \frac{2^m}{V(m, d_B-1)} > B-1\}$, $n_A = n - n_B$, and $A^{TS} = A_G^{TS}$. We denote $\alpha^* := \frac{n_A}{n}$ be the optimal code length allocation. Then the achievable size A in Corollary 3.1 satisfies

$$A \approx \frac{2^{n_A} V(n_B, d_B - 1) - V(n, d_B - 1)}{V(n, d_A - 1)} \approx \frac{2^{n_A} V(n_B, d_B - 1)}{V(n, d_A - 1)}. \quad (47)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A}{A^{TS}} &\approx \frac{V(n_A, d_A - 1) V(n_B, d_B - 1)}{V(n, d_A - 1)} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\approx} \frac{(\alpha^*)^{d_A-1} (1 - \alpha^*)^{d_B-1}}{(d_B - 1)!} n^{d_B-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where (a) follows from $V(n, r+1) = \frac{n^r}{r!} (1 + O(1/n))$, $\alpha^* = \alpha^*(n, d_B, B) := n_A/n$. Obviously, if

$$d_B < d_A < \log_{\alpha^*} \left(\frac{(d_B - 1)!}{[n(1 - \alpha^*)]^{d_B-1}} \right) + 1, \quad (49)$$

then we conclude that there is a non-vanishing rate gain of UEP over TS. If we assume $d_A = \beta_A n, d_B = \beta_B n$ where $1/2\alpha^* > \beta_A > \beta_B$, we can deduce the following size comparison.

Theorem 4.1: Given B . Then for any (β_A, β_B) satisfying $\beta_A \leq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^*, \beta_B \leq \min\{\frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha^*), \beta_A\}$, and

$$\alpha^* h\left(\frac{\beta_A}{\alpha^*}\right) + (1 - \alpha^*) h\left(\frac{\beta_B}{1 - \alpha^*}\right) - h(\beta_A) > 0, \quad (50)$$

there exists $n_0 = n_0(\alpha^*, \beta_A, \beta_B)$ *s.t.* $\forall n > n_0$, there exists a $(n, A, B, \beta_A n, \beta_B n)$ -UEP code and a constant $a > 1$ independent of n such that $A > a^n A^{TS}$, where A^{TS} is the parameter of the TS code $(\alpha^* n, (1 - \alpha^*) n, A^{TS}, B, \beta_A n, \beta_B n)$, which achieves GV bound.

Proof: It is well-known that (*e.g.*, see [23])

$$\frac{1}{n+1} 2^{nh(r/n)} \leq V(n, r) \leq 2^{nh(r/n)}, \quad \forall r \leq \frac{n}{2}. \quad (51)$$

TABLE I
SIMULATION FOR BOUNDS

$\log_2 A$	$\log_2 B$	d_A	d_B	n_G^{TS}	n_b^{TS}	n^U	n^u
2	3	5	4	22	15	16	11
2	4	5	4	24	16	18	12
2	3	6	4	24	16	17	12
4	5	3	2	19	13	16	12
4	6	4	2	23	15	14	14
2	4	7	4	28	19	20	15
4	7	4	2	24	16	15	15
4	8	3	2	22	16	20	15

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A}{A^{TS}} &\approx \frac{V(n_A, d_A - 1)V(n_B, d_B - 1)}{V(n, d_A - 1)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha^*(1 - \alpha^*)n^2} 2^{n[\alpha^*h(\frac{\beta_A}{\alpha^*}) + (1 - \alpha^*)h(\frac{\beta_B}{1 - \alpha^*}) - h(\beta_A)]}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

Remark 4.1: Using the monotonicity the function $f(\alpha^*, \beta_A, \beta_B) := h(\frac{\beta_A}{\alpha^*}) + (1 - \alpha^*)h(\frac{\beta_B}{1 - \alpha^*}) - h(\beta_A)$, we deduce that if $\alpha^*(n, d_B, B) \geq 0.1$, then (50) holds for all (β_A, β_B) satisfying

$$0 < \frac{\beta_A}{2} \leq \beta_B < \beta_A \leq \frac{\alpha^*}{3}. \quad (53)$$

Remark 4.2: Note that $h(\cdot)$ is increasing, which implies the conditions in Theorem 4.1 holds if

$$0 < (1 - \alpha^*)\beta_A \leq \beta_B \leq \beta_A \leq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^*. \quad (54)$$

V. SIMULATION

Table I presents the achievable length of UEP and TS codes with short code lengths. Specifically, n_G^{TS} is an achievable code length obtained by GV bound for TS as in (45), while n_b^{TS} is the minimum code length of TS code according to codetables.de [26]. n^U is deduced according to Theorem 3.2 where D_i s are chosen as the ‘‘cubes’’ $\{D_i := C_{TS}^A(m_i^A) \times F_2^{n_B}\}$ with n_B satisfying

$$B \leq \frac{2^{n_B}}{V(n_B, d_B - 1)}.$$

n^u is the length of the optimal LUEP given in [9].

It is evident that n^u surpasses n_b^{TS} for all cases, which indicates the superiority of UEP over TS for short codes. Furthermore, n^U is close to n^u when $d_B = 2$, which implies that this achievability bound is tight when d_B is small.

For longer code length, we summarize our achievability bounds as follows. By choosing D_i s as ‘‘cubes’’ and using Theorem 3.2, we obtain an achievability size

$$A_1 = A_G^{TS} + \frac{2^n - (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1) - A_G^{TS}I_1}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \vee 0. \quad (55)$$

where $I_1 = I(n, B, d_B, d_A - 1)$. If we choose D_i s as balls, then Theorem 3.2 and (19) imply an achievability size

$$A_2 = M_S^L + \frac{2^n - (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1) - M_S^L I_1}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \vee 0, \quad (56)$$




Fig. 4. Comparison on Several Bounds of TS and UEP Codes

where $M_S^L = 2^n/V(n, r_S)$ is a lower bound of M_S . Furthermore, if we use the enlargement bound and Theorem 3.2, another achievability size is obtained as

$$A_3 = M_S^L + \frac{2^n - (B - 1)V(n, d_B - 1) - I_2}{BV(n, d_A - 1)} \vee 0, \quad (57)$$

where $I_2 = I(n, M_S^L, 2r_S + 1, r_V + d_A - 1)$.

The rate obtained by bounds with longer code lengths are shown in Fig. 4, where the achievability bound of UEP is the maximum of our results, i.e. $\frac{\log_2 \max\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}}{n}$. The converse bound of UEP is from [27]. The Hamming (converse) bound of UEP is

$$A \leq \frac{2^n}{BV(n, [(d_B - 1)/2])}, \quad (58)$$

by trivially dropping the code distance requirement of \mathcal{A} from d_A to d_B .

The achievability bound

$$A = \frac{2^n}{BV(n_A, d_A - 1)} \quad (59)$$

of Equal-Error Protection (EEP) Code (defined as the UEP code with $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_m$) [28] is also included in the comparison. The EEP elevates the code spacing requirement to be consistent, which corresponds to the UEP code in Definition 2.1 with $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_m$. Although it will lose the rate due to the increased code distance, compared with TS, it constructs the codeword in the whole space without spatial segmentation, thus the advantages and disadvantages of the two strategies are not obvious (see Fig. 4).

From the simulations, we find that when $d_B \ll d_A$, UEP can obtain significant advantages. This is because UEP gathers B codewords with distance requirement d_B together, and thus the intersection of the balls with radius d_A is large. Therefore, there is more space left to place more codewords and the gain is obtained comparing with TS and EEP. It is notable that the achievability bounds are not coincide for $R_B = 0$, since in TS we always ask $n_B \geq d_B$. When d_B is close to d_A , the TS awkwardly combines two codes with similar protection levels independently and thus loses the code length gain. Furthermore, UEP does not show significant improvement compared to EEP when $d_B \approx d_A$, indicating that UEP is not necessary in this case.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we obtain the achievability bounds of UEP codes, and prove that UEP is superior to TS under certain conditions. We first consider the number of disjoint connected sets in the space \mathbb{F}_2^n and utilize a tighter estimation to the volume of union balls, such as intersection bound and enlargement bound, and then fill in the remaining gaps as much as possible. It is demonstrated that the UEP codes obtained by the above procedures achieve significant gains comparing with TS and EEP when $d_B \ll d_A$.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. M. Cohen, A. Steiner, and S. Shamai. Broadcasting with mixed delay demands. In *2012 IEEE 27th Convention of Electrical and Electronics Engineers in Israel*, pages 1–5, 2012.
- [2] K. M. Cohen, A. Steiner, and S. Shamai. The broadcast approach under mixed delay constraints. In *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, pages 209–213, 2012.
- [3] A. R. Calderbank and N. Seshadri. Multilevel codes for unequal error protection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 39(4):1234–1248, 1993.
- [4] L. Xie, H. Chen, P. Qu, and M. Zhang. The modified hamming bound for unequal error protection codes. In *IEEE 2002 International Conference on Communications, Circuits and Systems and West Sino Expositions*, volume 1, pages 92–95, 2002.
- [5] B. Masnick and J. Wolf. On linear unequal error protection codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 13(4):600–607, 1967.
- [6] L. A. Dunning and W.E. Robbins. Optimal encodings of linear block codes for unequal error protection. *Information and Control*, 37(2):150–177, 1978.
- [7] I. Boyarinov and G. Katsman. Linear unequal error protection codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 27(2):168–175, 1981.
- [8] W. van Gils. Linear unequal error protection codes from shorter codes (corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 30(3):544–546, 1984.
- [9] W. van Gils. Two topics on linear unequal error protection codes: Bounds on their length and cyclic code classes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 29(6):866–876, 1983.
- [10] R. H. Moreloszaragoza and L. Shu. On a class of optimal nonbinary linear unequal-error-protection codes for two sets of messages. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 40(1):196–200, 1994.
- [11] S. Borade, B. Nakiboğlu, and L. Zheng. Unequal error protection: An information-theoretic perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(12):5511–5539, 2009.
- [12] S. Salehkalaibar and M. Wigger. Distributed hypothesis testing based on unequal-error protection codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(7):4150–4182, 2020.
- [13] S. Borade and S. Sanghavi. Some fundamental coding theoretic limits of unequal error protection. In *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 2231–2235, 2009.
- [14] S.I. Bross and S. Litsyn. Improved upper bounds for codes with unequal error protection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(7):3329–3333, 2006.
- [15] A. Hadi, E. Alsusa, and A. Al-Dweik. Information unequal error protection using polar codes. *IET Communications*, 12(8):956–961, 2018.
- [16] C. Cui, W. Xiang, Z. Wang, and Q. Guo. Polar codes with the unequal error protection property. *Computer Communications*, 123:116–125, 2018.
- [17] M. A. Hanif and S. Vafi. An efficient serially concatenated polar code with unequal error protection property. In *2019 IEEE 4th International Conference on Computer and Communication Systems*, pages 497–501, 2019.
- [18] Y.-H. Chen, F.-C. Chang, H.-C. Huang, and T.-K. Huang. Unequal error protection for compressed sensing with polar codes. In *2019 IEEE 8th Global Conference on Consumer Electronics*, pages 225–226, 2019.
- [19] V. Ninkovic, D. Vukobratovic, C. Häger, H. Wymeersch, and A. Graell i Amat. Autoencoder-based unequal error protection codes. *IEEE Communications Letters*, 25(11):3575–3579, 2021.

- [20] M. Bossert, V. Sidorenko, and V. Zyablov. Finding distance profiles of unequal error protection block codes. *European Transactions on Telecommunications*, 18:541–546, 08 2007.
- [21] F. Fabris. Sharpening the gilbert-varshamov bound in the finite case. *Journal of Discrete Mathematical Sciences & Cryptography*, 4, 04 2001.
- [22] R. R. Varshamov. Estimate of the number of signals in error correcting codes. *Dokl. Acad. Nauk SSSR*, 117:739–741, 1957.
- [23] Y. Yonatan, A. K. d Haider, P. Sven, and W.-Z. Antonia. Bounds on mixed codes with finite alphabets. *arXiv: 2212.09314*, 2022.
- [24] J. Ta and A. Vardy. Asymptotic improvement of the gilbert-varshamov bound on the size of binary codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50(8):1655–1664, 2004.
- [25] V. Vu and L. Wu. Improving the gilbert-varshamov bound for q-ary codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(9):3200–3208, 2005.
- [26] Markus Grassl. Bounds on the minimum distance of linear codes and quantum codes. Online available at <http://www.codetables.de>, 2007. Accessed on 2024-08-09.
- [27] S. I. Bross and S. Litsyn. Improved upper bounds for codes with unequal error protection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(7):3329–3333, 2006.
- [28] O. Y. Bursalioglu and G. Caire. Is unequal error protection useful? In *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, pages 1402–1406, 2011.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Remark 3.2

We denote the information as $u \in (u_1^{k_A}, u_{k_A+1}^{k_A+k_B}) \in F_2^{k_A+k_B}$, where $u_1^{k_A}$ represent the messages in \mathcal{A} and $u_{k_A+1}^{k_A+k_B}$ represent the messages in \mathcal{B} .

Now we consider random matrix G with *i.i.d.* Bernoulli($\frac{1}{2}$) entries. Then fix any $u \in F_2^{k_A+k_B} \setminus \{0\}$, vector uG also has *i.i.d.* Bernoulli($\frac{1}{2}$) entries. Thus the event $A_{u,d} := \{\rho_H(uG) \leq d\}$ has probability

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{u,d}) = \frac{V(n,d)}{2^n}, \forall u \neq 0. \quad (60)$$

Since we need d_A minimum distance for $u_1^{k_A}$ and d_B minimum distance for $u_{k_A+1}^{k_A+k_B}$, the feasible event should be $\Theta := ((\bigcup_{u \in S_1} A_{u,d_A}) \cup (\bigcup_{u \in S_2} A_{u,d_B}))^c$, where

$$S_1 := \{u : u_1^{k_A} \neq 0\}, S_2 := \{u : u_{k_A+1}^{k_A+k_B} \neq 0\}. \quad (61)$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Theta) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\bigcup_{u \in S_1} A_{u,d_A}\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{u \in S_2} A_{u,d_B}\right)\right) \quad (62)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\bigcup_{u \in S_1} A_{u,d_A}\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{u \in S_1^c \cap S_2} A_{u,d_B}\right)\right) \quad (63)$$

$$\geq 1 - \left(\sum_{u \in S_1} \mathbb{P}(A_{u,d_A}) + \sum_{u \in S_1^c \cap S_2} \mathbb{P}(u, d_B)\right) \quad (64)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\mu(S_1)V(n, d_A) + \mu(S_1^c \cap S_2)V(n, d_B)}{2^n} \quad (65)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{B(A-1)V(n, d_A) + (B-1)V(n, d_B)}{2^n} \quad (66)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{>} 0, \quad (67)$$

where (a) comes from $d_A > d_B$ and (b) comes from (9). Clearly, (67) means the existence of generate matrix G_0 s.t.

$$\rho_H(uG_0) \geq d_A, \forall u \in S_1; \rho_H(uG_0) \geq d_B, \forall u \in S_2, \quad (68)$$

i.e. there exists a LUEP code that satisfies the requirements of code distance and code size. ■

B. Proof of $g(x, y) > 0, \forall x, y \in (0, 1/2)$

Proof: Fix any $x_0 \in (0, 1/2)$, then $g_0(y) := g(x_0, y)$ satisfying that $g'_0(y) = h'(y) - h'(x + y) > 0$ since $h''(x) < 0, \forall x \in (0, 1)$, then we conclude $g_0(y) > 0, \forall y \in (0, 1/2)$ by $g_0(0) = 0$. ■