

Identification via Permutation Channels

Abhishek Sarkar and Bikash Kumar Dey
 Department of Electrical Engineering
 Indian Institute of Technology Bombay
 {absarkar, bikash}@ee.iitb.ac.in

Abstract—We study message identification over a q -ary uniform permutation channel, where the transmitted vector is permuted by a permutation chosen uniformly at random. For discrete memoryless channels (DMCs), the number of identifiable messages grows doubly exponentially. Identification capacity, the maximum second-order exponent, is known to be the same as the Shannon capacity of the DMC. Permutation channels support reliable communication of only polynomially many messages. A simple achievability result shows that message sizes growing as $2^{c_n n^{q-1}}$ are identifiable for any $c_n \rightarrow 0$. We prove two converse results. A “soft” converse shows that for any $R > 0$, there is no sequence of identification codes with message size growing as $2^{Rn^{q-1}}$ with a power-law decay ($n^{-\mu}$) of the error probability. We also prove a “strong” converse showing that for any sequence of identification codes with message size $2^{Rn^{q-1} \log n}$ ($R > 0$), the sum of type I and type II error probabilities approaches at least 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To prove the soft converse, we use a sequence of steps to construct a new identification code with a simpler structure which relates to a set system, and then use a lower bound on the normalized maximum pairwise intersection of a set system. To prove the strong converse, we use results on approximation of distributions.

I. INTRODUCTION

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

We consider a uniform permutation channel over a q -ary alphabet \mathcal{A}_q , where the components of the transmitted n -length vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}_q^n$ are permuted by the channel using a permutation chosen uniformly at random from S_n , the set of permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Since the transmit vectors of the same type are not distinguishable, it is easy to show that the maximum number of messages M that can be reliably transmitted is the number of all possible types N over the channel input alphabet; this number grows polynomially with blocklength n . Thus the Shannon capacity is zero.

Ahlsvede and Dueck [1] introduced the problem of message identification, where the decoder is interested in knowing whether a particular message, which is unknown to the encoder, was transmitted. It needs to be ensured that both the false negative (type I) and false positive (type II) error probabilities should be small. Message identification is a weaker requirement than decoding, and here the decision regions for different messages are allowed to overlap. It was proved that by using stochastic encoding, a doubly exponential number

of messages can be identified for DMCs. The identification capacity, defined as the maximum achievable second order rate, $\frac{1}{n} \log \log M$, was proved to be the same as the Shannon capacity C of the DMC. A “soft” converse was proved. Later, a strong converse was proved by Han and Verdu [10], [11] (also see Steinberg [29]).

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

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

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

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

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

The achievability proof in [1] considers the set \mathcal{Z} to be the set of about 2^{n^C} messages, which can be communicated reliably. Since $\log N$ bits can be reliably communicated over the uniform permutation channel, one may expect that $2^{\epsilon N}$ messages may be identified. However, condition (1) implies that for the probability of error λ_n of a sequence of codes to go to 0, ϵ_n must also go to 0. We prove a soft converse in this paper in support of the claim that $2^{\epsilon N}$ (where ϵ is fixed) messages cannot be identified via uniform permutation channel.

We prove two converse results for identification over uniform permutation channels over \mathcal{A}_q . Proposition 1 directly gives an achievability result showing that any message size growing as $2^{c_n n^{q-1}}$, where $c_n \rightarrow 0$, is identifiable. We prove a soft converse showing that for any $R, \mu > 0$, no sequence of ID codes exist with message size growing as $2^{Rn^{q-1}}$ and probability of errors vanishing as $n^{-\mu}$. The soft converse meets the achievability result in terms of the message size, but it rules out only a power-law decay of the probability of errors. We also prove a strong converse showing that for any $R > 0$, and a sequence of ID codes with message size growing as $2^{Rn^{q-1} \log n}$, the sum of type I and type II probability of errors approaches at least 1. While the strong converse gives a stronger guarantee on the probability of error, it gives a weaker bound on the message size.

For proving the soft converse, we use a sequence of steps to derive a sequence of ID codes with a simple structure

and then prove the zero-rate converse for such a sequence of codes. However, one of these steps is to reduce the encoder distributions to uniform distributions, in a similar manner as in [1]. This step increases the probability of error by a (arbitrarily small) power of n . As a result, this argument works if the original sequence of codes has a probability of error decaying at least as fast as $n^{-\mu}$ for some $\mu > 0$. Several other steps in the argument are new, and arise due to the current channel model.

To prove the strong converse result, for a given sequence of ID codes, we first construct a sequence of ID codes with stochastic decoders for noiseless channels over types. We then use a result on approximation of distributions and a relation of the variational distance between encoder distributions with probability of error. The technique is similar to that in [10], [11]. Note that a direct application of the strong converse results of [10], [11] only implies a zero second-order rate (since the Shannon capacity is zero), while our strong converse bounds the message size to $2^{Rn^{q-1} \log n}$.

After the identification problem was introduced in [1], it has been studied in various setups. We now give a glimpse of such works, without being exhaustive. Identification over DMCs with noisy feedback under both deterministic and stochastic encoding was studied in [4], while identification over wiretap channels was studied in [28], [21], [4]. Identification over broadcast channels was investigated in [6], [22], while identification in the presence of feedback over multiple-access channels and broadcast channels was studied in [3]. Identification was studied over Gaussian channels in [24], [17]; over additive noise channels under average and peak power constraints in [32]; over compound channels and arbitrarily varying channels in [2]. Deterministic identification over DMCs with and without input constraints was studied in [23].

The permutation channel is relevant in DNA-based storage systems, multipath routing of packets in communication networks, and diffusion-based molecular communication [19]. In multipath routed networks, in the absence of any packet id in the packets, the out-of-order arrival of packets due to varying delay or changing topologies may be thought to be due to random permutations [9], [31]. The study by [16], [15] examined coding in channels with random permutations and other impairments such as insertion, deletion and substitution. See [5] and [20] for a comprehensive survey of molecular communication systems and the role of the permutation channel in diffusion-based communication systems.

An overview of coding challenges for DNA-based storage is presented in [27], while [26] presents an optimal code construction for correcting multiple errors in unordered string-based data encoding within DNA storage systems. See [25] for a comprehensive study of DNA-based storage systems. [18], [7] examined coding for permutation channels with restricted movements. Noisy permutation channels have been studied in [19] and [30]. To the best of our knowledge, identification over permutation channels has not been studied before.

The organization of this paper is as follows. We present the problem setup in Sec. II, and the main results in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, we give a series of constructions through which we

derive a new ‘canonical’ code from a given identification code. In Sec. V, we prove a bound on the intersection of a set system; this bound is later used in the proof of the soft converse. The proof of the soft converse is presented in Sec. VI. In Sec. VII, we present the proof of the strong converse. We conclude this paper in Sec. VIII.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

For a positive integer k , we denote $[k] := \{1, \dots, k\}$. For any set \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ denotes the set of all probability mass functions over \mathcal{A} . Let \mathcal{A}_q be a set of q elements and $\mathcal{T}_q^{(n)} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_q^n)$ be the set of all types over \mathcal{A}_q^n and denote $N := |\mathcal{T}_q^{(n)}| = \binom{n+q-1}{q-1}$. We note that

$$\frac{n^{(q-1)}}{(q-1)!} \leq N \leq \frac{n^{(q-1)}}{(q-1)!} \left(1 + \frac{q-1}{n}\right)^{q-1}. \quad (3)$$

For convenience, we index the types in $\mathcal{T}_q^{(n)}$ by $[N]$ and denote $\mathcal{T}_q^{(n)} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N\}$. For two sets \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , we denote by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}|\mathcal{B})$ the set of all conditional distributions $P_{X|Y}$ where $X \in \mathcal{A}, Y \in \mathcal{B}$. Any channel with input alphabet \mathcal{A} and output alphabet \mathcal{B} are specified by a conditional probability distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{A})$. The ‘‘noiseless channel’’ with input and output alphabets \mathcal{A} , where the output is the same as the input, is denoted by $\text{NL}_{\mathcal{A}}$. In particular, $\text{NL}_{[N]}$ denotes the noiseless channel with input and output alphabets $[N]$. We now consider q -ary permutation channels. Without loss of generality, consider the q -ary alphabet $\mathcal{A}_q := [q]$. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}_q^n$ and $\sigma \in S_n$, we define

$$\sigma \mathbf{x} := (x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, x_{\sigma^{-1}(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma^{-1}(n)}).$$

The n -block q -ary uniform permutation channel Π_n^q is defined as the channel with input and output alphabets \mathcal{A}_q^n and transition probability

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{y}=\sigma \mathbf{x}\}}$$

for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}_q^n$. We will refer to the sequence of channels $\{\Pi_n^q\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as the uniform permutation channel over \mathcal{A}_q and denote it by Π^q . For every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}_q^n$, the action of permutations generate the typeclass of \mathbf{x} :

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)} := \{\sigma \mathbf{x} | \sigma \in S_n\},$$

In the language of group action, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}$ is the orbit of \mathbf{x} under the action of S_n on \mathcal{A}_q^n . It is easy to check that if \mathbf{x} is transmitted and a permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ is chosen uniformly at random, then the output $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ is uniformly distributed in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}$.

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

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

of pairs with $Q_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$, and $\mathcal{D}_i \subset \mathcal{B}$, for $i = 1, \dots, M$. For such a code, a message i is encoded to a symbol $x \in \mathcal{A}$ with probability $Q_i(x)$, and the decoder for message i outputs 1 (‘‘Accept’’) if the received symbol $y \in \mathcal{D}_i$, and outputs 0 (‘‘Reject’’) otherwise. If, for each i , the encoding distribution

Q_i is the uniform distribution over some support set \mathcal{A}_i , then the ID code is specified by $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, M\}$.

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

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

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

For a stochastic ID code, the probability that a message $j \neq i$ is accepted (“false alarm” for j) when i is encoded is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} &:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{B}} Q_i(x) P(y|x) P_j(1|y) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(x) P(y|x) \quad (\text{for deterministic decoders}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{i \not\rightarrow i} &:= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{B}} Q_i(x) P(y|x) P_i(0|y) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}, y \notin \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(x) P(y|x) \quad (\text{for deterministic decoders}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

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

$$\lambda_1 := \max_{1 \leq i \leq M} \lambda_{i \not\rightarrow i}, \quad \lambda_2 := \max_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq M} \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}, \quad (6)$$

And we define the sum probability of error as

$$\lambda := \lambda_1 + \lambda_2. \quad (7)$$

We refer to an M -ary (i.e. with M messages) ID code for Π_n^q as an (n, M) ID code (or $(n, M, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ ID code) for the uniform permutation channel Π^q (or Π_n^q), and similarly, an ID code for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$ is referred as an (N, M) ID code (or $(N, M, \lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ ID code) for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$. Unless otherwise specified, an ID code will refer to one with deterministic decoders throughout the paper. For an (n, M) ID code with deterministic decoders for Π^q , the probability of errors are given by

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

and

$$\lambda_{i \not\rightarrow i} := \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}_i^n} Q_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{D}_i^c|}{|\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}|}. \quad (9)$$

III. MAIN RESULTS

We first present an achievability result for Π^q .

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

Proof: Recall that N is the number of types in \mathcal{A}_q^n . First, for any n , let us construct an ID code for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$.

Let us take

$$\epsilon'_n = \frac{n^{q-1}}{N} \left(\epsilon_n + \frac{1 + \log N}{n^{q-1}} \right), \quad (10)$$

$$\lambda_{2,n} = \frac{4}{\log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon'_n} \right)}, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{Z} = [N]. \quad (12)$$

in Proposition 1. It follows from (3) that $\epsilon'_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and hence for large enough n , $\epsilon'_n < \frac{1}{8}$. Also, for large enough n ,

$$\lambda_{2,n} \log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon'_n} - 1 \right) \geq \lambda_{2,n} \log \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon'_n} \right) \quad (13)$$

$$= \lambda_{2,n} \times \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon'_n} \right) - 1 \right) \quad (14)$$

$$\geq \frac{4}{\log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon'_n} \right)} \times \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon'_n} \right) \quad (15)$$

$$= 2 \quad (16)$$

Hence ϵ'_n and $\lambda_{2,n}$ satisfy the conditions in Proposition 1, which guarantees that there exist

$$M \geq 2^{\epsilon'_n N - 1 - \log N} \quad (17)$$

$$= 2 \left\{ \frac{n^{q-1}}{N} \left(\epsilon_n + \frac{1 + \log N}{n^{q-1}} \right) \cdot N - 1 - \log N \right\} \quad (18)$$

$$= 2 \{ \epsilon_n n^{q-1} \} \quad (19)$$

number of distinct subsets $\{\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M\}$ of $[N]$ such that

$$|\mathcal{U}_i| = \epsilon'_n N, \quad \forall i, \quad (20)$$

$$|\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j| \leq \lambda_{2,n} \epsilon'_n N, \quad \forall i \neq j. \quad (21)$$

This collection gives an ID code $\{(\mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{U}_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, M\}$ for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$ with probability of errors $\lambda_1 = 0$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_{2,n}$.

Now, since permutations preserve the type of a vector, the above code can be used to construct an ID code for Π_n^q . Suppose $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N$ are a set of representatives from the N distinct type classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N respectively in \mathcal{A}_q^n . Then we define the code $\{(Q_i, \mathcal{D}_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, M\}$ where Q_i is the uniform distribution over $\{\mathbf{x}_j \mid j \in \mathcal{U}_i\}$, and

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \cup_{j \in \mathcal{U}_i} T_j. \quad (22)$$

Since permutations do not change the type of a transmitted vector, the probability of error for this code are also $\lambda_1 = 0$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_{2,n}$. Since $\lambda_{2,n} \rightarrow 0$, this proves the theorem. ■

Remark 1. It is reasonable to expect that if ϵ_n diminishes slowly, effectively insisting on a faster growth of the message size, then the probability of error $\lambda_{2,n}$ will decay slowly as

well. By using the bounds (3), one can check that for the construction in the achievability proof, $\lambda_{2,n}$ is of the order

$$\lambda_{2,n} \simeq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_n}\right)} & \text{if } \frac{\epsilon_n n^{q-1}}{\log n} \rightarrow \infty, \\ \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{n^{q-1}}{\log n}\right)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

For the special case of binary uniform permutation channels Π^2 , Theorem 1 implies that any ‘sub-exponential’ message size can be identified over the binary uniform permutation channel.

Corollary 1 (Binary Uniform Permutation Channel). *For any $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, there exists a sequence of $(n, 2^{\epsilon_n n}, 0, \lambda_{2,n})$ ID codes for the binary uniform permutation channel with $\lambda_{2,n} \rightarrow 0$.*

We now present our converse results for the q -ary uniform permutation channel.

Theorem 2.

- A. *Soft Converse:* For any given $\mu, R > 0$, there does not exist a sequence of $(n_i, 2^{Rn_i^{q-1}}, \lambda_{1,i}, \lambda_{2,i})$ ID codes for the q -ary uniform permutation channel Π^q such that $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ and probability of errors $\lambda_{1,i}, \lambda_{2,i} < n_i^{-\mu}$ for all i .
- B. *Strong Converse:* For any given $R > 0$ and any sequence of $(n_i, 2^{Rn_i^{q-1} \log n_i}, \lambda_{1,i}, \lambda_{2,i})$ ID codes with $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ for the q -ary uniform permutation channel, $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_{1,i} + \lambda_{2,i}) \geq 1$.

Remark 2. Note that the probabilities of type-I and type-II errors for decoder j (i.e. when the decoder is interested in identifying message j), are $\lambda_{i,j \neq j}$ and $\lambda_{i,k \neq j}$ respectively. The strong converse also holds for each decoder, i.e., in Theorem 2B, $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \max_j (\lambda_{i,j \neq j} + \max_{k \neq j} \lambda_{i,k \neq j}) \geq 1$.

For the binary uniform permutation channels (i.e. for $q = 2$), the soft converse shows that no non-zero first order identification rate $R := \frac{\log M}{n}$ is achievable under power law decay of the probability of errors.

IV. MODIFICATION OF ID CODES

Towards proving Theorem 2A, in this section, we provide five simple code modification steps through which, given an ID code for Π_n^q , we construct a code for $NL_{[N]}$ with uniform encoder distributions and equal-sized supports. The first step, i.e., constructing an ID code for $NL_{[N]}$ with stochastic decoders from an ID code for Π_n^q , is also used in the proof of the strong converse Theorem 2B.

A. *From ID code with deterministic decoders for Π_n^q to a ID code with stochastic decoders for $NL_{[N]}$*

For every (n, M) ID code with deterministic decoders for Π_n^q , we present a construction of an (N, M) ID code with stochastic decoders for $NL_{[N]}$ with the same probability of error.

Lemma 1. *Given an ID code with deterministic decoders $\{(Q_i, P_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ for Π_n^q , there exists an ID code with stochastic decoders for the noiseless channel $NL_{[N]}$, having the same probability of errors $\{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} | 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M\}$ and $\{\lambda_{i \neq i} | i = 1, \dots, M\}$.*

Proof: We will construct an ID code $\{(Q'_i, P_i) | i = 1, \dots, M\}$ with stochastic decoders for $NL_{[N]}$. Let T_1, T_2, \dots, T_N be the distinct types for vectors in \mathcal{A}_q^n . For every type $T \in \mathcal{T}_q^{(n)}$, let $\mathcal{T}_T \subset \mathcal{A}_q^n$ denote the type class containing all n -length vectors with type T . Recall that for an $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}_q^n$, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}$ is the set of all n -length vectors that share the same type as \mathbf{x} . For every $i \in [M], j \in [N]$, we define

$$Q'_i(j) := Q_i(\mathcal{T}_{T_j}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_{T_j}} Q_i(\mathbf{x}),$$

$$P_i(1|j) := \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i \cap \mathcal{T}_{T_j}|}{|\mathcal{T}_{T_j}|}.$$

The probability of errors for the new code are given by

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

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{i \neq i} &:= \sum_{k \in [N]} Q'_i(k) P_i(0|k) \\ &= \sum_{k \in [N]} Q'_i(k) \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i^c \cap \mathcal{T}_{T_k}|}{|\mathcal{T}_{T_k}|} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}_q^n} Q_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{D}_i^c \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}|}{|\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}|} = \lambda_{i \neq i} \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. ■

B. *From ID codes with stochastic decoders to ID codes with deterministic decoders for noiseless channels*

In this subsection, we present a construction for an ID code with deterministic decoders for $NL_{[N]}$ from an ID code with stochastic decoders for $NL_{[N]}$.

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

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

where $\lambda_2 := \max_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq M} \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}$.

Proof: We fix any $0 < \alpha < 1$. Let us define, for each i ,

$$\mathcal{D}_i := \{k \in [N] | P_i(1|k) > \alpha\}. \quad (24)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} &= \sum_{k \in [N]} Q_i(k) P_i(0|k) \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) P_i(0|k) + \sum_{k \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) P_i(0|k) \\
&\geq 0 + \sum_{k \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) (1 - \alpha) \\
&= \sum_{k \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) - \alpha \sum_{k \in [N] \setminus \mathcal{D}_i} Q_i(k) \\
&\geq \tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} - \alpha \cdot 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Hence, we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} \leq \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} + \alpha. \tag{26}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{i \rightarrow j} &= \sum_{k \in [N]} Q_i(k) P_j(1|k) \\
&\geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(k) P_j(1|k) \\
&\geq \alpha \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(k) = \alpha \tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Hence, we have

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} \leq \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} / \alpha \tag{28}$$

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

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

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} &\leq \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} \times \frac{(1 + 2\gamma)N^\gamma}{\gamma(1 - N^{-\gamma})}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M, \\
\tilde{\lambda}_{i \nrightarrow i} &\leq \lambda_{i \nrightarrow i} \times \frac{(1 + 2\gamma)N^\gamma}{\gamma(1 - N^{-\gamma})}, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, M.
\end{aligned}$$

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

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

Then

$$Q_i(\{[N] \setminus \cup_{l=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{B}(l, i)\}) \leq N \cdot N^{-\gamma \kappa} = N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)} \tag{29}$$

and hence

$$Q_i(\cup_{l=1}^{\kappa} \mathcal{B}(l, i)) \geq (1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)}). \tag{30}$$

Choose $l_i^* := \operatorname{argmax}_{l \in [\kappa]} Q_i(\mathcal{B}(l, i))$ and define

$$\mathcal{U}_i := \mathcal{B}(l_i^*, i). \tag{31}$$

Combining (30) and (31), we can write

$$Q_i(\mathcal{U}_i) \geq \frac{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})}{\kappa}. \tag{32}$$

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

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

Using (32), we can write, for $k \in \mathcal{U}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\mathcal{U}_i}(k) &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}_i|} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}_i|} \times \frac{Q_i(\mathcal{U}_i) \kappa}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

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

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_i(\mathcal{U}_i) &= \sum_{\hat{k} \in \mathcal{U}_i} Q_i(\hat{k}) \leq \sum_{\hat{k} \in \mathcal{U}_i} N^\gamma Q_i(k) \\
&= |\mathcal{U}_i| N^\gamma Q_i(k).
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Combining (33) and (34), we can write, for every $k \in \mathcal{U}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\mathcal{U}_i}(k) &\leq \frac{Q_i(\mathcal{U}_i)}{|\mathcal{U}_i|} \times \frac{\kappa}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})} \\
&\leq \frac{|\mathcal{U}_i| N^\gamma Q_i(k)}{|\mathcal{U}_i|} \times \frac{\kappa}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})} \\
&= Q_i(k) \frac{\kappa N^\gamma}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})}.
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

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

$$Q_{\mathcal{U}_i}(k) \leq Q_i(k) \frac{\kappa N^\gamma}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})}. \tag{36}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_{\mathcal{U}_i}(k) \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa N^\gamma}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_j} Q_i(k) \\
&= \frac{\kappa N^\gamma}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma \kappa - 1)})} \times \lambda_{i \rightarrow j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Similarly, for any i , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow i} &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_i^c} Q_{\mathcal{U}_i}(k) \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa N^\gamma}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{D}_i^c} Q_i(k) \\ &= \frac{\kappa N^\gamma}{(1 - N^{-(\gamma\kappa-1)})} \times \lambda_{i \rightarrow i}.\end{aligned}\quad (38)$$

The lemma follows from the bounds $\kappa \leq \frac{1+2\gamma}{\gamma}$ for the numerators, and $\kappa > \frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma}$ for the denominators in (37) and (38). ■

We will use Lemma 3 for N denoting the number of types in \mathcal{A}_q^n . By (3), we can then write $N \leq 2n^{q-1}$ and $(1 - N^{-\gamma}) > 1/2$ for large enough n . Hence the error probability bounds in Lemma 3 may be further upper bounded by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} \leq \lambda_{i \rightarrow j} \times \frac{12n^{(q-1)\gamma}}{\gamma}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq M, \quad (39)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow i} \leq \lambda_{i \rightarrow i} \times \frac{12n^{(q-1)\gamma}}{\gamma}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, M. \quad (40)$$

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

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

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

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow j} \leq \frac{\lambda_{i \rightarrow j}}{1 - \lambda_{i \rightarrow i}} \quad (41)$$

for all $j \neq i$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_{i \rightarrow i} = 0$ for all i .

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

For $j \neq i$, we have

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

This proves the lemma. ■

E. ID codes with equal size support

Given an ID code with decoding sets the same as the encoder supports, we now give a construction of a similar code where the size of all the supports is equal. We will later use the following lemma with $\lambda_1 = 0$.

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

Proof: We prove the lemma by binning the support sizes and choosing the largest bin. For $k = 1, \dots, N$, we define the bins

$$\mathcal{N}(k) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, M\} \mid |\mathcal{A}_i| = k\}. \quad (42)$$

By pigeon hole principle, there exists at least one set $\mathcal{N}(k^*)$ with

$$M' := |\mathcal{N}(k^*)| \geq \frac{M}{N}.$$

We consider the new (N, M') ID code $\{(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_i) | i \in \mathcal{N}(k^*)\}$. The Type-I and Type-II error probabilities of the new code clearly satisfy

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 \leq \lambda_1, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\lambda}_2 \leq \lambda_2. \quad (43)$$

This proves the lemma. ■

V. WELL SEPARATED SET SYSTEMS

In this section, we present some concepts and a proposition on set systems [13]. This is used in the proof of the soft converse.

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

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

Note that if sets in a (Γ, Δ) set system over $[N]$ are used as encoding/decoding sets for an identification code for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$, then the sum probability of error λ of the code is $\frac{\Delta}{\Gamma}$.

Suppose, $\Gamma > \frac{N}{2}$. Consider the collection of complement subsets $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} := \{\mathcal{U}_1^c, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M^c\}$ with set-sizes $\Gamma' = N - \Gamma$ and maximum size of pairwise intersections by Δ' . Then

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

Hence

$$\Delta' = N - 2\Gamma + \Delta$$

This gives us

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

Hence, for a given set system \mathcal{U} with $\Gamma > \frac{N}{2}$, the complementary set system $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ has sets of size $\Gamma' \leq \frac{N}{2}$ and at least as small normalized intersection size $\frac{\Delta'}{\Gamma'}$.

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

$$\frac{\Delta}{\Gamma} \geq (1 - \alpha)h_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\log_2 M}{N}\right), \quad (44)$$

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

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

Let $\mathbb{1}$ denote the N -length vector of all ones. For a subset $A \subseteq [N]$, the characteristic vector $\mathbb{1}_A$ is an N -length vector with the i -th component 1 if and only if $i \in A$.

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

$$\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}} := \left(\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}} - \epsilon \mathbb{1}}{\sqrt{N\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}} \right) \quad (45)$$

For any two subsets $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2 \subseteq [N]$ with $|\mathcal{U}_1| = |\mathcal{U}_2| = N\epsilon$, we have

$$|\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2| = \langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_1}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \rangle. \quad (46)$$

Therefore we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_1}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \rangle &= \frac{1}{N\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} (\langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_1} - \epsilon \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_2} - \epsilon \mathbb{1} \rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{N\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} (\langle \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_1}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{U}_2} \rangle - \epsilon|\mathcal{U}_1| - \epsilon|\mathcal{U}_2| + N\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{N\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} (|\mathcal{U}_1 \cap \mathcal{U}_2| - N\epsilon^2). \quad (47)\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6 below can be proved using Johnson's bound. However, we give an elementary proof here; the alternate proof using Johnson's bound is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 6. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and N be fixed. Consider a collection of subsets of $[N]$, $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M\}$ with set sizes $N\epsilon$ and maximum pairwise intersection $N\delta$. If $M > 1 + \frac{N}{\alpha}$ then $\delta > (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$.*

Proof: We will prove by contradiction, that if $\delta \leq (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$, then $M \leq 1 + \frac{N}{\alpha}$. By (47), for all $i \neq j$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_i}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_j} \rangle \leq -\frac{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)}{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}. \quad (48)$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_i} \right\|_2^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^M \langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_i}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_j} \rangle \\ &= \sum_i \|\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_i}\|^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} \langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_i}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{U}_j} \rangle \\ &\leq M - M(M-1) \frac{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)}{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}. \quad (49)\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}M &\leq 1 + \frac{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{(\epsilon^2 - \delta)} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{(\epsilon^2 - (1-\alpha)\epsilon^2)} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon\alpha} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 1 + \frac{N}{\alpha} \quad (50)\end{aligned}$$

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}M &\leq \binom{N}{N\epsilon} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\pi\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}} 2^{Nh_2(\epsilon)} \quad (51)\end{aligned}$$

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

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N\pi\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \leq 1. \quad (52)$$

Therefore

$$M \leq 2^{Nh_2(\epsilon)}, \quad (53)$$

i.e.

$$\epsilon \geq h_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\log_2 M}{N}\right). \quad (54)$$

It is given in the proposition that $M > 1 + \frac{N}{\alpha}$. Therefore, by lemma 6 and (54) we have

$$\frac{\Delta}{\Gamma} = \frac{\delta}{\epsilon} > (1 - \alpha)\epsilon \quad (55)$$

$$\geq (1 - \alpha)h_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\log_2 M}{N}\right). \quad (56)$$

This proves the proposition. ■

VI. PROOF OF THEOREM 2A.

Consider a given sequence of $(n_i, 2^{n_i^{q-1}R}, \lambda_{1,n_i}, \lambda_{2,n_i})$ ID codes for Π^q with $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ and probability of errors $\lambda_{1,n_i}, \lambda_{2,n_i} < n_i^{-\mu}$ for all i . Through a series of modification steps, we will prove the existence of a sequence of ID codes for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$ with uniform encoding distributions, decoding

regions the same as the support of the corresponding encoding distributions, and vanishing error probability. We will then show using Proposition 2 that for such a sequence of codes to exist, the rate R must be 0.

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

Step 1: From the given code in Step 0, using Lemma 1, we construct an $(N, 2^{N^{q-1}R}, n^{-\mu}, n^{-\mu})$ ID code for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$ with stochastic decoders. Here $N = |\mathcal{T}_q^{(n)}|$.

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

Step 3: From the given code in Step 2, we use Lemma 3 (see (39) and (40)) with $\gamma = \frac{\mu}{4(q-1)}$, to construct an $(N, 2^{Rn^{q-1}}, 2Kn^{-\mu/4}, Kn^{-\mu/4})$ ID code for $\text{NL}_{[N]}$ with deterministic decoders and uniform encoding distributions. Here K is some constant which depends on q and μ .

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

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

Final argument: The sequence of codes obtained in Step 5 from the original sequence of codes for Π^q gives a sequence of set systems with $M_{n_i} = 2^{n_i^{q-1}R_{n_i}}$, and $\frac{\Delta_{n_i}}{\Gamma_{n_i}} \leq 2Kn_i^{-\mu/4}$. Hence $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta_{n_i}}{\Gamma_{n_i}} = 0$. On the other hand, by using the bounds on N in (3), for an n_i , we have

$$N_i \leq (n_i + q - 1)^{(q-1)}; \quad (57)$$

By Proposition 2, for $\alpha = 1/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta_{n_i}}{\Gamma_{n_i}} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} h_2^{-1} \left(\frac{\log(2^{R_{n_i} n_i^{q-1}})}{N_i} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} h_2^{-1} \left(\frac{n_i^{(q-1)} R_{n_i}}{(n_i + q - 1)^{(q-1)}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} h_2^{-1} \left(R_{n_i} \left[\frac{n_i}{(n_i + q - 1)} \right]^{q-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} h_2^{-1} \left(R_{n_i} \left[\frac{1}{(1 + q/n_i - 1/n_i)} \right]^{q-1} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} h_2^{-1} \left(\left[R - \frac{(q-1) \log(n_i + q - 1)}{n_i^{q-1}} \right] \left[\frac{1}{(1 + q/n_i - 1/n_i)} \right]^{q-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} h_2^{-1}(R) > 0 \text{ if } R > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This gives a contradiction if $R > 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2A.

VII. PROOF OF THEOREM 2B.

Towards proving Theorem 2B, we use a result on approximation of probability distributions with distributions having certain ‘‘resolution’’ [14], [11].

The variational distance between the two random variables X, Y taking values from the set \mathcal{Z} and having distributions P_X and P_Y respectively, is defined as

$$d(X, Y) := \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |P_X(z) - P_Y(z)|. \quad (58)$$

Unless otherwise specified, we shall use $d(P_X, P_Y)$ and $d(X, Y)$ interchangeably. For any random variable Y , the following lemma guarantees the existence of an approximating distribution of a certain resolution. The lemma is a special case of [14, Lemma 2.1.1]. The proof, which also specializes the proof of [14, Lemma 2.1.1], is given in Appendix B for completeness.

Lemma 7. *For any positive integer N , and any random variable Y taking values in $[N]$, and arbitrary constants $\alpha > a > 0$, there exists a mapping $\phi : [N^\alpha] \rightarrow [N]$ that satisfies*

$$d(Y, \phi(U_{N^\alpha})) \leq 2 \times \left\{ N^{-(\alpha-a)} + N^{-(a-1)} \right\} \quad (59)$$

where U_{N^α} is the uniform random variable on $[N^\alpha]$.

Proof of Theorem 2B:

Consider a given sequence of $(n_i, 2^{Rn_i^{q-1} \log n_i}, \lambda_{1,i}, \lambda_{2,i})$ ID codes for Π^q with $n_i \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that N_i is the number of type classes in $\mathcal{A}_q^{n_i}$. For each i , using Lemma 1, we construct an $(N_i, 2^{Rn_i^{q-1} \log n_i}, \lambda_{1,i}, \lambda_{2,i})$ ID code for $\text{NL}_{[N_i]}$ with stochastic decoders. We will now show that for such a sequence of codes, $\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_{1,i} + \lambda_{2,i}) \geq 1$.

Fix an i . The total variational distance between any two encoding distributions Q_j^i, Q_k^i is related to the error probability λ_i as follows. For all $j \neq k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(Q_j^i, Q_k^i) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in [N_i]} |Q_j^i(\mathbf{x}) - Q_k^i(\mathbf{x})| \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in [N_i]} P_j^i(1|\mathbf{x}) |Q_j^i(\mathbf{x}) - Q_k^i(\mathbf{x})| \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in [N_i]} P_j^i(1|\mathbf{x}) Q_j^i(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in [N_i]} P_j^i(1|\mathbf{x}) Q_k^i(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ &= 1 - \lambda_{i,j \neq k} - \lambda_{i,k \rightarrow j} \\ &\geq 1 - \lambda_{1,i} - \lambda_{2,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

i.e.,

$$\lambda_{1,i} + \lambda_{2,i} \geq 1 - d(Q_j^i, Q_k^i), \quad \forall j \neq k, \quad (62)$$

Now we take a constant R' satisfying $0 < R' < \frac{R}{q-1}$ and fix $1 < a < \alpha < 1 + R'$. Consider a fixed i . By Lemma 7, for every $j \in [2^{Rn_i^{q-1} \log n_i}]$, there exists a mapping $\phi_j^{(i)} : [N_i^\alpha] \rightarrow [N_i]$ such that the random variable $\tilde{Y}_i(j) := \phi_j^{(i)}(U_{N_i^\alpha})$ satisfies

$$d(Q_j^i, Q_{\tilde{Y}_i(j)}^i) \leq \delta_i, \quad (63)$$

where $\delta_i := 2 \times \left(N_i^{-(\alpha-a)} + N_i^{-(a-1)} \right)$. Since $\alpha > a > 1$, $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

The total number of distinct N_i^α -type distributions on $[N_i]$ is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{N_i^\alpha + N_i - 1}{N_i - 1} &\leq \frac{N_i^{\alpha(N_i-1)}}{(N_i - 1)!} \left(1 + \frac{N_i - 1}{N_i^\alpha} \right)^{N_i-1} \\ &\leq \frac{N_i \cdot N_i^{\alpha(N_i-1)}}{N_i!} \cdot 2^{N_i} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (2e)^{N_i} \times \frac{N_i^{[\alpha(N_i-1)+1]}}{N_i^{N_i}} \\ &= N_i^{\{\alpha N_i - \alpha + 1 - N_i + N_i \log_{N_i}(2e)\}} \\ &= N_i^{N_i} \left(\alpha - 1 + \frac{\log(2e)}{\log N_i} - \frac{\alpha - 1}{N_i} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Here (a) follows from Stirling's approximation $N_i! \geq \left(\frac{N_i}{e}\right)^{N_i}$. For large enough i (and hence N_i), (64) can be further upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} N_i^{N_i R'} &= 2^{R' N_i \log N_i} \\ &\leq 2^{R'_i n_i^{q-1} \log n_i}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R'_i := R'(q-1) \left(1 + \frac{q-1}{n_i} \right)^{q-1} \left(1 + \frac{\log \left(1 + \frac{q-1}{n_i} \right)}{\log n_i} \right).$$

Here we have used the bound (see (3))

$$N_i \leq (n_i + q - 1)^{(q-1)} = n_i^{q-1} \left(1 + \frac{q-1}{n_i} \right)^{q-1}.$$

Note that $R'_i \rightarrow R'(q-1) < R$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ (and hence $n_i \rightarrow \infty$). Hence $R'_i < R$ for large enough i . Hence, $\exists I$ such that for each $i > I$, there exist at least one pair (j, k) with $j \neq k$ and $Q_{\tilde{Y}_i(j)}^i = Q_{\tilde{Y}_i(k)}^i$ and we have

$$d(Q_j^i, Q_k^i) \leq d(Q_j^i, Q_{\tilde{Y}_i(j)}^i) + d(Q_k^i, Q_{\tilde{Y}_i(j)}^i) \quad (65)$$

$$= d(Q_j^i, Q_{\tilde{Y}_i(j)}^i) + d(Q_k^i, Q_{\tilde{Y}_i(k)}^i) \quad (66)$$

$$\leq 2\delta_i. \quad (67)$$

By combining (62) and (67) we have

$$\lambda_{1,i} + \lambda_{2,i} \geq 1 - 2\delta_i. \quad (68)$$

Since $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda_{1,i} + \lambda_{2,i}) \geq 1. \quad (69)$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2B.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We studied identification over uniform permutation channels. Our achievability result showed that message size growing as $2^{c_n n^{q-1}}$, where $c_n \rightarrow 0$, is identifiable. We showed a soft converse, proving that for any $R > 0$, there do not exist ID codes with message size $2^{Rn^{q-1}}$ and power-law decay of the probability of error. We proved a strong converse that for any sequence of ID codes with $2^{Rn^{q-1} \log n}$ messages, the sum error probability converges to at least 1.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

REFERENCES

- [1] Rudolf Ahlswede and Gunter Dueck. Identification via channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 35(1):15–29, 1989.
- [2] Rudolf Ahlswede and Ning Cai. Identification without randomization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 45(7):2636–2642, 1999.
- [3] Rudolf Ahlswede and Bart Verboven. On identification via multiway channels with feedback. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 37(6):1519–1526, 1991.
- [4] Rudolf Ahlswede and Zhen Zhang. New directions in the theory of identification via channels. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 41(4):1040–1050, 1995.
- [5] Ozgur B Akan, Hamideh Ramezani, Tooba Khan, Naveed A Abbasi, and Murat Kuscü. Fundamentals of molecular information and communication science. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 105(2):306–318, 2016.
- [6] Annina Bracher and Amos Lapidoth. Identification via the broadcast channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(6):3480–3501, 2017.
- [7] Yeow Meng Chee, Han Mao Kiah, San Ling, Tuan Thanh Nguyen, Xiande Zhang, et al. String concatenation construction for chebyshev permutation channel codes. In *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 2824–2828. IEEE, 2016.
- [8] Thomas M Cover. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [9] Maximilien Gadouleau and Alban Goupil. Binary codes for packet error and packet loss correction in store and forward. In *2010 International ITG Conference on Source and Channel Coding (SCC)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2010.
- [10] Te Sun Han and Sergio Verdu. New results in the theory of identification via channels. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 38(1):14–25, 1992.
- [11] Te Sun Han and Sergio Verdú. Approximation theory of output statistics. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 39(3):752–772, 1993.
- [12] W Cary Huffman and Vera Pless. *Fundamentals of error-correcting codes*. Cambridge university press, 2010.
- [13] Stasys Jukna. *Extremal combinatorics: with applications in computer science*, volume 571. Springer, 2011.
- [14] H Koga et al. *Information-spectrum methods in information theory*, volume 50. Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.
- [15] Mladen Kovačević and Vincent YF Tan. Codes in the space of multisets—coding for permutation channels with impairments. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(7):5156–5169, 2018.
- [16] Mladen Kovačević and Dejan Vukobratović. Perfect codes in the discrete simplex. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 75:81–95, 2015.
- [17] Wafa Labidi, Holger Boche, Christian Deppe, and Moritz Wiese. Identification over the gaussian channel in the presence of feedback. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 278–283. IEEE, 2021.
- [18] Michael Langberg, Moshe Schwartz, and Eitan Yaakobi. Coding for the l_∞ -limited permutation channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(12):7676–7686, 2017.
- [19] Anuran Makur. Coding theorems for noisy permutation channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(11):6723–6748, 2020.
- [20] Massimiliano Pierobon, Ian F Akyildiz, et al. Fundamentals of diffusion-based molecular communication in nanonetworks. *Foundations and Trends® in Networking*, 8(1-2):1–147, 2014.
- [21] Johannes Rosenberger, Abdalla Ibrahim, Boulat A Bash, Christian Deppe, Roberto Ferrara, and Uzi Pereg. Capacity bounds for identification with effective secrecy. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 1202–1207. IEEE, 2023.
- [22] Johannes Rosenberger, Uzi Pereg, and Christian Deppe. Identification over compound multiple-input multiple-output broadcast channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2023.
- [23] Mohammad J Salarisaddigh, Uzi Pereg, Holger Boche, and Christian Deppe. Deterministic identification over channels with power constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 68(1):1–24, 2021.
- [24] Mohammad J Salarisaddigh, Uzi Pereg, Holger Boche, and Christian Deppe. Deterministic identification over fading channels. In *2020 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2021.
- [25] Ilan Shomorony, Reinhard Heckel, et al. Information-theoretic foundations of dna data storage. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 19(1):1–106, 2022.

- [26] Jin Sima, Netanel Raviv, and Jehoshua Bruck. Robust indexing for the sliced channel: Almost optimal codes for substitutions and deletions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07793*, 2023.
- [27] Jin Sima, Netanel Raviv, Moshe Schwartz, and Jehoshua Bruck. Error correction for dna storage. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.01729, 2023.
- [28] Mattia Spandri, Roberto Ferrara, Christian Deppe, Moritz Wiese, and Holger Boche. Information-theoretically secret reed-muller identification with affine designs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16217*, 2023.
- [29] Yossef Steinberg. New converses in the theory of identification via channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(3):984–998, 1998.
- [30] Jennifer Tang and Yuri Polyanskiy. Capacity of noisy permutation channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2023.
- [31] John MacLaren Walsh, Steven Weber, and Ciira wa Maina. Optimal rate–delay tradeoffs and delay mitigating codes for multipath routed and network coded networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(12):5491–5510, 2009.
- [32] Moritz Wiese, Wafa Labidi, Christian Deppe, and Holger Boche. Identification over additive noise channels in the presence of feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2022.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 6

We present an alternate proof of Lemma 6 using Johnson’s bound.

Lemma 6 (restated). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and n be fixed. Consider a collection of subsets of $[N]$, $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_M\}$ with set sizes $N\epsilon$ and maximum pairwise intersection $N\delta$. If $M > \frac{N}{\alpha}$ then $\delta > (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$.*

Proof: Let $A_2(N, d, w)$ be the maximum number of codewords of a binary code of length N , minimum Hamming distance d , and constant codeword weight w . Johnson bound [12] gives that if $2w^2 - 2Nw + Nd > 0$, then

$$A_2(N, d, w) \leq \frac{Nd}{2w^2 - 2Nw + Nd}. \quad (70)$$

We will now prove that for a given collection of subsets \mathcal{U} of $[N]$, if $\delta \leq (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$, then $M \leq \frac{N}{\alpha}$. The characteristic vectors of the subsets in \mathcal{U} form an N length constant weight binary code with

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} &2w^2 - 2Nw + Nd \\ &= 2N^2\epsilon^2 - 2N^2\epsilon + 2N^2(\epsilon - \delta) \\ &= 2N^2(\epsilon^2 - \delta) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Johnson’s bound, we have

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

Here (a) follows because $\delta \leq (1 - \alpha)\epsilon^2$, (b) follows because $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{N}$. This proves the lemma. \blacksquare

APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 7

Let us define

$$T(a) = \left\{ y \in [N] \mid \frac{1}{\log N} \log \frac{1}{P_Y(y)} \leq a \right\}, \quad (71)$$

$$= \{y \in [N] \mid P_Y(y) \geq N^{-a}\}. \quad (72)$$

We denote $\tau := |T(a)|$. As $P_Y(y) \geq N^{-a}$ for all $y \in T(a)$, we have that $\tau \leq N^a < N^\alpha$. We construct the function $\phi : [N^\alpha] \rightarrow [N]$ as given below. Let us denote $T(a) = \{y_1, \dots, y_\tau\}$. First, we arbitrarily choose disjoint subsets (forming a partition) A_1, A_2, \dots, A_τ of $[N^\alpha]$ with cardinalities given by

$$|A_i| = \lfloor N^\alpha P_Y(y_i) \rfloor \text{ for } 1 \leq i < \tau, \quad (73)$$

$$|A_\tau| = N^\alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{\tau-1} |A_i|. \quad (74)$$

We define the mapping ϕ as follows

$$\phi(u) = y_i \text{ if } u \in A_i \quad (75)$$

and set $\tilde{Y} = \phi(U_{N^\alpha})$. Note that \tilde{Y} has an N^α -type distribution, i.e., for every y $P_{\tilde{Y}}(y) = \frac{k}{N^\alpha}$ for some non negative integer k . Now,

$$d(Y, \tilde{Y}) = \sum_{y \in [N]} |P_Y(y) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y)| \quad (76)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\tau-1} |P_Y(y_i) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_i)| + |P_Y(y_\tau) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_\tau)| \quad (77)$$

$$+ \sum_{y \notin T(a)} |P_Y(y) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y)|. \quad (78)$$

By noting that

$$|P_Y(y_\tau) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_\tau)| = \left| \sum_{y \neq y_\tau} P_Y(y) - \sum_{y \neq y_\tau} P_{\tilde{Y}}(y) \right| \quad (79)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\tau-1} |P_Y(y_i) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_i)| \quad (80)$$

$$+ \sum_{y \notin T(a)} |P_Y(y) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y)|, \quad (81)$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} d(Y, \tilde{Y}) &\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\tau-1} |P_Y(y_i) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_i)| \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{y \notin T(a)} |P_Y(y) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y)|. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

For $i = 1, 2, \dots, \tau - 1$, $P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_i) = \lfloor N^\alpha P_Y(y_i) \rfloor / N^\alpha$, and hence we have

$$|P_Y(y_i) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_i)| \leq \frac{1}{N^\alpha} \quad (83)$$

from the construction of A_i . It follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\tau-1} |P_Y(y_i) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y_i)| \leq \frac{N^a}{N^\alpha} = N^{-(\alpha-a)}. \quad (84)$$

On the other hand, $P_{\tilde{Y}}(y) = 0$ for $y \notin T(a)$. Thus,

$$\sum_{y \notin T(a)} |P_Y(y) - P_{\tilde{Y}}(y)| = \sum_{y \in [N]: \mathbb{P}_Y(y) < N^{-a}} \mathbb{P}_Y(y) \quad (85)$$

$$\leq N \cdot N^{-a} \quad (86)$$

$$\leq N^{-(a-1)}. \quad (87)$$

Combining (82), (84), and (87), we have

$$d(Y, \tilde{Y}) \leq 2 \times \{N^{-(\alpha-a)} + N^{-(a-1)}\}. \quad (88)$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 7.