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Abstract

We deal with decoding of Tanner codes using message-passing iterative decoding and linear programming (LP) decoding in memoryless binary-input output-symmetric (MBIOS) channels. We present a new combinatorial characterization for local-optimality of a codeword in irregular Tanner codes with respect to any MBIOS channel. This characterization is a generalization of [Arora, Daskalakis, Steurer; 2009] and [Vontobel; 2010] and is based on a conical combination of subtrees in the computation trees. The main novelty is that the subtrees may have any finite height $h$ (even greater than the girth of the Tanner graph). In addition, the degrees of local-code nodes are not restricted to two. We prove that local-optimality in this new characterization implies Maximum-Likelihood (ML) optimality and LP-optimality. Given a codeword and the channel output, we also show how to efficiently recognize if the codeword is locally optimal.

We present a novel message-passing iterative decoding algorithm, called normalized weighted min-sum (NWMS). NWMS algorithm is a BP-type algorithm that applies to any Tanner code with single parity-check local codes (e.g., LDPC codes). We prove that if a locally optimal codeword for depth $h$ exists, then the NWMS algorithm finds it in $h$ iterations. Hence, the NWMS algorithm has an ML-certificate for any bounded number of iterations. Furthermore, since the depth $h$ is not bounded, the guarantee for successful decoding by NWMS holds even if the number of iterations $h$ exceeds the girth of the Tanner graph.

Finally, we apply the new local-optimality characterization to regular Tanner codes, and prove lower bounds on the noise thresholds of LP-decoding in MBIOS channels. When the noise is below these lower bounds, the probability that LP-decoding fails decays doubly exponentially in the girth of the Tanner graph.
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1 Introduction

Modern coding theory deals with finding good error correcting codes that have efficient encoders and decoders ([RU08]). Message-passing iterative decoding algorithms based on belief-propagation (see e.g., [Gal63, BGT93, Mac99, LMSS01, RU01]) and linear-programming (LP) decoding [Fel03, FWK05] are examples of suboptimal decoders (i.e., may fail to correct errors that are corrected by a maximum-likelihood (ML) decoder).

Many works deal with low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes and generalizations of LDPC codes. LDPC codes were first defined by Gallager [Gal63] who suggested several message-passing iterative decoding algorithms (e.g., “sum-product”). Tanner [Tan81] introduced graph representations of linear codes based on bipartite graphs over variable nodes and constraint nodes, and viewed iterative decoding as message-passing algorithms over the edges of the Tanner graph. In the standard setting, constraint nodes compute the parity function. In the generalized setting, constraint nodes use a local error-correcting code. One may view a constraint node with a linear local-code as a coalescing of multiple single parity-check nodes. Therefore, a code may have a sparser and smaller representation when represented as a Tanner code in the generalized setting. Sipser and Spielman [SS96] studied Tanner codes based on expander graphs and analyzed a simple bit-flipping decoding algorithm.

Wiberg et al. [WLK95, Wib96] developed the use of graphical models for systematically describing instances of known decoding algorithms. In particular, the “sum-product” algorithm and the “min-sum” algorithm are presented as generic iterative message-passing decoding algorithms that apply to any graph realization of a Tanner code. Wiberg et al. proved that the min-sum algorithm can be viewed as a dynamic programming algorithm that computes the ML-codeword if the Tanner graph is a tree. For LDPC codes, Wiberg [Wib96] characterized a necessary condition for decoding failures of the min-sum algorithm by “negative” cost trees, called minimal deviations.

Linear programming (LP) decoding was introduced by Feldman, Wainwright and Karger [Fel03, FWK05] for binary linear codes. LP-decoding is based on solving a fractional relaxation of an integer program that models the problem of ML-decoding. LP decoding has been applied to several codes, among them: cycle codes, turbo-like codes and RA codes [FK04, HE05, GB11], LDPC codes [FMS07, DDKW08, KV06, ADS09, HE11], and expander codes [FS05, Ska11]. Our work is motivated by the problem of finite-length and average-case analysis of successful LP-decoding of Tanner codes. There are very few works on this problem, and they deal only with specific cases. For example, Feldman and Stein [FS05] analyzed special expander codes, and Goldenberg and Burshtein [GB11] deal with repeat-accumulate codes.
Previous results. Combinatorial characterizations of sufficient conditions for successful decoding are based on so called “certificates”. That is, given a channel observation $y$ and a codeword $x$, we are interested in a one-sided error test that answers the questions: is $x$ optimal with respect to $y$? is it unique? Note that the test may answer “no” for a positive instance. A positive answer for such a test is called a certificate for the optimality of a codeword. Upper bounds on the word error probability are obtained by lower bounds on the probability that a certificate exists.

Koetter and Vontobel [KV06] analyzed LP decoding of regular LDPC codes. Their analysis is based on decomposing each codeword (and pseudocodeword) to a finite set of minimal structured trees (i.e., skinny trees) with uniform vertex weights. Arora et al. [ADS09] extended the work in [KV06] by introducing nonuniform weights to the vertices in the skinny trees, and defining local-optimality. For a BSC, Arora et al. proved that local optimality implies both ML-optimality and LP-optimality. They presented an analysis technique that performs a finite-length density evolution of a min-sum process to prove bounds on the probability of a decoding error. Arora et al. also pointed out that it is possible to design a re-weighted version of the min-sum decoder for regular codes that finds the locally-optimal codeword if such exists for trees whose height is at most quarter of the girth. This work was further extended in [HE11] to memoryless channels. The analyses presented in these works [KV06, ADS09, HE11] are limited to skinny trees, the height of which is bounded by a half of the girth of the Tanner graph.

Vontobel [Von10] extended the decomposition of a codeword (and pseudocodeword) to skinny trees in graph covers. This enabled Vontobel to mitigate the limitation on the height by the girth. The decomposition is obtained by a random walk, and applies also to irregular Tanner graphs.

Various iterative message-passing decoding algorithms are derived from the belief propagation algorithm (e.g., max-product [WLK95], attenuated max-product [FK00], tree-reweighted belief-propagation [WJW05], etc.). The convergence of these BP-based iterative decoding algorithms to an optimum solution has been studied extensively in various settings (see e.g., [WLK95, FK00, WF01, CF02, CDE+05, WJW05, RU01, JP11]). However, bounds on the time and message complexity of these algorithms are not considered. The analyses in these works often rely on the existence of a single optimal solution in addition to other conditions such as: single-loop graphs, large girth, large reweighting coefficients, consistency conditions, etc.

Jian and Pfister [JP11] analyzed a special case of the attenuated max-product decoder [FK00], for regular LDPC codes. They considered skinny trees in the computation tree, the height of which is greater than the girth of the Tanner graph. Using contraction properties and consistency conditions, they proved sufficient conditions under which the message-passing decoder
converges to a locally optimal codeword. This convergence also implies convergence to the LP-optimum and therefore to the ML-codeword.

While local-optimality characterizations were investigated for the case of finite-length analysis of regular LDPC codes, no characterizations have been presented for the general case of Tanner codes. This paper presents the first decoding algorithm for finite-length LDPC codes over MBIOS channels with bounded time complexity that combines two properties: (1) it is a message-passing algorithm, and (2) the algorithm has an ML-certificate.

**Contributions.** We present a new combinatorial characterization of local-optimality for irregular Tanner codes with respect to any memoryless binary-input output-symmetric (MBIOS) channel (Definition 4). Local optimality is characterized via costs of deviations based on subtrees in computation trees of the Tanner graph. Consider a computation tree with height $2h$ rooted at some variable node. A deviation is based on a subtree such that (i) the degree of a variable node equals to its degree in the computation tree, and (ii) the degree of a local-code node equals some constant $d \geq 2$, provided that $d$ is at most the minimum distance of the local-codes. Furthermore, level weights $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$ are assigned to the levels of the tree. Hence, a deviation is a combinatorial structure that has three main parameters: deviation height $h$, deviation level weights $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$, and deviation “degree” $d$. Therefore, the new definition of local-optimality is based on three parameters: $h \in \mathbb{N}$, $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$, and $d \geq 2$.

This characterization extends the notion of deviations in local-optimality in four ways: (i) no restrictions are applied to the degrees of the nodes in the Tanner graph, (ii) arbitrary local linear codes may be associated with constraint nodes, (iii) deviations are subtrees in the computation tree and no limitation is set on the height of the deviations; in particular, their height may exceed the girth of the Tanner graph, (iv) minimal deviations may have a degree $d \geq 2$ in the check nodes (as opposed to skinny trees in previous analyses), provided that $d$ is at most the minimum distance of the local-codes. We prove that local-optimality in this characterization implies ML-optimality (Theorem 5). We utilize the equivalence of graph cover decoding and LP-decoding for Tanner codes, implied by Vontobel and Koetter [VK05], to prove that local-optimality suffices also for LP-optimality (Theorem 10). We present an efficient dynamic programming algorithm that computes a local-optimality certificate for a codeword with respect to a given channel output (Algorithm 1).

We present a new message-passing iterative decoding algorithm, called normalized weighted min-sum (NWMS) algorithm (Algorithm 2). NWMS algorithm applies to irregular Tanner codes with single parity-check local-codes (e.g., LDPC codes and HDPC codes). The characterization of local-optimality for Tanner codes with single parity-check local-codes has two parameters: (i) a certificate depth $h$, and (ii) a vector of layer weights $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+ \setminus \{0^h\}$. (Note that the local codes are single parity checks, and therefore the deviation degree $d$ equals 2.) We
prove that, for any finite $h$, the NWMS decoder is guaranteed to compute the ML codeword in $h$ iterations if an $h$-locally-optimal codeword exists (Theorem 16). Furthermore, the output of NWMS can be efficiently certified. The number of iterations, $h$, may exceed the girth. Because local-optimality is a pure combinatorial property, the results do not rely on convergence. The time and message complexity of NWMS is $O(|E| \cdot h)$ where $|E|$ is the number of edges in the Tanner graph. Local optimality, as defined in this paper, is a sufficient condition for successful decoding by our BP-based algorithm in loopy graphs.

Previous bounds on the probability that a local-optimality certificate exists [ADS09, HE11] hold for regular LDPC codes. The same bounds hold also for successful decoding by NWMS. These bounds are based on proving that a local-optimality certificate exists with high probability for noise thresholds close to the BP threshold. Specifically, noise thresholds of $p^* \geq 0.05$ in the case of BSC [ADS09], and $\sigma^* \geq 0.735$ in the case of BI-AWGN channel [HE11] are proven.

Finally, because trees in our new characterization may have degrees bigger than two, they contain more vertices. Hence this characterization leads to improved bounds for successful decoding of regular Tanner codes (Theorems 27 and 38). These bounds extend the probabilistic analysis of the min-sum process by Arora et al. [ADS09] to a sum-min-sum process on regular trees. For regular Tanner codes, we prove bounds on the word error probability of LP-decoding under MBIOS channels that are inverse doubly-exponential in the girth of the Tanner graph. We also prove bounds on the threshold of regular Tanner codes whose Tanner graphs have logarithmic girth. This means that if the noise in the channel is below that threshold, then the decoding error diminishes as a function of the block length. Note that Tanner graphs with logarithmic girth can be constructed explicitly (see e.g., [Gal63]).

To summarize, our contribution is threefold. (i) We present a new combinatorial characterization of local-optimality for Tanner codes with respect to any memoryless binary-input output symmetric (MBIOS) channel. This characterization provides an ML-certificate and an LP-certificate for a given codeword. The certificate can be efficiently computed by a dynamic programming algorithm. Based on this new characterization, we present two applications of local-optimality. (ii) A new efficient message-passing decoding algorithm, called normalized weighted min-sum (NWMS), for irregular Tanner codes with single parity-check local codes (e.g., LDPC codes and HDPC codes). The NWMS algorithm is guaranteed to find the locally optimal codeword in $h$ iterations, where $h$ determines the height of the local-optimality certificate. Note that $h$ is not bounded and may be larger than the girth of the Tanner graph (i.e., decoding with local-optimality guarantee “beyond” the girth). (iii) New bounds on the word error probability are proved for LP-decoding of regular Tanner codes.
Organization. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background on ML-decoding and LP-decoding of Tanner codes over MBIOS channels. Section 3 presents combinatorial certificate that applies to ML-decoding for codewords of Tanner codes. In Section 4 we prove that the certificate applies also to LP-decoding for codewords of Tanner codes. In Section 5 we present an efficient certification algorithm for local-optimality. In Section 6 we prove a structural decomposition for codewords of Tanner codes used as a key element in the proof of the main theorem of Section 3. Section 7 presents the NWMS iterative decoding algorithm for irregular Tanner codes with single parity-check local-codes, followed by a proof that NWMS finds the locally-optimal codeword. In Section 8, we use the combinatorial characterization of local-optimality to bound the error probability of LP decoding for regular Tanner codes. Finally, conclusions and discussion are given in Section 9.

2 Preliminaries

Graph Terminology. Let $G = (V, E)$ denote an undirected graph. Let $N_G(v)$ denote the set of neighbors of node $v \in V$, and for a set $S \subseteq V$ let $N_G(S) \triangleq \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G(v)$. Let $\deg_G(v) \triangleq |N_G(v)|$ denote the edge degree of node $v$ in graph $G$. A path $p = (v, \ldots, u)$ in $G$ is a sequence of vertices such that there exists an edge between every two consecutive nodes in the sequence $p$. Let $s(p)$ denote the first vertex of path $p$, and let $t(p)$ denote the last vertex of path $p$. If $s(p) = t(p)$ then the path is closed. A simple path is a path with no repeated vertex. A simple cycle is a closed path where the only repeated vertex is the first and last vertex. A path $p$ is backtrackless if every two consecutive edges along $p$ do not close a cycle. Let $|p|$ denote the length of a path $p$, i.e., the number of edges in $p$. Let $d_G(r, v)$ denote the distance (i.e., length of a shortest path) between nodes $r$ and $v$ in $G$, and let $\text{girth}(G)$ denote the length of the shortest cycle in $G$. Let $p$ and $q$ denote two paths in a graph $G$ such that $s(p) = t(q)$ then the path obtained by concatenating the paths $p$ and $q$ is denoted by $p \circ q$.

An induced subgraph is a subgraph obtained by deleting a set of vertices. The subgraph of $G$ induced by $S \subseteq V$ consists of $S$ and all edges in $E$, both endpoints of which are contained in $S$. Let $G_S$ denote the subgraph of $G$ induced by $S$.

Tanner-codes and Tanner graph representation. Let $G = (V \cup J, E)$ denote an edge-labeled bipartite-graph, where $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_N\}$ is a set of $N$ vertices called variable nodes, and $J = \{C_1, \ldots, C_J\}$ is a set of $J$ vertices called local-code nodes. We denote the degree of $C_j$ by $n_j$.

Let $\overline{C}^j \triangleq \{\overline{v}^j : \overline{v}^j$ is an $[n_j, k_j, d_j]$ code, $j \in [J]\}$ denote a set of $J$ linear local-codes. The local code $\overline{v}^j$ corresponds to the vertex $C_j \in J$. We say that $v_i$ participates in $\overline{C}^j$ if $(v_i, C_j)$ is an edge in $E$. The edges incident to each local-code node $C_j$ are labeled $\{1, \ldots, n_j\}$. This
labeling specifies the index of a variable nodes in the corresponding local-code.

A word \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \in \{0, 1\}^N \) is an assignment to variable nodes in \( \mathcal{V} \) where \( x_i \) is assigned to \( v_i \). Let \( \mathcal{V}_j \) denote the set \( \mathcal{N}_G(C_j) \) ordered according to labels of edges incident to \( C_j \). Denote by \( x_{\mathcal{V}_j} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{V}_j} \) the projection of the word \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \) onto entries associated with \( \mathcal{V}_j \).

The \textit{Tanner code} \( \mathcal{C}(G, \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j) \) based on the labeled Tanner graph \( G \) is the set of vectors \( x \in \{0, 1\}^N \) such that \( x_{\mathcal{V}_j} \) is a codeword in \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j \) for every \( j \in [J] \).

Let \( d_j \) denote the minimum distance of the local code \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j \). The minimum local distance \( d^* \) of a Tanner code \( \mathcal{C}(G, \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j) \) is defined by \( d^* = \min_j d_j \). We assume that \( d^* \geq 2 \).

If the bipartite graph is \( (d_L, d_R) \)-regular, i.e., the vertices in \( \mathcal{V} \) have degree \( d_L \) and the vertices in \( \mathcal{J} \) have degree \( d_R \), then the graph defines a \( (d_L, d_R) \)-regular Tanner code.

If the Tanner graph is sparse, i.e., \( |E| = O(N) \), then it defines a \textit{low-density} Tanner code. A \textit{parity code} is the code that contains all binary words with even Hamming weight. Tanner codes with parity local codes that are based on sparse Tanner graphs are called \textit{low-density parity-check} (LDPC) codes.

Consider a Tanner code \( \mathcal{C}(G, \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j) \). We say that a word \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) \) satisfies local-code \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j \) if its projection \( x_{\mathcal{V}_j} \) is in \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j \). The set of words \( x \) that satisfy the local-code \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{C}^j \), i.e., \( \mathcal{C}^j = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^N : x_{\mathcal{V}_j} \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j \} \). Namely, the resulting code \( \mathcal{C}^j \) is the extension of the local-code \( \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j \) from length \( n_j \) to length \( N \). The Tanner code is simply the intersection of the extensions of the local codes, i.e.,

\[
\mathcal{C}(G, \overline{\mathcal{C}}^j) = \bigcap_{j \in [J]} \mathcal{C}^j. \tag{1}
\]

**LP decoding of Tanner codes over memoryless channels.** Let \( c_i \in \{0, 1\} \) denote the \( i \)th transmitted binary symbol (channel input), and let \( y_i \in \mathbb{R} \) denote the \( i \)th received symbol (channel output). A \textit{memoryless binary-input output-symmetric} (MBIOS) channel is defined by a conditional probability density function \( f(y_i|c_i = a) \) for \( a \in \{0, 1\} \), that satisfies \( f(y_i|0) = f(-y_i|1) \). The binary erasure channel (BEC), binary symmetric channel (BSC) and binary-input additive white Gaussian noise (BI-AWGN) channel are examples for MBIOS channels. In MBIOS channels, the \textit{log-likelihood ratio} (LLR) vector \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N \) is defined by \( \lambda_i(y_i) \triangleq \ln \left( \frac{f(y_i|c_i=0)}{f(y_i|c_i=1)} \right) \) for every input bit \( i \). For a code \( \mathcal{C} \), Maximum-Likelihood (ML) decoding is equivalent to

\[
\hat{x}^{ML}(y) = \arg \min_{x \in \text{conv}(\mathcal{C})} \langle \lambda(y), x \rangle, \tag{2}
\]
where \( \text{conv}(\mathcal{C}) \) denotes the convex hull of the set \( \mathcal{C} \).

In general, solving the optimization problem in (2) for linear codes is intractable [BMV178]. Feldman \textit{et al.} [Fel03, FWK05] introduced a linear programming relaxation for the problem.
of ML decoding of Tanner codes with single parity check codes acting as local codes. This definition is based on a fundamental polytope that corresponds to the Tanner graph \( G \). We consider an extension of this definition to the case in which the local codes are arbitrary as follows. The generalized fundamental polytope \( \mathcal{P} \triangleq \mathcal{P}(G, \overline{C^J}) \) of a Tanner code \( C = C(G, \overline{C^J}) \) is defined by

\[
\mathcal{P} \triangleq \bigcap_{C^J \in \mathcal{C}^J} \text{conv}(C^J).
\] (3)

Note that a Tanner code may have multiple representations by a Tanner graph and local codes. Moreover, different representations \( (G, \overline{C^J}) \) of the same Tanner code \( C \) may yield different generalized fundamental polytopes \( \mathcal{P}(G, \overline{C^J}) \). If the degree of each local-code node is constant, then the generalized fundamental polytope can be represented by \( O(N + |\mathcal{J}|) \) variables and \( O(|\mathcal{J}|) \) constraints. Typically, \( |\mathcal{J}| = O(N) \), and the generalized fundamental polytope has an efficient representation. Such Tanner codes are often called generalized low-density parity-check codes.

Given an LLR vector \( \lambda \) for a received word \( y \), LP-decoding is defined by the following linear program:

\[
\hat{x}^{LP}(y) \triangleq \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{P}(G, \overline{C^J})} \langle \lambda(y), x \rangle.
\] (4)

The difference between ML-decoding and LP-decoding is that the fundamental polytope \( \mathcal{P}(G, \overline{C^J}) \) may strictly contain the convex hull of \( C \). Vertices of \( \mathcal{P}(G, \overline{C^J}) \) that are not codewords of \( C \) must have fractional components and are called pseudocodewords.

3 A Combinatorial Certificate for an ML Codeword

In this section we present combinatorial certificates for codewords of Tanner codes that apply both to ML-decoding and LP-decoding. A certificate is a proof that a given codeword is the unique solution of maximum-likelihood decoding and linear-programming decoding. The certificate is based on combinatorial weighted structures in the Tanner graph, referred to as local configurations. These local configurations generalize the minimal configurations (skinny trees) presented by Vontobel [Von10] as extension to Arora et al. [ADS09]. We note that for Tanner codes, the support of each weighted local configuration is not necessarily a local valid configuration. For a given codeword, the certificate is computed by a dynamic-programming algorithm on the Tanner graph of the code (see Section 5).

**Notation:** Let \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) denote the word received from the channel. Let \( \lambda = \lambda(y) \) denote the LLR vector for \( y \). Let \( G = (\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{J}, E) \) denote a Tanner graph, and let \( C(G) \) denote a Tanner code based on \( G \) with minimum local distance \( d^* \). Let \( x \in C(G) \) be a candidate for \( \hat{x}^{ML}(y) \) and \( \hat{x}^{LP}(y) \).
**Definition 1** (Path-Prefix Tree). Consider a graph \( G = (V, E) \) and a node \( r \in V \). Let \( \hat{V} \) denote the set of all backtrackless paths in \( G \) with length at most \( h \) that start at node \( r \), and let

\[
\hat{E} \triangleq \{(p_1, p_2) \in \hat{V} \times \hat{V} \mid p_1 \text{ is a prefix of } p_2, \ |p_1| + 1 = |p_2|\}.
\]

We identify the empty path in \( \hat{V} \) with \( (r) \). Denote by \( \mathcal{T}^h_r(G) \triangleq (\hat{V}, \hat{E}) \) the path-prefix tree of \( G \) rooted at node \( r \) with height \( h \).

Path prefix trees of \( G \) that are rooted in variable nodes are often called computation trees. We consider also path prefix trees of subgraphs that may be either rooted at a variable node or at a local-code node.

We use the following notation. Because vertices in \( \mathcal{T}^h_r(G) \) are paths in \( G \), we denote vertices in path-prefix trees by \( p \) and \( q \). Vertices in \( G \) are denoted by \( u, v, r \). For a path \( p \in \hat{V} \), let \( s(p) \) denote the first vertex (source) of path \( p \), and let \( t(p) \) denote the last vertex (target) of path \( p \). Denote by \( \text{Prefix}^+(p) \) the set of proper prefixes of the path \( p \), i.e.,

\[
\text{Prefix}^+(p) = \{q \mid q \text{ is a prefix of } p, \ 1 \leq |q| < |p|\}.
\]

Consider a Tanner graph \( G = (V \cup J, E) \) and let \( \mathcal{T}^h_r(G) = (\hat{V}, \hat{E}) \) denote a path-prefix tree of \( G \). Let \( \hat{V} \triangleq \{p \mid p \in \hat{V}, \ t(p) \in V\} \), and \( \hat{J} \triangleq \{p \mid p \in \hat{V}, \ t(p) \in J\} \). Paths in \( \hat{V} \) are called **variable paths**, and paths in \( \hat{J} \) are called **local-code paths**.

The following definitions expand the combinatorial notion of minimal valid deviations [Wib96] and weighted minimal local-deviations (skinny trees) [ADS09, Von10] to the case of Tanner codes.

**Definition 2** (d-tree). Consider a Tanner graph \( G = (V \cup J, E) \). Denote by \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_r(G) = (\hat{V} \cup \hat{J}, \hat{E}) \) the path-prefix tree of \( G \) rooted at node \( r \in V \). A subtree \( T \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{2h}_r(G) \) is a d-tree if: (i) \( T \) rooted at \( (r) \), (ii) for every local-code path \( p \in T \cap \hat{J} \), \( \text{deg}_T(p) = d \), and (iii) for every variable path \( p \in T \cap \hat{V} \), \( \text{deg}_T(p) = \text{deg}_{\mathcal{T}^{2h}_r}(p) \).

Note that the leaves of a d-tree are variable paths because a d-tree is rooted in a variable node and has an even height. Let \( \mathcal{T}[r, 2h, d](G) \) denote the set of all d-trees rooted at \( r \) that are subtrees of \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_r(G) \).

In the following definition we use “level” weights \( w = (w_1, \ldots, w_h) \) that are assigned to variables paths in a subtree of a path-prefix tree of height \( 2h \).

**Definition 3** (\( w \)-weighted subtree). Let \( \mathcal{T} = (\hat{V} \cup \hat{J}, \hat{E}) \) denote a subtree of \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_r(G) \), and let \( w = (w_1, \ldots, w_h) \in \mathbb{R}_+^h \) denote a non-negative weight vector. Let \( w_T : \hat{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) denote a weight function based on weight vector \( w \) for variable paths \( p \in \hat{V} \) defined as follows. If \( p \) is
an empty variable path, then \( w_T(p) = 0 \). Otherwise,
\[
    w_T(p) \triangleq \frac{w_\ell}{\|w\|_1} \cdot \frac{1}{\deg_G(t(p))} \cdot \prod_{q \in \text{Prefix}^+(p)} \frac{1}{\deg_T(q) - 1},
\]
where \( \ell = \lceil |p|/2 \rceil \). We refer to \( w_T \) as a \( w \)-weighed subtree.

For any \( w \)-weighted subtree \( w_T \) of \( T_r^{2h}(G) \), let \( \pi_{G,T,w} : \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{R} \) denote a function whose values correspond to the projection of \( w_T \) to the Tanner graph \( G \). That is, for every variable node \( v \) in \( G \),
\[
    \pi_{G,T,w}(v) \triangleq \sum_{\{p \in T : t(p) = v\}} w_T(p).
\]
We remark that: (i) If no variable path in \( T \) ends in \( v \), then \( \pi_{G,T,w}(v) = 0 \). (ii) If \( h < \text{girth}(G)/4 \), then every node \( v \) is an endpoint of at most one variable path in \( T_r^{2h}(G) \), and the projection is trivial. However, we deal with arbitrary heights \( h \), and the projection deals with many variable paths that end at the same variable node \( v \). (iii) \( \pi_{G,T,w}(v) \in [0, 1] \) for every weight vector \( w \in \mathbb{R}_+^h \setminus \{0^h\} \).

For a Tanner code \( C(G) \), let \( B_d^{(w)} \subseteq [0, 1]^N \) denote the set of all projections of \( w \)-weighted \( d \)-trees to \( G \). That is,
\[
    B_d^{(w)} \triangleq \{ \pi_{G,T,w} | T \in \bigcup_{r \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{T}[r, 2h, d](G) \}.
\]
Vectors in \( B_d^{(w)} \) are referred to as deviations.

For two vectors \( x \in \{0, 1\}^N \) and \( f \in [0, 1]^N \), let \( x \oplus f \in [0, 1]^N \) denote the relative point defined by \((x \oplus f)_i \triangleq |x_i - f_i| \) [Fel03]. The following definition is an extension of local-optimality [ADS09, Vont10] to Tanner codes on memoryless channels.

**Definition 4** (local-optimality). Let \( C(G) \subset \{0, 1\}^N \) denote a Tanner code with minimum local distance \( d^* \). Let \( w \in \mathbb{R}_+^h \setminus \{0^h\} \) denote a non-negative weight vector of length \( h \) and let \( 2 \leq d \leq d^* \). A codeword \( x \in C(G) \) is \((h, w, d)\)-locally optimal with respect to \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N \) if for all vectors \( \beta \in B_d^{(w)} \),
\[
    \langle \lambda, x \oplus \beta \rangle > \langle \lambda, x \rangle.
\]

Based on random walks on the Tanner graph, Vontobel showed that \((h, w, 2)\)-local optimality is sufficient both for ML-optimality and LP-optimality. The random walks are defined in terms derived from the generalized fundamental polytope. We extend the results of Vontobel [Vont10] to “thicker” sub-trees by using probabilistic combinatorial arguments on graphs and the properties of graph cover decoding [VK05]. Specifically, we prove that \((h, w, d)\)-local optimality, for any \( 2 \leq d \leq d^* \), implies both ML- and LP-optimality (Theorems 5 and 10).
Given the decomposition of Lemma 11 proved in Section 6, the following theorem is obtained by modification of the proof of [ADS09, Theorem 2] or [HE11, Theorem 6].

**Theorem 5** (local-optimality is sufficient for ML). Let $C(G)$ denote a Tanner code with minimum local distance $d^*$. Let $h$ be some positive integer and $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_h) \in \mathbb{R}^+_h$ denote a non-negative weight vector. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N$ denote the LLR vector received from the channel. If $x$ is an $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal codeword w.r.t. $\lambda$ and some $2 \leq d \leq d^*$, then $x$ is also the unique maximum-likelihood codeword w.r.t. $\lambda$.

**Proof.** We use the decomposition proved in Section 6 to show that for every codeword $x' \neq x$, $\langle \lambda, x' \rangle > \langle \lambda, x \rangle$. Let $z \triangleq x \oplus x'$. By linearity $z \in C(G)$. Moreover, $z \neq 0^N$ because $x \neq x'$. Because $d^* \geq 2$, it follows that $\|z\|_1 \geq 2$. By Lemma 11 there exists a distribution over the set $B_d(w)$, such that $E_{\beta \in B_d(w)} \beta = \frac{z}{\|z\|_1}$. Let $\alpha \triangleq \frac{1}{\|z\|_1} < 1$. Let $f : [0, 1]^N \to \mathbb{R}$ be the affine linear function defined by $f(\beta) \triangleq \langle \lambda, x \oplus \beta \rangle = \langle \lambda, x \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^N (-1)^{x_i} \lambda_i \beta_i$. Then,

$$
\langle \lambda, x \rangle < E_{\beta \in B_d(w)} \langle \lambda, x \oplus \beta \rangle \quad \text{(by local-optimality of $x$)}
= \langle \lambda, x \oplus E_{\beta \in B_d(w)} \beta \rangle \quad \text{(by linearity of $f$ and linearity of expectation)}
= \langle \lambda, x \oplus \alpha z \rangle \quad \text{(by Lemma 11)}
= \langle \lambda, (1 - \alpha)x + \alpha(x \oplus z) \rangle
= \langle \lambda, (1 - \alpha)x + \alpha x' \rangle
= (1 - \alpha)\langle \lambda, x \rangle + \alpha \langle \lambda, x' \rangle.
$$

which implies that $\langle \lambda, x' \rangle > \langle \lambda, x \rangle$ as desired. \qed

## 4 Local Optimality Implies LP-Optimality

In order to prove a sufficient condition for LP optimality, we consider graph cover decoding introduced by Vontobel and Koetter [VK05]. We note that the characterization of graph cover decoding and its connection to LP decoding can be extended to the case of Tanner codes in the generalized setting.

We use the terms and notation of Vontobel and Koetter [VK05] in the statements of Proposition 6 and Lemma 9. Specifically, let $\tilde{G}$ denote an $M$-cover of $G$. Let $\tilde{x} = x^\dagger M \in C(\tilde{G})$ and $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda^\dagger M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \cdot M}$ denote the $M$-lifts of $x$ and $\lambda$, respectively.

In this section we consider the following setting. Let $C(G)$ denote a Tanner code with minimum local distance $d^*$. Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+ \setminus \{0^h \}$ for some positive integer $h$ and let $2 \leq d \leq d^*$.

**Proposition 6** (local-optimality of all-zero codeword is preserved by $M$-lifts). $0^N$ is an $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal codeword for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N$ if and only if $0^{N \cdot M}$ is an $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal codeword w.r.t. $\tilde{\lambda}$.
Proof. Consider the surjection $\varphi$ of $d$-trees in the path-prefix tree of $\tilde{G}$ to $d$-trees in the path-prefix tree of $G$. This surjection is based on the covering map between $\tilde{G}$ and $G$. Given a deviation $\tilde{\beta} \triangleq \pi_{\tilde{G},T,w}$, let $\beta \triangleq \pi_{G,\varphi(T),w}$. The proposition follows because $\langle \lambda, \beta \rangle = \langle \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\beta} \rangle$. □

For two vectors $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let "*" denote coordinatewise multiplication, i.e., $y \ast z \triangleq (y_1 \cdot z_1, \ldots, y_N \cdot z_N)$. For a word $x \in \{0, 1\}^N$, let $b \in \{\pm 1\}^N$ denote a vector defined by $b_i \triangleq (-1)^{x_i}$.

**Proposition 7.** For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and every $\beta \in [0, 1]^N$,

$$\langle b \ast \lambda, \beta \rangle = \langle \lambda, x \oplus \beta \rangle - \langle \lambda, x \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

**Proof.** For $\beta \in [0, 1]^N$, it holds that $\langle \lambda, x \oplus \beta \rangle = \langle \lambda, x \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{N} (-1)^{x_i} \lambda_i \beta_i$. Hence,

$$\langle \lambda, x \oplus \beta \rangle - \langle \lambda, x \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (-1)^{x_i} \lambda_i \beta_i = \langle b \ast \lambda, \beta \rangle$$

□

The following proposition states that the mapping $(x, \lambda) \mapsto (0^N, b \ast \lambda)$ preserves local optimality.

**Proposition 8 (symmetry of local-optimality).** For every $x \in \mathcal{C}$, $x$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal for $\lambda$ if and only if $0^N$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal for $b \ast \lambda$.

**Proof.** By Proposition 7, $\langle \lambda, x \oplus \beta \rangle - \langle \lambda, x \rangle = \langle b \ast \lambda, \beta \rangle$.

□

The following lemma states that local-optimality is preserved by lifting to an $M$-cover.

**Lemma 9.** $x$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal w.r.t. $\lambda$ if and only if $\tilde{x}$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal w.r.t. $\tilde{\lambda}$.

**Proof.** Assume that $\tilde{x}$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal codeword for $\tilde{\lambda}$. By Proposition 8, $0^{N-M}$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal w.r.t. $(-1)^{\tilde{x}} \ast \tilde{\lambda}$. By Proposition 8, $0^N$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal w.r.t. $(b \ast \lambda)$. By Proposition 8, $x$ is $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal w.r.t. $\lambda$. Each of these implications is necessary and sufficient, and the lemma follows. □

The following theorem is obtained as a corollary of Theorem 5 and Lemma 9. The proof is based on arguments utilizing properties of graph cover decoding. Those arguments are used for a reduction from ML-optimality to LP-optimality similar to the reduction presented in the proof of [HE11, Theorem 8].

**Theorem 10 (local optimality is sufficient for LP optimality).** If $x$ is an $(h, w, d)$-locally optimal codeword w.r.t. $\lambda$, then $x$ is also the unique optimal LP solution given $\lambda$. 12
5 Verifying Local Optimality

In this section we address the problem of how to verify whether a codeword \( x \) is \((h, w, d)\)-locally optimal with respect to \( \lambda \). By Proposition 8, this is equivalent to verifying whether \( 0^N \) is \((h, w, d)\)-locally optimal with respect to \( b \star \lambda \), where \( b_i \triangleq (-1)^{x_i} \).

The verification algorithm is listed as Algorithm 1. It applies dynamic programming to find, for every variable node \( v \), a \( d \)-tree \( T_v \), rooted at \( v \), that minimizes the cost \( \langle b \star \lambda, \pi_G, T_v, w \rangle \). The algorithm returns false if and only if it finds a deviation with nonpositive cost.

The algorithm is presented as a message passing algorithm. In every step, a node propagates to its parent the minimum cost of the \( d \)-subtree that hangs from it based on the minimum values received from its children. The time and message complexity of Algorithm 1 is \( O(|E| \cdot h) \), where \( E \) denotes the edge set of the Tanner graph.

The following notation is used in Line 8 of the algorithm. For a set \( S \) of real values, let \( \min_{i \in S} \{ \} \) denote the \( i \)th smallest member in \( S \).

Algorithm 1 VERIFY-LO(\( x, \lambda, h, w, d \)) - An iterative verification algorithm. Let \( G = (V \cup J, E) \) denote a Tanner graph. Given an LLR vector \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{|V|} \), a codeword \( x \in C(G) \), level weights \( w \in \mathbb{R}^{h+} \), and a degree \( d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \), outputs "true" if \( x \) is \((h, w, d)\)-locally optimal w.r.t. \( \lambda \); otherwise, outputs "false".

1: Initialize: \( \forall v \in V: \lambda_v' \leftarrow \lambda_v \cdot (-1)^{x_v} \)
2: \( \forall C \in J, \forall v \in N(C): \mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(-1)} \leftarrow 0 \)
3: for \( l = 0 \) to \( h - 1 \) do
4: \hspace{1em} for all \( v \in V, C \in N(v) \) do
5: \hspace{2em} \( \mu_{v \rightarrow C}^{(l)} \leftarrow \frac{w_{h-1}}{d_{S_{C}(v)}} \lambda_v' + \frac{1}{d_{S_{C}(v)}-1} \sum_{C' \in N(v) \setminus \{C\}} \mu_{C' \rightarrow v}^{(l-1)} \)
6: \hspace{1em} end for
7: \hspace{1em} for all \( C \in J, v \in N(C) \) do
8: \hspace{2em} \( \mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(l)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{d-1} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \min_{i \in S} \{ \mu_{v' \rightarrow C}^{(l)} : v' \in N(C) \setminus \{v\} \} \)
9: \hspace{1em} end for
10: end for
11: for all \( v \in V \) do
12: \hspace{1em} \( \mu_v \leftarrow \sum_{C \in N(v)} \mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(h-1)} \)
13: \hspace{1em} if \( \mu_v \leq 0 \) then \{ min-cost \( w \)-weighted \( d \)-tree rooted at \( v \) has non-positive value \}
14: \hspace{1em} return false;
15: end if
16: end for
17: return true;

6 Constructing Codewords from Weighted Trees Projections

In this section we prove Lemma 11, the key structural lemma in the proof of Theorem 5. This Lemma states that every codeword of a Tanner code is a finite sum of projections of weighted
trees in the computation trees of $G$.

Throughout this section, let $C(G)$ denote a Tanner code with minimum local distance $d^*$, let $x$ denote a nonzero codeword, let $h$ denote some positive integer, and let $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^h \setminus \{0^h\}$ denote level weights.

**Lemma 11.** Consider a codeword $x \neq 0^N$. Then, for every $2 \leq d \leq d^*$, there exists a distribution $\rho$ over $d$-trees of $G$ of height $2h$ such that for every weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^h \setminus \{0\}$, it holds that

$$x = \|x\|_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}_\rho[\pi_{G,T,w}].$$

The proof of Lemma 11 is based on lemmas 12-13 and corollary 14. Lemma 12 states that every codeword $x \in C(G)$ can be decomposed into a set of weighted path-prefix trees. The number of trees in the decomposition equals $\|x\|_1$. Lemma 13 states that every weighted path-prefix tree is a convex combination of weighted $d$-trees. This lemma implies that the projection of a weighted path-prefix tree equals to the expectation of projections of weighted $d$-trees.

For a codeword $x \in C(G) \subset \{0,1\}_N$, let $V_x = \{v | x_v = 1\}$. Let $G_x$ denote the subgraph of the Tanner graph $G$ induced by $V_x \cup N(V_x)$.

**Lemma 12.** For every codeword $x \neq 0^N$, for every weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^h$, and for every variable node $v \in V_x$, we have:

$$x_v = \sum_{r \in V_x} \pi_{G,T^h(G_x),w}(v).$$

**Proof.** If $x_v = 0$, then $\pi_{G,T^h(G_x),w}(v) = 0$. It remains to show the equality holds for variable nodes $v \in V_x$.

Consider an all-one weight vector $\eta = 1^h$. Construct a path-suffix tree rooted at $v$. Level $\ell$ of this path-suffix trees consists of all backtrackless paths in $G_x$ of length $\ell$ that end at node $v$ (see Figure 1). We denote this level by $P_{\ell}(v)$.

We claim that for every $v \in V_x$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq 2h$,

$$\sum_{p \in P_{\ell}(v)} \eta_{T^h_{s(p)}}(p) = \frac{1}{h}. \quad (9)$$

The proof is by induction on $\ell$. The induction basis, for $\ell = 1$, holds because $|P_1(v)| = \deg_G(v)$ and $\eta_{T^h_{s(p)}}(p) = \frac{1}{h \cdot \deg_G(v)}$ for every $p \in P_1(v)$. The induction step is proven as follows. For each $p \in P_{\ell}(v)$, let $\text{aug}(p) = \{q \in P_{\ell+1}(v) | p$ is a suffix of $q\}$. Note that $|\text{aug}(p)| = \deg_{G_x}(s(p)) - 1$. Moreover, for each $q \in \text{aug}(p)$,

$$\frac{\eta_{T^h_{s(q)}}(q)}{\eta_{T^h_{s(p)}}(p)} = \frac{1}{\deg_{G_x}(s(p)) - 1}. \quad (10)$$
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Figure 1: Set of all backtrackless paths $P_\ell(v)$ as augmentation of the set $P_{\ell-1}(v)$ as viewed by the path-suffix tree of height $\ell$ rooted at $v$, in proof of Lemma 11.

Hence,

$$\sum_{q \in \text{aug}(p)} \eta_{T_{s(q)}}(q) = \eta_{T_{s(p)}}(p).$$

Finally, $P_{\ell+1}(v)$ is the disjoint union of $\bigcup\{\text{aug}(p) \mid p \in P_\ell(v)\}$. It follows that

$$\sum_{q \in P_{\ell+1}(v)} \eta_{T_{s(q)}}(q) = \sum_{p \in P_\ell(v)} \eta_{T_{s(p)}}(p). \quad (11)$$

By the induction hypothesis we conclude that $\sum_{q \in P_{\ell+1}(v)} \eta_{T_{s(q)}}(q) = 1/h$, as required. Note that the sum of weights induced by $\eta$ on each level is $1/h$, both for levels of paths beginning in variable nodes and in local-code nodes. In the rest of the proof we focus only on even levels that start at variable nodes. We now claim that

$$\sum_{p \in P_{2\ell}(v)} w_{T_{s(p)}}(p) = \frac{w_{\ell}}{\|w\|_1}. \quad (12)$$

Indeed, by Definition 3 it holds that $w_{T_{s(p)}}(p) = \eta_{T_{s(p)}}(p) \cdot \frac{w_{\ell}}{\|w\|_1} \cdot h$ for every $p \in P_{2\ell}(v)$. Therefore, Equation (12) follows from Equation (9).

The lemma follows because for every $v \in V_x$,

$$\sum_{r \in V_x} \pi_{G, T_{s(p)}(G_x), w}(v) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} \sum_{p \in P_{2\ell}(v)} w_{T_{s(p)}}(p) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} \frac{w_{\ell}}{\|w\|_1} = 1.$$
**Lemma 13.** Consider a subgraph $G_x$ of a Tanner graph $G$, where $x \in C(G) \setminus \{0^N\}$. Then, for every variable node $r \in G_x$, every positive integer $h$, every $2 \leq d \leq d^*$, and every weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$, it holds that

$$w_{T^{2h}(G_x)} = \mathbb{E}_{\rho_r} [w_T]$$

where $\rho_r$ is the uniform distribution over $T[r,2h,d](G_x)$.

**Proof.** Let $G_x = (V_x \cup J_x, E_x)$ and let $w_{T^{2h}(G_x)}$ denote a $w$-weighted path-prefix tree rooted at node $r$ with height $2h$. We claim that the expectation of $w$-weighted $d$-tree $w_T \in T[r,2h,d](G_x)$ equals $w_{T^{2h}(G_x)}$ if $w_T$ is chosen uniformly at random.

A random $d$-tree in $T[r,2h,d](G_x)$ is obtained as follows. Start from the root $r$. For each variable path, take all its augmentations, and for each local-code path choose $d-1$ distinct augmentations uniformly at random. Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq T[r,2h,d](G_x)$ denote such a random $d$-tree, and consider a variable path $p \in T_r^{2h}(G_x)$. Then,

$$\Pr_{T \in T[r,2h,d](G_x)} (p \in \mathcal{T}) = \prod_{\{q \mid \text{Prefix}^+(p):t(q) \in J_x\}} \frac{d-1}{\deg_{G_x}(t(q)) - 1}. \quad (13)$$

Note the following two observations: (i) if $p \notin \mathcal{T}$, then $w_T(p) = 0$, and (ii) if $p \in \mathcal{T}$, then the value of $w_T(p)$ is constant and does not depend on $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, from the two observations above we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{T \in T[r,2h,d](G_x)} [w_T(p)] = w_T(p) \cdot \Pr_{T \in T[r,2h,d](G_x)} (p \in \mathcal{T}). \quad (14)$$

By Definition[3] for $p \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$w_T(p) = \frac{w_{\|p\|/2}}{\|w\|_1} \frac{1}{\deg_{G_x}(t(p))} \cdot \frac{1}{(d-1)^{\|p\|/2}} \cdot \prod_{\{q \mid \text{Prefix}^+(p):t(q) \in V_x\}} \frac{1}{\deg_{G_x}(t(q)) - 1}. \quad (15)$$

By substituting Equations (13) and (15) in Equation (14), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_{T \in T[r,2h,d](G_x)} [w_T(p)] = \frac{w_{\|p\|/2}}{\|w\|_1} \cdot \frac{1}{\deg_{G_x}(t(p))} \cdot \prod_{q \in \text{Prefix}^+(p)} \frac{1}{\deg_{G_x}(t(q)) - 1}$$

$$= \ w_{T^{2h}(G_x)}(p).$$

$$\square$$

**Corollary 14.** For every positive integer $h$, every $2 \leq d \leq d^*$, and every weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$, it holds that

$$\pi_{G,T^{2h}(G_x),w} = \mathbb{E}_{\rho_r} [\pi_{G,T,w}].$$
Proof. By definition of $\pi_{G,T^2}(G_x),w$, we have

$$\pi_{G,T^2}(G_x),w(v) = \sum_{\{p \in T^2(G_x) : t(p) = v\}} w_{T^2}(G_x)(p).$$

(16)

By Lemma[13] and linearity of expectation we have

$$\sum_{\{p \in T^2(G_x) : t(p) = v\}} w_{T^2}(G_x)(p) = \sum_{\{p \in T^2(G_x) : t(p) = v\}} \mathbb{E}_{T \in T[r,2h,d]}[w_T(p)]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{T \in T[r,2h,d]} \left[ \sum_{\{p \in T^2(G_x) : t(p) = v\}} w_T(p) \right].$$

(17)

Now, for variable paths $p$ that are not in a $d$-tree $T$, $w_T(p) = 0$. Hence, if a $d$-tree $T$ is a subtree of $T^2(G_x)$, then

$$\sum_{\{p \in T^2(G_x) : t(p) = v\}} w_T(p) = \sum_{\{p \in T : t(p) = v\}} w_T(p)$$

$$\triangleq \pi_{G,T,w}(v).$$

(18)

From Equations (16)-(18) we conclude that for every $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$\pi_{G,T^2}(G_x),w(v) = \mathbb{E}_{T \in T[r,2h,d]}[\pi_{G,T,w}(v)].$$

Before proving Lemma[11] we state a proposition from probability theory.

Proposition 15. Let $\{\rho_r\}_{r=1}^K$ denote $K$ probability distributions. Let $\rho \triangleq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{r=1}^K \rho_r$. Then,

$$\sum_{r=1}^K \mathbb{E}_{\rho_r}[x] = K \cdot \mathbb{E}_\rho[x].$$

Proof of Lemma[17] By Lemmas[12] and Corollary[14] we have for every $v \in \mathcal{V}_x$

$$x_v = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{V}_x} \pi_{G,T^2(x),w}(v)$$

$$= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{V}_x} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_r}[\pi_{G,T,w}].$$

(19)

Let $\rho$ denote the distribution defined by $\rho \triangleq \frac{1}{\|x\|_1} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_x} \rho_r$. By Proposition[15] and Equation[19]

$$x_v = \|x\|_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}_\rho[\pi_{G,T,w}],$$
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and the lemma follows.

7 Message-Passing Decoding with ML Guarantee for Irregular LDPC Codes

In this section we present a weighted min-sum decoder (called NWMS) for irregular LDPC codes over any memoryless binary-input output-symmetric channels. In Section 7.1 we prove that the decoder computes the maximum-likelihood (ML) codeword if a locally-optimal code-word exists (Theorem [16]). Note that Algorithm NWMS is not presented as a min-sum process. However, in Section 7.1 an equivalent min-sum version is presented.

We deal with Tanner codes based on Tanner graphs $G = \{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{J}, E\}$ with single parity-check local-codes. Local-code nodes $C \in \mathcal{J}$ in this case are called check nodes. The graph $G$ may be either regular or irregular. All the results in this section hold for every Tanner graph, regardless of its girth, degrees, or density.

A huge number of works deal with message-passing decoding. We point out three works that can be viewed as precursors to our decoding algorithm. Gallager [Gal63] presented the sum-product iterative decoding algorithm for LDPC codes. Tanner [Tan81] viewed iterative decoding algorithms as message passing algorithms over the edges of the Tanner graph. Wiberg [Wib96] characterized decoding failures of the min-sum iterative decoding algorithm by negative cost trees. Message-passing decoding algorithms proceed by iterations of “ping-pong” messages between the variables nodes and the local-code nodes in the Tanner graph. These messages are sent only along the edges.

Algorithm description. Algorithm NWMS($\lambda, h, w$), listed as Algorithm 2, is a normalized $w$-weighted version of the min-sum algorithm for decoding Tanner codes with single parity-check local-codes. The input to algorithm NWMS consists of an LLR vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N$, an integer $h > 0$ that determines the number of iterations, and a nonnegative weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$. For each edge $(v, C)$, each iteration consists of one message from the variable node $v$ to the check node $C$ (that is, the “ping” message), and one message from $C$ to $v$ (that is, the “pong” message). Hence, the time and message complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(|E| \cdot h)$.

Let $\mu_{v\rightarrow C}^{(l)}$ denote the “ping” message from a variable node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ to an adjacent check-node $C \in \mathcal{J}$ in iteration $l$ of the algorithm. Similarly, let $\mu_{C\rightarrow v}^{(l)}$ denotes the “pong” message from $C \in \mathcal{J}$ to $v \in \mathcal{V}$ in iteration $l$. Denote by $\mu_v$ the final value computed by variable node $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Note that NWMS does not add $w_0\lambda_v$ in the computation of $\mu_v$ in Line 11 for ease of presentation. The output of the algorithm $\hat{x} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ is computed locally by each variable node.

---

1 Adding $w_0\lambda_v$ to $\mu_v$ in Line 11 requires changing the definition of deviations so that they also include the root
Algorithm NWMS may be applied to any memoryless binary-input output-symmetric channel (e.g., BEC, BSC, AWGN, etc.) because the input is the LLR vector.

**Algorithm 2 NWMS(λ, h, w)** - An iterative normalized weighted min-sum decoding algorithm. Given an LLR vector \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N \) and level weights \( w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+ \), outputs a binary string \( \hat{x} \in \{0, 1\}^N \).

1. Initialize: \( \forall C \in \mathcal{J}, \forall v \in \mathcal{N}(C) : \mu^{(-1)}_{C \rightarrow v} \leftarrow 0 \)
2. for \( l = 0 \) to \( h - 1 \) do
3. for all \( v \in \mathcal{V}, C \in \mathcal{N}(v) \) do {“PING”}
4. \( \mu^{(l)}_{v \rightarrow C} \leftarrow \frac{w_{v \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \lambda_v}{\deg_G(v) - 1} \sum_{C' \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{C\}} \mu^{(l-1)}_{C' \rightarrow v} \)
5. end for
6. for all \( C \in \mathcal{J}, v \in \mathcal{N}(C) \) do {“PONG”}
7. \( \mu^{(l)}_{C \rightarrow v} \leftarrow \left( \prod_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} \text{sign} (\mu^{(l)}_{u \rightarrow C}) \right) \cdot \min_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} \{|\mu^{(l)}_{u \rightarrow C}|\} \)
8. end for
9. end for
10. for all \( v \in \mathcal{V} \) do {Decision}
11. \( \mu_v \leftarrow \sum_{C \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mu^{(h-1)}_{C \rightarrow v} \)
12. \( \hat{x}_v \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 0 & \text{if } \mu_v > 0, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{array} \right. \)
13. end for

The following theorem states that NWMS(\( \lambda, h, w \)) computes an \( (h, w, 2) \)-locally-optimal codeword w.r.t. \( \lambda \) if such a codeword exists. Hence, Theorem 16 provides a sufficient condition for successful iterative decoding for any finite number \( h \) of iterations. In particular, the number of iterations may exceed the girth. Theorem 16 implies an alternative proof of the uniqueness of an \( (h, w, 2) \)-locally optimal codeword that is proved in Theorem 5. The proof appears in Section 7.1.

**Theorem 16 (NWMS finds the locally optimal codeword).** Let \( G = (\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{J}, E) \) denote a Tanner graph and let \( C(G) \subset \{0, 1\}^N \) denote the corresponding Tanner code with single parity-check local-codes. Let \( h \in \mathbb{N}_+ \) and let \( w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+ \setminus \{0^h\} \) denote a non-negative weight vector. Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N \) denote the LLR vector of the channel output. If \( x \in C(G) \) is an \( (h, w, 2) \)-locally optimal codeword w.r.t. \( \lambda \), then NWMS(\( \lambda, h, w \)) outputs \( x \).

The NWMS decoding algorithm has an ML-certificate. Namely, if a locally-optimal codeword exists, the dynamic programming algorithm VERIFY-LO described in Section 5 can be used to verify whether NWMS(\( \lambda, h, w \)) outputs an \( (h, w, 2) \)-locally optimal codeword. If so, then, by Theorem 5, the output of NWMS(\( \lambda, h, w \)) is the unique ML-codeword.
Corollary 26 states that for MBIOS channels, the probability that NWMS fails is independent of the transmitted codeword. Hence, the following corollary is a contra-positive of Theorem 16 provided the all-zero codeword assumption.

**Corollary 17.** Assume that the all-zero codeword is transmitted, and let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N \) denote the log-likelihood ratio for the received word. If NWMS(\( \lambda, h, w \)) fails to decode the all-zero codeword for \( w \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \{0^h\} \), then there exists a deviation \( \beta \in B_2^{(w)} \) such that \( \langle \lambda, \beta \rangle \leq 0 \).

Hence, for a fixed \( h \) and \( w \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \{0^h\} \),

\[
\Pr\{\text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w) \text{ fails } | \ c = 0^N \} \leq \Pr\{\exists \beta \in B_2^{(w)} \text{ such that } \langle \lambda, \beta \rangle \leq 0 | c = 0^N \}. \tag{20}
\]

Bounds on the existence of a non-positive weighted deviation (i.e., the right-hand side in Equation (20)) are discussed in Section 9.1.

### 7.1 Proof of Theorem [16] - NWMS Finds the Locally Optimal Codeword

**Proof outline.** The proof of Theorem 16 is based on two observations. (1) We present an equivalent algorithm, called NWMS2 (Section 7.1.1), and prove that Algorithm NWMS2 outputs the all-zero codeword if \( 0^N \) is locally optimal (Sections 7.1.2, 7.1.3). (2) In Lemma 25 we prove that algorithm NWMS is symmetric (Section 7.1.4). This symmetry is with respect to the mapping of a pair \((x, \lambda)\) of a codeword and an LLR vector to a pair \((0^N, \lambda^0)\) of the all-zero codeword and a corresponding LLR vector \( \lambda^0 \triangleq (-1)^x \ast \lambda \) (recall that \( \ast \) denotes a coordinate-wise vector multiplication).

To prove Theorem 16 we prove the contrapositive statement, that is, if \( x \neq \text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w) \), then \( x \) is not \((h, w, 2)\)-locally optimal w.r.t. \( \lambda \). Let \( x \) denote a codeword, and define \( b \in \{\pm 1\}^N \) by \( b_i \triangleq (-1)^{x_i} \). Define \( \lambda^0 \triangleq b \ast \lambda \). By definition \( \lambda = b \ast \lambda^0 \). The proof is obtained by the following derivations:

\[
\begin{align*}
x \neq \text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w) \iff & x \neq x \oplus \text{NWMS}(\lambda^0, h, w) \quad \text{[Lemma 25, symmetry of NWMS]} \\
0^N \neq \text{NWMS}(\lambda^0, h, w) \iff & \exists \beta \in B_2^{(w)} \cdot \langle \lambda^0, \beta \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{[Lemma 22, local optimality (LO)]} \\
x \text{ is not } (h, w, 2) \text{-locally optimal for } \lambda. \quad & \text{[Prop. 8, symmetry of LO]}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the only implication that is only sufficient is in the 4th line, which is based on Lemma 22.
We now prove the two lemmas used in the foregoing proof.

7.1.1 NWMS2: An Equivalent Version

Algorithm NWMS is input the log-likelihood ratio. We refer to this algorithm as a min-sum algorithm in light of the general description of Wiberg [Wib96] in the log-domain. In Wiberg’s description, every check node finds a minimum value from a set of functions on the incoming messages, and every variable node computes the sum of the incoming messages and its corresponding channel observation. Hence the name “min-sum”.

Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ denote channel observations. For $a \in \{0, 1\}$, define the log-likelihood of $y_i$ by

\[
\lambda_i(a) \triangleq -\log(\Pr(y_i|c_i = a)).
\]

Note that the log-likelihood ratio $\lambda_i$ for $y_i$ equals $\lambda_i(1) - \lambda_i(0)$.

Algorithm NWMS2($\lambda(0), \lambda(1), h, w$), listed as Algorithm 3, is a normalized $w$-weighted min-sum algorithm. Algorithm NWMS2 computes separate “reliabilities” for “0” and “1”.

Namely, $\mu_{v \rightarrow C}(a)$ and $\mu_{C \rightarrow v}(a)$ denote the messages corresponding to the assumption that no devariable node $v$ is assigned the value $a$ (for $a \in \{0, 1\}$). The higher the values of these messages, the lower the likelihood of the event $x_v = a$.

The main difference between the presentations of Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 is in Line 7. Consider a check node $C$ and valid assignment $x \in \{0, 1\}^{\deg(C)}$ to variable nodes adjacent to $C$ with even weight. For every such assignment $x$ in which $x_v = a$, the check node $C$ computes the sum of the incoming messages $\mu_{u \rightarrow C}(x_u)$ from the neighboring nodes $u \in N(C) \setminus \{v\}$. The message $\mu_{C \rightarrow v}(a)$ equals the minimum value over these valid summations.

Following Wiberg [Wib96, Appendix A.3], we claim that Algorithms 2 and 3 are equivalent.

Claim 18. Let $\lambda$, $\lambda(0)$, and $\lambda(1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ denote the LLR vector and the two log-likelihood vectors for a channel output $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Then, for every $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$, the following equalities hold:

1. $\mu_{v \rightarrow C}^{(l)} = \mu_{v \rightarrow C}^{(l)}(1) - \mu_{v \rightarrow C}^{(l)}(0)$ and $\mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(l)} = \mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(l)}(1) - \mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(l)}(0)$ in every iteration $l$.

2. $\mu_v = \mu_v(1) - \mu_v(0)$. Hence NWMS($\lambda, h, w$) and NWMS2($\lambda(0), \lambda(1), h, w$) output the same vector $\hat{x}$.

7.1.2 NWMS2 as a Dynamic Programming Algorithm

In Lemma [19] we prove that Algorithm NWMS2 is a dynamic programming algorithm that computes, for every variable node $v$, two min-weight valid configurations. One configuration is 0-rooted and the other configuration is 1-rooted. Algorithm NWMS2 decides $\hat{x}_v = 0$ if the min-weight valid configuration rooted at $v$ is 0-rooted, otherwise decides $\hat{x}_v = 1$. We now elaborate on the definition of valid configurations and their weight.
Algorithm 3 NWMS2($\lambda(0), \lambda(1), h, w$) - An iterative normalized weighted min-sum decoding algorithm. Given an log-likelihood vectors $\lambda(a) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and level weights $w \in \mathbb{R}^h$, outputs a binary string $\hat{x} \in \{0, 1\}^N$.

1: Initialize: $\forall C \in \mathcal{J}, \forall v \in \mathcal{N}(C), \forall a \in \{0, 1\}: \mu^{(l-1)}_{C \rightarrow v}(a) \leftarrow 0$
2: for $l \leftarrow 0$ to $h - 1$ do
3: \quad for all $v \in \mathcal{V}, C \in \mathcal{N}(v), a \in \{0, 1\}$ do \{“PING”\}
4: \quad $\mu^{(l)}_{v \rightarrow C}(a) \leftarrow \frac{w_h}{\deg_G(v)} \lambda_v(a) + \frac{1}{\deg_G(v)} \sum_{v' \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{C\}} \mu^{(l-1)}_{C \rightarrow v'}(a)$
5: \quad end for
6: for all $C \in \mathcal{J}, v \in \mathcal{N}(C), a \in \{0, 1\}$ do \{“PONG”\}
7: \quad $\mu^{(l)}_{C \rightarrow v}(a) \leftarrow \min \{x \in \{0, 1\}^{\deg(G)} : ||x||_1 \text{ is even and } x_v = a\} \{ \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} \mu^{(l)}_{u \rightarrow C}(x_u) \}$
8: \quad end for
9: end for
10: for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$ do \{Decision\}
11: \quad $\mu_v(a) \leftarrow \sum_{C \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mu^{(h-1)}_{C \rightarrow v}(a)$
12: \quad $\hat{x}_v \leftarrow \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\mu_v(1) - \mu_v(0)) > 0, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$
13: end for

Valid configurations and their weight. Fix a variable node $r \in \mathcal{V}$. We refer to $r$ as the root. Consider the path-prefix tree $T_r^{2h}(G)$ rooted at $r$ consisting of all the paths of length at most $2h$ starting at $r$. Denote the vertices of $T_r^{2h}$ by $\hat{\mathcal{V}} \cup \hat{\mathcal{J}}$, where paths in $\hat{\mathcal{V}} = \{p \mid p \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}, t(p) \in \mathcal{V}\}$ are variable paths, and paths in $\hat{\mathcal{J}} = \{p \mid p \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}, t(p) \in \mathcal{J}\}$ are parity-check paths. Denote by $(r)$ the empty path, i.e., the path consisting of only the root $r$.

A binary word $z \in \{0, 1\}^{||\hat{\mathcal{V}}||}$ is interpreted as an assignment to variable paths $p \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}$ where $z_p$ is assigned to $p$. We say that $z$ is a valid configuration if it satisfies all parity-check paths in $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$. Namely, for every check path $q \in \hat{\mathcal{J}}$, the assignment to its neighbors has an even number of ones. We denote the set of valid configurations of $T_r^{2h}$ by $\text{config}(T_r^{2h})$.

The weight $\mathcal{W}_{T_r^{2h}}(z)$ of a valid configuration $z$ is defined by weights $\mathcal{W}_{T_r^{2h}}(p)$ that are assigned to variable paths $p \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}$ as follows. We start with “level” weights $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_h) \in \mathbb{R}^h$ that are assigned to levels of variable paths in $T_r^{2h}$. Define the weight of a variable path $p \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}$ with respect to $w$ by the expression:

$$\mathcal{W}_{T_r^{2h}}(p) \triangleq \frac{w_{||p||/2}}{\deg_G(t(p))} \cdot \prod_{q \in \text{Prefix}^+(p) \cap \hat{\mathcal{V}}} \frac{1}{\deg_G(t(q)) - 1}.$$ 

There is a difference between Definition 3 and $\mathcal{W}_{T_r^{2h}}(p)$. In Definition 3, the product is taken over all paths in Prefix$^+(p)$. However, in $\mathcal{W}_{T_r^{2h}}(p)$ the product is taken only over variable paths in Prefix$^+(p)$.

\footnote{We use the same notation as in Definition 3}
The weight of a valid configuration \( z \in \{0, 1\}^{V} \) is defined by

\[
\mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(z) \triangleq \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}\setminus\{r\}} \lambda_{t(p)}(z_p) \cdot \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(p).
\]

Given a variable node \( r \in \mathcal{V} \) and a bit \( a \in \{0, 1\} \), our goal is to compute the value of a min-weight valid configuration \( \mathcal{W}^{\min}(r, a) \) defined by

\[
\mathcal{W}^{\min}(T^{2h}_r, a) \triangleq \arg\min \{ \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(z) \mid z \in \text{config}(T^{2h}_r), z(r) = a \}.
\]  \( 21 \)

In the following lemma we show that NWMS2 computes \( \mathcal{W}^{\min}(T^{2h}_r, a) \) for every \( r \in \mathcal{V} \) and \( a \in \{0, 1\} \). The proof is based on interpreting NWMS2 as a dynamic programming. See Appendix A for details.

**Lemma 19.** Consider an execution of NWMS2(\( \lambda(0), \lambda(1), h, w \)). For every variable node \( r \),

\[
\mu_r(a) = \mathcal{W}^{\min}(T^{2h}_r, a).
\]

From Line 12 in Algorithm NWMS2 we obtain the following corollary that characterizes NWMS2 as a computation of min-weight configurations.

**Corollary 20.** Let \( \hat{x} \) denote the output of NWMS2(\( \lambda(0), \lambda(1), h, w \)). For every variable node \( r \),

\[
\hat{x}_r = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \mathcal{W}^{\min}(T^{2h}_r, 1) > \mathcal{W}^{\min}(T^{2h}_r, 0), \\
1 & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

Define the \( \mathcal{W}^{\ast} \) cost of a configuration \( z \) in \( T^{2h}_r \) by

\[
\mathcal{W}^{\ast}_{T^{2h}}(z) \triangleq \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda_{t(p)} \cdot \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(p) \cdot z_p.
\]

Note that \( \mathcal{W}^{\ast}_{T^{2h}}(z) \) uses the LLR vector \( \lambda \) (i.e., \( \lambda_v = \lambda_v(1) - \lambda_v(0) \)).

**Corollary 21.** Let \( \hat{x} \) denote the output of NWMS(\( \lambda, h, w \)). Let \( z^\ast \) denote a valid configuration in \( T^{2h}_r \) with minimum \( \mathcal{W}^{\ast} \) cost. Then, \( \hat{x}_r = z^\ast(r) \).

**Proof.** The derivation in Equation (\( 22 \)) shows that the valid configuration \( z^\ast \) that minimizes the \( \mathcal{W}^{\ast} \) cost also minimizes the \( \mathcal{W} \) cost.

\[
\arg\min_{\text{valid } z \in T^{2h}} \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(z) = \begin{cases} 
\arg\min_{\text{valid } z \in T^{2h}} \{ \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(z) - \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(0^{\mathcal{V}}) \} \\
\arg\min_{\text{valid } z \in T^{2h}} \left\{ \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}: z_p=1} \lambda_{t(p)}(1) \cdot \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(p) - \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}: z_p=0} \lambda_{t(p)}(0) \cdot \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(p) \right\} \\
\arg\min_{\text{valid } z \in T^{2h}} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{V}} \lambda_{t(p)} \cdot \mathcal{W}_{T^{2h}}(p) \cdot z_p = \arg\min_{\text{valid } z \in T^{2h}} \mathcal{W}^{\ast}_{T^{2h}}(z).
\]  \( 22 \)
Equality (1) relies on the fact that $W_{T_{v}^{2h}}(p)$ is a constant. The elements $\lambda_{t(p)}(z_p) \cdot W_{T_{v}^{2h}}(p)$ in $W_{T_{v}^{2h}}(z)$ where $z_p = 0$ are reduced by the subtruction of the same elements in $W_{T_{v}^{2h}}(0)$.

Therefore, leaving in Equality (2) only elements that correspond to bits $z_p = 1$. Equality (3) is obtained by the LLR definition $\lambda_{t(p)} = \lambda_{t(p)}(1) - \lambda_{t(p)}(0)$.

Let $\hat{x} = \text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w)$ and $\hat{y} = \text{NWMS2}(\lambda(0), \lambda(1), h, w)$. By Corollary 20 and Equation 22, $\hat{y}_r = z^*_r$. By Claim 13, $\hat{x}_r = \hat{y}_r$, and the corollary follows. 

\[\square\]

### 7.1.3 Connections to Local Optimality

The following lemma states that the NWMS algorithm computes the all-zero codeword if $0^N$ is locally optimal.

**Lemma 22.** Let $\hat{x}$ denote the output of NWMS($\lambda, h, w$). If $0^N$ is $(h, w, 2)$-locally optimal w.r.t. $\lambda$, then $\hat{x} = 0^N$.

**Lemma 23.** Let $\hat{x}$ denote the output of NWMS($\lambda, h, w$). If $\hat{x}_v = 1$, then there exists a deviation $\beta \in B_2^{(w)}$ corresponding to a $w$-weighted 2-tree such that $\langle \lambda, \beta \rangle \leq 0$.

**Proof.** We prove the contrapositive statement. Assume that $\hat{x} \neq 0^N$. Hence, there exists a variable node $v$ for which $\hat{x}_v = 1$. Consider $T_v^{2h} = (\hat{V} \cup \hat{J}, \hat{E})$. Then, by Corollary 21, there exists a valid configuration $z^* \in \{0, 1\}^{|V|}$ in $T_v^{2h}$ with $z^*_v = 1$ that satisfies

\[
\forall \text{valid configuration } y \in T_v^{2h}. W_{T_v^{2h}}(z^*) \leq W_{T_v^{2h}}(y). \tag{23}
\]

Let $T(z^*)$ denote the subgraph of $T_v^{2h}$ induced by $\hat{V}(z^*) \cup N(\hat{V}(z^*))$ where $\hat{V}(z^*) = \{p \in \hat{V} | z^*_p = 1\}$. Note that $T(z^*)$ is a forest. Because $z^*_v = 1$ and $z^*$ is a valid configuration, the forest $T(z^*)$ must contain a 2-tree of height $2h$ rooted at the node $v$; denote this tree by $T$. Let $\tau \in \{0, 1\}^{|V|}$ denote the support of $T$, and let $z^0 \in \{0, 1\}^{|V|}$ denote the support of $T(z^*) \setminus T$. Then, $z^* = \tau + z^0$, where $z^0$ is also necessarily a valid configuration. By linearity and disjointness of $\tau$ and $z^0$, we have

\[
W_{T_v^{2h}}(z^*) = W_{T_v^{2h}}(\tau + z^0) = W_{T_v^{2h}}(\tau) + W_{T_v^{2h}}(z^0). \tag{24}
\]

Because $z^0$ is a valid configuration, by Equation (23), we have $W_{T_v^{2h}}(z^*) \leq W_{T_v^{2h}}(z^0)$. By Equation (24), $W_{T_v^{2h}}(\tau) \leq 0$.

Let $w^*_\tau \in R^{|V|}$ denote the vector whose component indexed by $p \in \hat{V}$ equals $W_{T_v^{2h}}(p) \cdot \tau_p$. The vector $w^*_\tau$ equals to the $w$-weighted 2-tree $w_\tau$ according to Definition 3. Hence, $\beta = \pi_{G, T, w} \in B_2^{(w)}$ satisfies $\langle \lambda, \beta \rangle = W_{T_v^{2h}}(\tau) \leq 0$. We therefore conclude that $0^N$ is not $(h, w, 2)$-locally optimal w.r.t. $\lambda$ and the lemma follows. 

\[\square\]
7.1.4 Symmetry and the All-Zero Codeword Assumption

We define symmetric decoding algorithms (see [RU08, Definition 4.81] for a discussion of symmetry in message passing algorithms).

**Definition 24** (symmetry of decoding algorithm). Let $x \in C$ denote a codeword and let $b \in \{\pm 1\}^N$ denote a vector defined by $b_i = (-1)^{x_i}$. Let $\lambda$ denote an LLR vector. A decoding algorithm, $\text{DEC}(\lambda)$, is symmetric with respect to code $C$, if

$$\forall x \in C. \quad x \oplus \text{DEC}(\lambda) = \text{DEC}(b \ast \lambda).$$

(25)

The following lemma states that NWMS algorithm is symmetric. The proof is by induction on the number of iterations.

**Lemma 25** (symmetry of NWMS). Fix $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Consider $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and a codeword $x \in C(G)$. Let $b \in \{\pm 1\}^N$ denote a vector defined by $b_i = (-1)^{x_i}$. Then,

$$x \oplus \text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w) = \text{NWMS}(b \ast \lambda, h, w).$$

(26)

**Proof.** Let $\mu_{v \rightarrow C}[l][\lambda]$ denote the message sent from $v$ to $C$ in iteration $l$ given an input $\lambda$. Let $\mu_{C \rightarrow v}[l][\lambda]$ denote the corresponding message from $C$ to $v$. From the decision of NWMS in Line 12, it’s sufficient to prove that $\mu_{v \rightarrow C}[l][\lambda] = (-1)^{x_v} \cdot \mu_{v \rightarrow C}[b \ast \lambda]$ and $\mu_{C \rightarrow v}[l][\lambda] = (-1)^{x_v} \cdot \mu_{C \rightarrow v}[b \ast \lambda]$ for every $0 \leq l \leq h - 1$.

The proof is by induction on $l$. The induction basis, for $l = -1$, holds because $\mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(-1)}[\lambda] = (-1)^{x_v} \cdot \mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(-1)}[b \ast \lambda] = 0$ for every codeword $x$.

The induction step is proven as follows. By induction hypothesis we have

$$\mu_{v \rightarrow C}[l][\lambda] = \frac{w_{h-l}}{\deg_G(v)} \lambda_v + \frac{1}{\deg_G(v) - 1} \sum_{C' \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{C\}} \mu_{C' \rightarrow v}[l-1][\lambda]$$

$$= (-1)^{x_v} \cdot \left( \frac{w_{h-l}}{\deg_G(v)} (-1)^{x_v} \lambda_v + \frac{1}{\deg_G(v) - 1} \sum_{C' \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{C\}} \mu_{C' \rightarrow v}[l-1][b \ast \lambda] \right)$$

$$= (-1)^{x_v} \cdot \mu_{v \rightarrow C}[l][b \ast \lambda].$$
For check to variable messages we have by induction hypothesis,

\[
\mu^{(l)}_{C \rightarrow v}[\lambda] = \left( \prod_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} \text{sign}(\mu^{(l)}_{u \rightarrow C}[\lambda]) \right) \cdot \min_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} \{ |\mu^{(l)}_{u \rightarrow C}[\lambda]| \}
\]

\[
= \left( \prod_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} \text{sign}\((-1)^{x_u} \cdot \mu^{(l)}_{u \rightarrow C}[b \ast \lambda]) \right) \cdot \min_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} \{ |(-1)^{x_u} \cdot \mu^{(l)}_{u \rightarrow C}[b \ast \lambda]| \}
\]

\[
= \left( \prod_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} (-1)^{x_u} \right) \cdot \mu^{(l)}_{C \rightarrow v}[b \ast \lambda].
\]

Because \(x\) is codeword, for every single parity check \(C\) we have \(\prod_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} (-1)^{x_u} = (-1)^{x_v}\). Therefore, \(\mu^{(l)}_{C \rightarrow v}[\lambda] = (-1)^{x_v} \cdot \mu^{(l)}_{C \rightarrow v}[b \ast \lambda]\) and the claim follows.

The following corollary follows from Lemma 25 and the symmetry of an MBIOS channel.

**Corollary 26** (All-zero codeword assumption). Fix \(h \in \mathbb{N}_+\) and \(w \in \mathbb{R}^N_+\). For MBIOS channels, the probability that NWMS fails is independent of the transmitted codeword. That is,

\[
\Pr\{\text{NWMS decoding fails} \} = \Pr\{\text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w) \neq 0^N | c = 0^N\}.
\]

**Proof.** Following Lemma 25 for every codeword \(x\),

\[
\Pr\{\text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w) \neq x | c = x\} = \Pr\{\text{NWMS}(b \ast \lambda, h, w) \neq 0^N | c = x\}.
\]

For MBIOS channels, \(\Pr(\lambda_i | 0) = \Pr(-\lambda_i | 1)\). Therefore, the mapping \((x, \lambda) \mapsto (0^N, b \ast \lambda)\) preserves probability measure. We apply this mapping to \((x, b \ast \lambda) \mapsto (0^N, b \ast b \ast \lambda)\) and conclude that

\[
\Pr\{\text{NWMS}(b \ast \lambda, h, w) \neq 0^N | c = x\} = \Pr\{\text{NWMS}(\lambda, h, w) \neq 0^N | c = 0^N\}.
\]

\[\square\]

8 Bounds on the Error Probability of LP-Decoding Using Local-Optimality

In this section we analyze the probability that a local optimality certificate for regular Tanner codes exists, and therefore LP decoding succeeds. The analysis is based on the study of a “sum-min-sum” process that characterizes \(d\)-trees of a regular Tanner graph. We prove upper bounds on the error probability of LP decoding of regular Tanner codes in memoryless channels. The upper bounds on the error probability imply lower bounds on the threshold of LP decoding.
We apply the analysis to the binary symmetric channel, and compare our results with previous results on expander codes. The analysis presented in this section generalizes the probabilistic analysis of Arora et al. [ADS09] from 2-trees (skinny trees) to d-trees for any \( d \geq 2 \).

In the remainder of this section, we restrict our discussion to \((d_L, d_R)\)-regular Tanner codes with minimum local distance \(d^*\). Let \(d\) denote a parameter such that \(2 \leq d \leq d^*\).

Theorem 27 summarizes the main results presented in this section for binary symmetric channels, and generalizes to any MBIOS channel as described in Section 8.3. Concrete bounds are given for a \((2, 16)\)-regular Tanner code with code rate at least 0.375 when using \([16, 11, 4]\)-extended Hamming codes as local codes.

**Theorem 27.** Let \( G \) denote a \((d_L, d_R)\)-regular bipartite graph with girth \(g\), and let \( C(G) \) denote a Tanner code based on \( G \) with minimum local distance \(d^*\). Let \( x \in C(G) \) be a codeword. Suppose that \( y \in \{0, 1\}^N \) is obtained from \( x \) by flipping every bit independently with probability \( p \). Then,

1. **[finite length bound]** Let \( d = d_0, p \leq p_0, (d_L, d_R) = (2, 16), \) and \( d^* = 4 \). For the values of \( d_0 \) and \( p_0 \) in Table I, it holds that \( x \) is the unique optimal solution to the LP decoder with probability at least

\[
\Pr(x^{LP}(y) = x) \geq 1 - N \cdot \alpha^{(d_1 - 1)(\frac{1}{2})}
\]

for some constant \( \alpha < 1 \).

2. **[asymptotic bound]** Let \( d = d_0, (d_L, d_R) = (2, 16), d^* = 4, \) and \( g = \Omega(\log N) \) sufficiently large. For the values of \( d_0 \) and \( p_0 \) in Table I, it holds that \( x \) is the unique optimal solution to the LP decoder with probability at least \( 1 - \exp(-N^3) \) for some constant \( 0 < \delta < 1 \), provided that \( p \leq p_0(d_0) \).

3. Let \( d' \triangleq d - 1, d'_L \triangleq d_L - 1, \) and \( d'_R \triangleq d_R - 1 \). For any \((d_L, d_R)\) and \( 2 \leq d' \leq d^* \) s.t. \( d'_L \cdot d'_R \geq 2 \), the codeword \( x \) is the unique optimal solution to the LP decoder with probability at least \( 1 - N \cdot \alpha^{(d'_L, d'_R)(\frac{1}{2})} \) for some constant \( \alpha < 1 \), provided that

\[
\min_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha_1(p, d, d_L, d_R, t) \cdot \alpha_2(p, d, d_L, d_R, t)^{(\frac{1}{2})} \right\} < 1,
\]

where

\[
\alpha_1(p, d, d_L, d_R, t) = \sum_{k=0}^{d'_R - 1} \left( \binom{d'_R}{k} \right) (1 - p)^{(d'_R - k)} e^{-t(d'_R - 2k)} + \sum_{k=d'_R}^{d'_R} \left( \binom{d'_R}{k} \right) p^k (1 - p)^{d'_R - k} e^{d'_R},
\]

\[
\alpha_2(p, d, d_L, d_R, t) = \left( \binom{d'_R}{d'_R} \right) (1 - p)^{-t} + p e^t d'_R.
\]
Table 1: Computed values of $p_0$ for finite $d_0 < d^*$ in Theorem 27. Values are presented for (2, 16)-Tanner code with rate at least 0.375 when using [16, 11, 4]-extended Hamming codes as local codes. (a) finite-length bound: $\forall p \leq p_0$ bound on the word error probability that is inverse doubly-exponential in the girth of the Tanner graph. (b) asymptotic-bound: For $g = \Omega(\log N)$ sufficiently large, LP decoder succeeds w.p. at least $1 - \exp(-N^{\delta})$ for some constant $0 < \delta < 1$, provided that $p \leq p_0(d_0)$.

Proof Outline. Theorem 27 follows from Lemma 30, Lemma 33, Corollary 36, and Corollary 37 as follows. The first part, that states a finite-length result, follows from Lemma 30 and Corollaries 36 and 37 by taking $s = 0 < h < \frac{1}{4}girth(G)$ which holds for any Tanner graph $G$. The second part, that deals with an asymptotic result, follows from Lemma 30 and Corollaries 36 and 37 by fixing $s = 10$ and taking $g = \Omega(\log N)$ sufficiently large such that $s < h = \Theta(\log N) < \frac{1}{4}girth(G)$. It therefore provides a lower bound on the threshold of LP-decoding. The third part, that states a finite-length result for any $(d_L, d_R)$-regular LDPC code, follows from Lemma 30 and Lemma 33. We refer the reader to Section 9.2 for a discussion on the results stated in Theorem 27.

We now provide more details and prove the lemmas and corollaries used in the proof of Theorem 27.

In order to simplify the probabilistic analysis of algorithms for decoding linear codes over symmetric channels, we apply the assumption that the all-zero codeword is transmitted, i.e., $c = 0^N$. Note that the correctness of the all-zero assumption depends on the employed decoding algorithm. Although this assumption is trivial for ML decoding because of the symmetry of a linear code $C(G)$, it is not immediately clear in the context of LP-decoding. Feldman et al. [Fel03, FWK05] noticed that the fundamental polytope $P(G)$ of Tanner codes with single parity-check local codes is highly symmetric, and proved that for binary-input output-symmetric channels, the probability that the LP decoder fails is independent of the transmitted codeword. The symmetry property of the polytope remains also for the generalized fundamental polytope of Tanner codes based on non-trivial linear local codes. Therefore, one can assume that $c = 0^N$ when analyzing LP-decoding failure for linear Tanner codes. The following corollary is the contrapositive statement of Theorem 10 given $c = 0^N$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$d_0$</th>
<th>$p_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“finite”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“asymptotic”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Corollary 28.** For every fixed \( h \in \mathbb{N} \), \( w \in \mathbb{R}^h_+ \setminus \{0^h\} \), and \( 2 \leq d \leq d^* \),

\[
\Pr\{\text{LP decoding fails}\} \leq \Pr\{\exists \beta \in \mathcal{B}_d^{(w)} \text{ such that } \langle \lambda, \beta \rangle \leq 0 | c = 0^N \}.
\]

### 8.1 Bounding Processes on Trees

Let \( G \) be a \((d_L, d_R)\)-regular Tanner graph, and fix \( h < \frac{1}{4} \text{girth}(G) \). Let \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_0}(G) \) denote the path-prefix tree rooted at a variable node \( v_0 \) with height \( 2h \). Since \( h < \frac{1}{4} \text{girth}(G) \), it follows that the projection of \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_0}(G) \) to \( G \) is a tree. We direct the edges of \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_0}(G) \) so that it is an in-branching directed toward the root \( v_0 \) (i.e., paths from all nodes are directed toward the root \( v_0 \)). For \( l \in \{0, \ldots, 2h\} \), denote by \( V_l \) the set of vertices of \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_0} \) at height \( l \) (the leaves have height \( 0 \) and the root has height \( 2h \)). Let \( \tau \subseteq V(\mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_0}) \) denote the vertex set of a \( d \)-tree rooted at \( v_0 \).

**Definition 29 ((h, w, d)-Process on a \((d_L, d_R)\)-Tree).** Let \( \omega \in \mathbb{R}_+^h \) denote a weight vector. Let \( \lambda \) denote an assignment of real values to the variable nodes of \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_0} \), we define the \( \omega \)-weighted value of a \( d \)-tree \( \tau \) by

\[
\text{val}_\omega(\tau; \lambda) \triangleq \sum_{l=0}^{h-1} \sum_{v \in \tau \cap V_2l} \omega_l \cdot \lambda_v.
\]

Namely, the sum of the values of variable nodes in \( \tau \) weighted according to their height.

Given a probability distribution over assignments \( \lambda \), we are interested in the probability

\[
\Pi_{\lambda, d_L, d_R}(h, \omega) \triangleq \Pr\lambda\left\{ \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{v_0}^{2h}, \mathcal{T}_{v_1}^{2h}} \text{val}_\omega(\tau; \lambda) \leq 0 \right\}.
\]

In other words, \( \Pi_{\lambda, d_L, d_R}(h, \omega) \) is the probability that the minimum value over all \( d \)-trees of height \( 2h \) rooted in some variable node \( v_0 \) in a \((d_L, d_R)\)-bipartite graph \( G \) is non-positive. For every two roots \( v_0 \) and \( v_1 \) the trees \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_0} \) and \( \mathcal{T}^{2h}_{v_1} \) are isomorphic, hence \( \Pi_{\lambda, d_L, d_R}(h, \omega) \) does not depend on the root \( v_0 \).

With this notation, the following lemma connects between the \((h, w, d)\)-process on \((d_L, d_R)\)-trees and the event where the all-zero codeword is \((h, w, d)\)-locally optimal. We apply a union bound utilizing Corollary 28 as follows.

**Lemma 30.** Let \( G \) be a \((d_L, d_R)\)-regular bipartite graph and \( w \in \mathbb{R}_+^h \setminus \{0^h\} \) be a weight vector with \( h < \frac{1}{4} \text{girth}(G) \). Assume that the all-zero codeword is transmitted, and let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N \) denote the LLR vector received from the channel. Then, \( 0^N \) is \((h, w, d)\)-locally optimal w.r.t. \( \lambda \) with probability at least

\[
1 - N \cdot \Pi_{\lambda, d_L, d_R}(h, \omega), \quad \text{where } \omega_l = w_{h-l} \cdot d_L^{-1} \cdot (d_L - 1)^{l-h+1} \cdot (d - 1)^{h-l},
\]

and with at least the same probability, \( 0^N \) is also the unique optimal LP solution given \( \lambda \).
Note the two different weight notations that we use for consistency with [ADS09]: (i) \( w \) denotes weight vector in the context of \((h, w, d)\)-local optimality certificate, and (ii) \( \omega \) denotes weight vector in the context of \(d\)-trees in the \((h, \omega, d)\)-process. A one-to-one correspondence between these two vectors is given by \( \omega_l = w_{h-l} \cdot d_L^{l-1} \cdot (d_L - 1)^{l-h+1} \cdot (d - 1)^{h-l} \) for \( 0 \leq l < h \). From this point on, we will use only \( \omega \) in this section.

Following Lemma 30, it is sufficient to estimate the probability \( \Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R} (h, \omega) \) for a given weight vector \( \omega \), a distribution of a random vector \( \lambda \), constant \( 2 \leq d \leq d^* \), and degrees \((d_L, d_R)\).

Arora et al. [ADS09] introduced a recursion for estimating and bounding the probability of the existence of a \(2\)-tree (skinny tree) with non-positive value in a \((h, \omega, 2)\)-process. We generalize the recursion and its analysis to \(d\)-trees with \( 2 \leq d \leq d^* \).

For a set \( S \) of real values, let \( \min_{[i]} \{S\} \) denote the \( i \)th smallest member in \( S \). Let \( \{\gamma\} \) denote an ensemble of i.i.d. random variables. Define random variables \( X_0, \ldots, X_{h-1} \) and \( Y_0, \ldots, Y_{h-1} \) with the following recursion:

\[
Y_0 = \omega_0 \gamma \tag{28}
\]

\[
X_l = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \min_{[i]} \{ Y_l^{(1)}, \ldots, Y_l^{(d_R-1)} \} \quad (0 \leq l < h) \tag{29}
\]

\[
Y_l = \omega_l \gamma + X_{l-1}^{(1)} + \ldots + X_{l-1}^{(d_L-1)} \quad (0 < l < h) \tag{30}
\]

The notation \( X^{(1)}, \ldots, X^{(k)} \) and \( Y^{(1)}, \ldots, Y^{(k)} \) denotes \( k \) mutually independent copies of the random variables \( X \) and \( Y \), respectively. Each instance of \( Y_l, 0 \leq l < h \), uses an independent instance of a random variable \( \gamma \). Note that for every \( 0 \leq l < h \), the \( d - 1 \) order statistic random variables \( \{ \min_{[i]} \{ Y_l^{(1)}, \ldots, Y_l^{(d_R-1)} \} \mid 1 \leq i \leq d - 1 \} \) in Equation (29) are dependent.

Consider a directed tree \( T = T_{v_0} \) of height \( 2h \), rooted at node \( v_0 \). Associate variable nodes of \( T \) at height \( 2l \) with copies of \( Y_l \), and check nodes at height \( 2l + 1 \) with copies of \( X_l \), for \( 0 \leq l < h \). Note that any realization of the random variables \( \{\gamma\} \) to variable nodes in \( T \) can be viewed as an assignment \( \lambda \). Thus, the minimum value of a \(d\)-tree of \( T \) equals \( \sum_{i=1}^{d_L} X_{h-1}^{(i)} \). This implies that the recursion in (28)-(30) defines a dynamic programming algorithm for computing \( \min_{\tau \in T_{[v_0, 2h, d]}} \text{val}_\omega (\tau; \lambda) \). Now, let the components of the LLR vector \( \lambda \) be i.i.d. random variables distributed identically to \( \{\gamma\} \), then

\[
\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R} (h, \omega) = \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{d_L} X_{h-1}^{(i)} \leq 0 \right\} . \tag{31}
\]

Given a distribution of \( \{\gamma\} \) and a finite “height” \( h \), the challenge is to compute the distribution of \( X_l \) and \( Y_l \) according to the recursion in (28)-(30). The following two lemmas play a major role in proving bounds on \( \Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R} (h, \omega) \).
Lemma 31 ([ADS09]). For every $t \geq 0$,

$$
\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h,\omega) \leq \left(\mathbb{E}e^{-tX_{h-1}}\right)^{d_L}.
$$

Let $d' \triangleq d - 1, d'_L \triangleq d_L - 1$ and $d'_R \triangleq d_R - 1$.

Lemma 32 (following [ADS09]). For $0 \leq s < l < h$, we have

$$
\mathbb{E}e^{-tX_l} \leq \left(\mathbb{E}e^{-tX_s}\right)^{(d'_L \cdot d'_R)^{l-s}} \cdot \prod_{k=0}^{l-s-1} \left(\left(\frac{d'_R}{d'}\right)^{(d'_L \cdot d'_R)^k}\right).
$$

Proof. See Appendix B.

In the following subsection we present concrete bounds on $\Pi_{\lambda,d,L,d_R}(h,\omega)$ for the BSC. The bounds are based on Lemmas 31 and 32. The technique used to derive concrete bounds for the BSC may be applied to other MBIOS channels. For example, concrete bounds for the BI-AWGN channel can be derived by a generalization of the analysis presented in [HE11].

8.2 Analysis for Binary Symmetric Channel

Consider the binary symmetric channel with crossover probability $p$ denoted by BSC($p$). In the case that the all-zero codeword is transmitted, the channel input is $c_i = 0$ for every $i$. Hence, $\Pr(\lambda_i = -\log(\frac{1-p}{p})) = p$, and $\Pr(\lambda_i = +\log(\frac{1-p}{p})) = 1 - p$. Since $\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h,\omega)$ is invariant under positive scaling of the vector $\lambda$, we consider in the following analysis the scaled vector $\lambda$ in which $\lambda_i = +1$ w.p. $p$, and $-1$ w.p. $(1 - p)$.

Following the analysis of Arora et al. [ADS09], we apply a simple analysis in the case of uniform weight vector $\omega$. Then, we present improved bounds by using a non-uniform weight vector.

8.2.1 Uniform Weights

Consider the case where $\omega = 1^h$. Let $\alpha_1 \triangleq \mathbb{E}e^{-tX_0}$ and $\alpha_2 \triangleq \left(\frac{d'_R}{d'}\right)(\mathbb{E}e^{-t\gamma})^{d'_R}$ where $\gamma$ i.i.d. $\sim \lambda_i$, and define $\alpha \triangleq \min_{t \geq 0} \alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2^{1/(d'_L \cdot d'_R - 1)}$. Note that $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ (see Equation (37)). We consider the
case where $\alpha < 1$. By substituting notations of $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ in Lemma 32 for $s = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}e^{-tX_l} \leq \left( \mathbb{E}e^{-tX_0} \right)^{(d'_L \cdot d')^l} \cdot \prod_{k=0}^{l-1} \left( \frac{d'_R}{d'} \right) \left( \mathbb{E}e^{-t\gamma} \right)^{d'_L \cdot d'^k}$$

$$= \alpha_1^{(d'_L \cdot d')^l} \cdot \prod_{k=0}^{l-1} \alpha_2^{(d'_L \cdot d')^k}$$

$$= \alpha_1^{(d'_L \cdot d')^l} \cdot \alpha_2^{\sum_{k=0}^{l-1} (d'_L \cdot d')^k}$$

$$= \alpha_1^{(d'_L \cdot d')^l} \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \cdot \frac{1}{d'_L \cdot d'^{-1}}$$

$$= \left( \alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2 \cdot \frac{1}{d'_L \cdot d'^{-1}} \right)^{(d'_L \cdot d')^l} \cdot \alpha_2^{-\frac{1}{d'_L \cdot d'^{-1}}}$$

$$\leq \alpha^{(d'_L \cdot d')^l - 1}.$$ 

By Lemma 31 we conclude that

$$\Pi_{\lambda, d, d_L, d_R}(h, 1^h) \leq \alpha^{d'_L \cdot (d'_L \cdot d')^h - 1}.$$ 

To analyze parameters for which $\Pi_{\lambda, d, d_L, d_R}(h, 1^h) \rightarrow 0$, we need to compute $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ as functions of $p, d, d_L$ and $d_R$. Note that

$$X_0 = \begin{cases} 
  d' - 2k & \text{w.p. } \binom{d'_R}{k} p^k (1-p)^{d'_R-k}, \forall k. 0 \leq k < d', \\
  -d' & \text{w.p. } \sum_{k=d'}^{d'_R} \binom{d'_R}{k} p^k (1-p)^{d'_R-k}.
\end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Therefore,

$$\alpha_1(p, d, d_L, d_R, t) = \sum_{k=0}^{d'-1} \binom{d'_R}{k} p^k (1-p)^{d'_R-k} e^{-t(d'-2k)} \quad (33)$$

$$+ \sum_{k=d'}^{d'_R} \binom{d'_R}{k} p^k (1-p)^{d'_R-k} e^{td'}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\alpha_2(p, d, d_L, d_R, t) = \frac{d'_R}{d'} \left( (1-p)e^{-t} + pe^t \right)^{d'} \quad (34).$$

The above calculations give the following bound on $\Pi_{\lambda, d, d_L, d_R}(h, 1^h)$.

**Lemma 33.** Let $p \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and let $d, d_L, d_R \geq 2$ s.t. $d'_L \cdot d' \geq 2$. Denote by $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ the functions defined in (33)-(34), and let

$$\alpha = \min_{t > 0} \left\{ \left( \alpha_1(p, d, d_L, d_R, t) \right) \cdot \left( \alpha_2(p, d, d_L, d_R, t) \right)^{1/(d'_L \cdot d'^{-1})} \right\}.$$ 
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Then, for $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w = 1^h$, we have

$$
\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, \omega) \leq \alpha^{d_L \cdot d'_L \cdot h - 1 - d_L}.
$$

Note that if $\alpha < 1$, then $\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, 1^h)$ decreases doubly-exponentially as a function of $h$.

For $(2, 16)$-regular graphs and $d \in \{3, 4\}$, we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 34.** Let $d_L = 2$, and $d_R = 16$.

1. Let $d = 3$ and $p \leq 0.0067$. Then, there exists a constant $\alpha < 1$ such that for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w = 1^h$,

$$
\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, 1^h) \leq \alpha^{2h - 1}.
$$

2. Let $d = 4$ and $p \leq 0.0165$. Then, there exists a constant $\alpha < 1$ such that for every $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w = 1^h$,

$$
\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, 1^h) \leq \alpha^{3h - 1}.
$$

The bound on $p$ for which Corollary 34 applies grows with $d$. This fact confirms that analysis based on denser trees, i.e., $d$-trees with $d > 2$ instead of skinny trees, implies better bounds on the error probability and higher lower bounds on the threshold. Also, for $d > 2$, we may apply the analysis to $(2, d_R)$-regular codes; a case that is not applicable by the analysis of Arora et al. [ADS09].

### 8.2.2 Improved Bounds Using Non-Uniform Weights

The following lemma implies an improved bound for $\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, \omega)$ using a non-uniform weight vector $\omega$.

**Lemma 35.** Let $p \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and let $d, d_L, d_R \geq 2$ s.t. $d'_L \cdot d' \geq 2$. For $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and a weight vector $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^s_+$, let

$$
\alpha = \min_{t \geq 0} \{ \mathbb{E}e^{-tX_s} \} \cdot \left( \left( \frac{d'_R}{d'} \right) \left( 2\sqrt{p(1-p)} \right)^{d'} \right)^{\frac{1}{d'_L \cdot d'_R - 1}}. \tag{35}
$$

Let $\omega^{(\rho)} \in \mathbb{R}^h_+$ denote the concatenation of the vector $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^s_+$ and the vector $(\rho, \ldots, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}^{h-s}$. Then, for every $h > s$ there exists a constant $\rho > 0$ such that

$$
\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, \omega^{(\rho)}) \leq \left( \left( \frac{d'_R}{d'} \right) \left( 2\sqrt{p(1-p)} \right)^{d'} \right)^{\frac{1}{d'_L \cdot d'_R - 1}} \cdot \alpha^{d_L \cdot (d'_L \cdot d')^{h-s-1}}.
$$

**Proof.** See Appendix C
Table 2: Computed values of $p_0$ for finite $s$ in Corollary 36. Values are presented for $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 16)$ and $d = 3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>$p_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider a weight vector $\overline{\omega}$ with components $\overline{\omega}_l = ((d_L - 1)(d - 1))^l$. This weight vector has the effect that every level in a skinny tree $\tau$ contributes equally to $val_\tau(\tau; |\lambda|)$ (note that $|\lambda| \equiv 1$). For $h > s$, consider a weight vector $\omega^{(\rho)} \in \mathbb{R}_+^h$ defined by

$$\omega_l^{(\rho)} = \begin{cases} \overline{\omega}_l & \text{if } 0 \leq l < s, \\ \rho & \text{if } s \leq l < h. \end{cases}$$

Note that the first $s$ components of $\omega^{(\rho)}$ are geometric while the other components are uniform.

For a given $p$, $d$, $d_L$, and $d_R$, and for a concrete value $s$ we can compute the distribution of $X_s$ using the recursion in (28)-(30). Moreover, we can also compute the value $\min_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} e^{-tX_s}$. For $(2, 16)$-regular graphs we obtain the following corollaries. Corollary 36 is stated for the case where $d = 3$, and Corollary 37 is stated for the case where $d = 4$.

**Corollary 36.** Let $p \leq p_0$, $d = 3$, $d_L = 2$, and $d_R = 16$. For the following values of $p_0$ and $s$ in Table 2 it holds that there exists constants $\rho > 0$ and $\alpha < 1$ such that for every $h > s$,

$$\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, \omega^{(\rho)}) \leq \frac{1}{420} \left( p(1 - p) \right)^{-1} \cdot \alpha^{2^{h-s}}.$$

**Corollary 37.** Let $p \leq p_0$, $d = 4$, $d_L = 2$, and $d_R = 16$. For the following values of $p_0$ and $s$ in Table 3 it holds that there exists constants $\rho > 0$ and $\alpha < 1$ such that for every $h > s$,

$$\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, \omega^{(\rho)}) \leq \frac{1}{60} \left( p(1 - p) \right)^{-1} \cdot \alpha^{3^{h-s}}.$$

Note that for a fixed $s$, the probability $\Pi_{\lambda,d,d_L,d_R}(h, \omega)$ decreases doubly-exponentially as a function of $h$.

### 8.3 Analysis for MBIOS Channels

Theorem 27 generalizes to MBIOS channels as follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s</th>
<th>$p_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Computed values of $p_0$ for finite $s$ in Corollary 37. Values are presented for $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 16)$ and $d = 4$.

**Theorem 38.** Let $G$ denote a $(d_L, d_R)$-regular bipartite graph with girth $\Omega(\log N)$, and let $C(G) \subset \{0, 1\}^N$ denote a Tanner code based on $G$ with minimum local distance $d^*$. Consider an MBIOS channel, and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^N$ denote the LLR vector received from the channel given $c = 0^N$. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ denote a random variable independent and identically distributed to components of $\lambda$. Then, for any $(d_L, d_R)$ and $2 \leq d \leq d^*$ s.t. $(d_L - 1)(d - 1) \geq 2$, LP-decoding succeeds with probability at least $1 - \exp(-N\delta)$ for some constant $0 < \delta < 1$, provided that

$$
\min_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \mathbb{E}e^{-tX_0} \cdot \left( \frac{d_R - 1}{d - 1} \right)^{(d-1)} \left( \mathbb{E}e^{-t\gamma} \right)^{(d-1)} \right\} < 1,
$$

where $X_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \min\{\gamma^{(i)}, \ldots, \gamma^{(d_R - 1)}\}$ and the random variables $\gamma^{(i)}$ are independent and distributed identically to $\gamma$.

## 9 Conclusions and Discussion

We present a new combinatorial characterization of local-optimality for Tanner codes with respect to any MBIOS channel. This characterization provides an ML-certificate and an LP-certificate for a given codeword. Moreover, the certificate can be efficiently computed by a dynamic programming algorithm. Two applications of local-optimality are presented based on this new characterization. (i) A new message passing decoding algorithm for irregular LDPC codes, called NWMS. The NWMS algorithm is guaranteed to find the locally optimal codeword if one exists. (ii) Bounds for LP-decoding failure are proved in the case of regular Tanner codes. We discuss these two applications of local-optimality in the following subsections.

### 9.1 Applying NWMS Algorithm to Regular LDPC Codes

The NWMS algorithm is a generalization of the min-sum algorithm (a.k.a. max-product in the probability-domain) and other BP-based decoding algorithms in the following sense. When restricted to regular Tanner graphs and exponential level weights (to cancel the normalization in the variable node degrees), the NWMS algorithm reduces to the standard min-sum algo-
rithm [WLK95, Wib96]. Reductions of NWMS to other BP-based algorithms (see e.g., attenuated max-product [FK00] and normalized BP-based [CF02, CDE+05]) can be obtained by other weight level functions.

Many works on the BP-based decoding algorithms study the convergence of message passing algorithms (e.g., [WF01, WJW05, RU01, JP11]). In particular, bounds on the time and message complexity are not considered. The analyses in these works rely on the existence of a single optimal solution in addition to other conditions such as: a single cycle, large girth, large reweighing coefficient, consistency conditions, etc. On the other hand, the NWMS algorithm is guaranteed to compute the ML codeword within $h$ iterations if a locally optimal certificate of depth $h$ exists for some codeword. Moreover, the certificate can be computed efficiently (see Algorithm [1]).

In previous works [ADS09, HE11], the probability that a locally optimal certificate of depth $h$ exists for some codeword was investigated for regular LDPC codes with $h < \frac{1}{4} \text{girth}(G)$. Consider $(d_L, d_R)$-regular LDPC code whose Tanner graph $G$ has logarithmic girth, let $h < \frac{1}{4} \text{girth}(G)$ and define a constant weight vector $w \triangleq 1^h$. In that case, the message normalization by variable node degrees has the effect that each level of variable nodes in a 2-tree contributes equally to the cost of the $w$-weighted value of the 2-tree. Hence, the set $B_2^{(w)}$ of deviations equals to the set of $(d_L - 1)$-exponentially weighted skinny trees [ADS09, HE11]. Following Equation (20), we conclude that the previous bounds on the probability that a locally optimal certificate exists [ADS09, HE11] apply also to the probability of NWMS decoding success.

Consider $(3, 6)$-regular LDPC codes whose Tanner graphs $G$ have logarithmic girth, and let $h = \frac{1}{3} \text{girth}(G)$ and $w = 1^h$. Then, NWMS($\lambda, h, w$) succeeds in recovering the transmitted codeword with probability at least $1 - \exp(-N\delta)$ for some constant $0 < \delta < 1$ in the following cases: (1) In a BSC with crossover probability $p < 0.05$ (implied by [ADS09, Theorem 5]). (2) In a BI-AWGN channel with $\frac{E_b}{N_0} \geq 2.67$dB (implied by [HE11, Theorem 1]).

It remains to explore good weighting schemes (choice of vectors $w$) for specific families of irregular LDPC codes, and prove that a locally optimal codeword exists with high probability provided that the noise is bounded. Such a result would imply that NWMS decoding algorithm is a good efficient replacement for LP-decoding.

### 9.2 Bounds on the Word Error Probability for LP-Decoding of Tanner Codes

In Section 8 we proved bounds on the word error probability of LP-decoding of regular Tanner codes. In particular, we considered a concrete example of $(2, 16)$-regular Tanner codes with [16, 11, 4]-Hamming codes as local-codes and Tanner graphs with logarithmic girth. The rate of such codes is at least 0.375. For the case of a BSC with crossover probability $p$, we prove...
a lower bound of \( p^* = 0.044 \) on the noise threshold. Below that threshold the word error probability decreases doubly exponential in the girth of the Tanner graph.

Most of the research on the error correction of Tanner codes deals with families of expander Tanner codes. How do the bounds presented in Section 8 compare with results on expander Tanner codes? The error correction capability of expander codes depends on the expansion, thus a fairly large degree and huge block-lengths are required to achieve good error correction. Our example for which results are stated in Theorem 27(1) and 27(2) relies only on a 16-regular graph with logarithmic girth. Sipser and Spielman [SS96] studied Tanner codes based on expander graphs and analyzed a simple bit-flipping iterative decoding algorithm. Their novel scheme was later improved, and it was shown that expander Tanner codes can even \textit{asymptotically} achieve capacity in the BSC with an iterative decoding bit-flipping scheme [Z01, BZ02, BZ04]. In these works, a worst-case analysis (for an adversarial channel) was performed as well.

The best result for iterative decoding of such expander codes, reported by Skachek and Roth [SR03], implies a lower bound of \( p^* = 0.0016 \) on the threshold of a certain iterative decoder for rate 0.375 codes. Feldman and Stein [FS05] proved that LP-decoding can \textit{asymptotically} achieve capacity with a special family of expander Tanner codes. They also presented a worst-case analysis, which in the case of a code rate of 0.375, proves that LP decoding can recover any pattern of at most 0.0008\( N \) bit flips. This implies a lower bound of \( p^* = 0.0008 \) on the noise threshold. These analyses yield overly pessimistic predictions for the average-case (i.e., the BSC). Theorem 27(2) deals with average case analysis and implies that LP-decoding can correct up to 0.044\( N \) bit flips with high probability. Furthermore, previous iterative decoding algorithms for expander Tanner codes deal only with bit-flipping channels. Our analysis for LP-decoding applies to any MBIOS channel, in particular, it can be applied to the BI-AWGN channel.

However, the lower bounds on the noise threshold proved for Tanner codes do not improve the best previous bounds for regular LDPC codes. An open question is whether using deviations denser than skinny trees for Tanner codes can beat the best previous bounds for regular LDPC codes [ADS09, HE11]. In particular, for a concrete family of Tanner codes with rate \( \frac{1}{2} \), it would be interesting to prove lower bounds on the threshold of LP-decoding that are larger than \( p^* = 0.05 \) in the case of BSC, and \( \sigma^* = 0.0735 \) in the case of BI-AWGN channel.

### A Optimal Valid Subconfigurations in the Execution of NWMS2

The description of algorithm NWMS2 as a dynamic programming deals with computation of optimal valid configurations and subconfigurations. In this appendix we define optimal valid subconfigurations and prove invariants for the messages of Algorithm NWMS2.
Denote by $T_{C \rightarrow v}^{2l+2}$ a path prefix tree of $G$ rooted at node $v$ with height $2l+2$ such that all paths must start with edge $(v, C)$ (see Figure 2(a)). Denote by $T_{v \rightarrow C}^{2l+1}$ a path prefix tree of $G$ rooted at node $C$ with height $2l+1$ such that all paths must start with edge $(C, v)$ (see Figure 2(b)).

Consider the message $\mu_{C \rightarrow v}^{(2l+2)}$. It is determined by the messages sent along the edges of $T_{v \rightarrow C}^{2l+1}(G)$ that hang from the edge $(v, C)$. We introduce the following notation of this subtree (see Figure 3). Consider a path-prefix tree $T_{r}^{2h}(G)$ and a variable path $p$ such that (1) $p$ is a path from root $r$ to a variable node $v$, (2) the last edge in $p$ is $(C', v)$ for $C' \neq C$, and (3) the length of $p$ is $2(h - l) - 1$. In such a case, $T_{C \rightarrow v}^{2l+2}$ is isomorphic to the subtree of $T_{r}^{2h}$ hanging from $p$ along the edge $(p, p \circ (v, C))$. Hence, we say that $T_{C \rightarrow v}^{2l+2}$ is a substructure of $T_{r}^{2h}(G)$. Similarly, if there exists a backtracless path $q$ in $G$ from $r$ to $C$ with length $2(h - l) - 1$ that does not end with edge $(v, C)$, we say that $T_{v \rightarrow C}^{2l+1}$ is a substructure of $T_{r}^{2h}(G)$.

Let $T_{\text{sub}}$ denote a substructure $T_{C \rightarrow v}^{2l+2}$ or $T_{v \rightarrow C}^{2l+1}$. A binary assignment $z \in \{0, 1\}^{|\hat{\mathcal{V}}(T_{\text{sub}})|}$ to variable paths $\hat{\mathcal{V}}(T_{\text{sub}})$ is a valid subconfiguration if it satisfies every parity-check path $q \in T_{\text{sub}}$ such that $|q| \geq 1$. We denote the set of valid subconfigurations of $T_{\text{sub}}$ by $\text{config}(T_{\text{sub}})$.

Define the weight of a variable path $q \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}(T_{\text{sub}})$ with respect to level weights $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_h) \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^h$ by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{sub}}(T_{\text{sub}}, q) \triangleq \frac{w_{h-l+1+\lfloor |q|/2 \rfloor}}{\deg_G(t(q))} \prod_{q' \in \text{Prefix}(q) \cap \hat{\mathcal{V}}(T_{\text{sub}})} \frac{1}{\deg_G(t(q')) - 1}.$$ 

The weight of a valid subconfiguration $z$ for a substructure $T_{\text{sub}}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{sub}}(T_{\text{sub}}, z) \triangleq \sum_{\{q \in \hat{\mathcal{V}}(T_{\text{sub}}) || q || \geq 1\}} \lambda_{t(q)}(z_q) \cdot \mathcal{W}_{\text{sub}}(T_{\text{sub}}, q).$$
Figure 3: $T^{2l+2}_{C \rightarrow v}$ as a substructure isomorphic to a subtree of the path-prefix tree $T^{2h}_{r}$. 

Define minimum weight of substructures $T^{2l+1}_{v \rightarrow C}$ and $T^{2l+2}_{C \rightarrow v}$ for $a \in \{0, 1\}$ as follows. 

$W_{\text{sub}}^{\min}(T^{2l+1}_{v \rightarrow C}, a) \triangleq \min \{ W_{\text{sub}}(T^{2l+1}_{v \rightarrow C}, z) \mid z \in \text{config}(T^{2l+1}_{v \rightarrow C}), z_{C,v} = a \}$, and 

$W_{\text{sub}}^{\min}(T^{2l+2}_{C \rightarrow v}, a) \triangleq \min \{ W_{\text{sub}}(T^{2l+2}_{C \rightarrow v}, z) \mid z \in \text{config}(T^{2l+2}_{C \rightarrow v}), z_{v} = a \}$. 

The minimum weight substructures satisfy the following recurrences. 

**Proposition 39.** Let $a \in \{0, 1\}$, then 

1. for every $1 \leq l \leq h - 1$, 

$$W_{\text{sub}}^{\min}(T^{2l+1}_{v \rightarrow C}, a) = \frac{w_{h-l}}{\deg_G(v)} \cdot \lambda_{v}(a) + \frac{1}{\deg_G(v) - 1} \cdot \sum_{C' \in \mathcal{N}(v) \setminus \{C\}} W_{\text{sub}}^{\min}(T^{2l-1}_{C' \rightarrow v}, a).$$ 

2. for every $0 \leq l \leq h - 1$, 

$$W_{\text{sub}}^{\min}(T^{2l+2}_{C \rightarrow v}, a) = \min \left\{ \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(C) \setminus \{v\}} W_{\text{sub}}^{\min}(T^{2l+1}_{u \rightarrow C}, x_u) \mid x \in \{0, 1\}^{\deg_G(C)}, \|x\|_1 \text{ even}, x_v = a \right\}.$$ 

The following claim states an invariant over the messages $\mu^{l}_{C \rightarrow v}(a)$ and $\mu^{l}_{v \rightarrow C}(a)$ that holds during the execution of NWMS2.
Claim 40. Consider an execution of NWMS2(λ(0), λ(1), h, w). Then, for every 0 ≤ l ≤ h − 1,

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu^{(l)}_{v \rightarrow C}(a) &= \mathcal{W}^\text{sub}_{\gamma}(T^{2l+1}_{v \rightarrow C}, a), \quad \text{and} \\
\mu^{(l)}_{C \rightarrow v}(a) &= \mathcal{W}^\text{sub}_{\gamma}(T^{2l+2}_{C \rightarrow v}, a).
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. The proof is by induction on l. The induction basis, for l = 0, holds because \(\mu^{(0)}_{v \rightarrow C}(a) = \mathcal{W}^\text{sub}_{\gamma}(T^1_{v \rightarrow C}, a) = \frac{w_h}{\deg_G(v)} \lambda_v(a)\) for every edge \((v, C)\) of \(G\). The induction step follows directly from the induction hypothesis and Proposition 39.

B Proof of Lemma 32

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on the difference \(l - s\). We first derive an equality for \(E e^{-tY_l}\) and a bound for \(E e^{-tX_l}\). Since \(Y_l\) is the sum of mutually independent variables,

\[
E e^{-tY_l} = (E e^{-t\omega\gamma})(E e^{-tX_{l-1}})^d'_L.
\]

(36)

By definition of \(X_l\) we have the following bound,

\[
e^{-tX_l} = e^{-t \sum_{j=1}^{d'_L} \min\{Y^{(i)}_l : 1 \leq i \leq d'_R\}} = \prod_{j=1}^{d'_L} e^{-t \min\{Y^{(i)}_l : 1 \leq i \leq d'_R\}} \leq \sum_{S \subseteq [d'_R]} \prod_{i \in S} e^{-tY^{(i)}_l}.
\]

By linearity of expectation and since \([Y^{(i)}_l : i = 1]\) are mutually independent variables, we have

\[
E e^{-tX_l} \leq \left(\frac{d'_R}{d'_L}\right) \left(E e^{-t\omega\gamma}\right)^{d'_L}.
\]

(37)

By substituting (36) in (37), we get

\[
E e^{-tX_l} \leq \left(E e^{-tX_{l-1}}\right)^{d'_L} \left(\frac{d'_R}{d'_L}\right) \left(E e^{-t\omega\gamma}\right)^{d'_L}.
\]

(38)

which proves the induction basis where \(s = l - 1\). Suppose, therefore, that the lemma holds for \(l - s = i\), we now prove it for \(l - (s - 1) = i + 1\). Then by substituting (38) in the induction
which concludes the correctness of the induction step for a difference of \( l - s + 1 \). □

C Proof of Lemma 35

Proof. By Lemma 32 we have

\[
E^{-tX_h-1} \leq \left( E^{-tX_s} \right)^{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}} \cdot \left( \left( d'_{R,j} \left( E^{-t_{l-1}} \right) \right)^{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}} \right) \frac{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}}{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}}.
\]

Note that \( E^{-t_{l+1}} \) is minimized for \( t_{l+1} = \sqrt{p(1-p)} \). Hence,

\[
E^{-tX_h-1} \leq \left( E^{-tX_s} \right)^{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}} \cdot \left( \left( d'_{R,j} \left( 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)} \right) \right)^{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}} \right) \frac{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}}{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}}
\]

\[
\leq \left( E^{-tX_s} \right)^{\left( \left( d'_{R,j} \left( 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)} \right) \right)^{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}} \right)} \cdot \left( \left( d'_{R,j} \left( 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)} \right) \right)^{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}} \right) \frac{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}}{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}}.
\]

Let \( \alpha \triangleq \min_{t \geq 0} \left\{ E^{-tX_s} \left( \left( d'_{R,j} \left( 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)} \right) \right)^{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}} \right) \right\} \). Let \( t^* = \arg \min_{t \geq 0} E^{-tX_s} \), then

\[
E^{-t^*X_h-1} \leq \alpha \left( d'_{L,d}^{h-s-1} \right) \cdot \left( \left( d'_{R,j} \left( 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)} \right) \right) \right)^{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}} \frac{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}}{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}}.
\]

Using Lemma 31, we conclude that

\[
\Pi_{\lambda,dL,dR}^{(h,\omega')}(d'_{L,d}^{h-s-1} \cdot \left( \left( d'_{R,j} \left( 2 \sqrt{p(1-p)} \right) \right) \right)^{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}} \frac{(d'_{L,d})^{h-s-1}}{d_{L,d}^{h-s-1}}},
\]

and the lemma follows. □
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