

# SC-LDPC Codes Over $\mathbb{F}_q$ : Minimum Distance, Decoding Analysis and Threshold Saturation

Jiaxin Lyu, Guanghui He, *Member, IEEE,*

## Abstract

We investigate random spatially coupled low-density parity-check (SC-LDPC) code ensembles over finite fields. Under different variable-node edge-spreading rules, the random Tanner graphs of several coupled ensembles are defined by multiple independent, uniformly random monomial maps. The two main coupled ensembles considered are referred to as the standard coupled ensemble and the improved coupled ensemble. We prove that both coupled ensembles exhibit asymptotically good minimum distance and minimum stopping set size. Theoretical and numerical results show that the improved coupled ensemble can achieve better distance performance than the standard coupled ensemble. We introduce the essential preliminaries and analytical tools needed to analyze the iterative decoding threshold of coupled ensembles over any finite field. We consider a class of memoryless channels with special symmetry—termed  $q$ -ary input memoryless symmetric channels (QMSCs)—and show that, for these channels, the distribution of channel messages (in form of probability vectors) likewise exhibits this symmetry. Consequently, we define symmetric probability measures and their reference measures on a finite-dimensional probability simplex, analyze their foundational properties and those of their linear functionals, endow their respective spaces with metric topologies, and conduct an in-depth study of their degradation theory. Based on our analytical framework, we establish a universal threshold saturation result for both of the coupled ensembles over a  $q$ -ary finite field on QMSCs. Specifically, as the coupling parameters increase, the belief-propagation threshold of a coupled system saturates to a well-defined threshold that depends only on the underlying ensemble and the channel family.

## Index Terms

Spatially coupled low-density parity-check (SC-LDPC) codes, minimum distance, belief propagation (BP),  $q$ -ary-input memoryless symmetric channels (QMSCs), symmetric probability measures, threshold saturation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

**L**OW-DENSITY parity-check (LDPC) convolutional codes, originally introduced by Felström and Zigangirov [1], have shown remarkable performance under low-complexity iterative decoding [2]–[5]. Compared to their block code counterparts, terminated LDPC convolutional code ensembles typically exhibit better asymptotic belief propagation (BP) thresholds, which can be further improved by increasing the connectivity in their Tanner graphs. The underlying mechanism, referred to as *threshold saturation via spatial coupling*, was first introduced by Kudekar *et al.* and proven for regular LDPC ensembles over the binary erasure channel (BEC) [6], and the corresponding results were subsequently extended to general binary-input memoryless output-symmetric (BMS) channels and irregular LDPC ensembles [7]–[9]. In a typical spatially coupled (SC) ensemble derived from a random LDPC block code ensemble, multiple copies of variable and check nodes from the underlying ensemble are sequentially arranged, locally and randomly coupled, and terminated at both boundaries, forming a chain structure. The termination at the boundaries leads to a large number of low-degree check nodes, which can be considered as perfect side information for decoding. Such perfect information propagates inward during iterative BP decoding and thereby significantly improves performance. As the length of the coupled chain and the coupling width increase, the BP threshold of the coupled ensemble saturates at the maximum *a posteriori* (MAP) threshold of the underlying ensemble, while the design rate of the coupled ensemble converges to that of the underlying ensemble [6]–[9]. Moreover, carefully designed SC-LDPC codes can inherit asymptotically good minimum distance performance from their underlying ensembles, e.g., protograph-based regular SC-LDPC codes due to Mitchell *et al.* [10]–[13]. Hence, spatial coupling exhibits great potential in designing good LDPC codes with both capacity-approaching thresholds and low error floors under low-complexity BP decoding over general BMS channels. For more details of SC-LDPC codes, see [14] for a comprehensive review, [6], [7] for rigorous construction and asymptotic analysis of random ensembles, and [12], [15]–[17] for finite-length scaling.

While extensive theoretical results have been established for binary SC-LDPC ensembles transmitted over BMS channels, the theoretical results for their nonbinary extensions, e.g., SC-LDPC ensembles over finite fields, remain relatively underdeveloped. Compared to binary LDPC codes, those defined over nonbinary finite fields generally offer a superior performance-length trade-off and are better suited for bandwidth-efficient modulation schemes. For example, Davey and Mackay showed that LDPC codes defined over binary extension fields can significantly improve performance at short-to-moderate code lengths when transmitted over binary-input channels [18]. Many works have already considered the analysis, construction, or optimization of SC-LDPC codes over nonbinary finite fields. In [19], Piemontese *et al.* analyzed the MAP threshold of coupled ensembles over binary extension fields under the binary erasure channel (BEC) and observed a threshold saturation phenomenon similar to that in the binary case. In [20], Wei *et al.* studied the asymptotic performance of nonbinary coupled ensembles with windowed decoding, under both the BEC and the binary-input additive white Gaussian noise channel (BIAWGNC). In [21], Andriyanova *et al.* proved the saturation of the BP threshold of coupled ensembles over binary extension fields to the potential threshold, defined

by Kumar *et al.* [9], under the BEC. In [22], Huang *et al.* compared the finite-length performance of nonbinary protograph-based block-LDPC and SC-LDPC codes with their binary counterparts, highlighting their trade-offs in performance, complexity and latency. In [23], Zhang *et al.* investigated random and protograph-based coupled ensembles over binary extension fields, and by optimizing non-uniform variable-to-check node connections, they achieved better BP thresholds and reduced rate loss. In [24], Hareedy *et al.* optimized nonbinary SC-LDPC codes using the weight consistency matrix framework, and significantly improved their FER performance. To the best of the authors' knowledge, the threshold saturation property of coupled ensembles over nonbinary finite fields has not yet been rigorously proven for general nonbinary-input channels. In our view, this might stem from the absence of comprehensive theoretical tools and results, similar to those available for BMS channels [25, Sec. IV], when performing iterative decoding analysis under the nonbinary cases. Furthermore, theoretical results of the minimum distance of nonbinary coupled ensembles are relatively scarce, and, to our knowledge, no study has yet established whether SC-LDPC codes over an arbitrary finite fields can have asymptotically good distance performance.

In this paper, we investigate two classes of random SC-LDPC code ensembles over any finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and show that they have asymptotically good distance properties. By developing analysis tools and foundational results for iterative decoding over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , we establish a universal threshold saturation result for these coupled ensembles. Our main contributions are as follows.

We construct the random Tanner graph of the coupled ensemble via variable-node edge spreading and multiple independent, uniformly random monomial maps, thereby constructing random code ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We consider two distinct variable-node edge-spreading rules, leading to two distinct coupled ensembles: one is a direct extension of the existing binary coupled ensemble in [6, Sec. II-B] and thus is referred to as the standard coupled ensemble, and the other is referred to as the improved coupled ensemble, which appears to exhibit stronger coupling gain in terms of distance properties. By analyzing their weight and stopping set distributions, we show that both of the coupled ensembles can have asymptotically good minimum distances and minimum stopping set sizes. More precisely, let  $d_l, d_r$  and  $n$  denote the variable-node degree, check-node degree, and the number of variable nodes of the underlying code graph, respectively; let  $w \geq d_l$  denote the coupling width and  $L$  measure the length of the coupling chain. Then we have the following probabilistic result.

*Theorem 1.1 (Informal Version of Theorems 3.18 and 3.23):* Let  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  denote the corresponding random coupled code (or graph) with block-length (or number of variable nodes)  $2Ln$ . Then for  $d_r \geq d_l \geq 3$  and any  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L})$

$$\Pr\{d(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} = \Theta(n^{c(q, d_l)})$$

for some constant  $c(q, d_l) < 0$  depending only on  $q$  and  $d_l$ . For a random code (or graph)  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$ ,  $d(\cdot)$  denotes its minimum distance (or stopping set size), and  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$  denotes the smallest positive zero of the asymptotic growth rate function of its average weight (or stopping set) distribution, which is always well defined.

Theoretical and numerical results show that under identical ensemble parameters, the improved coupled ensemble can achieve superior distance performance (measured by the zero  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$ ) compared to the standard coupled ensemble.

We develop analytical tools and establish many underlying results for the theoretical analysis of iterative decoding over any finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We consider a class of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -input memoryless channels with a certain symmetry, whose channel symmetry group contains the additive and multiplicative groups over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  as subgroups. Under transmission over such channels, the distribution of channel messages, in the form of length- $q$  probability vectors, also exhibits analogous symmetry. Consequently, we introduce the concepts of symmetric probability measures and their reference probability measures on the  $(q-1)$ -dimensional probability simplex. Metric topologies for the spaces of these two types of probability measures are established, and theoretical results on the degradation of symmetric probability measures are studied. It is worth noting that, although many of the results in this part have already been established for BMS channels, i.e.,  $q = 2$  (see, for example, [25, Sec. IV]), they might be entirely new for  $q \geq 3$ . This may be because the existing analytical tools developed for the binary case, like metric topology and degradation of distributions, are not fully applicable to nonbinary settings, as will be elaborated in Section IV. Leveraging our framework, we derive the threshold property and the stability condition for uncoupled LDPC code systems over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  under BP decoding.

We establish a universal threshold saturation result for random SC-LDPC codes over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , when transmission occurs over a family of the aforementioned  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -input memoryless symmetric channels. Specifically, as the coupling parameters  $L, w$  increase, the BP threshold of the coupled ensemble saturates to a well-defined threshold determined *solely* by the underlying ensemble and the channel family. For example, consider a  $(d_l, d_r)$ -regular ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and a complete  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -input symmetric channel family  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$  parameterized by its entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation (see Definition 4.30). Let  $h_c^{\text{BP}}(d_l, d_r, w, L, \{\mathbf{c}_h\})$  denote the BP threshold of the (either standard or improved) coupled ensemble  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  over  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$ , and let  $h^{\text{FP}}(d_l, d_r, \{\mathbf{c}_h\})$  denote a well-defined threshold, characterized by the nontrivial density evolution fixed points of the uncoupled  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble over  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$  (see Definition 5.11). By first increasing  $L$  and then increasing  $w$ , we have the following threshold saturation result.

*Theorem 1.2 (A Corollary of Theorems 5.12):* For  $d_l \geq 3$

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} h_c^{\text{BP}}(d_l, d_r, w, L, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}) = \lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} h_c^{\text{BP}}(d_l, d_r, w, L, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}) = h^{\text{FP}}(d_l, d_r, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}).$$

Similar results also hold for irregular cases, provided that the uncoupled system with degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$  is stable at the channel entropy  $h^{\text{FP}}(\lambda, \rho, \{\mathbf{c}_h\})$  (see Theorem 4.35 for the stability condition). Note that in Theorem 1.2, the design rate of the coupled ensemble converges to that of its underlying ensemble. Our proof of threshold saturation relies on the preliminary

results established in Section IV, and on the potential functional tools developed by Kumar *et al.* in [9]. However, our definition of the target threshold for saturation,  $h^{FP}$ , differs from the so-called potential threshold  $h^*$  in [9, Def. 28], and one always has  $h^{FP} \geq h^*$ . Under the binary case, we show that if the uncoupled system is stable at the channel entropy  $h^*$ , then  $h^{FP} = h^*$  and thus our threshold saturation result (Theorem 5.12) coincides with that of Kumar *et al.* [9, Thms. 45, 47].

With the threshold saturation result established, an open question remains whether, as the connectivity of the underlying graph increases, the threshold  $h^{FP}$  can universally approach the Shannon threshold of the underlying ensemble, which is  $\frac{d_l}{d_r} \log q$  in Theorem 1.2. For the binary case, the answer to this question is affirmative [7], [9]. The approach adopted in [9] exploits the lower-bound property of the replica-symmetric (RS) estimate of the code-induced conditional entropy [26]–[29], whereby the MAP threshold of the underlying ensemble can serve as an intermediate threshold to establish the limit-approaching behavior of  $h^{FP}$ . However, in the nonbinary case, due to the more challenging nature of the physical model, the lower-bound property of analogous RS formulas appears hard to establish using existing methods from statistical physics (e.g., [26]), and consequently this approach breaks down for  $q \geq 3$ . Nevertheless, the limit-approaching behavior of  $h^{FP}$  may be numerically observed. Our numerical results in Section V-B show that, under Gallager's  $q$ -ary symmetric channel family with  $q = 3$ , as  $d_l$  and  $d_r$  increase while  $\frac{d_l}{d_r}$  remains fixed, a numerical upper bound estimate on  $h^{FP}$  indeed approaches the Shannon threshold  $\frac{d_l}{d_r} \log q$ .

This paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we present our basic notations and conventions. In Section III, we define random SC-LDPC code ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and analyze their distance performance. In Section IV, we establish the foundational results and analytical tools for iterative decoding over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . In Section V, we establish the threshold saturation result for coupled ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Finally, Section VI summarizes this paper and discusses a potential extension of our work. Several secondary results and technical proofs are provided in the appendices.

## II. NOTATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

In this section, we present some fundamental notations and conventions that will be used throughout the rest of this paper.

The symbols  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}^+$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_n$  denote the ring of integers, the set of nonnegative integers, the set of positive integers, the field of real numbers, and the group of all permutations on  $n$  letters, respectively. Given a prime power  $q \geq 2$ , the finite field of order  $q$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and the multiplicative subgroup of nonzero elements in  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ . Given two groups  $G_1, G_2$ , we denote  $G_2 \leq G_1$  (or  $G_1 \geq G_2$ ) to mean that  $G_2$  is a subgroup of  $G_1$ . The  $n$ -fold Cartesian product of a set  $A$  is denoted by  $A^n$ , and a length- $n$  vector is typically denoted by an underline,  $\underline{a}$  (sometimes in bold,  $\mathbf{a}$ ), e.g.,  $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  where  $a_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th element of  $\underline{a}$ . The Hamming weight of any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$  is denoted by  $w(\mathbf{x})$ . For any function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , the  $n$ -fold Cartesian product of  $f$  is the function  $f^n : X^n \rightarrow Y^n$ , given by  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n))$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in X^n$ . For real-valued sequences  $f(n)$  and  $g(n)$  with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the asymptotic  $O$ -notation  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  means that there exist positive constants  $M$  and  $n_0$  such that  $|f(n)| \leq M|g(n)|$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . The asymptotic  $o$ -notation  $f(n) = o(g(n))$  means that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists positive constant  $n_0$  such that  $|f(n)| \leq \varepsilon g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . The asymptotic  $\Theta$ -notation  $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$  means that there exist positive constants  $c_1, c_2$  and  $n_0$ , such that  $c_1 g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . Throughout this paper, all logarithms are taken to the natural base. For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , the largest integer not exceeding  $x$  is denoted by  $\lfloor x \rfloor$ , while the smallest integer not less than  $x$  is denoted by  $\lceil x \rceil$ . Given a prime power  $q$ , the entropy function  $H_q : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \log q]$  is defined by  $x \mapsto -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x) + x \log(q-1) \forall x \in [0, 1]$ . It is well-known that  $H_q(x)$  is strictly concave in  $x$ , and that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left[ \binom{n}{\alpha n} (q-1)^{\alpha n} \right] = H_q(\alpha)$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .

A metric space is a pair  $(X, d)$  where  $X$  is a set and  $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  a distance metric. The space  $(X, d)$  is complete if every Cauchy sequence converges to a point in  $X$ , is totally bounded if every sequence in  $X$  admits a Cauchy subsequence, and is compact if it is complete and totally bounded. For a metric space  $(X, d)$ , compactness is also equivalent to sequential compactness—that is, every sequence in  $X$  has a convergent subsequence whose limit is in  $X$ . A subset  $A \subset X$  is closed if it contains all of its limit points, and  $A$  is open if and only if its complement  $X \setminus A$  is closed. Consequently, for a compact metric space  $(X, d)$ , every closed subset  $A \subset X$  is sequentially compact and thus  $(A, d)$  forms a compact metric space. The space  $(X, d)$  is separable if it contains a countable dense subset  $D \subset X$ . Since a compact space is totally bounded, compactness also implies separability. A Polish space is a separable completely metrizable topological space, that is, a space homeomorphic to a complete, separable metric space. As a result, a compact metric space is a Polish space. Given two metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a bijective mapping  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is called an isometric isomorphism, if  $d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) = d_X(x_1, x_2)$  for all  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ . In this case, the two metric spaces share the same topological properties. Given a metric space  $(X, d)$ , a function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called Lipschitz continuous, if there exists a constant  $L < +\infty$ , such that  $|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq Ld(x_1, x_2)$  for all  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ . In this case, we say  $f$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz. In this paper, when considering metric spaces in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we generally use the  $\ell_2$  distance as the metric. The  $\ell_2$  distance between any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted by the  $\ell_2$  norm  $\|x_1 - x_2\|$ .

A measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  consists of a nonempty sample space  $\Omega$  and a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\Omega$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a nonempty collection of subsets of  $\Omega$  satisfying 1)  $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$ ; 2) If  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ , then its complement  $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$ ; 3) If  $\{A_i\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  is any countable sequence, then  $\bigcup_i A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ . A measure  $\mu$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  is a function  $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  that satisfies 1)  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ ; 2)  $\mu(\bigcup_i A_i) = \sum_i \mu(A_i)$  for any countable pairwise disjoint  $\{A_i\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  (known as  $\sigma$ -additivity). For any measure  $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying the above two axioms, if  $\mu(\Omega) = 1$ , then  $\mu$  is called a probability measure and the triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  is called a probability space. For any set function  $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ , if  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -additive, then  $\mu$  is called a signed measure. When performing probability

analysis, the objectives being analyzed are relative to a basic probability space  $(\Omega_b, \mathcal{F}_b, \Pr)$ , where  $\Pr$  is our basic probability measure on  $(\Omega_b, \mathcal{F}_b)$ . For any event  $A \in \mathcal{F}_b$ ,  $\Pr(A)$  denotes the probability of  $A$ , and we say  $A$  occurs almost surely (a.s.) if  $\Pr(A) = 1$ . A random quantity is a measurable mapping from  $(\Omega_b, \mathcal{F}_b)$  to some measurable space. For example, a random quantity  $Z : \Omega_b \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  on a measurable space  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$  is given by  $\omega \mapsto Z(\omega)$  for  $\omega \in \Omega_b$  so that  $Z^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}_b$  for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , and  $Z$  induces a pushforward probability measure  $\mu$  on  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$ , given by  $\mu(B) = \Pr(Z^{-1}(B))$  for  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . In this case,  $\mu$  is called the distribution of  $Z$ , and we write  $Z \sim \mu$ . The smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega_b$  that makes  $Z$  measurable is the one generated by  $Z$ , namely  $\sigma(Z) := \{Z^{-1}(B) : B \in \mathcal{B}\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_b$ . We denote most random quantities by uppercase letters. Random LDPC codes over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and their random graph representations are frequently discussed. We use the notation like  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  to represent random codes and graphs, and refer to them as code and graph ensembles, respectively. For a nonrandom code or graph, we use the notation like  $C$  or  $G$ . For a metric space  $(\mathcal{X}, d)$ , the Borel- $\sigma$  algebra on  $\mathcal{X}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$ , is generated by all open subsets (and equivalently, all closed subsets) of  $\mathcal{X}$ , and any (probability or signed) measure  $\mu$  on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$  is called a Borel (probability or signed) measure. The space of all Borel probability measures on  $(\mathcal{X}, d)$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ . It is known that if  $\mathcal{X}$  is a Polish space, then  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  is also a Polish space under the weak topology,<sup>1</sup> and if  $\mathcal{X}$  is compact, then  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  is also compact. In this paper, for a Polish space  $(\mathcal{X}, d)$ , we consider the  $p$ -Wasserstein metric on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  to refine the aforementioned topological properties. For  $p \geq 1$  and any two Borel probability measures  $\mu, \nu$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , the  $p$ -Wasserstein metric between  $\mu, \nu$  is defined by [30, Def. 6.1]

$$W_p(\mu, \nu) := \left( \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} d(x, y)^p d\pi(x, y) \right)^{1/p},$$

where  $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$  denotes the set of all joint probability measures on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$  whose marginals are  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ . By definition,  $W_p$  is finite on the space of probability measures which have a finite moment of order  $p$ , called the Wasserstein space of order  $p$

$$\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X}) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \int_{\mathcal{X}} d(x_0, x)^p \mu(dx) < +\infty \right\},$$

where  $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$  can be arbitrarily chosen. It is known that  $W_p$  metrizes  $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})$  and convergence in  $(\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X}), W_p)$  is equivalent to weak convergence [30, Thm. 6.9],<sup>2</sup> and that if  $\mathcal{X}$  is a Polish (compact) space, then  $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})$  is also Polish (compact) [30, Thm. 6.18]. In this paper, random messages in the form of probability vectors are considered, and in our case,  $\mathcal{X}$  is a finite-dimensional probability simplex and is thus compact under the  $\ell_2$  distance. At this point,  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})$  for any  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), W_p)$  constitutes a compact metric space under the weak topology.

### III. COUPLED ENSEMBLES AND DISTANCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we define the coupled code and graph ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  considered in this paper, and study their distance properties, including the minimum distance and the minimum stopping set size.

#### A. Uncoupled LDPC Code Ensembles over $\mathbb{F}_q$

Let  $q \geq 2$  be a prime power. LDPC codes over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , similar to their binary counterparts, can be defined by bipartite Tanner graphs, where the variable nodes represent codeword symbols in  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and the check nodes represent parity checks. We assume each edge in the Tanner graph to be associated with some element from the multiplicative group  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ , so that the induced LDPC codes are linear over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We refer to such code graphs as  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ -labelled. An LDPC code is called *regular* if its Tanner graph is regular, i.e., all the variable nodes have the same degree and all the check nodes have the same degree. Otherwise, the code is referred to as *irregular*. The first ensemble of regular LDPC codes was proposed and studied by Gallager [31]. Subsequently, many (uncoupled) LDPC codes or code ensembles were defined [32]–[36]. Though most of these definitions are over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ , their extension to an arbitrary finite field is straightforward. In this work, we mainly focus on graph-based constructions, where graph connections can be defined by random permutations, due to Luby *et al.* [33] and Richardson *et al.* [34]. When  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ -labelled Tanner graphs are considered, extending a random permutation to a *random monomial map* admits a more compact definition.

**Definition 3.1 (Monomial Map):** For any  $\mathbf{c} \in (\mathbb{F}_q^\times)^n$  and permutation  $\pi_n \in \mathbb{S}_n$ , define the monomial map  $\xi_{\mathbf{c}, \pi_n} : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$  by

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto (c_1 x_{\pi_n^{-1}(1)}, c_2 x_{\pi_n^{-1}(2)}, \dots, c_n x_{\pi_n^{-1}(n)}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n.$$

Moreover, let  $\Xi_n$  denote a *uniformly random monomial map* on  $n$  letters in  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , i.e., the random map  $\Xi_n$  is uniformly distributed over the set of all such monomial maps  $\xi_{\mathbf{c}, \pi_n}$ .

We will briefly review the definition of regular LDPC code ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and some of their properties. A  $(d_l, d_r)$ -regular Tanner graph has variable-node degree  $d_l$  and check-node degree  $d_r$ , and we use  $n$  and  $m$  to denote the numbers of its variable nodes and check nodes, respectively. Clearly,  $m = \frac{d_l}{d_r} n$ .

<sup>1</sup>The weak topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  is the coarsest topology that makes the mappings  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \ni \mu \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\mu$  continuous for all bounded continuous  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

<sup>2</sup>Let  $(\mathcal{X}, d)$  be a metric space and  $\{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of probability measures on  $\mathcal{X}$ . We say that  $\mu_n$  converges weakly to a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\mu_n = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\mu$  for all bounded continuous  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**Definition 3.2 (Repetition and Check Maps):** A single repetition map  $f_{d_l}^{\text{rep}} : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^{d_l}$  with degree parameter  $d_l$  is given by  $v \mapsto (v, v, \dots, v)$ , and its  $n$ -fold Cartesian product is denoted by  $f_{d_l, n}^{\text{rep}} : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^{d_l n}$ . A single parity-check map  $f_{d_r}^{\text{chk}} : \mathbb{F}_q^{d_r} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$  with degree parameter  $d_r$  is given by  $v \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{d_r} v_i$ , and its  $m$ -fold Cartesian product is denoted by  $f_{d_r, m}^{\text{chk}} : \mathbb{F}_q^{d_r m} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$ .

**Definition 3.3 (( $d_l, d_r$ ) Ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ):** Let  $F_{d_l, d_r, n} : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$  be a random linear map defined by

$$\mathbf{v} \mapsto f_{d_r, m}^{\text{chk}}(\Xi_{d_l n}(f_{d_l, n}^{\text{rep}}(\mathbf{v}))) \quad \forall \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n.$$

A  $(d_l, d_r)$  regular LDPC code ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of block-length  $n$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n}$ , is defined as the *kernel* of  $F_{d_l, d_r, n}$ .

Readers familiar with the random bipartite graph model in [33], [34] may note that Definition 3.3 is a direct extension of the random Tanner graph definition for a binary regular ensemble, where the connections between variable nodes and check nodes (along with  $d_l n$  edge labels) are determined by the uniformly random monomial map  $\Xi_{d_l n}$ , and there might exist *multi-edge connections* in this random graph. Such a random Tanner graph of  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n}$ .

**Definition 3.4 (Weight and Stopping Set Distributions):** Let  $C_n$  be a linear code over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of block-length  $n$ , and  $G_n$  be one of its Tanner graph. The number of codewords (or stopping sets) of weight (or size)  $\ell$  ( $0 \leq \ell \leq n$ ) in the code  $C_n$  (or graph  $G_n$ ) is denoted by  $A_\ell(C_n)$  (or  $\tilde{A}_\ell(G_n)$ ).<sup>3</sup> The minimum distance of  $C_n$  and the minimum stopping set size (the size of the smallest nonempty stopping set) of  $G_n$  are denoted by  $d_{\min}(C_n)$  and  $d_{\text{ss}}(G_n)$ , respectively.

Note that, by the definition of stopping set, the stopping set distribution of a Tanner graph  $G_n$  depends only on the structure of  $G_n$ , and is independent of the edge labels and the field size  $q$ . The ensemble average weight (stopping set) distribution of  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n}$  ( $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n}$ ) is a known result, which is reviewed below.

**Theorem 3.5 (cf. [37]–[41]):** The average weight distribution of  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n}$  can be given by [37]–[39]

$$\mathbb{E}[A_\ell(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n})] = \frac{\binom{n}{\ell} \text{coeff} \{W_{q, d_r}(z)^m, z^{d_l \ell}\}}{\binom{d_l n}{d_l \ell} (q-1)^{(d_l-1)\ell}}, \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq n,$$

where the polynomial  $W_{q, d_r}(z) := \frac{1}{q} \{[1 + (q-1)z]^{d_r} + (q-1)(1-z)^{d_r}\}$  is the weight enumerator of a length- $d_r$  single parity-check code (i.e., the kernel of  $f_{d_r}^{\text{chk}}$ ) over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . The average stopping set distribution of  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n}$  can be given by [40], [41]

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n})] = \frac{\binom{n}{\ell} \text{coeff} \{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)^m, z^{d_l \ell}\}}{\binom{d_l n}{d_l \ell}}, \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq n,$$

where the polynomial  $\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z) := (1+z)^{d_r} - d_r z$  is the generating function for a degree- $d_r$  check node that selects  $k$  of its sockets, with  $0 \leq k \leq d_r$  and  $k \neq 1$ .

The asymptotic growth rate functions of the above average weight and stopping set distributions have also been well studied. Given a normalized weight (or size)  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , let

$$g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\alpha) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[A_{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n})], \quad \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\alpha) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n})]$$

be the corresponding asymptotic growth rate functions. Some related properties are reviewed as follows.

**Theorem 3.6 (cf. [39], [41]):** For any  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , the two growth rate functions can be evaluated by

$$\begin{aligned} g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\alpha) &= \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log \inf_{z > 0} \frac{W_{q, d_r}(z)}{z^{d_r \alpha}} - (d_l - 1)H_q(\alpha), \\ \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\alpha) &= \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log \inf_{z > 0} \frac{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)}{z^{d_r \alpha}} - (d_l - 1)H_2(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

and both  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\alpha)$  and  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\alpha)$  are continuous in  $\alpha$  on  $[0, 1]$ . Moreover, if  $d_r \geq d_l \geq 3$ , then  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}$  has a unique zero in  $(0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$ , denoted by  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$ ; if  $d_r, d_l \geq 3$ , then  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  has a unique zero in  $(0, 1)$ , denoted by  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$ .

The zeros  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$  are crucial for the probabilistic results concerning the minimum distance  $d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n})$  and the minimum stopping set size  $d_{\text{ss}}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n})$ . As shown in [39, Rem. 5.7], [41, p. 934], for the case where the design rate  $1 - \frac{d_l}{d_r}$  is fixed and the degrees  $d_l, d_r$  grow to infinity, the zero  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$  converges to the asymptotic Gilbert-Varshamov (GV) bound, while the zero  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$  converges to 0. We have the following achievability results for  $d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n})$  and  $d_{\text{ss}}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n})$ .

**Theorem 3.7 (cf. [39], [41], [42]):** If  $d_r \geq d_l \geq 3$ , then for any  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r})$ , from [39], [42]

$$\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, n}) \leq \alpha n\} = \begin{cases} \Theta(n^{2-d_l}), & q = 2, d_l \text{ is odd} \\ \Theta(n^{1-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $d_r, d_l \geq 3$ , then from [41, Thm. 8],  $\Pr\{d_{\text{ss}}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, n}) \leq \tilde{\alpha} n\} = \Theta(n^{1-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil})$  for any  $\tilde{\alpha} \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r})$ .

<sup>3</sup>In a Tanner graph, a subset  $U$  of variable nodes is called a stopping set if no check node is connected to  $U$  via a single edge.

We also consider irregular ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , which can be characterized by their degree profiles. Assume that all Tanner graphs under consideration contain no degree-one nodes. A node-perspective degree profile  $(\Lambda, P)$  is a pair of polynomials

$$\Lambda(x) = \sum_{l=2}^{l_{\max}} \Lambda_l x^l, \quad P(x) = \sum_{k=2}^{k_{\max}} P_k x^k \quad (1)$$

such that  $\Lambda_i$  ( $P_i$ ) denotes the fraction of variable (check) nodes of degree  $i$ , and  $\Lambda'(1)$  ( $P'(1)$ ) is the average degree of variable (check) nodes. Both  $\Lambda(x)$  and  $P(x)$  have nonnegative coefficients and satisfy the normalization condition  $\Lambda(1) = P(1) = 1$ . It is useful to define the corresponding edge-perspective degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$  by

$$\lambda(x) = \sum_l \lambda_l x^{l-1} := \frac{\Lambda'(x)}{\Lambda'(1)}, \quad \rho(x) = \sum_k \rho_k x^{k-1} := \frac{P'(x)}{P'(1)},$$

with  $\lambda_i$  ( $\rho_i$ ) being the fraction of edges adjacent to variable (check) nodes of degree  $i$ . The inverse relationships are given by  $\Lambda(x) = \int_0^x \lambda(z) dz / \int_0^1 \lambda(z) dz$  and  $P(x) = \int_0^x \rho(z) dz / \int_0^1 \rho(z) dz$ .

**Definition 3.8 (Irregular Ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ):** Given a node-perspective degree profile  $(\Lambda, P)$ , define the irregular repetition map  $f_{\Lambda, n}^{\text{rep}} : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^{\Lambda'(1)n}$  and the irregular parity-check map  $f_{P, m}^{\text{chk}} : \mathbb{F}_q^{P'(1)m} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$  by the Cartesian products

$$f_{\Lambda, n}^{\text{rep}} := f_{2, \Lambda_2 n}^{\text{rep}} \times \cdots \times f_{l_{\max}, \Lambda_{l_{\max}} n}^{\text{rep}}, \quad f_{P, m}^{\text{chk}} := f_{2, P_2 m}^{\text{chk}} \times \cdots \times f_{k_{\max}, P_{k_{\max}} m}^{\text{chk}},$$

where for each  $2 \leq l \leq l_{\max}$  and  $2 \leq k \leq k_{\max}$ , the single repetition map  $f_l^{\text{rep}}$  and its  $\Lambda_l n$ -fold Cartesian product  $f_{l, \Lambda_l n}^{\text{rep}}$ , and the single parity-check map  $f_k^{\text{chk}}$  and its  $P_k m$ -fold Cartesian product  $f_{k, P_k m}^{\text{chk}}$  follow Definition 3.2. Let  $F_{\Lambda, P, n} : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$  be a random linear map defined by  $\mathbf{v} \mapsto f_{P, m}^{\text{chk}}(\Xi_{\Lambda'(1)n}(f_{\Lambda, n}^{\text{rep}}(\mathbf{v})))$  for all  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ . Then a  $(\Lambda, P)$  (or  $(\lambda, \rho)$ ) LDPC code ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  of block-length  $n$  is defined as the kernel of  $F_{\Lambda, P, n}$ .

### B. Coupled Ensembles Over $\mathbb{F}_q$

We present our setup for coupled code and graph ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . As usual, the Tanner graph of a coupled ensemble can be obtained by coupling the Tanner graphs of multiple underlying ensembles. For clarity of exposition, we provide a specific definition for the case where the underlying Tanner graph is  $(d_l, d_r)$ -regular.

We still use  $d_l$  and  $d_r$  to represent the variable-node degree and the check-node degree of the underlying graph, respectively, and introduce the coupling parameters  $w, L \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $w$  represents the coupling width, and  $L$  measures the coupling chain length. Given a chain whose position index ranges from  $-\infty$  to  $+\infty$ , place  $n$  variable nodes at each position  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2L$ , and  $m = \frac{d_l}{d_r} n$  check nodes at each position  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2L + w - 1$ . These  $2Ln$  variable nodes are involved in encoding and correspond to codeword symbols in  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . In addition, place  $n$  “virtual” variable nodes at each position in  $[-(w-2), 0]$  and  $[2L+1, 2L+w-1]$ . These virtual variable nodes correspond to the zero element in  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , do not participate in encoding, and can be regarded as perfect side information induced by termination. For each of the  $n$  variable nodes at position  $k$ , we refer to the positions  $k, k+1, \dots, k+w-1$  as its *nearest w (check-node) positions*, while for each of the  $m$  check nodes at position  $k$ , we refer to the positions  $k-(w-1), k-(w-2), \dots, k$  as its *nearest w (variable-node) positions*. With coupling width  $w$ , any variable (or check) node can connect only to check (or variable) nodes located within its nearest  $w$  positions.

After the variable and check nodes are placed along the chain, the first step is to specify the edge spreading of the variable nodes, that is, to determine the check-node positions to which they are connected. To clarify the edge spreading of an individual variable node, we need the following concepts of *edge type* and *constellation*, which were first introduced in [6, Sec. II-B].

**Definition 3.9:** Consider any variable node at position  $k$ , and assign an arbitrary but fixed order to the  $d_l$  edges it emits. An *edge type*  $\underline{t} = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{w-1})$  is a  $w$ -tuple of natural numbers such that  $\sum_{i=0}^{w-1} t_i = d_l$ . The variable node is said to have edge type  $\underline{t}$  if, for each  $0 \leq i \leq w-1$ , there are  $t_i$  edges from this node absorbed by check-node sockets at position  $k+i$ . A *constellation*  $\underline{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{d_l})$  is a  $d_l$ -tuple of integers in  $[0, w-1]$ . The variable node is said to have constellation  $\underline{c}$  if, the  $j$ -th edges emanating from this node is absorbed by some check-node socket at position  $k+c_j$ .

Given any  $w \geq d_l$ , there are totally  $\binom{w+d_l-1}{d_l-1}$  edge types, and the set of all these edge types is denoted by  $\mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}$ . There are totally  $w^{d_l}$  constellations. For each  $\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}$ , there are totally  $\binom{d_l}{t}$  distinct constellations corresponding to the edge type  $\underline{t}$ , and the fraction of this part of constellations is denoted by

$$p_{w, d_l}(\underline{t}) := \binom{d_l}{t} / w^{d_l}, \quad \forall \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}.$$

The edge spreading of a single variable node can be described by its edge type. To describe the variable-node edge spreading of a coupled Tanner graph, we introduce the following definition of its edge-spreading profile.

**Definition 3.10 (Edge-Spreading Profile):** Let  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}$  be a subset of edge types and  $p$  be a probability distribution supported on  $\mathcal{T}$ . Under the above chain setting, a coupled Tanner graph is said to have edge-spreading profile  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$ , if all of its variable nodes can have edge types drawn only from  $\mathcal{T}$ , and at each position in  $[-(w-2), 2L+w-1]$ , a fraction  $p(\underline{t})$  of the  $n$  variable nodes have edge type  $\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ . Note that virtual variable nodes at the boundaries are also taken into account.




Fig. 1. An example of a coupled Tanner graph with  $d_l = 3$ ,  $d_r = 6$ ,  $w = 3$  and  $L = 2$ . Circles and squares represent variable and check nodes, respectively, and the edge spreading is subject to some profile. At the boundaries, there are arcs emanating from virtual variable nodes, which are not shown in this figure.

After the variable-node edge spreading is done according to any such profile  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$ , it is easy to verify that, the  $d_r m = d_l n$  check-node sockets at each position in  $[1, 2L+w-1]$  see  $\sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} p(t) n t_i = d_l n$  variable-node arcs (there exist arcs from virtual variable nodes at the boundaries). A random coupled Tanner graph with any fixed edge-spreading profile is defined by  $2L+w-1$  independent, uniformly random monomial maps  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Xi_{d_l n}^{(2L+w-1)}$ : for each  $k \in [1, 2L+w-1]$ , the connection between the  $d_l n$  variable-node arcs and check-node sockets at position  $k$ , as well as the  $d_l n$  edge labels from  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ , are given by the random map  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(k)}$ . See Fig. 1 for an example of such a random coupled graph.

We focus in particular on a class of edge-spreading profiles, subject to which each check-node position sees an equal number,  $d_l n / w$ , of variable-node arcs from each of its nearest  $w$  variable-node positions. Due to the uniformly random monomial maps, under this property, for each check node, each of its sockets is connected in a roughly independent and uniform manner to one of its nearest  $w$  variable-node positions. The term “roughly” means that this probability distribution deviates from the ideal uniform one by at most  $O(n^{-1})$ . In the asymptotic case, this property simplifies the density evolution equations for a coupled system; see Section V-A for details. An edge-spreading profile  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$  satisfies this property if and only if

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} p(t) t_i = d_l / w \quad \forall 0 \leq i \leq w-1. \quad (2)$$

Below we give three examples of  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$  satisfying (2), each of which specifies a class of coupled ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

**Definition 3.11**  $((d_l, d_r, L)$  Ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ): Assume that  $w = d_l$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{(1, \dots, 1)\}$  contains only a single all-ones edge type, then (2) trivially holds. The coupled ensemble with such an edge-spreading is called a  $(d_l, d_r, L)$  ensemble.

In Definition 3.11, all the  $d_l$  edges of each variable node are connected to  $d_l$  distinct check-node positions, so there are no multi-edge connections in the Tanner graph of this ensemble. For  $q = 2$ , this ensemble was first defined in [6, Sec. II-A].

**Definition 3.12** (Standard  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  Ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ): Assume that  $(\mathcal{T}, p) = (\mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}, p_{w, d_l})$ , i.e., variable nodes in the coupled graph can have all edge types from  $\mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}$ , then (2) holds. The coupled ensemble with such an edge-spreading is called a standard  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble.

The term “standard” is used because the above construction follows that in [6, Sec. II-B] for mainstream randomly constructed coupled ensembles. Note that there might be multi-edge connections in the Tanner graph of a standard coupled ensemble.

**Definition 3.13** (Improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  Ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ): Assume that  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$  is such that  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l} \cap \{0, 1\}^w$  and  $p$  is the uniform distribution over  $\mathcal{T}$ . In this case, each variable node always emits its  $d_l$  edges to  $d_l$  distinct check-node positions,<sup>4</sup> and  $p(t) = 1/\binom{w}{d_l}$  for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . One can easily verify that (2) holds. The coupled ensemble with such an edge-spreading is called an improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble.

Note that the above edge spreading prohibits multi-edge connections. For  $w = d_l$ , the improved ensemble is also a  $(d_l, d_r, L)$  ensemble. In Section III-C, we will see that distinct edge-spreading rules can lead to varying distance performance of coupled ensembles. In this regard, the improved ensemble exhibits better convolutional gain, which is why it is referred to as “improved.”

The above construction (through edge spreading and random monomial maps) of coupled ensembles can be easily extended to the case where the underlying code graph is irregular. To see this, let  $(\Lambda, P)$  be a node-perspective degree profile, as defined in (1), and  $w$  and  $L$  still measure the coupling width and length. At this time, each position along the chain has  $\Lambda_l n$  degree- $l$  ( $2 \leq l \leq l_{\max}$ ) variable nodes (with virtual variable nodes at the boundaries) and  $P_k m$  degree- $k$  ( $2 \leq k \leq k_{\max}$ ) check nodes, and we assume  $w \geq l_{\max}$ . Due to the irregularity of variable-node degrees, the edge-spreading profile in Definition 3.10 now takes the form  $\{(\mathcal{T}^{(l)}, p^{(l)}) : 2 \leq l \leq l_{\max}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{T}^{(l)} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{w, l}$  denotes the set of admissible edge types for degree- $l$  variable

<sup>4</sup>Such an edge-spreading idea is not new; for instance, it has already been adopted in [11] for constructing good graph-based coupled ensembles.

nodes, and  $p^{(l)}$  is a probability distribution supported on  $\mathcal{T}^{(l)}$ , such that at each position a fraction  $p^{(l)}(\underline{t})$  of the  $\Lambda_l n$  degree- $l$  variable nodes have edge type  $\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}^{(l)}$ . Under any such edge-spreading profile, it can be verified that at each position from 1 to  $2L+w-1$ , there are  $\Lambda'(1)n$  variable node arcs (with virtual variable node arcs at the boundaries) that need to be connected to the  $P'(1)m = \Lambda'(1)n$  check node sockets at that position. Then, one can use  $2L+w-1$  independent copies of a uniformly random monomial map  $\Xi_{\Lambda'(1)n}$  to determine these connections. We refer to this as a  $(\Lambda, P, w, L)$  (or  $(\lambda, \rho, w, L)$ , where  $(\lambda, \rho)$  is the edge-perspective degree profile) coupled ensemble. It is not hard to extend the edge-spreading rules in Definitions 3.12, 3.13 to this irregular case. For each degree  $l$ , one can set  $(\mathcal{T}^{(l)}, p^{(l)}) = (\mathcal{T}_{w,l}, p_{w,l})$  for a standard coupled ensemble, while for an improved coupled ensemble, one can set  $\mathcal{T}^{(l)} = \mathcal{T}_{w,l} \cap \{0, 1\}^w$  and let  $p^{(l)}$  be the uniform distribution over  $\mathcal{T}^{(l)}$ .

### C. Distance Analysis of Coupled Ensembles

We study the minimum distance and stopping set size of SC-LDPC codes over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  using random coding methods, by analyzing their weight and stopping set distributions. In the binary case, see [10]–[13], [43], [44] for related distance analyses of various ensembles of LDPC convolutional codes. Here, we consider the  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  coupled code and graph ensembles defined in Section III-B, where  $d_l, d_r, w, L$  are treated as constants independent of  $n$ , and we set  $K = 2L + w - 1$ .

*Definition 3.14 (Weight and Size Type):* Consider a  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  coupled ensemble with edge-spreading profile  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$ .

- 1) Let  $\underline{v} = (\underline{v}_1, \underline{v}_2, \dots, \underline{v}_{2L}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2Ln}$  be any possible codeword of some code drawn from this ensemble. For each  $1 \leq k \leq 2L$ , the component  $\underline{v}_k = (\underline{v}_{k,\underline{t}})_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$  of  $\underline{v}$  is taken by the  $n$  variable nodes at position  $k$ , where for each  $\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ , the component  $\underline{v}_{k,\underline{t}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{p(\underline{t})n}$  of  $\underline{v}_k$  is taken by the  $p(\underline{t})n$  variable nodes with edge type  $\underline{t}$  at position  $k$ . The *weight type* of  $\underline{v}$  is defined as  $\underline{\ell} := (\ell_{k,\underline{t}}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$  where  $\ell_{k,\underline{t}} = w(\underline{v}_{k,\underline{t}})$  is the Hamming weight of  $\underline{v}_{k,\underline{t}}$ , for each  $1 \leq k \leq 2L$  and  $\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ . We set  $\ell_{k,\underline{t}} = 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ .
- 2) Let  $U$  be any subset of variable nodes in the coupled Tanner graph. The size type of  $U$  is defined as  $\underline{\ell} := (\ell_{k,\underline{t}}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$ , where  $\ell_{k,\underline{t}}$  is the number of variable nodes in  $U$  at position  $k$  with edge type  $\underline{t}$ , for each  $1 \leq k \leq 2L$  and  $\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ . We set  $\ell_{k,\underline{t}} = 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ .

For any code  $C$  or graph  $G$  drawn from this ensemble and  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$ , the number of codewords in  $C$  of weight type  $\underline{\ell}$  is denoted by  $A_{\underline{\ell}}(C)$ , while the number of stopping sets in  $G$  of size type  $\underline{\ell}$  is denoted by  $\tilde{A}_{\underline{\ell}}(G)$ .

We first study the minimum distance of the coupled ensemble via its weight distribution.

*Theorem 3.15 (Average Weight-Type Distribution):* Let  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  denote a  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  coupled code ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with edge-spreading profile  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$ . Then for all  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = \left[ \prod_{k=1}^{2L} \prod_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \binom{p(\underline{t})n}{\ell_{k,\underline{t}}} (q-1)^{\ell_{k,\underline{t}}} \right] \Pr\{\underline{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\underline{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2Ln}$  is an arbitrary vector of weight type  $\underline{\ell}$ . For any  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , denote by  $e_k := \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} t_i \ell_{k-i,\underline{t}}$  the number of variable-node arcs from variable nodes associated with nonzero symbols in  $\underline{v}$  to check-node position  $k$ . Then

$$\Pr\{\underline{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} = \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{\text{coeff } \{W_{q, d_r}(z)^m, z^{e_k}\}}{\binom{d_l n}{e_k} (q-1)^{e_k}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $W_{q, d_r}(z)$  is the weight enumerator of a length- $d_r$  single parity-check code  $C_{d_r}^{\text{chk}}$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

*Proof:* Due to the  $K$  independent uniformly random monomial maps, the probability  $\Pr\{\underline{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}$  is invariant for any vector  $\underline{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2Ln}$  of weight type  $\underline{\ell}$ . Then (3) follows since there are  $\prod_{k=1}^{2L} \prod_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \binom{p(\underline{t})n}{\ell_{k,\underline{t}}} (q-1)^{\ell_{k,\underline{t}}}$  vectors in  $\mathbb{F}_q^{2Ln}$  having weight type  $\underline{\ell}$ . To see (4), we first compute the probability that  $\underline{v}$  satisfies all the  $m$  parity checks at a single position  $k$ . Since at position  $k$ , there are  $e_k$  variable node arcs originating from those variable nodes associated with nonzero symbols in  $\underline{v}$ , and the connection is given by the uniformly random monomial map  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(k)}$ , this probability is equal to the probability that a uniformly random weight- $e_k$  vector in  $\mathbb{F}_q^{d_l n}$  belongs to  $(C_{d_r}^{\text{chk}})^m$ , whose weight enumerator is  $W_{q, d_r}(z)^m$ . That is,

$$\Pr\{\Xi_{d_l n}^{(k)}(\underline{u}_k) \in (C_{d_r}^{\text{chk}})^m\} = \frac{\text{coeff } \{W_{q, d_r}(z)^m, z^{e_k}\}}{\binom{d_l n}{e_k} (q-1)^{e_k}}$$

with  $\underline{u}_k \in \mathbb{F}_q^{d_l n}$  being any fixed weight- $e_k$  vector. Since the  $K$  random monomial map  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Xi_{d_l n}^{(K)}$  are mutually independent, we have  $\Pr\{\underline{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} = \prod_{k=1}^K \Pr\{\Xi_{d_l n}^{(k)}(\underline{u}_k) \in (C_{d_r}^{\text{chk}})^m\}$ . This establishes (4).  $\square$

The average weight distribution of the code ensemble  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  can be evaluated by

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = \sum_{\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(\ell)} \mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})], \quad \forall 0 \leq \ell \leq 2Ln, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(\ell)$  denotes the set of all feasible weight types corresponding to weight  $\ell$ . That is,

$$\mathcal{L}(\ell) := \left\{ \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|} : \ell_{k,\underline{t}} \leq p(\underline{t})n \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}, \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \ell_{k,\underline{t}} = \ell \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Since there are at most polynomially many weight types in  $\mathcal{L}(\ell)$ , the exponent of  $\mathbb{E}[A_\ell(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]$  is asymptotically dominated by  $\max_{\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(\ell)} \mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]$ . Then using the asymptotic estimates  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left[ \binom{n}{\alpha n} (q-1)^{\alpha n} \right] = H_q(\alpha)$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{coeff} \{ W(z)^n, z^{\alpha n} \} = \log \inf_{z > 0} \frac{W(z)}{z^\alpha}$$

for any polynomial  $W(z)$  with nonnegative coefficients (cf. [45, Thm. 1]) in (3), one can obtain the following expression for the asymptotic growth rate function of the average weight distribution  $\mathbb{E}[A_\ell(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]$ .

*Proposition 3.16:* The asymptotic growth rate function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2Ln} \log \mathbb{E}[A_{[2Ln\alpha]}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]$  can be evaluated, for any normalized weight  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , by

$$g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) = \max_{\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha)} \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} p(\underline{t}) H_q \left( \frac{\alpha_{k,\underline{t}}}{p(\underline{t})} \right) + \frac{d_l}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{W_{q, d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - H_q(\beta_k) \right], \quad (7)$$

where the set  $\mathcal{A}(\alpha)$  of all feasible normalized weight type  $\underline{\alpha}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{A}(\alpha) := \left\{ \underline{\alpha} \in [0, 1]^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|} : 0 \leq \alpha_{k,\underline{t}} \leq p(\underline{t}) \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}, \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \alpha_{k,\underline{t}} = 2L\alpha \right\},$$

and for any normalized weight type  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta_k := \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i \alpha_{k-i,\underline{t}}}{d_l}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , with  $\alpha_{k,\underline{t}} := 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ .

Let us take a closer look at (7). First, at  $\alpha = 0$  or  $\alpha = 1$ , the feasible set  $\mathcal{A}(\alpha)$  contains a single normalized weight type  $\underline{\alpha}$ , where  $\alpha_{k,\underline{t}} = 0$  or  $\alpha_{k,\underline{t}} = p(\underline{t}) \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ . At this point, the function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  can be efficiently (numerically) evaluated. In particular, it can be verified that  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(0) = 0$ . For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the evaluation of (7) involves a nonlinear program, with  $2L|\mathcal{T}|$  bound constraints and an equality constraint. The objective function in (7) is continuously differentiable when  $0 \leq \alpha_{k,\underline{t}} \leq p(\underline{t})$ , by the continuous differentiability of the entropy function  $H_q$  and the function  $\beta \mapsto \log \inf_{z > 0} \frac{W_{q, d_r}(z)}{z^{d_r \beta}}$  (see [39] for a detailed analysis of this function). Hence, since  $\mathcal{A}(\alpha)$  is nonempty compact for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , the maximum value in (7) can be attained. Moreover, since  $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\alpha)$  is continuous with respect to the Hausdorff distance,<sup>5</sup> by Berge's maximum theorem, the growth rate function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  is *continuous* on  $[0, 1]$ .

*Lemma 3.17:* When  $d_l \geq 3$ , there exists an  $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) < 0$  for all  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$ . Furthermore, if  $d_r \geq d_l$ , one can choose  $\alpha_0$  such that

$$\alpha_0 = \alpha_{lb} := \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r},$$

where  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$  denotes the unique zero in  $(0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$  of the growth rate function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\alpha)$  for the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (see Theorem 3.6), and  $t_{\max} := \max_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \max_{0 \leq i \leq w-1} t_i$  denotes the largest component among all edge types in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

*Proof:* See Appendix I-A. □

By the continuity of the growth rate function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  and Lemma 3.17, for  $d_l \geq 3$  the quantity

$$\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} := \inf \{ \alpha \in (0, 1] : g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) > 0 \} \quad (8)$$

is strictly positive. Roughly speaking,  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$  is the smallest positive zero of the function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  on  $(0, 1)$  (if no zero exists, then  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} = 1$ ). For  $d_r \geq d_l \geq 3$ , the quantity  $\alpha_{lb}$  in Lemma 3.17 serves as a lower bound on  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$ . Note that, up to this point, we have not specified a particular edge-spreading profile  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$ . For the standard coupled ensemble in Definition 3.12,  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}$  and  $t_{\max} = d_l$ , in which case the lower bound estimate  $\alpha_{lb} = \frac{\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}}{2L}$ . For the improved coupled ensemble in Definition 3.13,  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l} \cap \{0, 1\}^w$  and  $t_{\max} = 1$ , in which case  $\alpha_{lb} = \frac{d_l \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}}{2L}$ . Numerical results show that the improved coupled ensemble can have a better achievable minimum distance, in the sense of  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$ . In Fig. 2, we plot the growth rate function  $g_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  for both coupled ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_4$  and small values of  $\alpha$ , under  $(d_l, d_r, w, L) = (3, 6, 3, 6)$ .<sup>6</sup> Using a bisection search, our numerical results indicate that the values of  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$  for the standard and improved ensembles are approximately 0.02607 and 0.03289, respectively. The following provides detailed probabilistic results on the minimum distance of the two classes of coupled code ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

<sup>5</sup>For a metric space  $(M, d)$  and each pair of nonempty subsets  $A \subset M$  and  $B \subset M$ , the Hausdorff distance between  $A$  and  $B$  is given by  $d_H(A, B) := \max \{ \sup_{a \in A} \inf_{b \in B} d(a, b), \sup_{b \in B} \inf_{a \in A} d(b, a) \}$ .

<sup>6</sup>Evaluating  $g_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  involves solving the constrained optimization problem in (7), which is nonconvex due to its objective function. Following [46, Alg. 17.4], we design an iterative algorithm with guaranteed first-order convergence, and run this algorithm under a large number of randomly chosen initial points from  $\mathcal{A}(\alpha)$ , to achieve the global optimum as closely as possible.




Fig. 2. The growth rate function  $g_{q,d_l,d_r,w,L}(\alpha)$  of the average weight distribution of the two coupled  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_4$  for small normalized weight  $\alpha$ , where  $(d_l, d_r, w, L) = (3, 6, 3, 6)$ . The smallest positive zero  $\alpha_{q,d_l,d_r,w,L}$  is approximately 0.02607 for the standard coupled ensemble and 0.03289 for the improved coupled ensembles.

**Theorem 3.18:** For  $d_r \geq d_l \geq 3$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  be either a standard or an improved coupled code ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with block-length  $2Ln$ , and  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$  be defined in (8). Then  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} \geq \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$ , and for any  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L})$

$$\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} = \Theta(n^{c(q, d_l)}),$$

where  $c(q, d_l) < 0$  is a constant independent of  $n$ . For a standard coupled ensemble,  $t_{\max} = d_l$  and  $c(q, d_l) = 2 - d_l$  if  $q = 2$  and  $d_l$  is odd, otherwise  $c(q, d_l) = 1 - \lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil$ ; for an improved coupled ensemble,  $t_{\max} = 1$  and  $c(q, d_l) = 2 - d_l$ .

*Proof:* See Appendices I-B and I-C for the proofs of the achievability and converse parts, respectively.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.19:** Following Theorems 3.18, if  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is a standard coupled code ensemble with  $d_l \geq 5$ , or if  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved coupled code ensemble with  $d_l \geq 4$ , then its minimum distance is asymptotically good a.s. as follows

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})}{2Ln} \geq \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

*Proof:* Given any  $\varepsilon \in (0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L})$ , define the sequence of events

$$E_n^\varepsilon := \left\{ \frac{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})}{2Ln} \leq \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} - \varepsilon \right\}.$$

By Theorem 3.18 and the condition of this corollary, we have  $\sum_n \Pr(E_n^\varepsilon) \leq \sum_n \Theta(n^{-2}) < +\infty$ . The Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that  $E_n^\varepsilon$  occurs only for finitely many  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  a.s., which further implies that with probability one

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})}{2Ln} \geq \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} - \varepsilon.$$

Finally, the claim follows from the arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$  in  $(0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}^{\text{ldpcc1}})$ .  $\square$

In the above corollary, we focus on almost sure achievability of the normalized minimum distance. If we focus on a weaker achievability result given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left\{ \frac{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})}{2Ln} \geq \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} - \varepsilon \right\} = 1 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0,$$

then by Theorems 3.18, for both coupled ensembles only  $d_l \geq 3$  is required. In Table I, we provide some numerical results for the achievable normalized minimum distance of  $(d_l, d_r, L)$  ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_4$ , where  $r_d := (1 - \frac{d_l}{d_r}) - \frac{d_l}{d_r} \frac{d_l - 1 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{d_l-1} (i/d_l)^{d_l}}{2L}$  measures the design rate (see [6, Lem. 3] for a detailed derivation),  $\alpha_{d_l, d_r, L}$  denotes the smallest positive zero of the weight distribution growth rate function, and  $\alpha_{\text{lb}} = \frac{d_l \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}}{2L}$  is the lower bound estimate on  $\alpha_{d_l, d_r, L}$  in Theorem 3.18. Numerical results indicate that  $\alpha_{\text{lb}}$  is somewhat loose. However, since the growth rate function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\alpha)$  of the average weight distribution of the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble can be evaluated quickly, solving for  $\alpha_{\text{lb}}$  is much faster than solving for  $\alpha_{d_l, d_r, L}$ .

We now study the stopping set distribution and the minimum stopping set size of the coupled graph ensemble. From now on,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$  are used to denote the size and the size type of subset of variable nodes. Given a coupled Tanner graph

TABLE I  
ACHIEVABLE NORMALIZED MINIMUM DISTANCE OF  $(d_l, d_r, L)$  ENSEMBLE OVER  $\mathbb{F}_4$

$d_l$	$d_r$	$L$	$r_d$	$\alpha_{d_l, d_r, L}$	$\alpha_{lb}$	$d_l$	$d_r$	$L$	$r_d$	$\alpha_{d_l, d_r, L}$	$\alpha_{lb}$	$d_l$	$d_r$	$L$	$r_d$	$\alpha_{d_l, d_r, L}$	$\alpha_{lb}$
3	6	6	0.44444	0.03289	0.01163	4	6	10	0.25885	0.12558	0.04539	6	12	8	0.37123	0.14994	0.06364
4	8	6	0.40690	0.09450	0.03895	6	9	10	0.19598	0.25337	0.08371	6	12	10	0.39699	0.12105	0.05091
5	10	6	0.36800	0.14847	0.06342	8	12	10	0.13142	0.38449	0.11558	6	12	12	0.41415	0.10004	0.04242
6	12	6	0.32831	0.19992	0.08484	10	15	10	0.06610	0.51818	0.14555	6	12	14	0.42642	0.08572	0.03636

$G$ , recall that we use  $\tilde{A}_\ell(G)$  and  $\tilde{A}_{\underline{\ell}}(G)$  to denote the number of stopping sets of size  $\ell$  and size type  $\underline{\ell}$  in  $G$ , respectively; we use  $S(G)$  to denote the collection of all stopping sets in  $G$ . The proof of the following result is analogous to that of Theorem 3.15 and is thus omitted.

**Theorem 3.20 (Average Stopping-Set-Size-Type Distribution):** Let  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  denote a  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  coupled graph ensemble with edge-spreading profile  $(\mathcal{T}, p)$ . Then for all  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = \left[ \prod_{k=1}^{2L} \prod_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \binom{p(\underline{t})n}{\ell_{k, \underline{t}}} \right] \Pr\{U \in S(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})\}, \quad (9)$$

where  $U$  is an arbitrary subset of variable nodes having size type  $\underline{\ell}$ . Let  $e_k := \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} t_i \ell_{k-i, \underline{t}}$  be the number of variable node arcs originating from those variable nodes in  $U$  to check-node position  $k$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . Then

$$\Pr\{U \in S(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})\} = \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{\text{coeff} \left\{ \tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)^m, z^{e_k} \right\}}{\binom{d_l n}{e_k}}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z) := (1+z)^{d_r} - d_r z$ .

By Theorem 3.20 and analogous to Proposition 3.16, the growth rate function of the average stopping-set distribution of the coupled ensemble can be expressed as follows.

**Proposition 3.21:** The growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2Ln} \log \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_{[2L\alpha n]}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]$  can be evaluated, for any normalized size  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , by

$$\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) = \max_{\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha)} \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} p(\underline{t}) H_2 \left( \frac{\alpha_{k, \underline{t}}}{p(\underline{t})} \right) + \frac{d_l}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - H_2(\beta_k) \right], \quad (11)$$

where the set  $\mathcal{A}(\alpha)$  takes the same form as that in Proposition 3.16, and for any normalized size type  $\underline{\alpha}$ ,  $\beta_k := \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i \alpha_{k-i, \underline{t}}}{d_l}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , with  $\alpha_{k, \underline{t}} := 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ .

Similar to the growth rate function for the weight distribution, the function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  is well defined and continuous on  $[0, 1]$  with  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(0) = 0$ . The following result is analogous to Lemma 3.17.

**Lemma 3.22:** When  $d_l \geq 3$ , there exists an  $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) < 0$  for all  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$ . Furthermore, if  $d_r \geq 3$ , one can choose  $\alpha_0$  such that

$$\alpha_0 = \tilde{\alpha}_{lb} := \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r},$$

where  $t_{\max} := \max_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \max_{0 \leq i \leq w-1} t_i$ , and  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$  denotes the unique zero in  $(0, 1)$  of the growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\alpha)$  of the average stopping set distribution of the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble (see Theorem 3.6).

*Proof:* See Appendix I-D.  $\square$

Differing slightly from Lemma 3.17, Lemma 3.22 does not require the condition  $d_r \geq d_l$ , since the zero  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r} \in (0, 1)$  of  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  exists and is unique for all  $d_l, d_r \geq 3$  (see Theorem 3.6). By the continuity of  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  and Lemma 3.22, for  $d_l \geq 3$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L} := \inf\{\alpha \in (0, 1) : \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha) > 0\} \quad (12)$$

is strictly positive, which can be regarded as the smallest positive zero of  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}$  on  $(0, 1)$  ( $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L} = 1$  if no zero exists). For  $d_l, d_r \geq 3$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}_{lb}$  serves as a lower bound estimate on  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}$ . In Fig. 3, we plot the growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  for both the standard and the improved coupled graph ensembles and small values of  $\alpha$  with  $(d_l, d_r, w, L) = (3, 6, 3, 6)$ . Numerically, we find that the smallest positive zero  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}$  is approximately 0.01011 for the standard coupled ensemble and 0.01278 for the improved coupled ensemble. This implies that the improved coupled ensemble, due to its edge spreading profile, can have better achievable minimum stopping set size (in terms of  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}$ ) compared to the standard coupled ensemble.

**Theorem 3.23:** For  $d_r, d_l \geq 3$ , let  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  be either a standard or an improved coupled graph ensemble with  $2Ln$  variable nodes, and  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}$  be defined in (12). Then  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L} \geq \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$ , and for any  $\alpha \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L})$

$$\Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} = \Theta(n^{c(d_l)}),$$




Fig. 3. The growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(\alpha)$  of the average stopping set distribution of the two coupled  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensembles for small normalized size  $\alpha$ , where  $(d_l, d_r, w, L) = (3, 6, 3, 6)$ . The smallest positive zero  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}$  is approximately 0.01011 for the standard coupled ensemble and 0.01278 for the improved coupled ensemble.

where  $c(d_l) < 0$  is a constant independent of  $n$ . For a standard coupled ensemble,  $t_{\max} = d_l$  and  $c(d_l) = 1 - \lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil$ , while for an improved coupled ensemble,  $t_{\max} = 1$  and  $c(d_l) = 2 - d_l$ .

*Proof:* See Appendices I-E and I-F for the proofs of the achievability and converse parts, respectively.  $\square$

The proof of the following corollary is analogous to that of Corollary 3.19, and thus is omitted.

**Corollary 3.24:** Following Theorems 3.23, if  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is a standard coupled graph ensemble with  $d_l \geq 5$ , or if  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved coupled graph ensemble with  $d_l \geq 4$ , then its minimum stopping set size is asymptotically good a.s. as follows

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{\text{ss}}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})}{2Ln} \geq \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Some numerical results for the achievable normalized minimum stopping set size (in terms of (12)) of the  $(d_l, d_r, L)$  ensemble are presented in Table II, where  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, L}$  denotes the smallest positive zero of the stopping set distribution growth rate function of the  $(d_l, d_r, L)$  ensemble in  $(0, 1)$ , and  $\tilde{\alpha}_{\text{lb}} := \frac{d_l \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}}{2L}$  is the lower bound estimate of  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, L}$  in Theorem 3.23. Since the ensemble parameters in Table II are identical to those in Table I, we omit the design rates in Table II.

TABLE II  
ACHIEVABLE NORMALIZED MINIMUM STOPPING SET SIZE OF  $(d_l, d_r, L)$  ENSEMBLE

$d_l$	$d_r$	$L$	$\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, L}$	$\tilde{\alpha}_{\text{lb}}$	$d_l$	$d_r$	$L$	$\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, L}$	$\tilde{\alpha}_{\text{lb}}$	$d_l$	$d_r$	$L$	$\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, L}$	$\tilde{\alpha}_{\text{lb}}$
3	6	6	0.01278	0.00450	4	6	10	0.04173	0.01756	6	12	8	0.04652	0.02363
4	8	6	0.03498	0.01511	6	9	10	0.06179	0.03041	6	12	10	0.03721	0.01891
5	10	6	0.05061	0.02415	8	12	10	0.07336	0.03896	6	12	12	0.03104	0.01575
6	12	6	0.06202	0.03151	10	15	10	0.08152	0.04540	6	12	14	0.02658	0.01350

#### IV. DECODING ANALYSIS: SYMMETRIC CHANNELS, MEASURES, LINEAR FUNCTIONALS AND DEGRADATION

In this section, we provide our settings, underlying results and analytical tools for iterative decoding over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

##### A. Memoryless Symmetric Channels

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  be measurable spaces. A Markov kernel  $W$  from  $\Omega$  to  $S$  is a real positive function on  $\mathcal{S} \times \Omega$  such that for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $W(\cdot | \omega)$  is a probability measure on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  and for all  $A \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $W(A | \cdot)$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable. A memoryless channel (MC) can be described by an input measurable space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ , an output measurable space  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A})$ , and a Markov kernel  $W$  from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{Y}$ . In this paper, the input alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$  is mostly assumed to be a finite set and  $\mathcal{F} = 2^{\mathcal{X}}$  is the power set of  $\mathcal{X}$ . This MC can be fully described by  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$ . For transmission of length  $n$  over such a finite-input MC, the  $n$ -fold Cartesian product channel is from input alphabet  $\mathcal{X}^n$  to output space  $(\mathcal{Y}^n, \mathcal{A}^n)$ , with product Markov kernel

$$W^n(A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n | \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n W(A_i | x_i)$$

for any  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ . The symmetry of the MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  refers to the invariance of the kernel  $W$  under some group action simultaneously on the channel input and output. Assume that  $|\mathcal{X}| = q$  and  $\Sigma \leq \mathbb{S}_q$  is a subgroup of the symmetric group over  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e., a permutation group acting faithfully on  $\mathcal{X}$ , and that there exists a well-defined group action of  $\Sigma$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$ . We call  $\Sigma$  the symmetry group of the MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  if the following holds.

*Definition 4.1:* The symmetry group  $\Sigma$  of a  $q$ -ary input MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  is the permutation group

$$\Sigma := \{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_q : W(\sigma A | \sigma x) = W(A | x) \ \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, A \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

The MC is said to be *symmetric* if the action of  $\Sigma$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  is *transitive*. It is well-known that the capacity and the random coding exponent of a symmetric MC can be achieved by a uniform input distribution on  $\mathcal{X}$  [47], [48]. Note that for a nonbinary-input symmetric MC, the action of its symmetry group on its input alphabet may not be merely transitive, e.g., it can be doubly transitive. For some  $q$ -ary input MCs with the highest level of symmetry, their symmetry groups can be up to the entire  $\mathbb{S}_q$ .

*Example 4.2 (QPEC [49]):* A  $q$ -ary partial erasure channel (QPEC) is an extension of a binary erasure channel (BEC) with a  $q$ -ary input alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$  and a finite output alphabet  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \cup \{?_x^i : x \in \mathcal{X}, 1 \leq i \leq \binom{q-1}{M-1}\}$  for some erasure size  $2 \leq M \leq q$ . For  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \binom{q-1}{M-1}$ , each  $?_x^i$ , a distinct subset of  $\mathcal{X}$  of size  $M$  containing  $x$ , denotes a partial erasure of the input symbol  $x$  and occurs with equal probability  $\varepsilon / \binom{q-1}{M-1}$ , where  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$  is the erasure probability. The transition probability is given by

$$W(\{y\}|x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \varepsilon, & y = x \\ \varepsilon / \binom{q-1}{M-1}, & y = ?_x^i \end{cases} \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

For a QPEC with erasure size  $M$ , we define the group action of  $\mathbb{S}_q$  on its output set  $\mathcal{Y}$  by

$$y \mapsto \sigma y = \begin{cases} \sigma x, & y = x \in \mathcal{X} \\ \{\sigma x_1, \dots, \sigma x_M\}, & y = \{x_1, \dots, x_M\} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \end{cases}$$

for  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_q$ , then it can be verified that  $\mathbb{S}_q$  is the symmetry group of the QPEC. A QPEC with erasure size 2 plays an important role in Lemma 4.24, a so called partial erasure decomposition lemma.

*Example 4.3 (Gallager's QSC [47]):* A  $q$ -ary symmetric channel (QSC) is a straightforward extension of a binary symmetric channel (BSC), whose input alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$  and output alphabet  $\mathcal{Y}$  are equal and  $q$ -ary, and the crossover probability  $\varepsilon$  of a QSC fulfills  $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{q-1}{q}$ . The transition probability of a QSC is given by

$$W(\{y\}|x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \varepsilon, & y = x \\ \frac{\varepsilon}{q-1}, & y \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\} \end{cases} \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X}.$$

The analysis of optimal or iterative decoding of linear codes can be greatly simplified if the transmission is over a symmetric MC with symmetry group matching the codes. Even for a symmetric MC, a larger channel symmetry group may induce richer results, so it is reasonable to hope that the symmetry group is not too small.

*Lemma 4.4:* The symmetry group of MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  contains  $G$  as a subgroup if and only if there exists a Markov kernel  $V$  from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$W(A|x) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} V(gA|gx).$$

*Proof:* First, assume that there is a Markov kernel  $V$  from  $\mathcal{X}$  to  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that  $W(A|x) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} V(gA|gx)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , then for each element  $\sigma \in G$ , we have

$$W(\sigma A | \sigma x) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} V(g(\sigma A) | g(\sigma x)) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g' \in G} V(g' A | g' x) = W(A|x),$$

thus  $\sigma$  must be an element in the symmetry group of the MC, i.e.,  $G$  is a subgroup. Now assume that the symmetry group of the MC contains  $G$  as a subgroup, at this point we can simply choose the kernel  $V = W$ .  $\square$

Given a  $q$ -ary input MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, \tilde{W})$ , assume that there is a well-defined group action of  $\mathbb{S}_q$  on the output alphabet  $\mathcal{Y}$ , but this MC is not necessarily symmetric. Lemma 4.4 provides an idea for constructing a symmetrized MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  with any desired symmetry, where  $W(A|x) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \tilde{W}(gA|gx)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and  $G \leq \mathbb{S}_q$  is the desired permutation group. We call  $W$  an  $G$ -symmetrized kernel of  $\tilde{W}$ , since by Lemma 4.4 the symmetry group of the MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  contains  $G$  as a subgroup. In practical, given any input symbol  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and the original kernel  $\tilde{W}$ , the new channel output  $Y \sim W(\cdot|x)$  can be easily obtained: first sample a uniformly random element  $g$  from  $G$ , and let  $g$  be shared between the sender and the receiver. Then the receiver sets  $Y = g^{-1}Y'$  with  $Y' \sim \tilde{W}(\cdot|gx)$  being the original channel output. Such an idea of constructing symmetric channels to simplify decoding analysis and code design is not new, e.g., the random coset mechanism in [50]–[52].

### B. Symmetric Probability Measures

In the following, we assume the channel input set  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{F}_q$ . Consider an MC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  with input-output random variable pair  $(X, Y)$ , where the input  $X$  is uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . In both theoretical and practical aspects of iterative decoding, one typically works with a sufficient statistic of the channel output  $Y$  for  $X$ , called a *message*, rather than with  $Y$  itself. Here, we consider messages in the form of probability vectors. Let

$$\mathcal{S}_q := \left\{ \underline{y} \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{F}_q} : \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_i = 1 \right\}$$

denote the probability simplex of dimension  $q - 1$ . Define the *a-posterior* probability (APP) operator  $\psi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_q$  by

$$[\psi(y)]_x := \Pr\{X = x | Y = y\} = \frac{W(dy|x)}{\sum_{x' \in \mathbb{F}_q} W(dy|x')}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{F}_q, y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

Given that  $X = x$  is transmitted, we obtain a probability space  $(\mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}, \times(\cdot|x))$  induced by the random APP vector  $\psi(Y)$ , where  $\mathcal{B} := \{B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q : \psi^{-1}B \in \mathcal{A}\}$  and  $\times(B|x) := W(\psi^{-1}B|x)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  are the pushforward  $\sigma$ -field and measure, respectively. In other words, we obtain an MC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}, \times)$  with input-output random variable pair  $(X, \psi(Y))$ . Such messages, in the form of probability vectors, are said to be in the *P*-domain. In BP decoding of LDPC codes over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , messages are usually updated in the form of log-likelihood ratios (LLRs) and discrete Fourier transforms (DFTs). Let  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$  be any probability vector. The  $q$ -dimensional LLR vector  $\underline{l}$  of  $\underline{y}$  is given, for each  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , by

$$l_i = [\text{LLR}(\underline{y})]_i := \log(y_0/y_i),$$

where we assume  $\ln(0) = -\infty$  and  $\ln(\infty) = \infty$ . The  $q$ -dimensional DFT vector  $\underline{f}$  of  $\underline{y}$  is given, for each  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , by

$$f_i = [\text{DFT}(\underline{y})]_i := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_k \chi(ki),$$

where for any prime power  $q = p^r$ , the homomorphism  $\chi : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$  is defined, for each  $v \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , by

$$\chi(v) := e^{2\pi i \text{Tr}(v)/p}, \quad \text{Tr}(v) := v + v^p + \cdots + v^{p^{r-1}} \in \mathbb{F}_p, \quad i := \sqrt{-1}.$$

The maps LLR and DFT are invertible. Similarly, we can consider the MC whose output message is an LLR or a DFT vector, and refer to the associated message as being in the *L*-domain or the *D*-domain. Due to the one-to-one correspondence, many results, once established in a certain domain, e.g., the *P*-domain, can be immediately translated into their equivalent forms in the *L*- or *D*-domain. In the binary case, most existing analyses are conducted in the *L*-domain or the *D*-domain. In this work, we primarily focus on message distributions in the *P*-domain for general nonbinary cases.

We assume that the original MC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  exhibits the following symmetry, which is referred to as a *q-ary memoryless symmetric channel (QMSC)*. If this is not the case, we can apply Lemma 4.4 to construct one with the same symmetric capacity.

**Definition 4.5:** An MC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  is called a QMSC, if its symmetry group  $\Sigma$ , up to isomorphism, contains the additive group and the multiplicative group on  $\mathbb{F}_q$  as subgroups, i.e.,  $\Sigma \geq A_q \cup M_q$  where

$$A_q := \{\sigma_{+a} \in \mathbb{S}_q : a \in \mathbb{F}_q\}, \quad M_q := \{\sigma_{\times b} \in \mathbb{S}_q : b \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times\}$$

and the maps  $\sigma_{+a}, \sigma_{\times b}$  are defined, for all  $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , by  $\sigma_{+a}x := a + x$  and  $\sigma_{\times b} := b \times x$ , using  $\mathbb{F}_q$  addition and multiplication.<sup>7</sup>

Note that under the above symmetry, the group  $\Sigma$  acts doubly transitive on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . We need  $\Sigma$  to contain the additive group on  $\mathbb{F}_q$  as a subgroup, to ensure that the MC is symmetric in the traditional sense. We further need that  $\Sigma$  contains the multiplicative group  $M_q$  as a subgroup, to derive more comprehensive results. For any  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , define the actions of  $A_q$  and  $M_q$  on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{+a}(\underline{y}_0, \dots, \underline{y}_{q-1}) &:= (\underline{y}_{\sigma_{+a}0}, \dots, \underline{y}_{\sigma_{+a}(q-1)}) =: \underline{y}^{+a} \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{F}_q, \\ \sigma_{\times b}(\underline{y}_0, \dots, \underline{y}_{q-1}) &:= (\underline{y}_{\sigma_{\times b}0}, \dots, \underline{y}_{\sigma_{\times b}(q-1)}) =: \underline{y}^{\times b} \quad \forall b \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times. \end{aligned}$$

It is not surprising that the MC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}, \times)$ , whose output is an APP vector induced by any QMSC, is itself a QMSC.

**Lemma 4.6:** Consider a QMSC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$  with input-output random variable pair  $(X, Y)$  where  $X$  is uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Let  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}, \times)$  be its induced MC with input-output pair  $(X, \underline{Y})$ , where  $\underline{Y} = \psi(Y)$  denotes the random APP vector. Let  $\bar{x} := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \times(\cdot|i)$  be the marginal distribution of  $\underline{Y}$ , then

- The symmetry group of the MC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}, \times)$  contains  $A_q \cup M_q$  as a subgroup: for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}, i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ ,

$$\times(B|i) = \times(B^{+i}|0), \quad \times(B^{\times k}|i) = \times(B|k \times i),$$

<sup>7</sup>In [52], a similar definition was proposed, where Bennatan and Burshtein referred to an MC as “cyclic-symmetric” if  $\Sigma$  contains  $A_q$  as a subgroup, and as “permutation-invariant” if  $\Sigma$  contains  $M_q$  as a subgroup. It can be verified that the capacity, the random-coding error exponent, and the expurgated error exponent of such a QMSC can be achieved with a uniform input distribution on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

and as a result,  $\bar{x}(B^{+i}) = \bar{x}(B^{\times k}) = \bar{x}(B)$ .

- ii) The Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $x(\cdot|i)$  with respect to  $\bar{x}$  is  $qy_i$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , i.e.,  $x(B|i) = q \int_B y_i \bar{x}(dy)$  for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ .
- iii) For  $\underline{Y} \sim \bar{x}$  and all distinct  $i, i' \in \mathbb{F}_q$ ,  $(Y_i, Y_{i'})$  are identically distributed.

*Proof:* See Appendix II-A.  $\square$

From Lemma 4.6, given a QMSC, the conditional distributions  $\{x(\cdot|i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q}$  and the marginal distribution  $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} x(\cdot|i)$  of its APP vector can be equivalently expressed in terms of each other, as long as one of them is specified, i.e., we have

$$x(B|i) = x(B^{+i}|0) = q \int_B y_i \bar{x}(dy), \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}, i \in \mathbb{F}_q.$$

As in the binary case, it is sufficient to focus on the distribution of the APP vector  $\underline{Y}$  conditioned on the channel input  $X = 0$ . By abuse of notation, such a conditional distribution  $x(\cdot|0)$  will be simplified to  $x$  in the remainder of this paper. By the second statement of Lemma 4.6,  $x$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\bar{x}$ , with  $x(B) = q \int_B y_0 \bar{x}(dy)$ . By choosing  $B = \{y_0 = 0\}$ , we obtain that  $y_0 > 0$   $x$ -a.e. Lemma 4.6 also implies that for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}, i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$

$$x(B^{+i}) = q \int_B y_i \bar{x}(dy) = q \int_B \frac{y_i}{y_0} y_0 \bar{x}(dy) = \int_B \frac{y_i}{y_0} x(dy)$$

and  $x(B^{\times k}) = x(B)$ . In the following, we make a slight extension.

**Definition 4.7:** We call a signed Borel measure  $x$  on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  *symmetric* if for any Borel set  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q)$  and  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}$

$$x(B^{+i}) = \int_B \frac{y_i}{y_0} x(dy), \quad x(B^{\times k}) = x(B).$$

For such a symmetric measure  $x$ , we define its reference measure  $\bar{x}$  on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  by  $\bar{x}(B) := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} x(B^{+i}) = \int_B \frac{x(dy)}{qy_0} \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ .

The above definition can be extended to other forms of messages, such as LLR or DFT vectors. For example, in the binary case, let  $L = \log(Y_0/Y_1)$  be the LLR random variable and  $c$  denote the probability measure of  $L$  when zero bit is transmitted. The well-known symmetry condition for  $c$  is given by [25], [53]

$$c(-E) = \int_E e^{-l} c(dl), \quad \forall E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

In the following, we will focus on two types of probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ : one is the symmetric probability measures, which correspond to the conditional distributions of the random APP vector given that  $0 \in \mathbb{F}_q$  is transmitted, and the other is their reference measures, which correspond to the marginal distributions of the random APP vector. By Lemma 4.6 and Definition 4.7, the following two propositions are immediate and their proofs are omitted.

**Proposition 4.8:** For any QMSC with input-output random variable pair  $(X, Y)$  where  $X$  is uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , the distribution of the random APP vector  $\psi(Y)$  conditioned on  $X = 0$  is symmetric.

**Proposition 4.9:** Let  $x$  be a symmetric signed Borel measure on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  and  $\bar{x}$  be the reference measure of  $x$ , respectively. Then for any Borel set  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q), i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}$

$$x(B^{+i}) = q \int_B y_i \bar{x}(dy), \quad \bar{x}(B) = \bar{x}(B^{+i}) = \bar{x}(B^{\times k}).$$

If, furthermore,  $x$  and  $\bar{x}$  are probability measures, then for  $\underline{Y} \sim \bar{x}$  and all distinct  $i, i' \in \mathbb{F}_q$ ,  $(Y_i, Y_{i'})$  are identically distributed.

Using Definition 4.7 and Proposition 4.9, we define the following two spaces for the two types of probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ . The relationship between the two spaces and their topological properties will be discussed in the next subsection.

**Definition 4.10:** The space of all symmetric probability measures on  $(\mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q))$  and the space of all their reference measures are denoted by  $\mathcal{X}_q$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$ , respectively. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_q &:= \left\{ x \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q) : x(B^{+i}) = \int_B \frac{y_i}{y_0} x(dy), x(B^{\times k}) = x(B) \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q), i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\} \right\}, \\ \bar{\mathcal{X}}_q &:= \left\{ \bar{x} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q) : \bar{x}(B^{+i}) = \bar{x}(B^{\times k}) = \bar{x}(B) \forall B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q), i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

An important and useful property is that the symmetry of the message distributions is preserved under linear codes and APP processing. The following result generalizes [25, Thm. 4.30].

**Theorem 4.11 (Symmetry is Preserved under APP Processing):** Let  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  be a codeword uniformly distributed over a linear code  $C_n$  of block-length  $n$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{X}$  is transmitted over a QMSC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$ , and let  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$  denote the output of the  $n$ -fold Cartesian product of the QMSC. For  $t \in [1, n]$ , assume that the  $t$ -th component of  $C_n$  is proper, i.e.,  $X_t$  is uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Define the extrinsic APP operator  $\psi_t : \mathcal{Y}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_q$  for  $X_t$  by

$$[\psi_t(\mathbf{y}_{\sim t})]_x := \Pr\{X_t = x | \mathbf{Y}_{\sim t} = \mathbf{y}_{\sim t}\} \quad \forall \mathbf{y}_{\sim t} \in \mathcal{Y}^{n-1}, x \in \mathbb{F}_q,$$

where the subscript  $\sim t$  denotes the operation of removing the  $t$ -th entry from the vector. Then

- 1)  $\psi_t(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim t})$  is conditionally independent of  $\mathbf{X}_{\sim t}$  given  $X_t$ .
- 2) The channel with input-output random variable pair  $(X_t, \psi_t(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim t}))$  is a QMSC.
- 3) The distribution of  $\psi_t(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim t})$  conditioned on  $X_t = 0$  or  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{0}$  is symmetric.

*Proof:* See Appendix II-B.  $\square$

Theorem 4.11 allows us to focus only on symmetric measures when analyzing message-passing decoding on tree code graphs over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  under transmission over a QMSC. At this point, the code graph is cycle-free, and each message passing along an edge is an extrinsic APP estimate. Then under the all-zeros codeword assumption, all message distributions are symmetric. There are two types of messages: one that pass from variable nodes to check nodes, and the other that pass from check nodes to variable nodes. We simply review the message update rule in the  $P$ -domain, where we define that, the incoming and outgoing messages of each variable node are probability vectors, representing soft estimates for the symbol in  $\mathbb{F}_q$  associated with this node. For a degree- $c$  variable node, let  $\underline{y}^{(0)}$  represent the message from the channel, and  $\underline{y}^{(1)}, \underline{y}^{(2)}, \dots, \underline{y}^{(c-1)}$  represent the incoming messages across its first  $c-1$  edges, then the output message of this variable node along its  $c$ -th edge is given by

$$[\psi_c^{\text{var}}(\underline{y}^{(0)}, \underline{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \underline{y}^{(c-1)})]_x = \frac{\prod_{t=0}^{c-1} y_x^{(t)}}{\sum_{x' \in \mathbb{F}_q} \prod_{t=0}^{c-1} y_{x'}^{(t)}} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{F}_q. \quad (13)$$

For a degree- $d$  check node with edge label  $e_t \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  assigned to its  $t$ -th edge for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , let  $\underline{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \underline{y}^{(d-1)}$  represent the incoming messages across its first  $d-1$  edges (these messages, passing from their respective variable nodes, are probability vectors for those variable nodes), then the output message of this check node along its  $d$ -th edge is given by (this message is a probability vector for its incoming variable node)

$$[\psi_d^{\text{chk}}(\underline{y}^{(1)}, \dots, \underline{y}^{(d-1)}; e_1, \dots, e_d)]_x = \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_{d-1} \in \mathbb{F}_q : \sum e_t v_t = -e_d x} \prod_{t=1}^{d-1} y_{v_t}^{(t)} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{F}_q. \quad (14)$$

Assume that the input random messages of a node are conditionally independent under the all-zeros codeword transmission (this assumption holds true when the Tanner graph is cycle-free and transmission is over an MC). In this case, we can compute the distribution of the corresponding output message using the input message distributions. By Theorem 4.11, the output message distribution will be symmetric if all the input message distributions are symmetric. Following [25], we adopt the convolution operators  $\circledast, \boxtimes : \mathcal{X}_q \times \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_q$  to represent the binary operators for updating the message distributions of variable nodes and check nodes, respectively, and the following are under the all-zeros codeword assumption. Given conditional independent random messages  $\underline{Y} \sim \mathbf{x}_1, \underline{Z} \sim \mathbf{x}_2$  where  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  are symmetric distributions,  $\mathbf{x}_1 \circledast \mathbf{x}_2$  denotes the distribution of  $\psi_2^{\text{var}}(\underline{Y}, \underline{Z})$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes_{e_1, e_2, e_3} \mathbf{x}_2$  denotes the distribution of  $\psi_3^{\text{chk}}(\underline{Y}, \underline{Z}; e_1, e_2, e_3)$  with  $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  being given edge labels. More precisely, for any bounded measurable  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by (13) and (14)

$$\begin{aligned} \int f d(\mathbf{x}_1 \circledast \mathbf{x}_2) &= \int f \left( \frac{y_0 z_0}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_x z_x}, \frac{y_1 z_1}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_x z_x}, \dots, \frac{y_{q-1} z_{q-1}}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_x z_x} \right) \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}) \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}), \\ \int f d(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes_{e_1, e_2, e_3} \mathbf{x}_2) &= \int f \left( \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ e_1 u + e_2 v = 0}} y_u z_v, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ e_1 u + e_2 v = -e_3}} y_u z_v, \dots, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ e_1 u + e_2 v = -(q-1)e_3}} y_u z_v \right) \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}) \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}). \end{aligned}$$

The presence of edge labels appears to complicate the check-node message distribution update when  $q \geq 3$ . In fact, due to our QMSC setting—that is, the channel symmetry group contains the multiplicative group on  $\mathbb{F}_q$  as a subgroup, edge labels from  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ , while influencing the update of messages, have no impact on the update of message distributions.

*Lemma 4.12:* For any  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ , let  $1 \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  denote the multiplicative identity of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , then

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes_{e_1, e_2, e_3} \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes_{1, 1, 1} \mathbf{x}_2.$$

*Proof:* See Appendix II-C.  $\square$

By Lemma 4.12, we can omit the subscript denoting edge labels in the operator  $\boxtimes$ , since they have no impact on the output message distribution. Assuming the input messages are conditionally independent, the output message distribution of a degree- $c$  node (along its  $c$ -th edge) can be expressed as  $\mathbf{x}_1 * \mathbf{x}_2 * \dots * \mathbf{x}_{c-1}$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_t$  denotes the distribution of the  $t$ -th input message for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, c-1$ , and  $*$  represents  $\circledast$  for a variable node and  $\boxtimes$  for a check node.

Similar to the binary case, there are two trivial distributions in  $\mathcal{X}_q$ . One corresponds to a perfect, noiseless QMSC, denoted by  $\Delta_\infty$  here, while the other corresponds to a useless, full noisy QMSC, denoted by  $\Delta_0$  here. More precisely,  $\underline{y} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$   $\Delta_\infty$ -a.e. and  $\underline{y} = (\frac{1}{q}, \dots, \frac{1}{q})$   $\Delta_0$ -a.e. For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , it can be verified that

$$\Delta_0 \circledast \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} \circledast \Delta_0 = \Delta_\infty \boxtimes \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} \boxtimes \Delta_\infty = \mathbf{x},$$

and for any  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3 \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , we have  $\mathbf{x}_1 * \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_2 * \mathbf{x}_1$  and  $(\mathbf{x}_1 * \mathbf{x}_2) * \mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{x}_1 * (\mathbf{x}_2 * \mathbf{x}_3)$  where  $*$  takes  $\circledast$  or  $\boxtimes$ . Hence both  $\circledast$  and  $\boxtimes$  induce a commutative monoid algebraic structure on  $\mathcal{X}_q$ , with identities  $\Delta_0$  and  $\Delta_\infty$ , respectively. Moreover, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , we also have  $\mathbf{x} \circledast \Delta_\infty = \Delta_\infty$  and  $\mathbf{x} \boxtimes \Delta_0 = \Delta_0$ .

### C. Linear Functionals and Metric Topology

Let  $x$  be a symmetric measure on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  and  $\bar{x}$  be the reference measure of  $x$ . Given a bounded measurable  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , define

$$F(x) := \int f d\bar{x} = \int \frac{f(y)}{qy_0} x(dy).$$

Clearly,  $F(\alpha x_1 + \beta x_2) = \alpha F(x_1) + \beta F(x_2)$ ,  $\forall \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ . Such an  $F(x)$  is called a linear functional of  $x$  (or  $\bar{x}$ ), and  $f$  is called a kernel of this functional. In this paper, we primarily focus on the following functionals.

**Definition 4.13** ( $\mathfrak{B}, H, \mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{E}, Q$ ): For any symmetric signed Borel measure  $x$  on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  and its reference measure  $\bar{x}$  on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ , the Bhattacharyya functional  $\mathfrak{B}$ , entropy functional  $H$ , pseudo error rate functional  $\mathfrak{P}$ , error rate functional  $\mathfrak{E}$  and squared norm functional  $Q$  are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{B}(x) &:= q \int \sqrt{y_0 y_1} \bar{x}(dy), \quad H(x) := -q \int y_0 \log y_0 \bar{x}(dy), \quad \mathfrak{P}(x) := \frac{q}{2} \int \min\{y_0, y_1\} \bar{x}(dy), \\ Q(x) &:= \int \|y\|^2 \bar{x}(dy), \quad \mathfrak{E}(x) := \int \left(1 - \max_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \{y_i\}\right) \bar{x}(dy). \end{aligned}$$

In the definitions of the functionals  $\mathfrak{B}, H, \mathfrak{P}$ , we use the property of the reference measure  $\bar{x}$  (see Proposition 4.9) to minimize the number of components in  $y$  involved in the integrand. These functionals can have other forms of kernel functions, e.g.,

$$\mathfrak{B}(x) = \frac{1}{q-1} \int \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j} \sqrt{y_i y_j} \bar{x}(dy), \quad H(x) = \int - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_i \log y_i \bar{x}(dy).$$

The names of these functionals are determined by their information-theoretic sense: when  $x$  is the distribution of the APP vector of a QMSC, given that  $0 \in \mathbb{F}_q$  is transmitted, it can be verified that  $\mathfrak{B}(x)$ ,  $H(x)$  and  $\mathfrak{E}(x)$  are the Bhattacharyya parameter, entropy and uncoded MAP error rate of the QMSC, respectively. We refer to  $\mathfrak{P}(\cdot)$  as the pseudo error rate functional since in the binary case, we have  $\mathfrak{P}(x) = \mathfrak{E}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_2$ . It is important to note that the kernels of all the above functionals exhibit *convexity*: for  $\mathfrak{B}, H, \mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{E}$  (or  $Q$ ), their kernels are concave (or convex) on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ . Moreover, for  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $H$  (or  $Q$ ), the convexity is strict (or strong). In Section IV-D, we reveal the equivalence between the degradation of the symmetric probability measures and the partial order induced by all concave kernels  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We present the extremal behavior of the above five functionals and the duality rule for the entropy functional. In Appendix II-D, we present several properties of the functionals  $\mathfrak{B}$ ,  $\mathfrak{E}$  and  $\mathfrak{P}$ .

**Lemma 4.14:** For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,

$$0 \leq \mathfrak{B}(x) \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq H(x) \leq \log q, \quad 0 \leq \mathfrak{P}(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad 0 \leq \mathfrak{E}(x) \leq \frac{q-1}{q}, \quad 1 \geq Q(x) \geq \frac{1}{q}$$

with equality on the left and right sides attained if and only if  $x = \Delta_\infty$  and  $x = \Delta_0$ , respectively.

**Proof:** We give a detailed proof for the Bhattacharyya functional and leave the proofs for the other functionals to the reader. Note that  $\mathfrak{B}(x) = q \int \sqrt{y_i y_j} \bar{x}(dy)$  for all distinct  $i, j \in \mathbb{F}_q$  and

$$0 \leq q \int \sqrt{y_i y_j} \bar{x}(dy) \leq q \left( \int y_i \bar{x}(dy) \int y_j \bar{x}(dy) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 1.$$

The left inequality is tight if and only if  $y_i y_j = 0$   $\bar{x}$ -a.e. In this case, using  $x(B) = q \int_B y_0 d\bar{x}$  for any Borel set  $B$  and choosing  $B = \{y_i \neq 0\}$  for  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$ , we find that  $y = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$   $x$ -a.e. This means that  $x = \Delta_\infty$ . The right inequality is tight if and only if  $y_i = y_j$   $\bar{x}$ -a.e. In this case,  $y = (\frac{1}{q}, \dots, \frac{1}{q})$   $\bar{x}$ -a.e. and thus  $x = \Delta_0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.15 (Duality Rule for the Entropy Functional):** For any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$

$$H(x_1 \circledast x_2) + H(x_1 \boxtimes x_2) = H(x_1) + H(x_2).$$

**Proof:** For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , let  $\bar{x}$  be its reference measure, then  $H(x) = -q \int y_0 \log y_0 \bar{x}(dy) = - \int \log y_0 x(dy)$ . By Lemma 4.12

$$\begin{aligned} H(x_1 \boxtimes x_2) &= H(x_1 \boxtimes_{1, -1, 1} x_2) = - \int \log \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_i z_i x_1(dy) x_2(dz) \\ &= \int \log \frac{y_0 z_0}{\sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_i z_i} x_1(dy) x_2(dz) - \int \log y_0 x_1(dy) - \int \log z_0 x_2(dz) = H(x_1) + H(x_2) - H(x_1 \circledast x_2). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The above duality rule for the entropy functional generalizes its binary case [25, Lem. 4.42]. Using this rule together with the linearity of  $H(\cdot)$ , we can obtain the following corollary, which generalizes [9, Prop. 5].

**Corollary 4.16:** For any  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \mathcal{X}_q$

$$\begin{aligned} H(x_1 \circledast (x_2 - x_3)) + H(x_1 \boxtimes (x_2 - x_3)) &= H(x_2 - x_3), \\ H((x_1 - x_2) \circledast (x_3 - x_4)) + H((x_1 - x_2) \boxtimes (x_3 - x_4)) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since iterative decoding analysis often involves sequences of probability measures and their functional sequences, establishing a well-defined metric topology for the space of probability measures is helpful in clearly describing certain convergence results. We briefly review the relevant constructions from existing work [7], [9], [25] in the binary case. In [25, Sec. IV], Richardson and Urbanke considered the space of symmetric distributions in the  $|D|$ -domain, where messages are in the form of the absolute value of the DFT variable  $y_0 - y_1$ , and showed that it is a compact metric space under the weak topology. In [7], Kudekar *et al.* further introduced the 1-Wasserstein metric on this space. In [9], Kumar *et al.* considered the space of symmetric distributions in the  $L$ -domain. Thanks to the absolute convergence of the power series expansion of the binary entropy function around the uninformative point,<sup>8</sup> in the binary case the entropy functional  $H(x)$  admits a well-defined series representation

$$H(x) = (\log 2)x(\bar{\mathbb{R}}) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k M_k(x), \quad (15)$$

where  $x$  here represents a symmetric measure on  $(\bar{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{B}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}))$  in the  $L$ -domain,  $\gamma_k := \frac{1}{2k(2k-1)}$  and  $M_k(x) := \int \tanh^{2k}(\frac{l}{2})x(dl)$ . Due to this series representation, Kumar *et al.* defined the following entropy distance [9, Def. 10]

$$d_H(x_1, x_2) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k |M_k(x_1) - M_k(x_2)|$$

between two symmetric measures  $x_1, x_2$  in the  $L$ -domain, and showed in [9, Prop. 65] that under  $d_H$ , the space of all symmetric distributions in the  $L$ -domain is homeomorphic to the weak topology on  $\mathcal{P}([0, 1])$ , and thus is compact. Unfortunately, both of the above constructions are difficult to extend to the nonbinary cases: for the first method, it is challenging to find a message form that is analytically tractable and corresponds to the  $|D|$ -domain message in the binary case, while for the second method, the analogous series expansion of entropy function converges only on a small subset of the domain for  $q \geq 3$ ,<sup>9</sup> thus one fails to define an analogous entropy distance as in [9]. To establish an appropriate metric topology in the general nonbinary cases, we first consider  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$ , which consists of all reference probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  (see Definition 4.10), with the  $p$ -Wasserstein metric on it. Note that  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q), W_p)$  is a compact metric space under the weak topology, where  $W_p$  represents the  $p$ -Wasserstein metric, and in this space, convergence under  $W_p$  is equivalent to weak convergence. Here, to establish a metric topology on  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$ , we can select any order  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , but for the convenience of illustrating the connection between  $W_p$  and the degradation of symmetric probability measures (see Section IV-D), we will choose  $W_2$  as our metric.

*Lemma 4.17:*  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$  constitutes a compact metric space.

*Proof:* See Appendix II-E.  $\square$

Note that all the functionals  $F(x) = \int f d\bar{x}$  in Definition 4.13 have bounded continuous kernels  $f$ , then for any convergent  $\bar{x}_n \xrightarrow{W_2} \bar{x}$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$  which implies weak convergence, it follows that  $\int f d\bar{x}_n \rightarrow \int f d\bar{x}$ , i.e.,  $F$  is bounded continuous on  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$  and can attain its extremum. In this paper, most involved functionals are bounded continuous on  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$ . Since we frequently consider symmetric probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ , we hope that the space  $\mathcal{X}_q$  also has good topological properties under some metric. This can be established by noting the existence of a measure bijection between  $\mathcal{X}_q$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$ .

*Proposition 4.18:* Let  $\Psi : \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$  be the measure map defined by  $(\Psi x)(B) = \int_B \frac{1}{qy_0} x(dy)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and Borel sets  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ . Then  $\Psi$  is bijective, and its inverse is given by  $(\Psi^{-1} \bar{x})(B) = q \int_B y_0 \bar{x}(dy)$  for all  $\bar{x} \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$ .

*Proof:* We first show that  $\Psi$  is injective. For any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , if  $\Psi x_1 = \Psi x_2$ , then for any Borel set  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$  it follows that  $\int_B \frac{x_1(dy)}{qy_0} = \int_B \frac{x_2(dy)}{qy_0}$ . Since  $y_0 > 0$   $x$ -a.e for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , it follows that  $x_1 = x_2$ . Next we show that  $\Psi$  is surjective. Given any  $\bar{x} \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$ , define the probability measure  $x$  by  $x(B) = q \int_B y_0 \bar{x}(dy) =: (\Psi^{-1} \bar{x})(B)$  for any Borel set  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$ , then we have  $y_0 > 0$   $x$ -a.e., and can verify that  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $\Psi x = \bar{x}$ . Hence,  $\Psi$  is bijective and its inverse is given by  $\Psi^{-1}$  here.  $\square$

Due to the above bijection, we can define a metric  $d_W$  on  $\mathcal{X}_q$  induced by the 2-Wasserstein metric on  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$ , given by

$$d_W(x_1, x_2) := W_2(\Psi x_1, \Psi x_2).$$

This induces an isometric isomorphism between  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  and  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$ . By Lemma 4.17, the following is immediate.

*Corollary 4.19:*  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  constitutes a compact metric space. For any functional  $F : \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $x \mapsto \int f d\Psi x$  with bounded continuous  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $F$  is bounded continuous on  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  and thus attains its extremum on  $\mathcal{X}_q$ .

Due to the isometric isomorphism between  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  and  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$ , many continuity results can be stated equivalently in either space. Under the all-zero codeword assumption, such results are usually stated using symmetric probability measures in  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ ; however, when involving concrete proofs, it is often more convenient to work with reference measures in  $(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$ , as convergence under  $W_2$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$  is equivalent to weak convergence.

*Lemma 4.20 (Continuity of  $\otimes$  and  $\boxtimes$ ):* For any  $x_{1,n} \xrightarrow{d_W} x_1$  and  $x_{2,n} \xrightarrow{d_W} x_2$  in  $\mathcal{X}_q$ , we have  $x_{1,n} * x_{2,n} \xrightarrow{d_W} x_1 * x_2$ , where the binary operator  $*$  takes  $\otimes$  or  $\boxtimes$ .

*Proof:* See Appendix II-F.  $\square$

<sup>8</sup>The Taylor series of the binary entropy function  $H_2(x)$  at  $\frac{1}{2}$  is  $H_2(x) = \log 2 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-2x)^{2k}}{2k(2k-1)}$ , which is absolutely convergent for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

<sup>9</sup>This is a pain point for analysis in the nonbinary case. Due to the absence of an analogous convergent series representation, some powerful statistical physics methods that are effective in the binary case [26]–[29] fail to extend to the nonbinary case. This will be detailed in Section V-C.

#### D. Degradation of Symmetric Probability Measures

A useful analytical tool, referred to as the *degradation* of symmetric probability measures, is introduced for general  $q \geq 2$ . The motivation comes from the stochastic degradation of MCs, which is defined as follows.

**Definition 4.21 (Stochastic Degradation):** For any two MCs  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{A}_1, W_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{A}_2, W_2)$ , the second MC is stochastically degraded with respect to the first one if there exists a Markov kernel  $Q$  from  $\mathcal{Y}_1$  to  $\mathcal{Y}_2$  such that

$$W_2(A|x) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1} Q(A|y)W_1(dy|x), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{A}_2, x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

A stronger definition, termed *physical degradation*, is that  $X \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$  constitutes a Markov chain, with  $(X, Y_1)$  being the input-output pair of the first MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{A}_1, W_1)$  and  $(X, Y_2)$  being the input-output pair of the second MC  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{A}_2, W_2)$ . Physical degradation clearly implies stochastic degradation. On the other hand, stochastic degradation in Definition 4.21 implies the existence of a coupling  $(X, Y_1, Y_2)$ , such that  $X \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$  constitutes a Markov chain, with  $Y_i | \{X = x\} \sim W_i(\cdot|x)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Hence, many literatures do not make a strict distinction between the two types of degradation.

For the binary case, the degradation of symmetric distributions, which serves as a fundamental tool for iterative decoding analysis, was studied in [25, Sec. 4.1.11], where Richardson and Urbanke considered symmetric distributions in the  $|D|$ -domain and proved the equivalence between the degradation of such distributions on  $[0, 1]$  and the partial order induced by all concave decreasing functions on  $[0, 1]$ . However, as previously mentioned in the discussion of the metric topology, the analysis based on the  $|D|$ -domain in the binary case is difficult to generalize to the nonbinary cases. To develop analytical tools for the general nonbinary cases, we study the theoretical results of degradation in the  $P$ -domain.

Let  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  be two symmetric distributions and  $\bar{x}_i = \Psi x_i, i = 1, 2$  be their reference measures. Consider two QMSCs  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}_i, W_i), i = 1, 2$  with uniform input in  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and outputs APP vectors  $\underline{Y}$  and  $\underline{Z}$ , respectively, where  $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2 = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q)$  are the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  and  $W_i(B_i|x) = x_i(B_i^{+x})$  for  $i = 1, 2, B_i \in \mathcal{B}_i$  and  $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$ . For any Markov kernel  $Q$  from  $\mathcal{S}_q$  to  $\mathcal{S}_q$ , we say that  $Q$  is *symmetric* if

$$Q(B|\underline{y}) = Q(B^{+i}|\underline{y}^{+i}) \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}_2, i \in \mathbb{F}_q, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q.$$

The following result shows that the stochastic degradation of the two QMSCs can be characterized by  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , the conditional distributions when  $0 \in \mathbb{F}_q$  is transmitted.

**Lemma 4.22:** The QMSC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}_2, W_2)$  is stochastically degraded with respect to the QMSC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}_1, W_1)$  if and only if there exists a symmetric kernel  $Q$  from  $\mathcal{S}_q$  to  $\mathcal{S}_q$ , such that

$$x_2(B) = \int Q(B|\underline{y})x_1(dy) \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}_2.$$

*Proof:* First, if there exists such a symmetric kernel  $Q$ , then for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}_2$  and  $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$

$$W_2(B|x) = x_2(B^{+x}) = \int Q(B^{+x}|\underline{y})x_1(dy) = \int Q(B|\underline{y}^{-x})x_1(dy) = \int Q(B|\underline{y})W_1(dy|x),$$

i.e., the second QMSC is stochastically degraded with respect to the first one. Conversely, if there exists a kernel  $Q$  such that

$$W_2(B|x) = \int Q(B|\underline{y})W_1(dy|x) \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}_2, x \in \mathbb{F}_q$$

then we can construct a symmetric one,  $Q'$ , by  $Q'(B|\underline{y}) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} Q(B^{+x}|\underline{y}^{+x})$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}_2$ . □

We refer to the above relationship between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  as  $x_2$  being degraded with respect to  $x_1$ , or  $x_2 \succeq x_1$  (equivalently  $x_1$  being upgraded with respect to  $x_2$ , or  $x_1 \preceq x_2$ ). Clearly,  $\Delta_0 \succeq x \succeq \Delta_\infty$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . Our main theorem of this subsection, which reveals the equivalence between *degradation*, *coupling of random vectors with given marginals*, *partial order induced by concave kernels on  $\mathcal{S}_q$* , and *partial order induced by optimal transport functional*, is shown below.

**Theorem 4.23:** The following statements are *equivalent*, collectively referred to as  $x_1 \preceq x_2$ :

- i) There is a symmetric kernel  $Q$  from  $\mathcal{S}_q$  to  $\mathcal{S}_q$ , such that  $x_2(B) = \int Q(B|\underline{y})x_1(dy)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}_2$ .
- ii) There exists a coupling of random vectors  $\underline{Y} \sim \bar{x}_1, \underline{Z} \sim \bar{x}_2$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}|\underline{Z}] = \underline{Z}$  a.s.
- iii)  $\int f d\bar{x}_1 \leq \int f d\bar{x}_2$  for all bounded concave  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .<sup>10</sup>
- iv)  $W_2(\bar{x}_1, \mu)^2 - W_2(\bar{x}_2, \mu)^2 \leq Q(x_1) - Q(x_2)$  for all Borel probability measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)$ .

*Proof:* See Appendix II-G. □

The above theorem on degradation has rich corollaries. It is immediate that degradation induces a partial order on  $\mathcal{X}_q$  and is preserved under convex combination, i.e., for any  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$  and  $x_1 \succeq x_2, x_3 \succeq x_4$ , it holds that

$$\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_3 \succeq \lambda x_2 + (1 - \lambda)x_4.$$

<sup>10</sup>Since  $\mathcal{S}_q$  is a finite-dimensional probability simplex, it can be verified that any bounded convex (or concave)  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ -measurable and thus integrable with respect to all Borel probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ .

For any  $x_1 \succeq (\preceq)x_2$  and  $x_1 \neq x_2$ , we say that  $x_1$  is strictly degraded (upgraded) with respect to  $x_2$ , denoted by  $x_1 \succ (\prec)x_2$ . From Theorem 4.23 i), we have the following two results, which generalize [25, Lems. 4.80, 4.82].

**Lemma 4.24 (Partial Erasure Decomposition Lemma):** Any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$  is degraded with respect to  $x_{\text{QPEC}(2\mathfrak{P}(x))}$ , the conditional distribution of the APP vector of a QPEC with erasure size 2 and erasure probability  $2\mathfrak{P}(x)$  when  $0 \in \mathbb{F}_q$  is transmitted.

*Proof:* The claim trivially follows if  $x = \Delta_\infty$  or  $\Delta_0$ . For any  $\Delta_0 \prec x \prec \Delta_\infty$ , it follows from Lemma 4.14 that  $0 < \mathfrak{P}(x) < \frac{1}{2}$ . Construct a real nonnegative  $Q : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q) \times \mathcal{O}_{\text{QPEC}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$Q(B|i) = \frac{\frac{q}{q-1}}{(1-2\mathfrak{P}(x))} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{i\}} \int_B (y_i - \min\{y_i, y_j\}) \bar{x}(dy), \quad Q(B|\{i, j\}) = \frac{q}{2\mathfrak{P}(x)} \int_B \min\{y_i, y_j\} \bar{x}(dy)$$

for all distinct  $i, j \in \mathbb{F}_q$  and Borel sets  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{QPEC}}$  represents the output alphabet of a QPEC with erasure size 2, and  $\bar{x} = \Psi x$ . It can be verified that  $Q$  is a probability distribution on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  under any perfect input  $i$  and erasure input  $\{i, j\}$ , and is a symmetric Markov kernel. The claim follows since for any Borel set  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$  it can be verified that

$$\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{QPEC}}} Q(B|o) x_{\text{QPEC}(2\mathfrak{P}(x))}(o) = (1-2\mathfrak{P}(x))Q(B|0) + \frac{2\mathfrak{P}(x)}{q-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}} Q(B|\{0, j\}) = \int_B q y_0 \bar{x}(dy) = x(B).$$

From Theorem 4.23 i), this means that  $x \succeq x_{\text{QPEC}(2\mathfrak{P}(x))}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.25 (APP Processing Preserves Degradation):** Let  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  be a random codeword uniformly distributed over a linear code  $C_n$  of block-length  $n$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . For each  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , consider two transmission scenarios: In the first scenario, the  $t$ -th codeword symbol  $X_t$  is transmitted over a QMSC, where the output random APP vector  $\underline{Y}_t| \{X_t = 0\} \sim \mathbf{a}_t$ ; in the second scenario,  $X_t$  is transmitted over another QMSC, where the output random APP vector  $\underline{Z}_t| \{X_t = 0\} \sim \mathbf{b}_t$ . Assume that the  $i$ -th position of  $C_n$  is proper and that  $\mathbf{0} \in C_n$  is transmitted. Let  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  be the distributions of the extrinsic APP vectors for estimating  $X_i$  using  $\underline{Y}_{\sim i}$  and  $\underline{Z}_{\sim i}$ , respectively. Then if  $\mathbf{a}_t \succeq \mathbf{b}_t$  for all  $1 \leq t \leq n$ , we have  $x_i \succeq y_i$ . In particular, if  $\mathbf{a}_1 \succeq \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \succeq \mathbf{b}_2$ , then  $\mathbf{a}_1 * \mathbf{a}_2 \succeq \mathbf{b}_1 * \mathbf{b}_2$  where  $*$  takes  $\circledast$  or  $\boxtimes$ .

*Proof:* Same as the proof of [25, Lem. 4.82], by utilizing the property that sufficient statistic preserves degradation, as stated in [25, Lem. 4.81].  $\square$

From Theorem 4.23 ii), we have the following result about strict degradation and strictly concave kernels on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ .

**Lemma 4.26:** For any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,  $x_1 \prec x_2$  and bounded, strictly concave  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have  $\int f d\Psi x_1 < \int f d\Psi x_2$ .

*Proof:* By Theorem 4.23 ii), there exists a coupling  $(\underline{Y}, \underline{Z})$  such that  $\underline{Y} \sim \bar{x}_1, \underline{Z} \sim \bar{x}_2$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}|\underline{Z}] = \underline{Z}$  a.s. where  $\bar{x}_i = \Psi x_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . For any bounded, strictly concave  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , it follows from Jensen's inequality that

$$f(\underline{Z}) = f(\mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}|\underline{Z}]) \geq \mathbb{E}[f(\underline{Y})|\underline{Z}] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

If  $\int f d\bar{x}_1 = \int f d\bar{x}_2$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[f(\underline{Z})] = \mathbb{E}[f(\underline{Y})]$ , then the above inequality must be tight a.s. Due to the strict concavity of  $f$ ,  $\underline{Y}$  is a constant vector given  $\underline{Z}$  a.s., i.e.,  $\underline{Y}$  is  $\sigma(\underline{Z})$ -measurable. Then  $\underline{Z} = \mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}|\underline{Z}] = \underline{Y}$  a.s. and thus  $\underline{Y}, \underline{Z}$  are identically distributed, i.e.,  $\bar{x}_1 = \bar{x}_2$ , which means that  $x_1 = x_2$  since  $\Psi$  is bijective. This contradicts the condition  $x_1 \prec x_2$ , so  $\int f d\bar{x}_1 < \int f d\bar{x}_2$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.27 ( $\circledast$  Preserves Strict Degradation):** If  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $x_1 \succ x_2$ , then  $x_1 \circledast x_3 \succ x_2 \circledast x_3$  for all  $x_3 \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \{\Delta_\infty\}$ .

*Proof:* By condition, we have  $x_1 \circledast x_3 \succeq x_2 \circledast x_3$ , so it is sufficient to show that  $x_1 \circledast x_3 \neq x_2 \circledast x_3$ . By Lemmas II-D.1 and II-D.6,  $\mathfrak{B}$  is multiplicative under  $\circledast$  (i.e.,  $\mathfrak{B}(a \circledast b) = \mathfrak{B}(a)\mathfrak{B}(b)$  for all  $a, b \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ) and admits a strictly concave kernel on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ . Then by Lemmas 4.26 and the condition  $x_3 \neq \Delta_\infty$ , we have  $\mathfrak{B}(x_1) > \mathfrak{B}(x_2)$  and  $\mathfrak{B}(x_3) > 0$ . Hence, this corollary follows from  $\mathfrak{B}(x_1 \circledast x_3) = \mathfrak{B}(x_1)\mathfrak{B}(x_3) > \mathfrak{B}(x_2)\mathfrak{B}(x_3) = \mathfrak{B}(x_2 \circledast x_3)$ .  $\square$

By combining degradation with the duality rule of the entropy functional (see Lemma 4.15 and Corollary 4.16), we obtain the following inequalities, which generalize the inequalities in [9, Prop. 9] for the binary case.

**Proposition 4.28:** For any  $x_1, x'_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  with  $x'_1 \succeq x_1$  and  $*$  taking either  $\circledast$  or  $\boxtimes$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_2) \leq H(x'_1 - x_1), \\ |H((x'_1 - x_1) * (x_2 - x_3))| &\leq H(x'_1 - x_1), \\ |H((x'_1 - x_1) * (x_2 - x_3) * x_4)| &\leq H(x'_1 - x_1). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof:* Our proof differs from that in [9, Prop. 9], which uses a series expansion of the entropy functional  $H$  under the binary case. Note that  $H$  has a concave kernel and preserves the order by degradation. For the first inequality,  $H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_2) \geq 0$  follows from  $x'_1 * x_2 \succeq x_1 * x_2$ , and implies that

$$H(x'_1 - x_1) \stackrel{(a)}{=} H((x'_1 - x_1) \circledast x_2) + H((x'_1 - x_1) \boxtimes x_2) \geq H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_2).$$

(a) follows from Corollary 4.16. For the second inequality, note that

$$H((x'_1 - x_1) * (x_2 - x_3)) = H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_2) - H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_3)$$

and by the first inequality, both  $H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_2)$  and  $H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_3)$  are nonnegative, then further by the first inequality

$$|H((x'_1 - x_1) * (x_2 - x_3))| \leq \max\{H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_2), H((x'_1 - x_1) * x_3)\} \leq H(x'_1 - x_1).$$

The third inequality follows from the second one by replacing  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  with  $x_2 * x_4$  and  $x_3 * x_4$ , respectively.  $\square$

Theorem 4.23 iii) and iv) implies the following results regarding degradation and convergent sequences in  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ .

**Lemma 4.29:** Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be two sequences in  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ .

- i) If  $x_n \succeq x_{n-1}$  (respectively,  $x_n \preceq x_{n-1}$ ), then  $x_n \xrightarrow{d_W} x$  for some  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , and  $x \succeq x_n$  (respectively,  $x \preceq x_n$ ) for all  $n$ .
- ii) If  $x_n \succeq y_n$ ,  $x_n \xrightarrow{d_W} x$  and  $y_n \xrightarrow{d_W} y$ , then  $x \succeq y$ .

*Proof:* See Appendix II-H.  $\square$

Lemma 4.29 ii) implies that the partial order induced by degradation is *closed*. In the remainder of this paper, in order to define various thresholds of a code ensemble, we often consider a complete family of QMSCs ordered by degradation. Assume that channels in such a QMSC family are parameterized by their entropy.

**Definition 4.30:** A complete family of QMSCs  $\{c_h\} \subset \mathcal{X}_q$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation is such that 1)  $c_{h_1} \succ c_{h_2}$  for all  $h_1 > h_2$ ; 2)  $H(c_h) = h$  for all  $h \in [0, \log q]$ .

There are many channel families of interest belong to such a QMSC family, including the QPEC parameterized by erasure probability, the QSC parameterized by cross probability, and the  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -input additive channels (after symmetrization) parameterized by noise variance. For any nontrivial  $c \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , one can also construct the corresponding QMSC family by interpolation

$$c_h = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{H(c)}[(H(c) - h)\Delta_\infty + hc], & 0 \leq h \leq H(c), \\ \frac{1}{1-H(c)}[(h - H(c))\Delta_0 + (1 - h)c], & H(c) \leq h \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 4.31:** For any QMSC family  $\{c_h\}$  in Definition 4.30, the map  $h \mapsto c_h$  is continuous in  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ . Hence,  $\{c_h\}$  is a compact subset of  $\mathcal{X}_q$ , and the map  $h \mapsto F(c_h)$  is continuous for any bounded continuous functional  $F$  on  $\mathcal{X}_q$ .

*Proof:* Given any  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and convergent  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \log q]$  with  $h_n \rightarrow h$ , we need to show  $c_{h_n} \rightarrow c_h$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}_q$  is compact, it suffices to show that any convergent subsequence of  $\{c_{h_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $c_h$ . For any such convergent subsequence  $\{c_{h_k}\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  where  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} c_{h_k} = c^*$  for some  $c^* \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , we claim that  $c^* = c_h$ . Since every convergent sequence of real numbers admits a subsequence converging from above or below, without loss of generality, assume  $h_k \geq h$  for all  $k \in \mathcal{K}$  (the case  $h_k \leq h$  is similar). By Definition 4.30,  $c_{h_k} \succeq c_h$  for all  $k \in \mathcal{K}$ , and then by Lemma 4.29 ii) and  $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} c_{h_k} = c^*$ ,  $c^* \succeq c_h$ . As the entropy functional  $H$  is continuous and has a strictly concave kernel on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ , we must have  $c^* = c_h$ ; otherwise  $c^* \succ c_h$ , which, by Lemma 4.26, implies  $h = H(c_h) < H(c^*) = \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} H(c_{h_k}) = \lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} h_k = h$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

### E. Application to the Underlying LDPC Ensemble over $\mathbb{F}_q$

This subsection presents results on the BP decoding of uncoupled LDPC code ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , based on the prior results established in the preceding subsections. The uncoupled ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is reviewed in Section III-A. Similar to the binary case [25, Sec. IV], two reasonable assumptions are made here: (1) It is assumed that the transmission occurs over a QMSC, and that all-zero codeword is transmitted; (2) It is assumed that the BP decoder performs message passing on a tree ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  characterized by the degree profile of the uncoupled ensemble.<sup>11</sup> The first assumption is based on Lemma 4.4, which states that for any  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -input MC, we can construct its  $A_q \cup M_q$ -symmetrized version, a QMSC retaining the same symmetric capacity, and then all-zeros codeword is sufficient to capture any relevant performance metric. The second assumption is based on the well-known concentration inequality for sparse graph code ensembles [34], which implies that the asymptotic behavior of BP decoding can be characterized by *density evolution* (DE) on the tree ensemble.<sup>12</sup>

**Definition 4.32 (DE Operator and Fixed Points of a Single System):** Given an edge perspective degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$ , define the DE operator  $T_s^{(\ell)} : \mathcal{X}_q \times \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_q$  as follows (the subscript  $s$  denotes a single system, i.e., the uncoupled case):

$$T_s^{(0)}(x; c) := x, \quad T_s^{(1)}(x; c) = T_s(x; c) := c \circledast \lambda^*(\rho^{\boxtimes}(x)), \quad T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c) := \underbrace{T_s(\dots(T_s(x; c); c); c)}_{\ell\text{-fold}}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots$$

where given any polynomial  $p(x) = \sum_i p_i x^i$ ,  $p^*(x) = \sum_i p_i x^{*i} \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_q$  where  $* = \circledast$  or  $\boxtimes$ . If  $T_s(x; c) = x$ , then  $x$  is called a DE fixed point of the single (or uncoupled) system.

In Definition 4.32, and under the transmission of all-zeros codeword,  $c$  typically denotes the distribution of the probability vector from some QMSC, and  $x$  is typically the distribution of the variable-node output messages in the  $P$ -domain. Initialized with some  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,  $T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c)$  evaluates the distribution of the variable-node output messages after  $\ell$  iterations. See [25, Sec. 4.5.2] for a detailed derivation of the DE operator under an edge-perspective degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$ . Note that  $\Delta_\infty$  is always a (trivial) fixed point of all single systems. In Appendix II-I, we present a practical, sampling-based implementation algorithm for DE, applicable to general  $q \geq 2$ , and demonstrate how to search for nontrivial fixed points using DE.

<sup>11</sup>See [25, Sec. 3.7] for a detailed description of the tree ensemble in the binary case. For  $q \geq 3$ , each edge of such a tree ensemble is independently assigned a uniformly random edge label from  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ , and by Lemma 4.12, edge labels do not affect the message distributions involved in DE.

<sup>12</sup>In [34, Thm. 2], it was first shown that the iterative decoding performance of a random sparse graph concentrates around its ensemble average, and then shown that this ensemble average converges to that of the tree ensemble. Although the theorem was established for the binary case, it is not difficult to extend it to the general nonbinary case.

Since the DE operator corresponds to BP decoding on a cycle-free graph (which is equivalent to APP decoding), it preserves degradation and thus exhibits certain monotonicity properties. The following lemma follows from the results on degradation established in the previous subsection and generalizes the corresponding results in [25, Sec. 4.6] for the binary case.

**Lemma 4.33:** The following results regarding the monotonicity or convergence of  $T_s^{(\ell)}$  holds for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

- i) If  $x_1 \succeq x_2$ , then  $T_s^{(\ell)}(x_1; c) \succeq T_s^{(\ell)}(x_2; c)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{X}_q$ .
- ii) If  $c_1 \succeq c_2$ , then  $T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c_1) \succeq T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c_2)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$ .
- iii) If  $T_s(x; c) \preceq (\succeq)x$ , then  $T_s^{(\ell+1)}(x; c) \preceq (\succeq)T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c)$  and the sequence  $T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c) \xrightarrow{d_W} x_\infty$  for some fixed point  $x_\infty \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , which satisfies  $x_\infty \preceq (\succeq)T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c)$ .
- iv) If  $T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c) \succeq T_s^{(k)}(x; c)$  and  $T_s^{(\ell+1)}(x; c) \succeq T_s^{(k)}(x; c)$  for some  $0 \leq k \leq \ell$ , then the DE sequence  $T_s^{(\ell)}(x; c) \xrightarrow{d_W} x_\infty$  for some fixed point  $x_\infty \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , and  $x_\infty \succeq T_s^{(k)}(x; c)$ .

Specifically, when the DE iteration is initialized with  $x = \Delta_0$  (referred to as forward DE), the DE sequence always converges to a fixed point under  $d_W$ . Such a fixed point is referred to as the forward DE fixed point.

**Theorem 4.34 (Forward DE of  $(\lambda, \rho)$  Ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ):** Under an edge-perspective degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$ , let  $x_0 = \Delta_0$  and  $x_{\ell+1} = T_s(x_\ell; c)$  for some  $c \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

- i)  $x_\ell \xrightarrow{d_W} x_\infty$ , where  $x_\infty \in \mathcal{X}_q$  is the forward DE fixed point of this single system.
- ii) If the DE equation has no fixed point other than  $\Delta_\infty$ , then  $x_\infty = \Delta_\infty$ .
- iii) If the DE equation has a nontrivial fixed point  $x \succ \Delta_\infty$ , then  $x_\infty \succeq x \succ \Delta_\infty$ .

The forward DE fixed point characterizes the asymptotic performance of the  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble under BP decoding. Assume that transmission is over a complete family of QMSCs  $\{c_h\}$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation. Then there is a well-defined BP threshold  $h_s^{\text{BP}} \in [0, \log q]$  of this ensemble under  $\{c_h\}$ , given by

$$h_s^{\text{BP}}(\lambda, \rho, \{c_h\}) := \sup\{h \in [0, \log q] : T_s^{(\infty)}(\Delta_0; c_h) = \Delta_\infty\}, \quad (16)$$

such that reliable communication is possible using a random LDPC graph uniformly distributed over the  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble under BP decoding, provided that  $h < h_s^{\text{BP}}$ ; otherwise, if  $h > h_s^{\text{BP}}$ , with high probability the BP decoder suffers from a non-vanishing symbol error rate. The following stability condition for an uncoupled  $(\lambda, \rho, c)$  system generalizes [25, Thm. 4.127].

**Theorem 4.35 (Stability Condition for DE):** Under an edge-perspective degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$ , given any  $c, x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , define  $x_\ell = T_s^{(\ell)}(x_0; c)$  for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we have the following.

- i) Necessity: If  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) > 1$ , then there exists a strictly positive constant  $\xi = \xi(\lambda, \rho, c)$  such that

$$\liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{P}(x_\ell) > \xi \quad \forall x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \{\Delta_\infty\}.$$

- ii) Sufficiency: If  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$ , then there exists a strictly positive constant  $\xi = \xi(\lambda, \rho, c)$  such that if  $\mathfrak{E}(x_{\ell_0}) \leq \xi$  for some  $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $x_\ell \xrightarrow{d_W} \Delta_\infty$ .

*Proof:* See Appendix II-J. □

Due to Theorem 4.35, we call an uncoupled system  $(\lambda, \rho, c)$  stable if  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$ . Clearly, for those  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensembles with  $\lambda'(0) = 0$  (e.g., a  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble with  $d_l \geq 3$ ), the system is universally stable for all  $c \in \mathcal{X}_q$ .

## V. THRESHOLD SATURATION OF COUPLED ENSEMBLES OVER $\mathbb{F}_q$ ON QMSCS

We establish the threshold saturation result for coupled ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  on general QMSC families ordered by degradation, using the analytical tools presented in Section IV together with the potential functional method developed by Kumar *et al.* [9]. We further discuss the problem of whether the resulting threshold for the coupled ensemble can be limit-approaching—a problem that has been answered affirmatively in the binary case but remains open in the nonbinary case.

### A. Density Evolution of Coupled System

In Section III-B  $(\lambda, \rho, w, L)$  coupled ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  are considered, where  $(\lambda, \rho)$  denotes the edge-perspective degree profile of the underlying ensemble, and  $w, L \in \mathbb{N}$  measure the coupling width and coupling length, respectively. Under a given edge-spreading profile, the random coupled Tanner graph is constructed by multiple independent, uniformly random monomial maps. In Section III-C, we show that when the underlying Tanner graph is  $(d_l, d_r)$ -regular, the improved coupled ensemble (Definition 3.13) can have better achievable normalized  $d_{\min}$  and  $d_{\text{ss}}$  than the standard coupled ensemble (Definition 3.12). In this section, our theoretical results suggest that, the BP threshold of both coupled ensembles can be equally good. The degrees of  $(\lambda, \rho)$ ,  $w$ ,  $L$  and the round  $\ell$  of BP decoding are treated as constants independent of  $n$ , the number of variable nodes at each position. Due to the locality of a message-passing decoder (that is, the message along an edge at the  $\ell$ -th iteration is merely a function of the height- $\ell$  computation graph of this edge<sup>13</sup>) and the sparsity of the Tanner graph, it can be shown that many performance metrics related to message-passing decoding concentrate around their ensemble averages.

<sup>13</sup>See [34, Sec. II-B], [25, Sec. 3.7] for a detailed definition of a computation graph for message-passing decoding.

*Theorem 5.1 (Concentration around Ensemble Average):* Let  $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, \rho, w, L, n}$  be the random coupled graph ensemble (see Section III-B for definition) over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  used for transmission over a QMSC characterized by its  $P$ -domain symmetric distribution  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . Assume that the decoder performs  $\ell$  rounds of message-passing decoding on  $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, \rho, w, L, n}$  and let  $P_{v \rightarrow c}^{\text{MP}}(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, \rho, w, L, n}, \mathbf{c}, \ell)$  denote the fraction of incorrect variable-to-check messages among all  $2L\Lambda'(1)n$  variable-to-check messages at the  $\ell$ -th iteration.<sup>14</sup> Then, for any given  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a  $\beta > 0$  where  $\beta = \beta(\lambda, \rho, w, L, \delta)$  is independent of  $n$ , such that

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| P_{v \rightarrow c}^{\text{MP}}(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, \rho, w, L, n}, \mathbf{c}, \ell) - \mathbb{E}[P_{v \rightarrow c}^{\text{MP}}(\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, \rho, w, L, n}, \mathbf{c}, \ell)] \right| > \delta \right\} \leq e^{-\beta n}.$$

*Proof:* See Appendix III-A.  $\square$

The above  $P_{v \rightarrow c}^{\text{MP}}$  can be replaced with other performance metrics related to message-passing decoding, such as the fraction of incorrect symbol decisions among all  $2Ln$  symbol decisions, or the fraction of incorrect variable-to-check messages among all  $\Lambda'(1)n$  check-node-input messages at any single position. In these cases, similar concentration inequalities still hold in the same way. Moreover, similar to the argument for the cycle-free case of the computation graph in the underlying Tanner graph [34, App. A], it can be concluded that any computation graph of height  $\ell$  in the coupled Tanner graph  $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, \rho, w, L, n}$  is cycle-free with probability  $1 - O(n^{-1})$ .<sup>15</sup> Therefore, the above ensemble average metrics converge to their cycle-free cases in the large  $n$  limit, which can be characterized using the DE of the coupled system. Combined with Theorem 5.1, DE provides a convincing asymptotic performance analysis for the coupled system under message-passing (e.g., BP) decoding.

We now derive the DE equations for the coupled system under BP decoding. To simplify the notation, we will only present the results for the case where the underlying graph ensemble is  $(d_l, d_r)$ -regular. The extension to the more general case, where the underlying ensemble has a degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$  is straightforward. Let  $\mathcal{N}_v := \{1, 2, \dots, 2L\}$  be the set of variable-node position indices and  $\mathcal{N}_c := \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$  with  $K = 2L + w - 1$  be the set of check-node position indices. Under all-zeros codeword transmission, let  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$  be the conditional distribution of the QMSC output messages. During the BP iteration, let  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}$  denote the conditional distribution of *check-node-input* messages at position  $i$  in the  $\ell$ -th iteration, and we set  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)} = \Delta_\infty$  for  $i \notin \mathcal{N}_c$ . For a standard coupled ensemble, the DE update for  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}$  is a known result [9, Eq. (5)], [7, Eq. (13)] given by

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell+1)} = \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} \mathbf{c}_{i-k} \circledast \left( \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} \mathbf{x}_{i-k+j}^{(\ell) \boxtimes d_r - 1} \right)^{\circledast d_l - 1} \quad (17)$$

for  $i \in \mathcal{N}_c$ , where  $\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{c}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{N}_v$  and  $\mathbf{c}_i = \Delta_\infty$  otherwise. The DE for an improved coupled ensemble is shown below.

*Lemma 5.2 (DE of Improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  Ensemble):* For each  $0 \leq k \leq w - 1$ , let  $\mathcal{C}_k$  denote the set of all combinations of  $d_l - 1$  distinct elements from  $\{0, 1, \dots, w - 1\} \setminus \{k\}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_k := \{(j_1, \dots, j_{d_l-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_l-1} : j_1 < \dots < j_{d_l-1}; j_d \in \{0, 1, \dots, w - 1\} \setminus \{k\}, d = 1, 2, \dots, d_l - 1\}.$$

For an improved coupled  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble,  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)}$  can be updated by

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell+1)} = \frac{1}{C_{w, d_l}} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k} \mathbf{c}_{i-k} \circledast \left( \sum_{d=1}^{d_l-1} \mathbf{x}_{i-k+j_d}^{(\ell) \boxtimes d_r - 1} \right) \quad (18)$$

for  $i \in \mathcal{N}_c$ , where  $C_{w, d_l} := w \binom{w-1}{d_l-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{c}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{N}_v$ , and  $\mathbf{c}_i = \Delta_\infty$  otherwise.

*Proof:* For  $i \in \mathcal{N}_v \cup \{-w+2, \dots, 0\} \cup \{2L+1, \dots, K\}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq w - 1$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,k}^{(\ell)}$  represent the conditional distribution of the messages passed from the variable nodes at position  $i$  to the check nodes at position  $i + k$ . By construction, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the endpoint position of each edge originating from each check node is independently and uniformly distributed over the nearest  $w$  positions of this check node (see Section III-B for details). Thus,

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i-k, k}^{(\ell)}.$$

The conditional distribution of *check-node-output* messages at position  $i$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{y}_i^{(\ell)}$ , is  $\mathbf{y}_i^{(\ell)} = \mathbf{x}_i^{(\ell) \boxtimes d_r - 1}$ . Since a uniformly chosen variable node at each position has a uniformly distributed edge type in  $\mathcal{T}_{w, d_l} \cap \{0, 1\}^w$ , given that an arc of a uniformly chosen variable node at position  $i$  is absorbed by check-node position  $i + k$ , the remaining  $d_l - 1$  arcs of this variable node are uniformly absorbed by a set of check-node positions in  $i + \mathcal{C}_k$ . Thus, the update rule of  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,k}^{(\ell)}$  is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,k}^{(\ell+1)} = \mathbf{c}_i \circledast \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}_k|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k} \sum_{d=1}^{d_l-1} \mathbf{y}_{i+j_d}^{(\ell)},$$

<sup>14</sup>It can be shown that (e.g., [34, Lem. 1], [52, Lem. 1]) when a linear code over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is transmitted over a symmetric  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -input MC (i.e., the symmetry group of the MC contains the additive group on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ), its message-passing decoder exhibits a uniform error property, in both block and symbol error rates.

<sup>15</sup>This can be proven by induction: given any cycle-free computation graph of height  $\ell - 1$  in the coupled Tanner graph, a breadth-first operation is used to expand its leaf nodes to form a computation graph of height  $\ell$ . This operation introduces one or more cycles with at most probability  $O(n^{-1})$ .

where  $|\mathcal{C}_k| = \binom{w-1}{d_l-1}$ ,  $c_i = c$  for  $i \in \mathcal{N}_v$ , and  $c_i = \Delta_\infty$  otherwise. Combining the above two equations gives (18).  $\square$

Following [9, Sec. III-B], vectors of symmetric measures will be denoted with underlines, e.g.,  $\underline{x}$  with  $[\underline{x}]_i = x_i$ , and if all components are probability measures, there is a partial order naturally induced by the degradation of all measure components: given  $\underline{x}', \underline{x}$ , if all  $x'_i, x_i \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , then we write  $\underline{x}' \succeq \underline{x}$  if  $x'_i \succeq x_i$  for all  $i$ , and  $\underline{x}' \succ \underline{x}$  if  $x'_i \succ x_i$  for some  $i$ . For a sequence  $\underline{x}^{(\ell)}$  in  $\mathcal{X}_q^K$ , if  $x_i^{(\ell)} \xrightarrow{d_w} x_i$  for all  $i$  and some  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ , then we say  $\underline{x}^{(\ell)}$  converges pointwise to  $\underline{x}$ .

**Definition 5.3 (DE Operator and Fixed Point of Coupled Systems):** The DE operators  $T_c^{(\ell)} : \mathcal{X}_q^K \times \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_q^K$  of the two coupled ensembles are both denoted by

$$T_c^{(0)}(\underline{x}; c) := \underline{x}, \quad T_c^{(1)}(\underline{x}; c) = T_c(\underline{x}; c), \quad T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}; c) := \underbrace{T_c(\dots(T_c(\underline{x}; c); c); c)}_{\ell\text{-fold}}, \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots$$

where for the standard  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, the  $i$ -th output component  $x_i^{(\ell+1)} = [T_c(\underline{x}^{(\ell)}; c)]_i$  is defined by (17), and for the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, the  $i$ -th output component  $x_i^{(\ell+1)} = [T_c(\underline{x}^{(\ell)}; c)]_i$  is defined by (18). If  $T_c(\underline{x}; c) = \underline{x}$ , then  $\underline{x}$  is called a fixed point of the coupled system.

Similar to the DE operator  $T_s$  of the underlying ensemble,  $T_c$  corresponds to the APP processing of a (coupled) tree graph, and thus preserves degradation. The following results establish some monotonicity and convergence properties of  $T_c^{(\ell)}$ , which can be easily derived from Lemmas 4.25 and 4.29, and thus the proof is omitted.

**Lemma 5.4:** The following results regarding the monotonicity or convergence of  $T_c^{(\ell)}$  holds for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

- i) If  $\underline{x}_1 \succeq \underline{x}_2$ , then  $T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}_1; c) \succeq T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}_2; c)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{X}_q$ .
- ii) If  $c_1 \succeq c_2$ , then  $T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}; c_1) \succeq T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}; c_2)$  for all  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$ .
- iii) If  $T_c(\underline{x}; c) \preceq (\succeq) \underline{x}$ , then  $T_c^{(\ell+1)}(\underline{x}; c) \preceq (\succeq) T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}; c)$  and the sequence  $T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}; c)$  converges pointwise to some fixed point  $\underline{x}^{(\infty)} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$ , which satisfies  $\underline{x}^{(\infty)} \preceq (\succeq) T_c^{(\ell)}(\underline{x}; c)$ .

A useful observation is that when the coupled systems are initialized with  $x_i^{(0)} = \Delta_0$  for  $i \in \mathcal{N}_c$ , due to the symmetry of the coupling chain and boundary conditions, the vector  $\underline{x}^{(\ell)}$  exhibits left-right symmetry, i.e., for all  $\ell$

$$x_i^{(\ell)} = x_{2L+w-i}^{(\ell)}.$$

As DE progresses, the perfect message distribution,  $\Delta_\infty$ , originating from the boundaries, propagates inward. This leads to a nondecreasing degradation order on positions  $1, \dots, \lceil K/2 \rceil$ , and a nonincreasing degradation order on positions  $\lceil K/2 \rceil + 1, \dots, K$ . Thus, in terms of degradation, the message distribution reaches its maximum at position  $i_0 = \lceil K/2 \rceil$ . Inspired by this, [7]–[9] considered a modified DE recursion to serve as an upper bound on the original recursion in terms of degradation. The system corresponding to the modified DE recursion is referred to as the *modified system*, which serves as a lower bound for the performance of the original coupled system and plays a crucial role in establishing the achievability of threshold saturation.

**Definition 5.5:** The modified system involves a modification of the original DE update for  $\underline{x}^{(\ell)}$  in (17) or (18), by fixing the components at positions *outside*  $\mathcal{N}'_c = \{1, 2, \dots, i_0\}$  where  $i_0 := \lceil K/2 \rceil$ : for each  $\ell$ , after obtaining  $\underline{x}^{(\ell)}$  from the original DE update, we fix the components  $x_i^{(\ell)} = x_{i_0}^{(\ell)}$  for  $i_0 < i \leq K$  and use this modified vector for the next DE update.

The secondary update operation of the modified system makes the vector of probability measures degraded with respect to that of the original coupled system. For both systems, if the DE recursion is initialized with  $\underline{x}^{(0)} = \underline{\Delta}_0 := [\Delta_0, \dots, \Delta_0]$ , then the resulting sequence of measure vectors  $\underline{x}^{(\ell)}$  satisfies  $\underline{x}^{(\ell+1)} \prec \underline{x}^{(\ell)}$  and converges pointwise to a forward fixed point  $\underline{x}$ . For the original coupled system, such a fixed point satisfies  $\underline{x} = T_c(\underline{x}; c)$ , while for the modified system, such a fixed point satisfies  $x_i = T_c(\underline{x}; c)_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq i_0$ , and  $x_i = x_{i_0}$  for  $i_0 < i \leq K$ . Moreover, for the modified system, the components of its forward fixed point also fulfill the following monotonicity property, which can be proven in the same manner as in [9, Lem. 36] (since only degradation is involved) and thus the proof is omitted here.

**Lemma 5.6:** For both the standard and the improved coupled ensembles, the forward fixed point  $\underline{x}$  of the modified system under  $\underline{\Delta}_0$ -initialization satisfies

$$x_i \succeq x_{i-1} \quad \forall 2 \leq i \leq K.$$

Assume that transmission is over a complete family of QMCSs  $\{c_h\}$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation (see Definition 4.30). The BP threshold of a  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  coupled ensemble under  $\{c_h\}$  is defined as

$$h_c^{\text{BP}}(d_l, d_r, w, L, \{c_h\}) := \sup\{h \in [0, \log q] : T_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{\Delta}_0; c_h) = \underline{\Delta}_\infty\}. \quad (19)$$

Reliable communication is possible using this coupled ensemble under BP decoding, provided that  $h < h_c^{\text{BP}}$ ; otherwise  $h > h_c^{\text{BP}}$ , with high probability the BP decoder suffers from a non-vanishing symbol error rate. A straightforward numerical method for computing  $h_c^{\text{BP}}$  is to run the DE of this coupled system for a large number of iterations until convergence (see Appendix II-G for an implementation of DE). Lemma 5.4 ensures the convergence of DE under  $\underline{\Delta}_0$ -initialization. However, this procedure typically converges very slowly (especially when the coupling length is large) and overlooks the inherent theoretical properties of spatial coupling. In the binary case, many existing theoretical results (e.g., [7, Thm. 41], [9, Thms. 45, 47]) show that, under appropriate ensemble parameters,  $h_c^{\text{BP}}$  can saturate to a well-defined threshold that depends solely on the underlying ensemble

and the BMSC family. This property for coupled code systems, known as *threshold saturation*, has not yet been theoretically established for general nonbinary cases.

In the next subsection, we will show that, for general nonbinary cases, threshold saturation still holds for the coupled system. Specifically, we define a threshold  $h^{FP}$ , characterized by the nontrivial DE fixed points of the uncoupled system, and prove the universal achievability of threshold saturation to  $h^{FP}$ . That is, when  $w$  is sufficiently large,  $h_c^{BP} \geq h^{FP}$  for all  $L$ . On the other hand, when the uncoupled system is stable at  $h = h^{FP}$ , we prove the corresponding converse result of threshold saturation, that is, for any fixed  $w$ ,  $h_c^{BP} \leq h^{FP}$  for sufficiently large  $L$ . Hence, for many cases of interest (e.g., the underlying code graph is  $(d_l, d_r)$ -regular with  $d_l \geq 3$ ),  $h_c^{BP}$  saturates to  $h^{FP}$  as the coupling parameters  $L$  and then  $w$  tend to infinity. At this point, the BP threshold of the coupled ensemble can be entirely determined by the underlying ensemble and the QMSC family.

### B. Threshold Saturation of Coupled System

To simplify the notation in the statements and proofs, we present our results for the case where the underlying code graph is  $(d_l, d_r)$ -regular. All the results in this subsection, along with their proofs, can be extended to a slightly more general case where the underlying ensemble has a degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$ . The following definition is due to [9, Def. 20].

**Definition 5.7:** Given degree pair  $(d_l, d_r)$  of the underlying ensemble,<sup>16</sup> the potential functional  $U_s : \mathcal{X}_q \times \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the check-node-input message distribution  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and the channel message distribution  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$  is defined by

$$U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c}) := \left( \frac{d_l}{d_r} - d_l \right) H(\mathbf{x}^{\boxtimes d_r}) + d_l H(\mathbf{x}^{\boxtimes d_r-1}) - H(\mathbf{c} \circledast (\mathbf{x}^{\boxtimes d_r-1})^{\circledast d_l}).$$

In the fields of coding theory and statistical mechanics, the negative of the potential functional is commonly known by other names, such as trial entropy, replica-symmetric estimate, or Bethe free energy of sparse graphical models. In the binary case,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_2} -U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c})$  is conjectured (and proven for certain degree profiles or special  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_2$ ) to be a (tight) lower bound on the normalized ensemble average code-induced conditional entropy under transmission over  $\mathbf{c}$  [26]–[29]. Due to the continuity of the entropy functional  $H$  and the operators  $\circledast$  and  $\boxtimes$ ,  $U_s$  is continuous with respect to  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c})$ , and since  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  is compact,  $U_s(\cdot; \mathbf{c})$  attains extremum on  $\mathcal{X}_q$ . Some results concerning the potential functional  $U_s$  are shown in Appendix III-B.

**Definition 5.8 (Energy Gap Characterized by Nontrivial Fixed Points):** Given a degree pair  $(d_l, d_r)$  and  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , let  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c}) := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \{\Delta_\infty\} : T_s(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{a}\}$  be the set of all nontrivial DE fixed points of the uncoupled system. Define the energy gap

$$\Delta E(\mathbf{c}) := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c})} U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c})$$

with the convention that the infimum over an empty set is  $+\infty$ .

When the uncoupled system  $(\lambda, \rho, \mathbf{c})$  is stable in the sense of Theorem 4.35,  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c})$  exhibits a good topological property.

**Lemma 5.9:** For  $d_l \geq 3$  and  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c})$  is either empty or nonempty compact in  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ .

**Proof:** See Appendix III-C. For a  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , the condition  $d_l \geq 3$  can be replaced with  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{c})\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$ , in which case Lemma 5.9 still holds.  $\square$

By the continuity of  $U_s$  and Lemma 5.9, if the uncoupled system is stable, then the infimum in  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c})$  can be replaced with a minimum: when  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c})$  is nonempty, the minimum value can be attained by some nontrivial DE fixed point in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c})$ , with the convention that the minimum over an empty set is  $+\infty$ . We have the following monotonicity of  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c})$ .

**Lemma 5.10:** For any  $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  with  $\mathbf{c}_1 \succ \mathbf{c}_2$  and  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c}_2)$  being nonempty, we have  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_1) \leq \Delta E(\mathbf{c}_2)$ . Furthermore, if  $d_l \geq 3$ , then  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_1) < \Delta E(\mathbf{c}_2)$ .

**Proof:** See Appendix III-D. For a  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , the condition  $d_l \geq 3$  can be replaced with  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{c}_1)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$ , in which case Lemma 5.10 still holds.  $\square$

**Definition 5.11 (Threshold  $h^{FP}$ ):** Given a degree pair  $(d_l, d_r)$  and a complete QMSC family  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation, define the threshold

$$h^{FP}(d_l, d_r, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}) := \sup\{h \in [0, \log q] : \Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h) > 0\}. \quad (20)$$

The above threshold  $h^{FP}$  depends solely on the underlying ensemble and the QMSC family, and it will serve as the threshold saturation target for the coupled ensemble that we aim to establish. In [9, Def. 25], Kumar *et al.* defined their energy gap by

$$\Delta \tilde{E}(\mathbf{c}) := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{c})} U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c}), \quad \forall \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q,$$

where  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{c}) := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{X}_q : T_s^{(\infty)}(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{c}) = \Delta_\infty\}$  denotes the basin of attraction to  $\Delta_\infty$ . Correspondingly, they defined the potential threshold under a complete QMSC family  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$  by [9, Def. 28]<sup>17</sup>

$$h^*(d_l, d_r, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}) := \sup\{h \in [0, \log q] : \Delta \tilde{E}(\mathbf{c}_h) > 0\}. \quad (21)$$

<sup>16</sup>See [9, Def. 20] for the definition of the potential functional for an irregular  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble.

<sup>17</sup>The definitions of energy gap and potential threshold in [9], although given in the binary case, extend naturally to general nonbinary cases.

Similar to [9, Lem. 26], it is not hard to show that for general  $q \geq 2$ ,  $\Delta\tilde{E}(\mathbf{c}_h)$  is nonincreasing in  $h$ . Because  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{c})$  for all  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , it follows that  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h) \geq \Delta\tilde{E}(\mathbf{c}_h)$  for all  $h$ . Moreover, for any  $h < h_s^{\text{BP}}$  where  $h_s^{\text{BP}}$  is the BP threshold of the underlying ensemble defined in (16), we have  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c}_h) = \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{c}_h) = \emptyset$  and both  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h), \Delta\tilde{E}(\mathbf{c}_h)$  diverges to  $\infty$ . Thus

$$h_s^{\text{BP}} \leq h^* \leq h^{\text{FP}}$$

always holds. In the binary case, we will show in Lemma 5.13 that, when the uncoupled system is stable at the channel entropy  $h^*$ ,<sup>18</sup> it follows that  $h^* = h^{\text{FP}}$ , in which case our result exactly coincides with that in [9]. For general  $q \geq 3$ , we choose  $h^{\text{FP}}$  instead of  $h^*$  as the target for threshold saturation of the coupled system because: 1) As an upper bound on  $h^*$ ,  $h^{\text{FP}}$  is clearly a better achievable threshold; 2) If numerical programs are developed to search for (or bound)  $h^{\text{FP}}$  and  $h^*$ , the former may be easier since  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c}_h) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{c}_h)$  can be compact under the stability condition (e.g., for  $d_l \geq 3$ ), making  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h)$  easier to evaluate (or bound) than  $\Delta\tilde{E}(\mathbf{c}_h)$ ; 3) For general nonbinary cases, a similar converse result of threshold saturation, to [9, Thm. 47], can be established, using  $h^{\text{FP}}$  rather than  $h^*$  as a target threshold. To avoid trivial cases, we assume that  $0 < h^{\text{FP}} < \log q$ . Otherwise, the following theorem would imply that  $h_c^{\text{BP}} = h^{\text{FP}} = 0$  or  $\log q$  for certain coupling parameters.

**Theorem 5.12 (Threshold Saturation of Coupled Systems):** Given a degree pair  $(d_l, d_r)$  and a complete QMSC family  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation, let  $h^{\text{FP}}$  be defined in (20). For both the standard and the improved coupled  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , let  $h_c^{\text{BP}}$  denote the BP threshold of the coupled ensemble under  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$ , as defined in (19). Then the following two statements hold for both coupled ensembles.

- i) *Achievability:* For any  $h < h^{\text{FP}}$ ,  $w > K_{q, d_l, d_r}/(2\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h))$  and  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ , the unique DE fixed point of the coupled system is  $\underline{\Delta}_\infty$ , where the constant  $K_{q, d_l, d_r} := d_l(d_r - 1)(2d_l d_r - 2d_l - 1) \log q$  for both coupled ensembles.
- ii) *Converse:* For  $d_l \geq 3$ , any  $h > h^{\text{FP}}$ , and any fixed  $w \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists an  $L_0 > 0$  such that for all  $L > L_0$ , the DE fixed point of the coupled system initialized with  $\underline{\Delta}_0$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{\Delta}_0; \mathbf{c}_h) \succ \underline{\Delta}_\infty.$$

*Proof:* See Sections V-D and V-E. This theorem can be adapted to the case where the underlying ensemble has a degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$ . For the achievability, the constant  $K_{q, d_l, d_r}$  should be replaced with  $K_{q, \lambda, \rho} := \Lambda'(1)[2\rho''(1) + \rho'(1) + 2\lambda'(1)\rho'(1)^2] \log q$ , as derived in [9, Lem. 43]. For the converse part, the condition  $d_l \geq 3$  should be replaced with the stability condition

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{c}_{h^{\text{FP}}})\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1. \quad (22)$$

The condition  $d_l \geq 3$  or (22) is required to ensure that  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h) < 0$  for all  $h > h^{\text{FP}}$ . To see this, assume that (22) holds for an uncoupled system  $(\lambda, \rho, \mathbf{c}_h)$ . Since  $h \mapsto \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{c}_h)$  is continuous (see Lemma 4.31), the system is also stable for  $h \in [h^{\text{FP}}, h^{\text{FP}} + \Delta h]$  and some  $\Delta h > 0$ . By Lemma 5.10 and (20), the energy gap  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h)$  is decreasing and nonpositive for  $h > h^{\text{FP}}$ , and *strictly decreasing* on  $(h^{\text{FP}}, h^{\text{FP}} + \Delta h)$ , and thus strictly negative for all  $h > h^{\text{FP}}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.13:** Under the same scenario in Theorem 5.12 and  $d_l \geq 3$ , we have

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} h_c^{\text{BP}}(d_l, d_r, w, L, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}) = \lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} h_c^{\text{BP}}(d_l, d_r, w, L, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}) = h^{\text{FP}}(d_l, d_r, \{\mathbf{c}_h\}).$$

*Proof:* Define  $a_{w, L} := h_c^{\text{BP}}(d_l, d_r, w, L, \{\mathbf{c}_h\})$ ,  $b_w := \liminf_{L \rightarrow \infty} a_{w, L}$  and  $c_w := \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} a_{w, L}$  for  $w, L \in \mathbb{N}$ . Clearly,  $b_w \leq c_w$  for all  $w$ . By Theorem 5.12 i), for any  $h < h^{\text{FP}}$ , there exists some  $L$ -independent  $w_0(h)$  such that  $a_{w, L} \geq h$  for all  $w > w_0(h)$  and  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ , and thus  $b_w \geq h$  for all  $w > w_0(h)$ . On the other hand, by Theorem 5.12 ii), we have  $c_w \leq h^{\text{FP}}$  for all  $w$ . Then given any  $h < h^{\text{FP}}$ , it follows that  $h \leq \liminf_{w \rightarrow \infty} b_w \leq * \leq \limsup_{w \rightarrow \infty} c_w \leq h^{\text{FP}}$  where  $*$  takes  $\limsup_{w \rightarrow \infty} b_w$  or  $\liminf_{w \rightarrow \infty} c_w$ . Letting  $h \uparrow h^{\text{FP}}$ , we obtain  $\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} b_w = \lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} c_w = h^{\text{FP}}$ . For the case where the underlying ensemble has a degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$ , the condition  $d_l \geq 3$  should be replaced with the stability condition (22).  $\square$

By Theorem 5.12, we have established a threshold saturation result for the coupled system, which universally holds for general complete QMSC families ordered by degradation. The target threshold,  $h^{\text{FP}}$ , depends solely on the underlying ensemble and the channel family. As  $L$  and then  $w$  tend to infinity, the design rate of the coupled ensemble converges to that of the underlying ensemble, and Corollary 5.13 shows that the BP threshold  $h_c^{\text{BP}}$  of the coupled system can be determined by  $h^{\text{FP}}$  under certain coupling parameters  $w, L$ . A natural problem is whether it is possible to show that, under certain ensemble parameters (e.g., increasing  $d_l, d_r$  while keeping  $d_l/d_r$  fixed),  $h^{\text{FP}}$  can approach the Shannon threshold of the underlying ensemble. The problem can be answered affirmatively in the binary case, but remains open in the general nonbinary cases. First, except for the erasure channel family, it is hard to directly derive such limit-approaching results using the known properties of the potential functional and the definition of  $h^{\text{FP}}$ . In the binary case, due to the simplicity of the statistical model, we can identify some intermediate threshold associated with optimal decoding to help establish the limit-approaching of  $h^{\text{FP}}$ . One such threshold is the so-called MAP threshold of the underlying ensemble. Unfortunately, for  $q \geq 3$ , the model no longer possesses desirable properties, and the existing statistical mechanics methods no longer work. We will elaborate on this in the next subsection.

<sup>18</sup>This is the assumption made in [9, Thm. 47] to establish the converse result for threshold saturation of binary coupled ensembles on BMSC families.

In any case, we can obtain an upper bound on  $h^{FP}$  using numerical methods. This can be achieved by numerically capturing as many nontrivial DE fixed points as possible of the uncoupled system at each channel entropy  $h$ , thereby obtaining an upper bound estimate on  $\Delta E(c_h)$ , given by

$$\Delta U(c_h) := \min_{x \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(c_h)} U_s(x; c_h) \geq \inf_{x \in \mathcal{F}(c_h)} U_s(x; c_h) = \Delta E(c_h),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(c_h) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(c_h)$  denotes the set of nontrivial DE fixed points captured by the numerical procedure. Then an upper bound on  $h^{FP}$  can be obtained, by replacing  $\Delta E(c_h)$  with  $\Delta U(c_h)$  in (20), which is given by

$$\tilde{h}^{FP} := \sup\{h \in [0, \log q] : \Delta U(c_h) > 0\}.$$

For example, we consider the family of QSCs with  $q = 3$  and several  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_3$  with  $d_l \geq 3$ , and we use the program in Appendix II-I to search for the nontrivial DE fixed points of this system. The obtained upper bound  $\tilde{h}^{FP}$  on  $h^{FP}$  and the Shannon threshold  $h^{Sh} = (d_l/d_r) \log 3$  are provided in Table III, where numerical results show that as  $d_l, d_r$  increase,  $\tilde{h}^{FP}$  rapidly approaches  $h^{Sh}$ . For most of the cases in Table III, our program identifies two distinct nontrivial fixed points at large  $h$  near  $h^{Sh}$ , one of which is the forward fixed point  $x_h^{BP}$  and  $\Delta U(c_h)$  always attains its value at  $x_h^{BP}$ .

TABLE III  
NUMERICAL UPPER BOUNDS ON  $h^{FP}$  OF  $(d_l, d_r)$  ENSEMBLES OVER  $\mathbb{F}_3$  UNDER A QSC FAMILY WITH  $q = 3$

$d_l$	$d_r$	$\tilde{h}^{FP}$	$h^{Sh}$	$d_l$	$d_r$	$\tilde{h}^{FP}$	$h^{Sh}$	$d_l$	$d_r$	$\tilde{h}^{FP}$	$h^{Sh}$
3	6	0.52401		3	5	0.63820		4	6	0.73094	
4	8	0.54337	0.54931	6	10	0.65831	0.65917	6	9	0.73238	0.73241
5	10	0.54752		9	15	0.65891		8	12	0.73240	
6	12	0.54893		12	20	0.65917		10	15	0.73241	

### C. Binary Case: The Blessing of the MAP Threshold

Based on the existing results established for BMSCs, we first show how our threshold saturation result, Theorem 5.12, aligns with that of Kumar *et al.* [9, Thms. 45, 47] in the binary case.

*Lemma 5.14:* Consider the use of binary  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble for transmission over a complete BMSC family  $\{c_h\}$  parameterized by  $h \in [0, \log 2]$  and ordered by degradation. Let  $h^{FP}$  be the threshold defined in (20), and  $h^*$  be the potential threshold defined in (21) (or see [9, Def. 28 iii])), then  $h^* \leq h^{FP}$ . If the system is stable at  $h = h^*$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{B}(c_{h^*})\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$ , then  $h^* = h^{FP}$ .

*Proof:* By the definitions of the two threshold and the fact that  $\Delta E(c) \geq \Delta \tilde{E}(c)$  for all  $c \in \mathcal{X}_2$ ,  $h^* \leq h^{FP}$  trivially follows. If the system is stable at  $h = h^*$ , then due to the continuity of  $h \mapsto \mathcal{B}(c_h)$ , the system is also stable for  $h \in (h^*, h^* + \Delta h)$  and some  $\Delta h > 0$ . Then by [9, Lem. 30], for any  $h > h^*$ , there exists some  $x \in \mathcal{X}_2$  such that  $U_s(x; c_h) < 0$ . Moreover, by [9, Lem. 24], any local minimizer (and hence global minimizer) for  $\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}_2} U_s(x; c)$  is a DE fixed point under  $c$ . Therefore, for any  $h > h^*$ , the global minimizer for  $\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}_2} U_s(x; c_h)$  must be some nontrivial DE fixed point  $x_h^* \in \mathcal{F}(c_h)$  such that  $U_s(x_h^*; c_h) < 0$  (the trivial fixed point  $\Delta_\infty$  cannot be a global minimizer since  $U_s(\Delta_\infty; c_h) = 0$ ), and thus  $\Delta E(c_h) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{F}(c_h)} U_s(x; c_h) = U_s(x_h^*; c_h) < 0$  which implies that  $h \geq h^{FP}$ . In summary,  $h \geq h^{FP}$  holds for any  $h > h^*$ , which means that  $h^* \geq h^{FP}$ . Thus,  $h^* = h^{FP}$ .  $\square$

As a result, under the binary case and the condition that the uncoupled system is stable at  $h^*$ , Theorem 5.12 exactly coincides with [9, Thms. 45, 47]. Lemma 5.14 relies on a key property proven in the binary case in [9, Lem. 24], which states that, for any  $c \in \mathcal{X}_2$ , any local minimizer of  $\min_{x \in \mathcal{X}_2} U_s(x; c)$  must be a DE fixed point from  $\mathcal{F}(c) \cup \{\Delta_\infty\}$ . This ensures that if the system is stable at  $h = h^*$ , then for any  $h > h^*$ ,  $\Delta E(c_h) = \Delta \tilde{E}(c_h) < 0$ . The analogous property regarding the minimizer of  $U_s$  and the DE fixed point may still exist in the nonbinary cases, but is hard to prove rigorously.<sup>19</sup>

We now consider the limit-approaching problem related to  $h^{FP}$ . In the binary case, although it is difficult to directly use the properties of the potential functional to show the limit-approaching behavior of  $h^{FP}$  towards the Shannon threshold, the lower-bound property of the replica-symmetric (RS) formula for the normalized ensemble average conditional entropy enables the use of the MAP threshold as an intermediate threshold to establish the limit-approaching of  $h^{FP}$ . More precisely, the RS formula states that [26]–[29], under a suitable degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$  (e.g.,  $\Lambda(x)$  is convex on  $[-e^+, e^+]$ ),

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[H_{\mathcal{G}_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c))] \geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_2} -U_s(x; c) \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{X}_2, \quad (23)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_n$  denotes a binary  $(\lambda, \rho)$  graph ensemble with  $n$  variable nodes, and for any graph  $G_n$  in the ensemble,  $H_{G_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c))$  denotes the code-induced conditional entropy when  $G_n$  is used for transmission over a BMSC characterized by  $c$ , with  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}(c))$  being the input-output pair of the  $n$ -th product of this BMSC, and  $\mathbf{X}$  being a uniformly distributed codeword. For the cases where  $c$  corresponds to a BEC or BIAWGNC, (23) follows for any degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$  [28]. The MAP threshold of a binary

<sup>19</sup>A key step in the proof of [9, Lem. 24] is the use of [9, Prop. 8 ii)], which can be proven for  $q = 2$  using the series expansion of the entropy functional. However, we have found numerical counterexamples for  $q \geq 3$ , indicating that [9, Prop. 8 ii)] does not universally hold for nonbinary cases.

$(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble under a complete BMSC family  $\{c_h\}$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log 2]$  and ordered by degradation is typically defined by [54, Def. 7], [7, Def. 2], [9, Def. 28]

$$h^{\text{MAP}}(\lambda, \rho, \{c_h\}) := \inf \left\{ h \in [0, \log 2] : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[H_{\mathcal{G}_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c_h))] / n > 0 \right\}.$$

By definition and Fano's inequality, the MAP threshold  $h^{\text{MAP}}$  is such that for all  $h > h^{\text{MAP}}$ , the ensemble average block or bit error rate under optimal decoding does not vanish. Thus, at least for  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble  $h^{\text{MAP}}$  approaches the Shannon threshold  $\frac{d_l}{d_r} \log 2$ , as  $d_l$  and  $d_r$  increase with  $d_l/d_r$  fixed. Similar to [9, Lem. 32], it is easy to see that if the RS formula (23) holds, and the system is stable at  $h = h^*$ , then  $h^{\text{FP}} = h^* \geq h^{\text{MAP}}$ . If a formula analogous to (23) holds for general nonbinary cases, then  $h^{\text{MAP}}$  can still serve as an intermediate threshold such that  $h^{\text{FP}} \geq h^{\text{MAP}}$ . However, due to the absence of a convergent power series expansion of the entropy functional  $H : \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow [0, \log q]$  when  $q \geq 3$  (a convergent series expansion under  $q = 2$  is reviewed in (15)), the existing methods for establishing (23) fails to extend to the nonbinary cases. In coding theory, most of existing proofs of (23) follows the interpolation method introduced by Montanari [26] from statistical mechanics, and the main idea is reviewed here. To bound  $\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[H_{\mathcal{G}_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c))] + U_s(x; c)$  for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}_2$ , the graph ensemble  $\mathcal{G}_n$  is first Poissonized, allowing interpolation with respect to its Poisson parameter. The above quantity can then be expressed as an integral along the interpolation path, up to some vanishing term in  $n$ . By performing a series expansion of each entropy term in the integrand, followed by appropriate reorganization, and using the convexity of  $\Lambda(x)$ , it can be shown that each term in the resulting series is nonnegative. Hence, (23) holds for the Poissonized  $\mathcal{G}_n$ , and thus holds for  $\mathcal{G}_n$  upon de-Poissonization. For  $q \geq 3$ , similar interpolation can still be done. However, since the entropy functional no longer admits a absolutely convergent series expansion, we fail to prove the nonnegativity of similar integrand terms. Under the *conjecture* that a formula similar to (23) holds when  $q \geq 3$ , just as in the binary case, we have the following proposition.

*Proposition 5.15:* Given a degree pair  $(d_l, d_r)$  and a complete QMSC family  $\{c_h\}$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation, let  $h^{\text{FP}}$  be the threshold defined in (20). Let  $\mathcal{G}_n$  denote the random Tanner graph of  $(d_l, d_r)$  LDPC ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with block-length  $n$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[H_{\mathcal{G}_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c))]$  denote the ensemble average conditional entropy of the uniformly random codeword  $\mathbf{X}$  given its channel observation  $\mathbf{Y}(c)$ , when  $\mathcal{G}_n$  is used for transmission over a QMSC characterized by  $c \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . For  $d_l \geq 3$  and under the *conjecture* that for any  $h \in (h^{\text{FP}}, \log q)$  and  $c \in \{c_h\}$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[H_{\mathcal{G}_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c))] \geq \sup_{x \in \mathcal{F}(c) \cup \{\Delta_\infty\}} -U_s(x; c),$$

it holds that  $h^{\text{FP}} \geq h^{\text{MAP}} := \inf\{h \in [0, \log q] : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[H_{\mathcal{G}_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c_h))] / n > 0\}$ .

*Argument:* Since  $d_l \geq 3$  and  $\mathcal{F}(c_h)$  is nonempty for  $h > h_s^{\text{BP}}$ , by Lemma 5.10  $\Delta E(c_h)$  is strictly decreasing on  $(h_s^{\text{BP}}, \log q)$ . Thus by the definition of  $h^{\text{FP}}$ ,  $\Delta E(c_h) < 0$  for all  $h \in (h^{\text{FP}}, \log q)$ . Therefore, for any  $h > h^{\text{FP}}$ , there exists some nontrivial DE fixed point  $x_h \in \mathcal{F}(c_h)$  such that  $U_s(x_h; c_h) < 0$ , and at this point the conjecture implies that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[H_{\mathcal{G}_n}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}(c_h))] \geq -U_s(x_h; c_h) > 0,$$

then by definition, we have  $h \geq h^{\text{MAP}}$ . In summary,  $h \geq h^{\text{MAP}}$  holds for any  $h > h^{\text{FP}}$ , which means  $h^{\text{FP}} \geq h^{\text{MAP}}$ .  $\square$

#### D. Proof of Achievability of Threshold Saturation

We present the proof of the achievability part of Theorem 5.12. Building on the underlying analysis in Section IV, our proof strategy follows the method in [9], by considering the potential functional of the coupled system along with its first-order and second-order directional derivatives. The coupled ensembles considered here include the standard and the improved coupled  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensembles. See Section V-A for definitions and properties related to the modified system.

*Definition 5.16:* The potential functional for the coupled system, denoted as  $U_c : \mathcal{X}_q^K \times \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is given by

$$U_c(\mathbf{x}; c) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_c} \left[ d_l H(x_i^{\boxplus d_r - 1}) + \left( \frac{d_l}{d_r} - d_l \right) H(x_i^{\boxplus d_r}) \right] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_v} H(c \circledast g(x_i, \dots, x_{i+w-1})), \quad (24)$$

where for the standard  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble

$$g(x_i, \dots, x_{i+w-1}) := \left( \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} x_{i+j}^{\boxplus d_r - 1} \right)^{\circledast d_r}$$

and for the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble

$$g(x_i, \dots, x_{i+w-1}) := \frac{1}{\binom{w}{d_l}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{d=1}^{d_l} x_{i+j}^{\boxplus d_r - 1}$$

and  $\mathcal{C}$  represents the set of all combinations of  $d_l$  distinct elements from  $\{0, 1, \dots, w-1\}$  with  $|\mathcal{C}| = \binom{w}{d_l}$ .

We now calculate the directional derivative of the potential functional defined above. The definition and operational formulas of the directional derivative can be found in [9, Sec. II-E] and will not be elaborated here. Define the space of differences of symmetric probability measures by  $\mathcal{X}_d := \{\underline{x}_1 - \underline{x}_2 : \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q\}$ . The first-order and the second-order directional derivatives of the potential functional  $U_c$  are shown below.

**Lemma 5.17:** For both the standard and the improved coupled  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensembles, the first-order directional derivative of the potential functional  $U_c$  in (24) with respect to  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$ , evaluated in the direction  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{X}_d^K$ , is given by

$$d_{\underline{x}} U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c})[\underline{y}] = d_l(d_r - 1) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_c} H((\mathbf{T}_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c})_i - x_i) \boxtimes x_i^{\boxtimes d_r - 2} \boxtimes y_i). \quad (25)$$

*Proof:* See Appendix III-E.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.18:** The second-order directional derivative of the potential functional with respect to  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$ , evaluated in the direction  $[\underline{y}, \underline{z}] \in \mathcal{X}_d^K \times \mathcal{X}_d^K$  is given by (26) at the bottom of this page. For the standard and the improved coupled  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensembles, the term  $F_i$  in (26) is given by  $F_i^1$  and  $F_i^2$ , as shown below (26), respectively. In the expression for  $F_i^2$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_{k, m-i+k}$  denotes the set of all combinations of  $d_l - 2$  distinct elements from  $\{0, 1, \dots, w - 1\} \setminus \{k, m - i + k\}$ .

*Proof:* See Appendix III-E.  $\square$

Following [9, Def. 40], a right shift operator  $\underline{S} : \mathcal{X}_q^K \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_q^K$  is used for the perturbation of any fixed point  $\underline{x}$  of the modified system, which is defined as follows.

**Definition 5.19:** The shift operator  $\underline{S} : \mathcal{X}_q^K \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_q^K$  is defined pointwise by

$$[\underline{S}(\underline{x})]_1 := \Delta_\infty, \quad [\underline{S}(\underline{x})]_i := x_{i-1}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq K.$$

**Lemma 5.20:** Let  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$  be such that  $x_i = x_{i_0}$  for all  $i_0 \leq i \leq K$ . Then for either the standard or the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, the change in the potential functional for a modified system associated with the shift operator is bounded by

$$U_c(\underline{S}(\underline{x}); \mathbf{c}) - U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c}) \leq -U_s(x_{i_0}; \mathbf{c}).$$

*Proof:* See Appendix III-F.  $\square$

As mentioned in Section V-A, a typical  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$  that satisfies the condition in Lemma 5.20 is any fixed point of the modified system. For a nontrivial forward fixed point of the modified system, we have the following.

**Lemma 5.21:** If  $\underline{x} \succ \underline{\Delta_\infty} := [\Delta_\infty, \dots, \Delta_\infty]$  is a fixed point of the modified system for either the standard or the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble under  $\underline{\Delta_0}$ -initialization and transmission over  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , then  $\Delta_\infty \prec x_{i_0} \preceq \mathbf{T}_s(x_{i_0}; \mathbf{c})$  and

$$d_{\underline{x}} U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c})[\underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}] = 0.$$

*Proof:* See Appendix III-G.  $\square$

The above two lemmas with Lemma III-B.3 imply that for either the standard or the improved coupled ensemble, a nontrivial forward fixed point  $\underline{x}$  of its modified system satisfies

$$U_c(\underline{S}(\underline{x}); \mathbf{c}) - U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c}) \leq -U_s(x_{i_0}; \mathbf{c}) \leq -U_s(\mathbf{T}_s(x_{i_0}; \mathbf{c}); \mathbf{c}) \leq \dots \leq -U_s(\mathbf{T}_s^{(\infty)}(x_{i_0}; \mathbf{c}); \mathbf{c}) \leq -\Delta E(\mathbf{c}), \quad (27)$$

where  $\mathbf{T}_s^{(\infty)}(x_{i_0}; \mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c})$  is a nontrivial fixed point of the uncoupled system, since  $x_{i_0} \preceq \mathbf{T}_s(x_{i_0}; \mathbf{c})$ . Thus, when  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}) > 0$ , the absolute change in potential functional  $U_s$  due to the shift  $\underline{S}$  can be lower bounded by some constant that depends solely on the uncoupled system.

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\underline{x}}^2 U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c})[\underline{y}, \underline{z}] &= d_l(d_r - 1) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_c} \left[ (d_r - 2) H(\mathbf{T}_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c})_i \boxtimes x_i^{\boxtimes d_r - 3} \boxtimes y_i \boxtimes z_i) - (d_r - 1) H(x_i^{\boxtimes d_r - 2} \boxtimes y_i \boxtimes z_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{w} F_i(x_{i-(w-1)}, \dots, x_{i+(w-1)}, y_i, z_{\max\{i-(w-1), 1\}}, \dots, z_{\min\{i+(w-1), K\}}, \mathbf{c}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$F_i^1 = \frac{(d_l-1)(d_r-1)}{w} \sum_{m=\max\{i-(w-1), 1\}}^{\min\{i+(w-1), K\}} \sum_{k=\max\{i-m, 0\}}^{w-1+\min\{i-m, 0\}} H \left( \mathbf{c}_{i-k} \circledast \left( \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} x_{i-k+j}^{\boxtimes d_r - 1} \right)^{\circledast d_l - 2} \circledast (x_i^{\boxtimes d_r - 2} \boxtimes y_i) \circledast (x_m^{\boxtimes d_r - 2} \boxtimes z_m) \right)$$

$$F_i^2 = \frac{d_r - 1}{(d_l - 1)} \sum_{m=\max\{i-(w-1), 1\}}^{\min\{i+(w-1), K\}} \sum_{k=\max\{i-m, 0\}}^{w-1+\min\{i-m, 0\}} \sum_{\substack{j \in \mathcal{C}_{k, m-i+k} \\ m \neq i}} H \left( \mathbf{c}_{i-k} \circledast \left( \underset{d=1}{\circledast} x_{i-k+j}^{\boxtimes d_r - 1} \right) \circledast (x_i^{\boxtimes d_r - 2} \boxtimes y_i) \circledast (x_m^{\boxtimes d_r - 2} \boxtimes z_m) \right)$$

*Lemma 5.22:* For either the standard or the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, let  $\underline{x}$  be the forward DE fixed point of the modified system under  $\underline{\Delta}_0$ -initialization and transmission over  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . Then the second-order directional derivative of  $U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c})$  with respect to any  $\underline{x}' \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$ , evaluated in the direction  $[\underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}, \underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}]$ , can be absolutely bounded by

$$\left| d_{\underline{x}'}^2 U_c(\underline{x}'; \mathbf{c}) [\underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}, \underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}] \right| \leq \frac{K_{q, d_l, d_r}}{w}, \quad (28)$$

where  $K_{q, d_l, d_r} := d_l(d_r - 1)(2d_l d_r - 2d_l - 1) \log q$  for both the standard and the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensembles.  $\square$

*Proof:* See Appendix III-H.

With the above results, following the strategy in [9, Thm. 45], we establish the achievability part of Theorem 5.12 through proof by contradiction. Consider a coupled system at  $\mathbf{h} < \mathbf{h}^{\text{FP}}$ , with a fixed coupling width  $w > K_{q, d_l, d_r} / (2\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h))$  (by the definition in (20),  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h) > 0$  at this point). Suppose  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$  is a fixed point of its modified system under  $\underline{\Delta}_0$ -initialization. If  $\underline{x} = \underline{\Delta}_\infty$ , then the claim trivially follows, as there cannot be any other fixed points for the modified system, and consequently, for the original coupled system. Suppose instead that  $\underline{x} \succ \underline{\Delta}_\infty$ , in which case a contradiction can be arrived. Define  $\underline{y} = \underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}$  and  $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\phi(t) = U_c(\underline{x} + t\underline{y}; \mathbf{c}_h).$$

By [9, Prop. 16],  $\phi$  is a polynomial function in  $t$ . By the second-order Taylor expansion, there exists some  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$\phi(1) = \phi(0) + \phi'(0) + \frac{1}{2}\phi''(t_0).$$

The first and second derivatives of  $\phi$  are characterized by the first- and second-order directional derivatives of  $U_c$ , i.e.,

$$\phi'(t) = d_{\underline{x}_1} U_c(\underline{x}_1; \mathbf{c}_h)[\underline{y}] \Big|_{\underline{x}_1=\underline{x}+t\underline{y}}, \quad \phi''(t) = d_{\underline{x}_1}^2 U_c(\underline{x}_1; \mathbf{c}_h)[\underline{y}, \underline{y}] \Big|_{\underline{x}_1=\underline{x}+t\underline{y}}.$$

Substituting the results for  $\phi'(0), \phi''(t_0)$  into the above Taylor expansion, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} d_{\underline{x}_1}^2 U_c(\underline{x}_1; \mathbf{c}_h)[\underline{y}, \underline{y}] \Big|_{\underline{x}_1=\underline{x}+t_0\underline{y}} = U_c(\underline{S}(\underline{x}); \mathbf{c}_h) - U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c}_h) - d_{\underline{x}} U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c}_h)[\underline{y}] \stackrel{(a)}{=} U_c(\underline{S}(\underline{x}); \mathbf{c}_h) - U_c(\underline{x}; \mathbf{c}_h) \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} -\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h),$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 5.21 and (b) follows from (27). Taking the absolute value and applying Lemma 5.22, we obtain

$$\frac{K_{q, d_l, d_r}}{2w} \geq \Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h),$$

which is a contradiction since we have assumed  $w > K_{q, d_l, d_r} / (2\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h))$ . Therefore, for  $\mathbf{h} < \mathbf{h}^{\text{FP}}$  and  $w > K_{q, d_l, d_r} / (2\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h))$ , the unique fixed point of the modified system is  $\underline{\Delta}_\infty$ , and thus the same holds for the original coupled system.

#### E. Proof of Converse of Threshold Saturation

We present the proof of the converse part of Theorem 5.12. Since  $d_l \geq 3$  and  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c}_h)$  is nonempty for all  $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbf{h}_s^{\text{BP}}, \log q)$ , by Lemma 5.10  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h)$  is strictly decreasing in  $\mathbf{h}$  on  $(\mathbf{h}_s^{\text{BP}}, \log q)$ . Then from the definition of  $\mathbf{h}^{\text{FP}}$ , we have  $\Delta E(\mathbf{c}_h) < 0$  for all  $\mathbf{h} \in (\mathbf{h}^{\text{FP}}, \log q)$ . Therefore, for any  $\mathbf{h} > \mathbf{h}^{\text{FP}}$ , there exists some nontrivial DE fixed point  $\underline{x}_h \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{c}_h)$  such that  $U_s(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) < 0$ . Initialize the coupled system with  $\underline{x}_h = [\underline{x}_h, \dots, \underline{x}_h]$  at this channel entropy  $\mathbf{h} > \mathbf{h}^{\text{FP}}$ . Using (17) or (18), and the fact that  $\underline{x}_h$  is a fixed point of the uncoupled system, we have that for all  $1 \leq i \leq K$

$$[\mathbf{T}_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h)]_i \preceq \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} \mathbf{c}_h \circledast (\underline{x}_h^{\boxtimes d_r - 1})^{\circledast d_l - 1} = \underline{x}_h.$$

That is,  $\mathbf{T}_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) \preceq \underline{x}_h$ . Thus, from the monotonicity of  $\mathbf{T}_c$ , the limit  $\mathbf{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h)$  exists and

$$\mathbf{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) \preceq \dots \preceq \mathbf{T}_c^{(2)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) \preceq \mathbf{T}_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) \preceq \underline{x}_h$$

By Lemma III-B.4 and the continuity of  $U_c(\cdot; \mathbf{c}_h)$ ,

$$U_c(\mathbf{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h); \mathbf{c}_h) \leq \dots \leq U_c(\mathbf{T}_c^{(2)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h); \mathbf{c}_h) \leq U_c(\mathbf{T}_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h); \mathbf{c}_h) \leq U_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h).$$

Since all components of  $\underline{x}_h$  are equal, for both the standard and the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble

$$U_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) = (2L + w - 1)U_s(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) + (w - 1)H(\mathbf{c}_h \circledast \mathbf{g}(\underline{x}_h, \dots, \underline{x}_h)) \leq (2L + w - 1)U_s(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) + (w - 1)\log q$$

where  $\mathbf{g}$  is the APP operator in (24). Since  $U_s(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) < 0$  and  $w$  is fixed, there exists a sufficiently large  $L_0$  such that for all  $L \geq L_0$ ,  $U_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) < 0$ , in which case

$$U_c(\mathbf{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h); \mathbf{c}_h) \leq U_c(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) < 0$$

and since  $U_c(\underline{\Delta}_\infty; \mathbf{c}_h) = 0$ , we have  $\mathbf{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) \succ \underline{\Delta}_\infty$ . Since  $\underline{\Delta}_0 \succeq \underline{x}_h$ , at this point we can conclude that

$$\mathbf{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{\Delta}_0; \mathbf{c}_h) \succeq \mathbf{T}_c^{(\infty)}(\underline{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h) \succ \underline{\Delta}_\infty.$$

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, random SC-LDPC codes over finite fields are investigated. Under distinct variable node edge-spreading rules, we consider two classes of coupled ensemble: one is called the standard coupled ensemble, and the other is called the improved coupled ensemble. We have proven that both ensembles can have asymptotically good minimum distance and minimum stopping set size, and numerical results show that, under the same parameters, the achievable results of the improved ensemble can be better than those of the standard ensemble. This observation holds not only for randomly constructed coupled ensembles but also, as demonstrated in [11], for protograph-based coupled ensembles employing a similar edge-spreading rule, resulting in a comparable improvement in distance performance. We have established necessary preliminary results and analytical tools for iterative decoding analysis over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , including the properties of symmetric measures and their reference measures, the properties of their linear functionals, the metric topologies of measure spaces, and the degradation of symmetric distributions. Our results and tools are established in the  $P$ -domain, in which messages are in the form of probability vectors, and in many aspects, such as the metric topology and the degradation of distributions, our analysis differs from that in the binary case [25, Sec. IV] and is applicable to general nonbinary cases. We have proven that, threshold saturation of a coupled system over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  universally occurs in the general  $q \geq 2$ . Specifically, when the coupling parameters are sufficiently large, the BP threshold of the coupled system saturates to a well-defined threshold characterized by the nontrivial DE fixed points of the corresponding uncoupled system. We have shown how our threshold saturation result aligns with that in [9, Thms. 45, 47] when  $q = 2$ , in which case the MAP threshold of the uncoupled system can be used as a mediator to establish the limit-approaching behavior of the coupled system, and we also explain why this fails to extend to the case of  $q \geq 3$ .

After proving the threshold saturation result under a QMSC family for the coupled ensembles over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , one remaining question in this paper is whether the resulting threshold can approach the Shannon threshold under certain ensemble parameters. In the binary case, due to the lower bound property of the RS formula (23), the MAP threshold of the underlying ensemble can help establish this limit-approaching result. For the nonbinary cases, assuming that the RS formula provides a similar lower bound, Proposition 5.15 shows that the same limit-approaching behavior extends. However, as the QMSC model is more complicated, existing interpolation methods are hard to extend to the nonbinary case to prove the lower-bound property of the RS estimate. We believe that further investigation of the RS formula in a nonbinary coding system will require adjustments to the underlying statistical mechanics model. In the binary case, existing methods [26]–[29] relate the coding system to a spin glass system, in which binary variables can values of  $\pm 1$ . For the nonbinary case, a more complex physical model with the corresponding statistical mechanics methods may need to be identified to help study the properties of the RS estimate.

## APPENDIX I MINIMUM DISTANCE AND STOPPING SET SIZE ANALYSIS

### A. Proof of Lemma 3.17

The strategy is to construct an upper bound on the objective function in (7) using the growth rate function  $g_{q,d_l,d_r}$  of the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and then to establish the result using the known properties of  $g_{q,d_l,d_r}$ . For any normalized weight type  $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha)$ , the objective function in (7) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} p(\underline{t}) H_q \left( \frac{\alpha_{k,\underline{t}}}{p(\underline{t})} \right) + \frac{d_l}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{W_{q,d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - H_q(\beta_k) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i}{d_l} p(\underline{t}) H_q \left( \frac{\alpha_{k-i,\underline{t}}}{p(\underline{t})} \right) + \frac{d_l}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{W_{q,d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - H_q(\beta_k) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ H_q(\beta_k) + \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{W_{q,d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - d_l H_q(\beta_k) \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K g_{q,d_l,d_r}(\beta_k), \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where we define  $\alpha_{k,\underline{t}} := 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ , and  $\beta_k := \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i \alpha_{k-i,\underline{t}}}{d_l}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . In (a), we use the definition of edge types, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=0}^{w-1} t_i = d_l \forall \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ ; (b) follows from Jensen's inequality. It is known that the growth rate function  $g_{q,d_l,d_r}(\alpha)$  is twice differentiable inside its finite domain,  $g_{q,d_l,d_r}(0) = 0$ , and for  $d_l \geq 3$ , its right derivative  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{dg_{q,d_l,d_r}(x)}{dx} = -\infty$  [39, Sec. V]. Thus, for  $d_l \geq 3$  there exists a  $\beta_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $g_{q,d_l,d_r}(\beta) < 0$  for all  $\beta \in (0, \beta_0)$ . We can set  $\alpha_0 = \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \beta_0$ , where  $t_{\max} := \max_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \max_{0 \leq i \leq w-1} t_i$  denotes the largest component among all edge types in  $\mathcal{T}$ , then given any normalized weight  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$  and any normalized weight type  $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha)$ , for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$  we have

$$0 \leq \beta_k = \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i \alpha_{k-i,\underline{t}}}{d_l} \leq \frac{t_{\max}}{d_l} \sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \alpha_{k,\underline{t}} = \frac{2L t_{\max}}{d_l} \alpha < \beta_0,$$

and since  $\alpha > 0$ , there must be some  $1 \leq k_1 \leq K$  such that  $\beta_{k_1} \in (0, \beta_0)$  and  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\beta_{k_1}) < 0$ . Therefore, the upper bound in (29) is strictly negative for all  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$ . The proof is complete by substituting (29) into (7). Finally, for  $d_r \geq d_l \geq 3$ , by Theorem 3.6 there exists a unique zero,  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$ , of the function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}$  in  $(0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$ , which is the largest  $\beta_0$  in the above.

### B. Proof of Achievability Part of Theorem 3.18

In this subsection we prove the polynomially small (in  $n$ ) upper bound on the probability concerning the minimum distance for the coupled code ensemble  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . That is, for any  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L})$

$$\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} \leq \Theta(n^{c(q, d_l)}).$$

For a standard coupled code ensemble,  $c(q, d_l) = 2 - d_l$  if  $q = 2$  and  $d_l$  is odd, otherwise  $c(q, d_l) = 1 - \lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil$ . For an improved coupled code ensemble,  $c(q, d_l) = 2 - d_l$ . The lower bound estimate

$$\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L} \geq \alpha_{\text{lb}} := \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$$

follows from Lemma 3.17, where  $t_{\max} = \max_{0 \leq i \leq w-1} \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} t_i$  is the maximum element among all edge types in  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r} \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$  is the unique zero of the growth rate function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}$  of the average weight distribution of the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  in  $(0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$ . Specifically,  $t_{\max} = d_l$  for a standard coupled code ensemble, while  $t_{\max} = 1$  for an improved coupled code ensemble. We use  $\ell$  and  $\underline{\ell}$  to denote the weight and weight type of codewords, respectively, and use  $K = 2L + w - 1$  to denote the maximum check-node position index. By the union bound and the Markov inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} &= \Pr\left\{\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \{A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \geq 1\}\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \Pr\{A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \geq 1\} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The bound in (30) can be refined for some special cases: when  $q = 2$  and  $d_l$  is odd, the random linear code  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  cannot contain odd-weight codewords, i.e., at this point  $\mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = 0$  for any odd  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ; when  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved coupled ensemble, it cannot contain weight-1 codewords as its Tanner graph does not contain multi-edge connections. At this point  $\mathbb{E}[A_1(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = 0$ . We divide the final summation term in (30) into three parts as follows

$$\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} \leq S_1 + S_2 + S_3, \quad (31)$$

where

$$S_1 := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})], \quad S_2 := \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})], \quad S_3 := \sum_{\ell=\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})].$$

Here,  $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  is an  $n$ -independent constant that will be determined later, and  $0 < \alpha_1 < \min\{\alpha, \alpha_{\text{lb}}\}$  can be chosen arbitrarily. Since  $\alpha_1 < \alpha < \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}$ , it follows that  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(x) < 0$  for all  $x \in [\alpha_1, \alpha]$ , and thus the term  $S_3$  decays exponentially in  $n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . By selecting an appropriate constant  $\ell_0$ , it can be shown that the term  $S_1$  dominates (31) and corresponds to the polynomial bound in this theorem. To proceed the proof, we review the following results.

*Lemma I-B.1* [39, Eq. (15)]: Let  $W_{q, d_r}(z) := \frac{1}{q} \{[1 + (q-1)z]^{d_r} + (q-1)(1-z)^{d_r}\}$  denote the weight enumerator of a length- $d_r$  single parity-check code over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , where  $d_r \geq 2$ . For any constant  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  independent of  $n$

$$\text{coeff}\{W_{q, d_r}(z)^n, z^{\ell}\} = \begin{cases} 0, & q = 2, \ell \text{ is odd} \\ \Theta(n^{\lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \rfloor}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

*Lemma I-B.2* [39, Thms. 5.6, 6.1]: Let  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}$  denote the asymptotic growth rate function of the average weight distribution of the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (see Theorem 3.6 for the explicit form of  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}$ ). Then  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(x)$  is continuous on its finite domain  $[0, x_{q, d_r}]$ , where  $x_{q, d_r} = 1 - \frac{1}{d}$  if  $q = 2$  and  $d_r$  is odd, and  $x_{q, d_r} = 1$  otherwise. Moreover,

- 1) For  $d_r \geq d_l \geq 3$ , there exists an  $0 < x_1 < \frac{q-1}{q}$  such that  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(x)$  is strictly decreasing on  $(0, x_1)$  and strictly increasing on  $(x_1, \frac{q-1}{q})$ . As a result, for  $x \in (0, \frac{q-1}{q}]$  the unique zero  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$  of  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(x)$  lies in  $(x_1, \frac{q-1}{q}]$ .
- 2) For  $q \geq 2$ ,  $d_l \geq 1$ ,  $d_r \geq 2$  and  $x \in (0, 1/q^2]$

$$g_{q, d_l, d_r}(x) \leq \left(\frac{d_l}{2} - 1\right) x \log x + \kappa_{q, d_l, d_r} x \quad (33)$$

where the constant  $\kappa_{q, d_l, d_r} := \log(q-1) + \frac{d_l}{2} \log(d_r - 1) + 3d_l$ .

Using the results above, we can derive the following upper bounds on the average weight distribution of the coupled ensemble.

*Lemma I-B.3:* For any constant weight  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $\ell$  may depend on  $q, d_l, d_r, w, L$ , but not on  $n$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[A_\ell(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{-\lceil(d_l-2)\ell/2\rceil}). \quad (34)$$

For any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \leq 2L\alpha_{lb}n = \frac{d_l}{t_{\max}}\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}n$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[A_\ell(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2}+|\mathcal{T}|)K-1})e^{n \max\{g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell}{Kn}), g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{t_{\max}\ell}{d_l n})\}}. \quad (35)$$

*Proof:* Given a weight  $1 \leq \ell \leq 2Ln$ , let  $\mathcal{L}(\ell)$  denote the set of all feasible weight types corresponding to  $\ell$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}(\ell) := \left\{ \underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|} : \ell_{k, \underline{t}} \leq p(\underline{t})n \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}, \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \ell_{k, \underline{t}} = \ell \right\}.$$

First, we consider the case where  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  is an  $n$ -independent constant. In this case for any weight type  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(\ell)$ , its components are also  $n$ -independent constants. Using the estimate  $\binom{n}{l} = \Theta(n^l)$  for any  $n$ -independent constant  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  and the estimate (32) in the expression (3), for any  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(\ell)$  the average weight-type distribution can be upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta\left(n^{\sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \ell_{k, \underline{t}}}\right) \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{\Theta\left(n^{\lfloor \frac{e_k}{2} \rfloor}\right)}{\Theta(n^{e_k})} = \frac{\Theta(n^\ell)\Theta\left(n^{\sum_{k=1}^K \lfloor \frac{e_k}{2} \rfloor}\right)}{\Theta(n^{d_l \ell})} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Theta\left(n^{-\lceil(d_l-2)\ell/2\rceil}\right).$$

where  $e_k := \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} t_i \ell_{k-i, \underline{t}}$  denotes the number of variable node arcs directed to check-node position  $k$  originating from variable nodes associated with nonzero codeword symbols (we define  $\ell_{k, \underline{t}} = 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ ), and  $\sum_{k=1}^K e_k = d_l \ell$ . In (a), we use the inequality  $\sum_i \lfloor x_i \rfloor \leq \lfloor \sum_i x_i \rfloor$ . Then (34) follows since

$$\mathbb{E}[A_\ell(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = \sum_{\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(\ell)} \mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq |\mathcal{L}(\ell)| \Theta\left(n^{-\lceil(d_l-2)\ell/2\rceil}\right)$$

and  $|\mathcal{L}(\ell)|$  is an  $n$ -independent constant. Next, for any  $\ell \leq 2L\alpha_{lb}n$  and any weight type  $\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(\ell)$ , let  $\underline{\alpha}$  denote the normalized weight type of  $\underline{\ell}$ , i.e.,  $\alpha_{k, \underline{t}} = \frac{\ell_{k, \underline{t}}}{n} \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2L, \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$  with  $\alpha_{k, \underline{t}} = 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ . Define  $\beta_k = \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} t_i \alpha_{k-i, \underline{t}}/d_l$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . Note that  $\beta_k = \frac{e_k}{d_l n} \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k = \frac{\ell}{n}$ . Taking the logarithm of  $\mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]$ , using the bounds  $\binom{n}{l}(q-1)^l \leq e^{H_q(\frac{l}{n})}$  and  $\text{coeff}\{W_{q, d_r}(z)^m, z^l\} \leq \inf_{z>0} \frac{W_{q, d_r}(z)^m}{z^l}$  for  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , and following the same steps in (29), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \sum_{k=1}^K g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\beta_k) + d_l \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ H_2(\beta_k) - \frac{1}{d_l n} \log \binom{d_l n}{d_l \beta_k n} \right]. \quad (36)$$

We examine the first term in the right side of (36). Since  $t_{\max} = \max_{0 \leq i \leq w-1} \max_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} t_i$ , we have

$$0 \leq \beta_k = \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i \alpha_{k-i, \underline{t}}}{d_l} \leq \frac{t_{\max}}{d_l} \sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \alpha_{k, \underline{t}} = \frac{t_{\max}}{d_l} \frac{\ell}{n} \leq \frac{2L t_{\max}}{d_l} \alpha_{lb} = \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r} \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq K.$$

Note that  $\alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$  is the unique zero of  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(x)$  in  $(0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$  and  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(x) < 0$  for all  $x \in (0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r})$ . Thus  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\beta_k) \leq 0$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . Moreover, since  $\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k = \frac{\ell}{n}$ , there must exist some  $1 \leq k_1 \leq K$  such that  $\beta_{k_1} \in [\frac{\ell}{Kn}, \frac{t_{\max}\ell}{d_l n}]$ . From the continuity and monotonicity of  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}$  shown in the first statement of Lemma I-B.2, the maximum value of  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}$  over any closed interval  $I \subseteq [0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$  is attained at one of the endpoints of  $I$ . Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\beta_k) \leq g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\beta_{k_1}) \leq \max \left\{ g_{q, d_l, d_r} \left( \frac{\ell}{Kn} \right), g_{q, d_l, d_r} \left( \frac{t_{\max}\ell}{d_l n} \right) \right\}. \quad (37)$$

We now examine the second term in the right side of (36). Using Stirling's approximation  $n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n e^{\lambda_n}$  for  $n \geq 1$  with  $\frac{1}{12n+1} \leq \lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{12n}$ , we can obtain that

$$0 \leq H_2(\beta_k) - \frac{1}{d_l n} \log \binom{d_l n}{d_l \beta_k n} \leq \frac{\log(d_l n \beta_k (1 - \beta_k))}{2d_l n} + O(n^{-1}) \leq \frac{\log(n^{\frac{1}{2}}) + C_k}{d_l n}$$

for some  $n$ -independent constant  $C_k \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore

$$d_l \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ H_2(\beta_k) - \frac{1}{d_l n} \log \binom{d_l n}{d_l \beta_k n} \right] \leq \frac{\log(n^{\frac{K}{2}}) + C}{n} \quad (38)$$

where  $C := \sum_{k=1}^K C_k$  is an  $n$ -independent constant. Substituting (37) and (38) into (36), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{\frac{K}{2}}) e^{n \max\{g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell}{Kn}), g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{t_{\max \ell}}{d_l n})\}}.$$

From the above bound, (35) follows since

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = \sum_{\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}(\ell)} \mathbb{E}[A_{\underline{\ell}}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq |\mathcal{L}(\ell)| \Theta(n^{\frac{K}{2}}) e^{n \max\{g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell}{Kn}), g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{t_{\max \ell}}{d_l n})\}}$$

and  $|\mathcal{L}(\ell)| \leq |\{\underline{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|} : \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 2L, t \in \mathcal{T}} \ell_{k, t} = \ell\}| = \binom{\ell+2L|\mathcal{T}|-1}{2L|\mathcal{T}|-1} \leq \Theta(n^{2L|\mathcal{T}|-1}) \leq \Theta(n^{K|\mathcal{T}|-1})$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to deal with (31). We choose the constant weight

$$\ell_0 = 2K + (1 + 2|\mathcal{T}|)K^2$$

and an arbitrary  $0 < \alpha_1 < \min\{\alpha_{lb}, \alpha\}$ . For the term  $S_1$  in (31), if  $q = 2$  and  $d_l$  is odd, then  $\mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = 0$  for any odd  $\ell$ , and by the upper bound estimate (34)

$$S_1 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor \frac{\ell_0}{2} \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[A_{2\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{2-d_l}).$$

If  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved coupled ensemble, then  $\mathbb{E}[A_1(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = 0$  and similarly we still have

$$S_1 = \sum_{\ell=2}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{2-d_l}).$$

Otherwise,  $S_1$  can be bounded by

$$S_1 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{1-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}).$$

For the term  $S_2$  in (31), we assume that  $n$  is sufficiently large such that  $\ell_0 \leq \lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor$  and  $\frac{\ell_0}{Kn} \leq \frac{1}{q^2}$ . Since the parameter  $\alpha_1$  is chosen such that  $\alpha_1 < \alpha_{lb}$ , we can apply the upper bound in (35) and then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \\ &\leq \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2}+|\mathcal{T}|)K-1}) \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor} e^{n \max\{g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell}{Kn}), g_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{t_{\max \ell}}{d_l n})\}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2}+|\mathcal{T}|)K}) \left[ e^{ng_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell_0}{Kn})} + e^{ng_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{2L t_{\max \alpha_1}}{d_l})} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2}+|\mathcal{T}|)K}) \Theta\left(n^{-\left(\frac{d_l}{2}-1\right)[2+(1+2|\mathcal{T}|)K]}\right) + \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2}+|\mathcal{T}|)K}) e^{ng_{q, d_l, d_r}(\frac{2L t_{\max \alpha_1}}{d_l})} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \Theta(n^{2-d_l}) \Theta\left(n^{-(d_l-3)(\frac{1}{2}+|\mathcal{T}|)K}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we use the fact that the maximum value of  $g_{q, d_l, d_r}(x)$  over any closed interval  $I \subseteq [0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$  is attained at one of the end points of  $I$ ; in (b) we use the upper bound (33) (since  $\frac{\ell_0}{Kn} \leq \frac{1}{q^2}$ ), and  $\ell_0 = 2K + (1 + 2|\mathcal{T}|)K^2$ ; (c) follows since

$$0 < \frac{2L t_{\max \alpha_1}}{d_l} < \frac{2L t_{\max \alpha_{lb}}}{d_l} = \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r}$$

and thus the second term in (b) is exponentially small in  $n$ . Finally, the term  $S_3$  in (31) decays exponentially in  $n$ , since

$$S_3 = \sum_{\lceil 2L\alpha_1 n \rceil}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[A_{\ell}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(f(n)) e^{2L n \max_{x \in [\alpha_1, \alpha]} g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(x)},$$

where  $f(n)$  is a subexponential factor of  $n$  and the growth rate function  $g_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L}(x) < 0$  for all  $x \in [\alpha_1, \alpha]$ . Substituting the above bounds on  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and  $S_3$  into (31), we obtain the desired polynomial upper bound on  $\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha_1 n\}$  for any fixed  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_{q, d_l, d_r, w, L})$ .

### C. Proof of Converse Part in Theorem 3.18

In this subsection we derive polynomially small lower bounds on the probability that the random SC-LDPC code has a poor minimum distance of 1 or 2. That is, if  $q = 2$  and  $d_l$  is odd, or  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved coupled code ensemble, then

$$\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 2\} \geq \Theta(n^{2-d_l}). \quad (39)$$

Otherwise, the minimum distance of  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  could be 1, and

$$\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 1\} \geq \Theta(n^{1-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}). \quad (40)$$

We first prove (40). At this point  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is a standard coupled ensemble, where the variable nodes in its Tanner graph can have all edge types from  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}$ . Furthermore,  $q = 2$  and  $d_l$  is even, or  $q \geq 3$ . We consider such an edge type  $\hat{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ , whose components are given by  $\hat{t}_0 = d_l$  and  $\hat{t}_1 = \dots = \hat{t}_{w-1} = 0$ . This is one of the edge types most likely to induce multi-edge connections in the Tanner graph, and there are

$$p(\hat{t})n = \frac{n}{w^{d_l}} := \hat{n}$$

variable nodes having edge type  $\hat{t}$  at each position. We consider such a weight type  $\hat{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$  corresponding to weight 1, where  $\hat{\ell}_{1, \hat{t}} = 1$  and all other components of  $\hat{\ell}$  are 0. There are  $(q-1)\hat{n}$  vectors in  $\mathbb{F}_q^{2Ln}$  that have weight type  $\hat{\ell}$ , and the set of these vectors can be represented as the disjoint union of  $\hat{n}$  multiplicative classes.<sup>20</sup> By retaining exactly one representative vector from each of the  $\hat{n}$  multiplicative classes, we obtain a set consisting of  $\hat{n}$  pairwise linearly independent vectors, denoted as  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\hat{n}}$ , having weight 1 and weight type  $\hat{\ell}$ . Using the principle of inclusion-exclusion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 1\} &\geq \Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\hat{n}} \{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{n}} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \hat{n}} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{n}} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \hat{n}} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \stackrel{(b)}{=} \hat{n}\Theta(n^{-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}) - \binom{\hat{n}}{2}\Theta(n^{-d_l}) = \Theta(n^{1-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows since the random code  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is linear and thus  $\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}$  implies  $\{\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}$ ; (b) can be obtained by substituting the estimate (32) and the estimate  $\binom{n}{l} = \Theta(n^l)$  for any  $n$ -independent constant  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  into (4), and then deriving the following estimates:

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} = \Theta(n^{-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}) \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq \hat{n}$$

and the estimates (noting that for any weight-1 linearly independent  $\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2Ln}$  having weight type  $\hat{\ell}$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j$  must have weight 2 and weight type  $2\hat{\ell}$ )

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} = \Theta(n^{-d_l}) \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq \hat{n}.$$

Therefore we complete the proof of (40).

We next prove (39). At this point  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  can be a standard coupled ensemble, where  $q = 2$  and  $d_l$  is odd;  $\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  can also be an improved coupled ensemble. We give a unified proof, by considering such an edge type  $\tilde{t} \in \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l} \cap \{0, 1\}^w$ , whose components are given by  $\tilde{t}_0 = \dots = \tilde{t}_{d_l-1} = 1$  and  $\tilde{t}_{d_l} = \dots = \tilde{t}_{w-1} = 0$ . In the Tanner graphs of both cases considered above, there exist variable nodes having edge type  $\tilde{t}$ . More precisely, there are

$$p(\tilde{t})n = \begin{cases} \frac{\binom{d_l}{\tilde{t}}}{w^{d_l}}n, & \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n} \text{ is a standard ensemble} \\ \frac{n}{\binom{w}{d_l}}, & \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n} \text{ is an improved ensemble} \end{cases} =: \tilde{n}$$

variable nodes having edge type  $\tilde{t}$  at each position. We consider such a weight type  $\tilde{\ell} \in \mathbb{N}^{2L \times |\mathcal{T}|}$  corresponding to weight 2, where  $\tilde{\ell}_{1, \tilde{t}} = 2$  and all other components of  $\tilde{\ell}$  are 0. There are  $(q-1)^2 \binom{\tilde{n}}{2}$  vectors in  $\mathbb{F}_q^{2Ln}$  that have weight type  $\tilde{\ell}$ , and the set of these vectors can be represented as the disjoint union of

$$\tilde{n}_q := (q-1) \binom{\tilde{n}}{2} = \Theta(n^2)$$

multiplicative classes. By retaining exactly one representative vector from each of these  $\tilde{n}_q$  multiplicative classes, we obtain a set consisting of  $\tilde{n}_q$  pairwise linearly independent vectors, denoted as  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{\tilde{n}_q}$ , having weight 2 and weight type  $\tilde{\ell}$ . Let  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}) := \{i : v_i \neq 0\}$  be the support of any vector  $\mathbf{v}$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , then  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) = 2$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \tilde{n}_q$ . For  $1 \leq i < j \leq \tilde{n}_q$ , the weight and weight type of the linear combination of  $\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j$  have the following possible cases.

<sup>20</sup>Given a vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , we define the multiplicative class of  $\mathbf{v}$  as  $[\mathbf{v}] := \{\lambda\mathbf{v} : \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times\}$ , and any vector in  $[\mathbf{v}]$  is called a representative of  $[\mathbf{v}]$ .

1)  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_j) = \emptyset$ . At this point  $\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j$  has weight 4 and weight type  $2\tilde{\ell}$ . There are a total of

$$3(q-1)^2 \binom{\tilde{n}}{4} = \Theta(n^4)$$

such pairs  $i < j$ , and the set of all these pairs  $(i, j)$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{I}_1$ .

2)  $q = 2$  and  $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_j)| = 1$ . At this point  $\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j$  has weight 2 and weight type  $\tilde{\ell}$ . There are a total of

$$\tilde{n} \binom{\tilde{n}-1}{2} = \Theta(n^3)$$

such pairs  $i < j$ , and the set of all these pairs  $(i, j)$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{I}'_2$ .

3)  $q \geq 3$  and  $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_j)| = 1$ . At this point there exists some  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  such that  $\mathbf{v}_i + a\mathbf{v}_j$  has weight 3 and weight type  $\frac{3}{2}\tilde{\ell}$ . There are a total of

$$(q-1)^2 \tilde{n} \binom{\tilde{n}-1}{2} = \Theta(n^3)$$

such pairs  $i < j$ , and the set of all these pairs  $(i, j)$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{I}_2$ .

4)  $q \geq 3$  and  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) = \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_j)$ . At this point  $\mathbf{v}_i + a\mathbf{v}_j$  has weight 1 or 2 for all  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ . There are a total of

$$\binom{q-1}{2} \binom{\tilde{n}}{2} = \Theta(n^2)$$

such pairs  $i < j$ , and the set of all these pairs  $(i, j)$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{I}_3$ .

Now, we use the principle of inclusion-exclusion to bound the probability  $\Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 2\}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 2\} &\geq \Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}_q} \{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}_q} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \tilde{n}_q} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The first term in (41) is straightforward to estimate. Since each  $\mathbf{v}_i$  has weight type  $\tilde{\ell}$ , using the estimate (32) and the estimate  $\binom{n}{l} = \Theta(n^l)$  for any  $n$ -independent constant  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  in (4), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}_q} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} = \tilde{n}_q \Theta(n^{-d_l}) = \Theta(n^{2-d_l}). \quad (42)$$

Consider the second term in (41). First, for  $q \geq 3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \tilde{n}_q} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} &= \left( \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_1} + \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_2} + \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_3} \right) \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_1} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} + \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_2} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i + a_{ij}\mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} + \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_3} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \Theta(n^4)\Theta(n^{-2d_l}) + \Theta(n^3)\Theta(n^{-2d_l}) + 0 = \Theta(n^{4-2d_l}). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

In (a), for each  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j$  has weight 4 and weight type  $2\tilde{\ell}$ , and for each  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_2$ ,  $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  is such that  $\mathbf{v}_i + a_{ij}\mathbf{v}_j$  has weight 3 and weight type  $\frac{3}{2}\tilde{\ell}$ . In (b), we use  $|\mathcal{I}_1| = \Theta(n^4)$ ,  $|\mathcal{I}_2| = \Theta(n^3)$  and the estimates of  $\Pr\{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}$  for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2L_n}$  of weight types  $2\tilde{\ell}$  and  $\frac{3}{2}\tilde{\ell}$ . Moreover, for any  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_3$ , it follows that  $\Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} = 0$ , since by the definition of  $\mathcal{I}_3$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_i$  and  $\mathbf{v}_j$  have nonzero symbols at the same two coordinates, and due to the linear independence of  $\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j$ , the event  $\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}$  implies that a  $d_l \times 2$  nonzero matrix over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , with elements from  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$ , has a null space of dimension 2, which is impossible. Next for  $q = 2$ , the method is slightly different. The key is to compute the probability

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}$$

for any  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}'_2$ . At this point,  $\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2L_n}$  are linearly independent and have weight 2, with  $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_i) \cap \text{supp}(\mathbf{v}_j)| = 1$ . Let  $v_1, v_2$  represent the variable nodes corresponding to the two nonzero bits in  $\mathbf{v}_i$ , and  $v_2, v_3$  represent the variable nodes corresponding to the two nonzero bits in  $\mathbf{v}_j$ . Since  $\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j$  have weight type  $\tilde{\ell}$ , the three variable nodes  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  are at position 1, and have edge type  $\tilde{\ell}$ . The event  $\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}$  is then equivalent to  $\{\partial v_1 = \partial v_2 = \partial v_3\}$ , i.e.,  $v_1, v_2, v_3$  have the

same  $d_l$  adjacent check nodes, which are located at position  $1, 2, \dots, d_l$ , respectively. Since the connection is determined by  $d_l$  independent, uniformly random permutations, this probability can be calculated using the following sequential procedure

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} &= \Pr\{\partial v_1 = \partial v_2 = \partial v_3\} \\ &= \sum_c \Pr\{\partial v_1 = c\} \Pr\{\partial v_2 = c | \partial v_1 = c\} \Pr\{\partial v_3 = c | \partial v_1 = \partial v_2 = c\} \\ &= \sum_c \Pr\{\partial v_1 = c\} \left(\frac{d_r - 1}{d_l n - 1}\right)^{d_l} \left(\frac{d_r - 2}{d_l n - 2}\right)^{d_l} = \Theta(n^{-2d_l}) \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{I}'_2, \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $c$  to denote the realization of  $\partial v_1$ . Therefore, at this point the second term in (41) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \tilde{n}_2} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} &= \left( \sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_1} + \sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}'_2} \right) \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \\ &\leq \sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_1} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i + \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} + \sum_{(i, j) \in \mathcal{I}'_2} \Pr\{\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j \in \mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \\ &= \Theta(n^4) \Theta(n^{-2d_l}) + \Theta(n^3) \Theta(n^{-2d_l}) = \Theta(n^{4-2d_l}). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Substituting (42), (43) or (44) into (41), we establish the lower bound (39).

#### D. Proof of Lemma 3.22

The strategy is similar to that of the proof of Lemma 3.17. We first construct an upper bound on the objective function in (11), using the growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  for the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  graph ensemble, and then establish the result using the known properties of  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$ . For any normalized size type  $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha)$ , the objective function in (11) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} p(\underline{t}) H_2 \left( \frac{\alpha_{k, \underline{t}}}{p(\underline{t})} \right) + \frac{d_l}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - H_2(\beta_k) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i}{d_l} p(\underline{t}) H_2 \left( \frac{\alpha_{k-i, \underline{t}}}{p(\underline{t})} \right) + \frac{d_l}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - H_2(\beta_k) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ H_2(\beta_k) + \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log \inf_{z_k > 0} \frac{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z_k)}{z_k^{d_r \beta_k}} - d_l H_2(\beta_k) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2L} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\beta_k), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where we define  $\alpha_{k, \underline{t}} := 0$  if  $k < 1$  or  $k > 2L$ , and  $\beta_k := \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i \alpha_{k-i, \underline{t}}}{d_l}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq K$ . In (a), we use the definition of edge types, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=0}^{w-1} t_i = d_l \forall \underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ ; (b) follows from Jensen's inequality. It is shown in [25, Lem. 3.163] that

$$\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\beta) = \left( \frac{d_l}{2} - 1 \right) \beta \log \beta + \left[ \frac{d_l}{2} \log(d_r - 1) - \frac{d_l}{2} + 1 \right] \beta + O(\beta^2),$$

then due to the term  $\beta \log \beta$  and the condition  $d_l \geq 3$ ,  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\beta)$  is always negative for sufficiently small  $\beta > 0$ . That is, there exist a  $\beta_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\beta) < 0$  for all  $\beta \in (0, \beta_0)$ . Choose  $\alpha_0 = \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \beta_0$ , where  $t_{\max} := \max_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \max_{0 \leq i \leq w-1} t_i$  denotes the largest component among all edge types in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then given any normalized weight  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$  and any normalized weight type  $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}(\alpha)$ , for each  $1 \leq k \leq K$  we have

$$0 \leq \beta_k = \sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{t_i \alpha_{k-i, \underline{t}}}{d_l} \leq \frac{t_{\max}}{d_l} \sum_{k=1}^{2L} \sum_{\underline{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \alpha_{k, \underline{t}} = \frac{2L t_{\max}}{d_l} \alpha < \beta_0,$$

and since  $\alpha > 0$ , there must be some  $1 \leq k_1 \leq K$  such that  $\beta_{k_1} \in (0, \beta_0)$  and  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\beta_{k_1}) < 0$ . Therefore, the upper bound in (45) is strictly negative for all  $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$ . The proof is complete by substituting (45) into (11). Finally, for  $d_r, d_r \geq 3$ , by Theorem 3.6 there exists a unique zero,  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$ , of the function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  in  $(0, 1)$ , which is the largest  $\beta_0$  in the above.

### E. Proof of Achievability Part of Theorem 3.23

In this subsection we prove the polynomially small upper bound (in  $n$ ) on the probability concerning the minimum stopping set size for the coupled graph ensemble  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$ . That is, for any  $\alpha \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L})$

$$\Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} \leq \Theta(n^{c(d_l)}),$$

where  $c(d_l) = 1 - \lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil$  for a standard ensemble and  $c(d_l) = 2 - d_l$  for an improved ensemble. The lower bound estimate

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L} \geq \tilde{\alpha}_{lb} := \frac{d_l}{2L t_{\max}} \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$$

follows from Lemma 3.22, where  $t_{\max} = \max_{0 \leq i \leq w-1} \max_{\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{T}} t_i$  is the maximum element among all edge types in  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r} \in (0, 1)$  is the unique zero of the growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  of the average stopping set distribution of the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble in  $x \in (0, 1)$ . Specifically,  $t_{\max} = d_l$  for a standard ensemble, while  $t_{\max} = 1$  for an improved ensemble. We use  $\ell$  and  $\underline{\ell}$  to represent the size and size type of subsets of variable nodes, respectively, and let  $K = 2L + w - 1$  be the maximum check-node position index. By the union bound and the Markov inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} &= \Pr\left\{\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \{\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \geq 1\}\right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \Pr\{\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \geq 1\} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})]. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Note that when  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved ensemble, there are no multi-edge connections in  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$ , and thus it follows that  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_1(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = 0$ . Similar to (31), we divide the upper bound in (46) into the following three parts

$$\Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\} \leq S_1 + S_2 + S_3, \quad (47)$$

where

$$S_1 := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})], \quad S_2 := \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})], \quad S_3 := \sum_{\ell=\lceil 2L\alpha_1 n \rceil}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})].$$

Here,  $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  is an  $n$ -independent constant which will be determined later, and  $0 < \alpha_1 < \min\{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}_{lb}\}$  can be chosen arbitrarily. Since  $\alpha_1 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}$ , it follows that  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(x) < 0$  for all  $x \in [\alpha_1, \alpha]$ , and thus the term  $S_3$  vanishes exponentially fast in  $n$ . Under an appropriate  $\ell_0$ , it can be shown that the term  $S_1$  dominates (47) and corresponds to our desired polynomial bound. To proceed the proof, we need the following results on the stopping set distribution of the underlying  $(d_l, d_r)$  ensemble and its growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$ .

*Lemma I-E.1:* Let  $\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z) = (1+z)^{d_r} - d_r z$  denote the generating function involved in the counting of stopping sets, where  $d_r \geq 2$ . For any constant  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  independent of  $n$

$$\text{coeff}\{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)^n, z^\ell\} = \begin{cases} 0, & \ell = 1 \\ \Theta(n^{\lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \rfloor}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

*Proof:* When  $\ell = 0$  or  $1$ , the estimate trivially follows. For  $\ell \geq 2$ , the following upper bound is established in [55, Lem. 18]

$$\text{coeff}\{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)^n, z^\ell\} \leq \binom{n + \lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \rfloor - \lceil \frac{\ell}{d_r} \rceil}{\lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \rfloor} (2d_r - 3)^\ell = \Theta(n^{\lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \rfloor}).$$

The converse part can be established by discussing  $\ell$ : if  $\ell$  is even, then

$$\text{coeff}\{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)^n, z^\ell\} \geq \text{coeff}\left\{\left(1 + \binom{d_r}{2} z^2\right)^n, z^\ell\right\} = \binom{n}{\frac{\ell}{2}} \binom{d_r}{2}^{\frac{\ell}{2}} = \Theta(n^{\frac{\ell}{2}}),$$

and if  $\ell$  is odd, then  $\ell \geq 3$  and  $\ell - 3$  is even, and thus

$$\text{coeff}\{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)^n, z^\ell\} \geq n \binom{d_r}{3} \text{coeff}\left\{\left(1 + \binom{d_r}{2} z^2\right)^{n-1}, z^{\ell-3}\right\} = \Theta(n^{\frac{\ell-1}{2}}).$$

Putting the above bounds together, we obtain the estimate (48). □

*Lemma I-E.2:* For the growth rate function

$$\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x) = \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log \inf_{z>0} \frac{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)}{z^{d_r} x} - (d_l - 1) H_2(x), \quad x \in [0, 1],$$

it is continuous on  $[0, 1]$  and differentiable on  $(0, 1)$ , and  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(0) = \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(1) = 0$ . Moreover,

- 1) If  $d_l, d_r \geq 3$ , then there exist  $0 < x_1 < x_2 < 1$  such that  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)$  is strictly decreasing on  $(0, x_1) \cup (x_2, 1)$  and strictly increasing on  $(x_1, x_2)$ . As a result, for  $x \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)$  has the unique zero  $\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$  located in  $(x_1, x_2)$ .
- 2) For  $d_l \geq 1, d_r \geq 2$  and  $x \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ ,

$$\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x) \leq \left( \frac{d_l}{2} - 1 \right) x \log x + \kappa_{d_l, d_r} x, \quad (49)$$

where the constant  $\kappa_{d_l, d_r} := \frac{d_l}{2} \log(d_r - 1) + 3$ .

*Proof:* The continuity of the function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  is shown in [55]. From [55, Thm. 7],

$$\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x = 0 \text{ or } 1 \\ \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log \left( \frac{(1+z_0)^{d_r} - d_r z_0}{z_0^{d_r x}} \right) - (d_l - 1) H_2(x), & x \in (0, 1) \end{cases}$$

where  $z_0 = z_0(x)$  is the unique positive root of the equation

$$\frac{z[(1+z)^{d_r-1} - 1]}{(1+z)^{d_r} - d_r z} = x$$

solved for  $z$  as a function of  $x$ . The function  $z_0(x)$  is continuously differentiable on  $(0, 1)$  with strictly positive derivative, and moreover,  $z_0(0^+) = 0$  and  $z_0(1^-) = +\infty$ , so it is a monotonic and invertible map from  $(0, 1)$  to  $(0, +\infty)$ , and its inverse is given by  $z_0^{-1}(z) = \frac{z[(1+z)^{d_r-1} - 1]}{(1+z)^{d_r} - d_r z}$ . Therefore  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)$  is differentiable on  $(0, 1)$ . Some manipulation yields that for  $x \in (0, 1)$

$$\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx} = \log \left\{ \frac{[(1+z_0)^{d_r-1} - 1]^{d_l-1}}{z_0[(1+z_0)^{d_r-1} - (d_r - 1)z_0]^{d_l-1}} \right\}, \quad z_0 = z_0(x),$$

which is also continuously differentiable. We now prove the first statement. Since  $d_l, d_r \geq 3$ , it follows that

$$\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx} \Big|_{x=0^+ \text{ or } 1^-} = -\infty, \quad \frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx} \Big|_{x=z_0^{-1}(1)=\frac{2^{d_r-1}-1}{2^{d_r}-d_r}} = (d_l - 1) \log \frac{2^{d_r-1} - 1}{2^{d_r-1} - (d_r - 1)} > 0.$$

We claim that, there exists an  $x_3 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx}$  is strictly increasing on  $(0, x_3)$ , and strictly decreasing on  $(x_3, 1)$ , then  $\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx}$  achieves its maximum (strictly positive) value at  $x = x_3$ , and by the continuity of  $\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx}$ , the equation

$$\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx} = 0$$

has exactly two roots,  $x_1 \in (0, x_3)$  and  $x_2 \in (x_3, 1)$ , and hence,  $\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx}$  is strictly negative on  $(0, x_1) \cup (x_2, 1)$  and strictly positive on  $(x_1, x_2)$ , which implies the first statement. To show our claim, we examine the sign of the second derivative

$$\frac{d^2\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx^2} = \frac{d}{dz_0} \left( \frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx} \right) \cdot \frac{dz_0(x)}{dx}, \quad x \in (0, 1).$$

Since  $\frac{dz_0(x)}{dx} > 0$  for all  $x \in (0, 1)$ , we only need to analyze the first part, which can be treated as a function of  $z_0$ . Using the change of variable  $y = z_0 + 1 \in (1, +\infty)$  and after some manipulation, we can write

$$\frac{d}{dz_0} \left( \frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx} \right) = \frac{\xi_{d_l, d_r}(y)}{(y-1)(y^{d_r-1}-1)(y^{d_r-1}-(d_r-1)(y-1))}$$

where the denominator is strictly positive for  $y > 1$ , and the polynomial function  $\xi_{d_l, d_r}(y)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{d_l, d_r}(y) = & -y^{2d_r-2} + (d_r - 1)[1 - (d_l - 1)(d_r - 2)]y^{d_r} + [2(d_l - 1)(d_r - 1)^2 - (d_r - 2)]y^{d_r-1} \\ & - (d_l - 1)(d_r - 1)d_r y^{d_r-2} - d_l(d_r - 1)y + d_l(d_r - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the nonzero coefficients of  $\xi_{d_l, d_r}(y)$  have signs  $-$ ,  $-$ ,  $+$ ,  $-$ ,  $-$ ,  $+$ , changing three times from left to right. By Descartes' rule of signs,  $\xi_{d_l, d_r}(y)$  can have three or one positive zeros. Moreover, it can be verified that

$$\xi_{d_l, d_r}(0) = d_l(d_r - 1) > 0, \quad \xi_{d_l, d_r}(1) = 0, \quad \xi'_{d_l, d_r}(1) = (d_l - 2)(d_r - 1) > 0, \quad \xi_{d_l, d_r}(+\infty) = -\infty,$$

then  $\xi_{d_l, d_r}(y)$  must have three positive zeros  $y_1, 1, y_2$  where  $y_1 < 1 < y_2$ , and for  $y > 1$ ,  $\xi_{d_l, d_r}(y)$  is strictly positive on  $(1, y_2)$  and strictly negative on  $(y_2, +\infty)$ . Then by the monotonicity of  $z_0(x)$ , the unique maximum point of  $\frac{d\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x)}{dx}$  occurs at

$$x_3 = z_0^{-1}(y_2 - 1) = \frac{(y_2 - 1)(y_2^{d_r-1} - 1)}{y_2^{d_r} - d_r(y_2 - 1)},$$

which proves our claim. We now prove the second statement. For  $z > 0$ , setting  $z = \frac{\hat{x}}{1-\hat{x}}$  for  $\hat{x} \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x) &= \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log \inf_{z>0} \frac{\tilde{W}_{d_r}(z)}{z^{d_r x}} - (d_l - 1)H_2(x) \\ &= -(d_l - 1)H_2(x) + \inf_{\hat{x} \in (0, 1)} \frac{d_l}{d_r} \log [1 - d_r \hat{x}(1 - \hat{x})^{d_r - 1}] + d_l \left[ x \log \frac{1}{\hat{x}} + (1 - x) \log \frac{1}{1 - \hat{x}} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Set  $\hat{x} = \sqrt{\frac{x}{d_r - 1}}$  in the above expression. Then for  $x \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ , we have  $\hat{x} \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(x) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (d_l - 1)x \log x - \frac{d_l}{d_r} \cdot d_r \hat{x}(1 - \hat{x})^{d_r - 1} + d_l \left[ x \log \frac{1}{\hat{x}} + \frac{\hat{x}}{1 - \hat{x}} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} (d_l - 1)x \log x + d_l \left[ x \log \frac{1}{\hat{x}} + \frac{\hat{x}}{1 - \hat{x}} - \hat{x} + (d_r - 1)\hat{x}^2 \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \left( \frac{d_l}{2} - 1 \right) x \log x + \left( \frac{d_l}{2} \log(d_r - 1) + 3 \right) x.\end{aligned}$$

(a) follows from  $\log y \leq y - 1$  and  $x \in (0, 1)$ ; (b) follows from  $(1 - \hat{x})^{d_r - 1} \geq 1 - (d_r - 1)\hat{x}$ ; (c) follows from  $d_r \geq 2$  and  $\hat{x} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

By Lemmas I-E.1 and I-E.2, we can derive the following upper bound on the average stopping set distribution of  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$ .

*Lemma I-E.3:* For any constant size  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $\ell$  may depend on  $q, d_l, d_r, w, L$ , but not on  $n$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{-\lceil(d_l - 2)\ell/2\rceil}). \quad (50)$$

For any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\ell \leq 2L\tilde{\alpha}_{lb}n = \frac{d_l}{t_{\max}}\tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}n$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2} + |\mathcal{T}|)K - 1}) e^{n \max\{\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell}{Kn}), \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\frac{t_{\max}\ell}{d_l n})\}}. \quad (51)$$

*Proof:* The proof of this lemma can be directly transformed from that of Lemma I-B.3, so we omit the details here. For the case where  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  is an  $n$ -independent constant, the bound follows from (48) and the estimate  $\binom{n}{\ell} = \Theta(n^\ell)$  for  $n$ -independent constant  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ; for the case where  $\ell \leq 2L\tilde{\alpha}_{lb}n$ , we use Lemma I-E.3, whose first statement implies that the maximum value of  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  over any closed interval  $I \subseteq [0, \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}]$  is attained at one of the endpoints of  $I$  (here, we take  $I = [\frac{\ell}{Kn}, \frac{t_{\max}\ell}{d_l n}]$ ).  $\square$

We are ready to deal with (47). We choose the constant size

$$\ell_0 = 2K + (1 + 2|\mathcal{T}|)K^2$$

and an arbitrary  $0 < \alpha_1 < \min\{\tilde{\alpha}_{lb}, \alpha\}$ . For the term  $S_1$  in (47), if  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is a standard ensemble, then by (50)

$$S_1 = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{1 - \lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}),$$

and if  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved ensemble, then  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_1(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] = 0$  and

$$S_1 = \sum_{\ell=2}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(n^{2 - d_l}).$$

For the term  $S_2$  in (47), we assume that  $n$  is sufficiently large such that  $\ell_0 \leq \lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor$  and  $\frac{\ell_0}{Kn} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ . Since the parameter  $\alpha_1$  is chosen such that  $\alpha_1 < \tilde{\alpha}_{lb}$ , we can apply the upper bound in (51) and then obtain

$$\begin{aligned}S_2 &= \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \\ &\leq \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2} + |\mathcal{T}|)K - 1}) \sum_{\ell=\ell_0}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha_1 n \rfloor} e^{n \max\{\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell}{Kn}), \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\frac{t_{\max}\ell}{d_l n})\}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2} + |\mathcal{T}|)K}) \left[ e^{n\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\frac{\ell_0}{Kn})} + e^{n\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\frac{2Lt_{\max}\alpha_1}{d_l})} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2} + |\mathcal{T}|)K}) \Theta\left(n^{-(\frac{d_l}{2} - 1)[2 + (1 + 2|\mathcal{T}|)K]}\right) + \Theta(n^{(\frac{1}{2} + |\mathcal{T}|)K}) e^{n\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}(\frac{2Lt_{\max}\alpha_1}{d_l})} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \Theta(n^{2 - d_l}) \Theta\left(n^{-(d_l - 3)(\frac{1}{2} + |\mathcal{T}|)K}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we use the fact that the maximum value of  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r}$  over any closed interval  $I \subseteq [0, \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}]$  is attained at one of the end points of  $I$ ; in (b) we use the upper bound (49) (since  $\frac{\ell_0}{Kn} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ ), and  $\ell_0 = 2K + (1 + 2|\mathcal{T}|)K^2$ ; (c) follows since

$$0 < \frac{2Lt_{\max}\alpha_1}{d_l} < \frac{2Lt_{\max}\tilde{\alpha}_{lb}}{d_l} = \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r}$$

and thus the second term in (b) is exponentially small in  $n$ . Finally, the term  $S_3$  in (31) decays exponentially in  $n$ , since

$$S_3 = \sum_{\lceil 2L\alpha_1 n \rceil}^{\lfloor 2L\alpha n \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{A}_\ell(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})] \leq \Theta(f(n))e^{2Ln \max_{x \in [\alpha_1, \alpha]} \tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(x)},$$

where  $f(n)$  is a subexponential factor of  $n$ , and the growth rate function  $\tilde{g}_{d_l, d_r, w, L}(x) < 0$  for all  $x \in [\alpha_1, \alpha]$ . Substituting the above bounds on  $S_1, S_2$  and  $S_3$  into (47), we obtain the desired polynomial upper bound on  $\Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) \leq 2L\alpha n\}$  for any fixed  $\alpha \in (0, \tilde{\alpha}_{d_l, d_r, w, L})$ .

#### F. Proof of Converse Part of Theorem 3.23

In this subsection we derive polynomially small lower bound on the probability that the random coupled Tanner graph has a poor minimum stopping set size of 1 or 2. That is, for a standard coupled ensemble

$$\Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 1\} \geq \Theta(n^{1-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}), \quad (52)$$

while for an improved coupled ensemble

$$\Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 2\} \geq \Theta(n^{2-d_l}). \quad (53)$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n} = S(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n})$  denote the collection of all stopping sets in  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$ . We first prove (52). At this point  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is a standard coupled graph ensemble, and variable nodes in  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  can have all edge types from  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{w, d_l}$ . We consider such an edge type  $\hat{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ , whose entries are given by  $\hat{t}_0 = d_l$  and  $\hat{t}_1 = \dots = \hat{t}_{w-1} = 0$ . This is one of the edge types most likely to induce multi-edge connections in the Tanner graph, and there are

$$p(\hat{t})n = \frac{n}{w^{d_l}} := \hat{n}$$

variable nodes having edge type  $\hat{t}$  at each position. We consider the  $\hat{n}$  such variable nodes, denoted as  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{\hat{n}}$ , at position 1. By the principle of inclusion-exclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 1\} &\geq \Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\hat{n}} \{\{v_i\} \in \mathcal{S}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\}\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{n}} \Pr\{\{v_i\} \in \mathcal{S}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \hat{n}} \Pr\{\{v_i\}, \{v_j\} \in \mathcal{S}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{n}} \Pr\{\{v_i\} \in \mathcal{S}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \hat{n}} \Pr\{\{v_i, v_j\} \in \mathcal{S}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}\} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \hat{n}\Theta(n^{-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}) - \binom{\hat{n}}{2}\Theta(n^{-d_l}) = \Theta(n^{1-\lceil \frac{d_l}{2} \rceil}). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

In (a), we use the fact that the union of any two stopping sets is also a stopping set; in (b), we use the estimate  $\binom{n}{l} = \Theta(n^l)$  for  $n$ -independent  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  and the estimate (48) to estimate the probability in (10).

We next prove (53). At this point  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  is an improved ensemble. Using the lower bound in (39), we obtain

$$\Pr\{d_{ss}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 2\} \geq \Pr\{d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}) = 2\} \geq \Theta(n^{2-d_l}),$$

since a weight-2 codeword implies a size-2 stopping set.

## APPENDIX II ITERATIVE DECODING ANALYSIS

#### A. Proof of Lemma 4.6

Here we use  $z \in \mathcal{Y}$  to denote the output realization of the original channel. The first statement follows from

$$x(B|i) = W(\psi^{-1}B|i) = W(\sigma_{-i}\psi^{-1}B|0) \stackrel{(a)}{=} W(\psi^{-1}B^{+i}|0) = x(B^{+i}|0),$$

where (a) follows since the original channel is a QMSC, then for any  $\sigma \in A_q$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Y}$  and  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q$

$$[\psi(\sigma z)]_i = \frac{W(\mathrm{d}\sigma z|i)}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} W(\mathrm{d}\sigma z|x)} = \frac{W(\mathrm{d}z|\sigma^{-1}i)}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} W(\mathrm{d}z|x)} = [\psi(z)]_{\sigma^{-1}i}.$$

The verification for  $\mathbf{x}(B^{\times k}|i) = \mathbf{x}(B|k \times i)$  is similar. The claim  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(B^{+i}) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}(B^{\times k}) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}(B)$  follows from

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}(B^{+i}) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} \mathbf{x}(B^{+i}|x) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} \mathbf{x}(B|x+i) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}(B) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} \mathbf{x}(B|k \times x) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} \mathbf{x}(B^{\times k}|x) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}(B^{\times k}).$$

For the second statement, we have

$$\int_B y_i \mathbf{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}|i') = \int_{\psi^{-1}B} \frac{W(\mathrm{d}z|i)}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} W(\mathrm{d}z|x)} W(\mathrm{d}z|i') = \int_{\psi^{-1}B} \frac{W(\mathrm{d}z|i')}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} W(\mathrm{d}z|x)} W(\mathrm{d}z|i) = \int_B y_{i'} \mathbf{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}|i)$$

for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $i, i' \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , then the statement follows from

$$q \int_B y_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}) = \sum_{i' \in \mathbb{F}_q} \int_B y_{i'} \mathbf{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}|i') = \int_B \sum_{i' \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_{i'} \mathbf{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}|i) = \mathbf{x}(B|i).$$

The third statement follows since for  $\underline{Y} \sim \bar{\mathbf{x}}$ , the random vectors  $\underline{Y}$  and  $(\underline{Y}^{\times b})^{+a}$  are identically distributed for all  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q, b \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}$  (this follows from  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(B) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}(B^{+a}) = \bar{\mathbf{x}}(B^{\times b})$ ), so are their components at the same coordinates, and moreover,  $A_q \cup M_q$  acts doubly transitively on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ .

### B. Proof of Theorem 4.11

Assume  $t = n$  without loss of generality and define  $N := n - 1$ . Given a QMSC  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, W)$ , define the product Markov kernel from  $\mathbb{F}_q^N$  to  $\mathcal{Y}^N$  by

$$W^N(A_1 \times \dots \times A_N | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) = \prod_{j=1}^N W(A_j | x_j)$$

for all  $A_1, \dots, A_N \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{\sim n} \in \mathbb{F}_q^N$ . Consider the channel  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}^N, \mathcal{A}^N, V)$  for performing extrinsic MAP decoding for  $X_n$ , where given that  $X_n = x$  is transmitted, the conditional distribution

$$V(E|x) := \frac{q}{|C_n|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_n : x_n = x} W^N(E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}), \quad \forall E \in \mathcal{A}^N.$$

The assumption that the  $n$ -th component of  $C_n$  is proper ensures that  $V$  is well-defined. Since transmission is over a QMSC, the product channel also exhibits the corresponding symmetry, e.g., for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_q^N$  and  $b \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}$

$$W^N(\sigma_{+\mathbf{a}} E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n} + \mathbf{a}) = W^N(E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) = W^N(\sigma_{\times b} E | b\mathbf{x}_{\sim n})$$

where for all  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^N$ , the actions  $\sigma_{+\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\sigma_{\times b}$  are given by

$$\sigma_{+\mathbf{a}}(y_1, \dots, y_N) = (\sigma_{+a_1} y_1, \dots, \sigma_{+a_N} y_N), \quad \sigma_{\times b}(y_1, \dots, y_N) = (\sigma_{\times b} y_1, \dots, \sigma_{\times b} y_N)$$

and the actions of  $\sigma_{+a_1}, \dots, \sigma_{+a_N}, \sigma_{\times b}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  are determined by the QMSC. For all codewords  $\mathbf{c} \in C_n$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$  and  $E \in \mathcal{A}^N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} V(E|x) &= \frac{q}{|C_n|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_n : x_n = x} W^N(E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) = \frac{q}{|C_n|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_n : x_n = x} W^N(\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n} + \mathbf{c}_{\sim n}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{q}{|C_n|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_n : x_n = x + c_n} W^N(\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) = V(\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} E | x + c_n), \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that  $C_n$  is closed under vector addition. Moreover, for all  $b \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}$

$$\begin{aligned} V(E|x) &= \frac{q}{|C_n|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_n : x_n = x} W^N(E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) = \frac{q}{|C_n|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_n : x_n = x} W^N(\sigma_{\times b} E | b\mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{q}{|C_n|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in C_n : x_n = b \times x} W^N(\sigma_{\times b} E | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) = V(\sigma_{\times b} E | b \times x). \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where (b) follows from the fact that  $C_n$  is closed under scalar multiplication. Given any output realization  $\mathbf{y}_{\sim n} \in \mathcal{Y}^N$  of the channel  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{Y}^N, \mathcal{A}^N, V)$ , the extrinsic APP vector  $\psi_n(\mathbf{y}_{\sim n})$  for estimating  $X_n$  can be given by

$$[\psi_n(\mathbf{y}_{\sim n})]_i = \frac{V(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}_{\sim n}|i)}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} V(\mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}_{\sim n}|x)}, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{F}_q.$$

From (55), for any codeword  $\mathbf{c} \in C_n$  we have

$$[\psi_n(\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} \mathbf{y}_{\sim n})]_i = \frac{V(d\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} \mathbf{y}_{\sim n} | i)}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} V(d\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} \mathbf{y}_{\sim n} | x)} = \frac{V(d\mathbf{y}_{\sim n} | \sigma_{-\mathbf{c}_n} i)}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} V(d\mathbf{y}_{\sim n} | x)} = [\psi_n(\mathbf{y}_{\sim n})]_{\sigma_{-\mathbf{c}_n} i},$$

i.e.,  $\psi_n(\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} \mathbf{y}_{\sim n}) = \sigma_{-\mathbf{c}_n} \psi_n(\mathbf{y}_{\sim n})$ . Let  $\mathcal{B} := \{B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q : \psi_n^{-1} B \in \mathcal{A}^N\}$  be the pushforward  $\sigma$ -field induced by  $\psi_n$ . For any two codewords  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in C_n$  such that  $x_n = x'_n$ , let  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}$  also be a codeword, then we have  $c_n = 0$  and for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\psi_n(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim n}) \in B | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}\} &= W^N(\psi_n^{-1} B | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n}) = W^N(\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} \psi_n^{-1} B | \mathbf{x}_{\sim n} + \mathbf{c}_{\sim n}) \\ &= W^N(\psi_n^{-1} B^{-c_n} | \mathbf{x}'_{\sim n}) = \Pr\{\psi_n(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim n}) \in B | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}'\}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,  $\psi_n(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim n})$  is conditionally independent of  $\mathbf{X}_{\sim n}$  given  $X_n$ . This proves the first statement. Now we focus on the distribution of  $\psi_n(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim n})$  conditioned on  $X_n = i$ , which is defined by  $\mathbf{x}(B|i) := V(\psi_n^{-1} B | i)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}, i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ . From (55), by choosing any  $\mathbf{c} \in C_n$  with  $c_n = -i$ , we have

$$\mathbf{x}(B|i) = V(\psi_n^{-1} B | i) = V(\sigma_{+\mathbf{c}_{\sim n}} \psi_n^{-1} B | i + (-i)) = V(\psi_n^{-1} B^{+i} | 0) = \mathbf{x}(B^{+i} | 0),$$

and similarly, from (56) we have that for all  $k \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$

$$\mathbf{x}(B|i \times k) = V(\psi_n^{-1} B | i \times k) = V(\sigma_{\times k-1} \psi_n^{-1} B | i) = V(\psi_n^{-1} B^{\times k} | i) = \mathbf{x}(B^{\times k} | i).$$

Hence, the channel  $(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{x})$  with input-output pair  $(X_n, \psi_n(\mathbf{Y}_{\sim n}))$  is a QMSC, which proves the second statement. Since the output is itself an APP vector, by Proposition 4.9 the distribution  $\mathbf{x}(\cdot | 0)$  is symmetric. This proves the third statement.

### C. Proof of Lemma 4.12

Define  $\tilde{e}_i = e_3^{-1} e_i \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then for any bounded measurable  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int f d(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes_{e_1, e_2, e_3} \mathbf{x}_2) \\ &= \int f \left( \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ \tilde{e}_1 u + \tilde{e}_2 v = 0}} y_u z_v, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ \tilde{e}_1 u + \tilde{e}_2 v = -1}} y_u z_v, \dots, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ \tilde{e}_1 u + \tilde{e}_2 v = -(q-1)}} y_u z_v \right) \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}) \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}) \\ &= \int f \left( \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ u+v=0}} y_u z_v, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ u+v=-1}} y_u z_v, \dots, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ u+v=-(q-1)}} y_u z_v \right) \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}^{\times \tilde{e}_1}) \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}^{\times \tilde{e}_2}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \int f \left( \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ u+v=0}} y_u z_v, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ u+v=-1}} y_u z_v, \dots, \sum_{\substack{u, v \in \mathbb{F}_q \\ u+v=-(q-1)}} y_u z_v \right) \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}) \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}) \\ &= \int f d(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes_{1, 1, 1} \mathbf{x}_2), \end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we use the property that  $\mathbf{x}(B^{\times k}) = \mathbf{x}(B)$  for any symmetric distribution  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_q$  and  $k \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ .

### D. Some Lemmas Concerning $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{E}, \mathfrak{P}$

We first consider the Bhattacharyya functional  $\mathfrak{B}$ . As in the binary case, the following multiplicativity of  $\mathfrak{B}$  with respect to the variable node operator  $\boxtimes$  holds.

*Lemma II-D.1:* For any  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes \mathbf{x}_2) = \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1) \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_2)$ .

*Proof:* Note that  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = q \int \sqrt{y_0 y_1} \mathbf{x}(d\underline{y}) = \int \sqrt{y_1 / y_0} \mathbf{x}(d\underline{y})$ , then

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes \mathbf{x}) = \int \sqrt{\frac{y_1 z_1}{y_0 z_1}} \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}) \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}) = \int \sqrt{\frac{y_1}{y_0}} \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}) \int \sqrt{\frac{z_1}{z_0}} \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}) = \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1) \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_2). \quad \square$$

The following result generalizes [25, Lem. 4.65].

*Lemma II-D.2 (Bhattacharyya Versus  $\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{E}$ ):* For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,

$$2\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{(q-1)\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x})(1-\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x}))} + (q-2)\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x})}{q-1},$$

where the left side is tight when  $\mathbf{x}$  is the message distribution from a QPEC with erasure size  $M = 2$ , and the right side is tight when  $\mathbf{x}$  is the message distribution from a QSC.

*Proof:* First, note that  $\min\{y_0, y_1\} \leq \sqrt{y_0 y_1}$ ,

$$2\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}) = q \int \min\{y_0, y_1\} \bar{\mathbf{x}}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}) \leq q \int \sqrt{y_0 y_1} \bar{\mathbf{x}}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}) = \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}).$$

It can be verified that when  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  is the distribution associated with a QPEC with erasure size 2, any two elements in  $\underline{y}$  are either the same or one of them is 0, at this point the above inequality is tight. To prove the second inequality, using the property of reference measures we rewrite

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{q-1} \int \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j} \sqrt{y_i y_j} \bar{\mathbf{x}}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y})$$

and examine the functions  $f(y) := \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j} \sqrt{y_i y_j}$  and  $g(y) := 1 - \max_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \{y_i\}$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $y_0$  attains the maximum value among  $\underline{y}$ . In this case,  $g = 1 - y_0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \frac{2}{q-1} \sqrt{y_0} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}} \sqrt{y_j} + \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}, i \neq j} \sqrt{y_i y_j} \leq \frac{2}{q-1} \sqrt{y_0} \sqrt{(q-1)(1-y_0)} + \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}, i \neq j} \frac{y_i + y_j}{2} \\ &= \frac{2\sqrt{(q-1)g(1-g)} + (q-2)g}{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Jensen's inequality to the following inequality, we have (noting that  $\sqrt{g(1-g)}$  is concave in  $g$  and  $\int g \mathrm{d}\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x})$ )

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \int f \mathrm{d}\bar{\mathbf{x}} \leq \int \frac{2\sqrt{(q-1)g(1-g)} + (q-2)g}{q-1} \mathrm{d}\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{2\sqrt{(q-1)\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x})(1-\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x}))} + (q-2)\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x})}{q-1}.$$

It can be verified that the above inequalities are tight if  $\mathbf{x}$  is due to a QSC.  $\square$

In the binary case, we have  $q = 2$  and  $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x})$ , and the above inequality simplifies to [25, Lem. 4.65]

$$2\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 2\sqrt{\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x})(1-\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x}))}.$$

For the the check node operator  $\boxplus$ , the following property of  $\mathfrak{B}$  was proven in [52, Lem. 31]. However, the setup in [52] differs significantly from the setup in this paper, so we provide the transformation of their proof under our setup.

*Lemma II-D.3:* For any  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxplus \mathbf{x}_2) \leq \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1) + \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_2) + O(\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1)\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_2))$ .

*Proof:* We first show that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ ,  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \int f \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$  where  $f(\underline{y}) := \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j} \sqrt{y_i y_j}$ . Note that the integral here is with respect to the symmetric probability measure  $\mathbf{x}$ , rather than its reference measure. To this end, for any  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , define the set  $\underline{y}^* := \{\underline{y}^{+i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q}$ , and let  $n(\underline{y})$  be the number of elements  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$  satisfying  $\underline{y}^{+a} = \underline{y}$ . Note that  $n(\underline{y}) \geq 1$  for all  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$  because  $\underline{y}^{+0} = \underline{y}$ . Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $\underline{Y} \sim \mathbf{x}$ , then for any given  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , the symmetry of  $\mathbf{x}$  implies that

$$\Pr\{\underline{Y} \in \underline{y}^*\} = \sum_{\underline{z} \in \underline{y}^*} \Pr\{\underline{Y} = \underline{z}\} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{n(\underline{y})} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \Pr\{\underline{Y} = \underline{y}^{+i}\} \stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{n(\underline{y})} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \frac{y_i}{y_0} \Pr\{\underline{Y} = \underline{y}\} = \frac{\Pr\{\underline{Y} = \underline{y}\}}{y_0 n(\underline{y})}. \quad (57)$$

(a) follows since  $n(\underline{z}) = n(\underline{y})$  for all  $\underline{z} \in \underline{y}^*$ , and hence each  $\underline{z} \in \underline{y}^*$  is added in  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \Pr\{\underline{Y} = \underline{y}^{+i}\}$  exactly  $n(\underline{y})$  times; (b) follows since  $\underline{Y} \sim \mathbf{x}$ , and  $\mathbf{x}(B^{+i}) = \int_B \frac{y_i}{y_0} \mathbf{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y})$  for any Borel set  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$ . Note that (57) is the symmetry condition proposed in [52] and can be written as

$$\Pr\{\underline{Y} = \underline{y} | \underline{Y} \in \underline{y}^*\} = y_0 n(\underline{y}) \quad \underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q.$$

This symmetry condition allows us to compute  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})$  in an alternative manner. Since  $\mathbf{x}(B^{\times k}) = \mathbf{x}(B)$  for any Borel set  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$ , we can express  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})$  using the random probability vector  $\underline{Y} \sim \mathbf{x}$  as follows:

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\frac{Y_1}{Y_0}} \right] = \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sqrt{\frac{Y_k}{Y_0}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}} \sqrt{\frac{Y_k}{Y_0}} \middle| \underline{Y} \in \underline{Y}^* \right] \right].$$

The outer expectation is with respect to the random set  $\underline{Y}^*$ . The following is straightforward from [52, App. VI]: using the symmetry condition (57) we can derive

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}} \sqrt{\frac{Y_k}{Y_0}} \middle| \underline{Y} \in \underline{Y}^* \right] = \mathbb{E}[f(\underline{Y}) | \underline{Y} \in \underline{Y}^*] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

and thus  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}[f(\underline{Y})] = \int f \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}$ . Using the bound [52, Lem. 31]

$$f(\underline{y} \odot \underline{z}) \leq f(\underline{y}) + f(\underline{z}) + O(f(\underline{y})f(\underline{z}))$$

where  $\underline{y} \odot \underline{z}$  denotes the output message of a degree-3 check node with all-one edge labels and input messages  $\underline{y}, \underline{z}$ , we finish the proof by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes \mathbf{x}_2) &= \int f(\underline{y} \odot \underline{z}) \mathbf{x}_1(d\underline{y}) \mathbf{x}_2(d\underline{z}) \leq \int f d\mathbf{x}_1 + \int f d\mathbf{x}_2 + O\left(\int f d\mathbf{x}_1 \int f d\mathbf{x}_2\right) \\ &= \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1) + \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_2) + O(\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1)\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_2)). \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

In the binary case, a more refined bound is shown in [25, Problem 4.62], that is, let  $\beta_i = \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , then

$$\sqrt{\beta_1^2 + \beta_2^2 - \beta_1^2\beta_2^2} \leq \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}_1 \boxtimes \mathbf{x}_2) \leq \beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_1\beta_2.$$

The above is called the extremes of information combining, where the lower bound is tight when both  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$  are distributions from BSC, and the upper bound is tight when one of  $\mathbf{x}_1$  or  $\mathbf{x}_2$  is a distribution from BEC. However, it seems difficult to extend this to the nonbinary case and we only obtain Lemma II-D.3. The following large deviation result generalizes [25, Lem. 4.67].

*Lemma II-D.4 (Large Deviation):* For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$

$$\frac{2}{3\pi} \frac{\left(\frac{e^2}{4n} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 + \frac{e^2}{4n} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})^{n+1} \leq \mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes n}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})^n.$$

*Proof:* The right side follows from Lemmas II-D.1 and II-D.2. For the proof of the left side, the key is to express  $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})$  as

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \int e^{-|x/2|-x/2} \mathbf{a}(dx) =: \mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{a}), \quad \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \int e^{-\frac{x}{2}} \mathbf{a}(dx) =: \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{a}). \quad (58)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}$  denotes the pushforward measure of the LLR variable  $x = l(\underline{y}) := \log(\frac{y_0}{y_1})$  on  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  induced by  $\mathbf{x}$ , and to show that  $\mathbf{a}$  is symmetric in the binary  $L$ -domain sense that

$$\mathbf{a}(-E) = \int_E e^{-x} \mathbf{a}(dx) \quad (59)$$

for any Borel set  $E \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , then the subsequent steps are exactly the same as those in [25, Lem. 4.67]. To see (58), note that

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{q}{2} \int \min\{y_0, y_1\} \mathbf{x}(d\underline{y}) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\min\{y_0, y_1\}}{y_0} \mathbf{x}(d\underline{y}), \quad \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \int \sqrt{\frac{y_1}{y_0}} \mathbf{x}(d\underline{y})$$

and that  $\frac{\min\{y_0, y_1\}}{y_0} = e^{-|x/2|-x/2}$  and  $\sqrt{\frac{y_1}{y_0}} = e^{-\frac{x}{2}}$  for any  $x = \log(\frac{y_0}{y_1})$ . To see (59), note that for any Borel set  $E \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$

$$\int_E e^{-x} \mathbf{a}(dx) = \int_{l^{-1}E} \frac{y_1}{y_0} \mathbf{x}(d\underline{y}) = \mathbf{x}((l^{-1}E)^+) = \mathbf{x}(l^{-1}(-E)) = \mathbf{a}(-E).$$

The remaining proof follows [25, Lem. 4.67]: for any even  $n$ , it can be shown that

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes n}) \geq \frac{2}{3\pi} \frac{\left(\frac{e^2}{4n} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 + \frac{e^2}{4n} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})^n$$

and for any odd  $n$  we use the degradation: since  $\mathbf{x}^{\otimes(n+1)} \preceq \mathbf{x}^{\otimes n}$  and the kernel,  $\frac{q}{2} \min\{y_0, y_1\}$ , of  $\mathfrak{P}$  is concave in  $\underline{y}$ ,

$$\mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes n}) \geq \mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes(n+1)}) \geq \frac{2}{3\pi} \frac{\left(\frac{e^2}{4n} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{1 + \frac{e^2}{4n} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})} \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x})^{n+1}. \quad \square$$

*Corollary II-D.5:* For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \{\Delta_\infty\}$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathfrak{P}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes n}) = \log \mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes n}).$$

*Proof:* The left side follows from Lemma II-D.4. The proof for the right side is left to the reader (Hint:  $\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes n})$  is the error probability of a length- $n$  repetition code over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  transmitted over a QMSC characterized by  $\mathbf{x}$ . At this point, the union bound on  $\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{x}^{\otimes n})$  is exponentially tight and gives the correct error exponent).  $\square$

*Lemma II-D.6 (Strict Concavity of the Kernel of  $\mathfrak{B}$ ):* The Bhattacharyya functional  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \int f d\mathbf{x}$  admits a strictly concave kernel  $f(\underline{y}) := \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j} \sqrt{y_i y_j}$  on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ .

*Proof:* For any  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and  $\underline{y}, \underline{z} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , we have the following Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda f(\underline{y}) + (1 - \lambda) f(\underline{z}) &= \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j} \lambda \sqrt{y_i y_j} + (1 - \lambda) \sqrt{z_i z_j} \leq \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j} \sqrt{(\lambda y_i + (1 - \lambda) z_i)(\lambda y_j + (1 - \lambda) z_j)} \\ &= f(\lambda \underline{y} + (1 - \lambda) \underline{z}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $f$  is concave. We now show that the above inequality is tight if and only if  $\underline{y} = \underline{z}$ , which means that  $f$  is strictly concave on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ . Assume that the above inequality is tight. By the condition for equality in the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$y_i z_j = y_j z_i \quad \forall i, j \in \mathbb{F}_q, i \neq j.$$

Note that  $\underline{y}, \underline{z}$  are probability vectors in  $\mathcal{S}_q$ . If  $y_i = 0$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , then  $z_i = 0$  must hold, otherwise, the above condition implies that  $\underline{y}$  is a zero vector, which is a contradiction. Conversely,  $z_i = 0$  implies  $y_i = 0$ . Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$  be the set of all indices  $i$  for which  $y_i, z_i > 0$ . Then the above condition implies that  $\frac{y_i}{z_i} = \kappa$  for all  $i \in A$  and some constant  $\kappa > 0$ . Moreover, since  $\sum_{i \in A} y_i = \sum_{i \in A} z_i = 1$ , there must be  $\kappa = 1$  and thus  $\underline{y} = \underline{z}$ .  $\square$

#### E. Proof of Lemma 4.17

Since  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q), W_2)$  constitutes a compact metric space, it is sufficient to show that  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$  is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ . We first show that given any  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ ,  $\bar{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$  if and only if for all bounded continuous  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$

$$\int f(\underline{y}) \bar{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}^{+i}) = \int f \mathrm{d}\bar{x} = \int f(\underline{y}) \bar{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}^{\times k}). \quad (60)$$

The necessity is obvious, since  $\bar{x}(B) = \bar{x}(B^{+i}) = \bar{x}(B^{\times k})$  for any  $\bar{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$  and Borel set  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$ . For the sufficiency, we have a standard argument using the monotone convergence theorem and the  $\pi$ - $\lambda$  theorem. Let  $E \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$  be any closed subset. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $f_n : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function defined by  $f_n(\underline{y}) := 1 - \min\{nd(\underline{y}, E), 1\}$  for all  $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , where

$$d(\underline{y}, E) = \min_{\underline{z} \in E} \|\underline{y} - \underline{z}\|$$

denotes the distance from  $\underline{y}$  to  $E$ . Then  $f_n$  is bounded continuous and the sequence  $\{f_n\}$  converges pointwise from above to the indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_E$ , and is decreasing in  $n$ . By the monotone convergence

$$\int f_n(\underline{y}) \bar{x}(\mathrm{d}\underline{y}^{+i}) \rightarrow \bar{x}(E^{+i}), \quad \int f_n \mathrm{d}\bar{x} \rightarrow \bar{x}(E), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{F}_q.$$

Then (60) implies that  $\bar{x}(E^{+i}) = \bar{x}(E)$  for any closed  $E \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$  and  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ . Similarly, we have  $\bar{x}(E^{\times k}) = \bar{x}(E)$  for any closed  $E \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$  and  $k \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ . Now define

$$A := \{F \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q : \bar{x}(F^{+i}) = \bar{x}(F^{\times k}) = \bar{x}(F), \forall i \in \mathbb{F}_q, k \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times\}.$$

It can be verified that  $A$  is a  $\lambda$ -system, since for any involved group action, say,  $+i$ , and  $F \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$ , we have  $(F^c)^{+i} = (F^{+i})^c$ , and for any pairwise disjoint  $F_1, \dots, F_m \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$  we have

$$(F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_m)^{+i} = F_1^{+i} \cup \dots \cup F_m^{+i}$$

and  $F_1^{+i}, \dots, F_m^{+i}$  are also pairwise disjoint. On the other hand, by the above discussion,  $A$  contains all closed subsets of  $\mathcal{S}_q$ , which forms a  $\pi$ -system that generates the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Consequently, it follows from the  $\pi$ - $\lambda$  theorem that  $A$  contains all Borel sets  $B \subseteq \mathcal{S}_q$ , i.e., (60) implies that  $\bar{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$ .

By the equivalent condition (60) for elements belonging to  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$ , it can be verified that for any convergent sequence  $\bar{x}_n \xrightarrow{W_2} \bar{x}$  with  $\{\bar{x}_n\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$ , the limit point  $\bar{x}$  is also in  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$ , since in  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q), W_2)$  convergence under  $W_2$  is equivalent to weak convergence, which implies that (60) holds for  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ . Therefore,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_q$  is closed in  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q), W_2)$ .

#### F. Proof of Lemma 4.20

Due to the isometric isomorphism between  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  and  $(\overline{\mathcal{X}}_q, W_2)$ , it is equivalent to show  $\Psi(x_{1,n} * x_{2,n}) \xrightarrow{W_2} \Psi(x_1 * x_2)$  where  $*$  takes  $\circledast$  or  $\boxtimes$ , which is further equivalent to show

$$\int f \mathrm{d}\Psi(x_{1,n} * x_{2,n}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f \mathrm{d}\Psi(x_1 * x_2)$$

for all bounded continuous  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We provide a detailed proof for  $* = \circledast$ , and the proof for  $* = \boxtimes$  can be obtained in a similar manner. Let  $\underline{w} : \mathcal{S}_q \times \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_q$  denote the output APP vector function of a degree-3 variable node given two input probability vectors, defined by

$$\underline{w}(\underline{y}, \underline{z}) := \left( \frac{y_i z_i}{\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_x z_x} \right)_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \quad \forall \underline{y}, \underline{z} \in \mathcal{S}_q.$$

Let  $\bar{x}_{1,n} = \Psi x_{1,n}, \bar{x}_{2,n} = \Psi x_{2,n}$  be the corresponding measure sequences in  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_q$ . By  $x_{1,n} \xrightarrow{d_W} x_1, x_{2,n} \xrightarrow{d_W} x_2$  and the isometric isomorphism, it follows that  $\bar{x}_{1,n} \xrightarrow{W_2} \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_{2,n} \xrightarrow{W_2} \bar{x}_2$  where  $\bar{x}_1 = \Psi x_1, \bar{x}_2 = \Psi x_2$ . For any bounded continuous  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int f d\Psi(x_{1,n} \otimes x_{2,n}) &= \int \frac{f(\underline{w})}{q w_0} (x_{1,n} \otimes x_{2,n})(d\underline{w}) = \int \frac{f(w(y, \underline{z}))}{q \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_x z_x} x_{1,n}(dy) x_{2,n}(d\underline{z}) \\ &= \underbrace{\int q f(\underline{w}(y, \underline{z})) \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q} y_x z_x \bar{x}_{1,n}(dy) \bar{x}_{2,n}(d\underline{z})}_{g(\underline{y}, \underline{z})} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g(\underline{y}, \underline{z}) \bar{x}_1(dy) \bar{x}_2(d\underline{z}) = \int f d\Psi(x_1 \otimes x_2). \end{aligned}$$

The convergence is due to the boundedness and continuity of the function  $g$  with respect to  $(\underline{y}, \underline{z})$  and the fact that  $\bar{x}_{1,n} \xrightarrow{W_2} \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_{2,n} \xrightarrow{W_2} \bar{x}_2$ . This proves the continuity of  $\otimes$ .

#### G. Proof of Theorem 4.23

We first show i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  ii). Assume that i) holds. Due to the symmetry of the kernel  $Q$ , for all  $i \in \mathbb{F}_q$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}_2$  we have

$$\int_B z_i \bar{x}_2(d\underline{z}) = \int y_i Q(B|\underline{y}) \bar{x}_1(dy). \quad (61)$$

Define the joint distribution  $P$  on  $(\mathcal{S}_q \times \mathcal{S}_q, \mathcal{B}_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2)$  by

$$P(B_1, B_2) = \int_{B_1} Q(B_2|\underline{y}) \bar{x}_1(dy) \quad \forall B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$$

and the coupling of random vectors  $(\underline{Y}, \underline{Z}) \sim P$ , then we have 1)  $P(B_1, \mathcal{S}_q) = \int_{B_1} \bar{x}_1(dy) = \bar{x}_1(B_1) \forall B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$ , i.e.,  $\underline{Y} \sim \bar{x}_1$ ; 2)  $\underline{Z} \sim \bar{x}_2$  since  $\forall B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$

$$P(\mathcal{S}_q, B_2) = \int Q(B_2|\underline{y}) \bar{x}_1(dy) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \int Q(B_2|\underline{y}) x_1(dy^{+i}) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} \int Q(B_2^{+i}|\underline{y}) x_1(dy) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} x_2(B_2^{+i}) = \bar{x}_2(B_2);$$

3)  $\forall i \in \mathbb{F}_q, B \in \mathcal{B}_2$ , by (61) we have  $\int_{\mathcal{S}_q \times B} z_i dP(\underline{y}, \underline{z}) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_q \times B} y_i dP(\underline{y}, \underline{z})$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}|\underline{Z}] = \underline{Z}$  a.s. Thus i)  $\Rightarrow$  ii). Now if ii) holds, i.e., there exists a joint probability distribution  $P$  such that  $(\underline{Y}, \underline{Z}) \sim P, \underline{Y} \sim \bar{x}_1, \underline{Z} \sim \bar{x}_2$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}|\underline{Z}] = \underline{Z}$  a.s. then

$$\bar{x}_1(B_1) = P(B_1, \mathcal{S}_q) \geq P(B_1, B_2) \quad \forall B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2.$$

Define the Radon-Nikodym derivative  $Q(B|\underline{y}) = \frac{P(dy, B)}{\bar{x}_1(dy)}$  for  $B \in \mathcal{B}_2, \underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ , and then by  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i|\underline{Z}] = Z_i \forall i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , we have

$$x_2(B^{+i}) = q \int_B z_i \bar{x}_2(d\underline{z}) = q \int y_i Q(B|\underline{y}) \bar{x}_1(dy) = \int Q(B|\underline{y}^{-i}) x_1(dy)$$

i.e.,  $x_2(B) = \int Q(B^{+i}|\underline{y}^{+i}) x_1(dy) \forall B \in \mathcal{B}_2, i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ . Thus, we can choose a symmetric kernel  $Q'(B|\underline{y}) = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_q} Q(B^{+i}|\underline{y}^{+i})$  to make i) hold.

The equivalence of ii) and iii) is a known result due to Strassen [56], which is shown below.

*Theorem II-G.1 (Strassen's Theorem [56]):* Let  $\Omega$  be a compact convex metrizable subset of a locally convex topological vector space, and  $\mu, \nu$  be two Borel probability measures on  $\Omega$ , then the following two statements are *equivalent*.

- 1)  $\int f d\mu \leq \int f d\nu$  for all continuous concave  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .
- 2) There exists a coupling of random vectors  $\underline{Y} \sim \mu, \underline{Z} \sim \nu$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\underline{Y}|\underline{Z}] = \underline{Z}$  a.s.

When  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu, \nu$  are distributions on the real line, there are several elementary and constructive proofs of this theorem. For the general case, most existing proofs are based on some deep theorems from functional analysis, such as the Hahn-Banach theorem and the Riesz representation theorem. See [56] for a proof. Note that in 1) of the above theorem, Strassen considered all continuous concave  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In fact, this is equivalent to considering all bounded concave  $f$  on  $\Omega$ ,<sup>21</sup> since, if we denote “ $\int f d\mu \leq \int f d\nu$  for all bounded measurable concave  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ” as statement 3), then by Theorem II-G.1 we have 3)  $\Rightarrow$  1)  $\Rightarrow$  2)  $\Rightarrow$  3), where 1) and 2) denote the two statements in Theorem II-G.1, and the implication 2)  $\Rightarrow$  3) follows from Jensen's inequality. As a result, it is sufficient to consider all continuous concave  $f$  on  $\Omega$  when we want to establish 3).

We slightly rewrite iii) and iv) in their equivalent forms. As discussed above, iii) is equivalent to

$$\int f d\bar{x}_1 \geq \int f d\bar{x}_2$$

<sup>21</sup>In our case, when  $\Omega$  is a finite-dimensional probability simplex, any bounded concave function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ -measurable.

for all *bounded convex* (or *continuous convex*)  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . For iv), some calculation shows that it is equivalent to

$$C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) \geq C(\bar{x}_2, \mu), \quad \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q) \quad (62)$$

where  $C(\mu, \nu)$  denotes the optimal transport inner product functional between probability measures  $\mu, \nu$ , defined by

$$C(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int \langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle d\pi(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$$

and  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^q) : \int \|\underline{x}\|^2 \mu(d\underline{x}) < \infty\}$  is the 2-Wasserstein space. Note that all the integrals above are well defined and bounded. Some concepts and results on convex analysis and optimal transport are reviewed below.

We review the convex conjugate of convex functions and its relation to the subdifferential. Although here we consider convex functions defined on a compact subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , we extend them to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by setting the function value to  $+\infty$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega$ , so that existing results apply. On the other hand, for any  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ , we can define its restricted function  $f_\Omega : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  on  $\Omega$  such that  $f_\Omega(\underline{x}) = f(\underline{x}) \forall \underline{x} \in \Omega$ . For a lower semicontinuous (l.s.c.) convex  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ , let  $f^* : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  denote its convex conjugate, which is given, for all  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , by

$$f^*(\underline{y}) := \sup_{\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{ \langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle - f(\underline{x}) \},$$

and denote the subdifferential of  $f$  at  $\underline{x}$  by  $\partial f(\underline{x}) := \{\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \forall \underline{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d, f(\underline{z}) - f(\underline{x}) \geq \langle \underline{z} - \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle\}$ .<sup>22</sup> The elements of  $\partial f(\underline{x})$  are called subgradients of  $f$  at  $\underline{x}$ . Then by Fenchel's inequality it holds that for all  $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$f(\underline{x}) + f^*(\underline{y}) \geq \langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle$$

with equality if and only if  $\underline{y} \in \partial f(\underline{x})$ . The following result [57, Thm. 1] shows the existence of an optimal coupling for any inner product functional  $C(\mu, \nu)$  where  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and provides a necessary and sufficient condition for optimality.

*Theorem II-G.2* [57, Thm. 1]: For any  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$

- 1) There exists an optimal coupling  $(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$  such that  $\underline{X} \sim \mu$ ,  $\underline{Y} \sim \nu$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\langle \underline{X}, \underline{Y} \rangle] = C(\mu, \nu)$ .
- 2) Let  $\underline{X} \sim \mu$ ,  $\underline{Y} \sim \nu$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[\langle \underline{X}, \underline{Y} \rangle] = C(\mu, \nu)$  if and only if there exists a l.s.c. convex  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  such that

$$\underline{Y} \in \partial f(\underline{X}) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

- 3) The dual problem for  $C(\mu, \nu)$ , given by

$$C(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{g \in L^1(\mu), h \in L^1(\nu)} \left\{ \int g d\mu + \int h d\nu : g(\underline{x}) + h(\underline{y}) \geq \langle \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle \forall \underline{x}, \underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}$$

can be achieved by a convex function pair  $(f, f^*)$ , where  $f$  is a l.s.c. convex function in ii),  $f^*$  is the convex conjugate of  $f$ , and  $L^1(\mu)$  denotes the space of all integrable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with respect to  $\mu$ . That is,  $C(\mu, \nu) = \int f d\mu + \int f^* d\nu$ .

*Lemma II-G.3*: For any l.s.c. convex  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  where  $\Omega$  is a nonempty convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists a sequence of convex Lipschitz  $f_n$  on  $\Omega$  such that  $f_n \uparrow f$  pointwise.

*Proof:* We construct such a sequence of  $f_n$  using infimal convolution. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$f_n(x) := \inf_{y \in \Omega} \{f(y) + n\|x - y\|\} \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

By construction,  $f_n$  is convex on  $\Omega$  and  $f_n(x)$  is nondecreasing in  $n$  for any  $x \in \Omega$ . The Lipschitz continuity of  $f_n$  follows from the triangle inequality: for any  $x_1, x_2 \in \Omega$

$$f(y) + n\|x_1 - y\| \leq f(y) + n\|x_1 - x_2\| + n\|x_2 - y\| \quad \forall y \in \Omega.$$

Taking the infimum over  $y \in \Omega$  shows that  $f_n(x_1) - f_n(x_2) \leq n\|x_1 - x_2\|$ . Exchanging  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , we have  $|f_n(x_1) - f_n(x_2)| \leq n\|x_1 - x_2\|$ , i.e.,  $f_n$  is  $n$ -Lipschitz. We finally show that  $f_n$  converges pointwise to  $f$ . Fix any  $x \in \Omega$  and assume  $f(x) < +\infty$ . Since  $f_n(x) \leq f(x)$ , we have  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) \leq f(x)$ . Due to the lower semicontinuity of  $f$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $f(y) > f(x) - \epsilon$  for all  $y \in B(x, \delta) := \{y \in \Omega : \|x - y\| < \delta\}$ . Fix such  $\epsilon, \delta$ . If  $y \in B(x, \delta)$ , then

$$f(y) + n\|x - y\| \geq f(x) - \epsilon + 0 = f(x) - \epsilon,$$

otherwise  $y \notin B(x, \delta)$ , at this point  $\|x - y\| \geq \delta$ , and since  $f$  is bounded below, i.e.,  $f \geq -M$  for some  $M < +\infty$ , we have

$$f(y) + n\|x - y\| \geq -M + n\delta \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} +\infty.$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large  $n \geq n(\epsilon, \delta, M)$

$$f_n(x) = \min \left\{ \inf_{y \in B(x, \delta)} f(y) + n\|x - y\|, \inf_{y \notin B(x, \delta)} f(y) + n\|x - y\| \right\} \geq f(x) - \epsilon.$$

<sup>22</sup>If  $f$  is defined on a subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , then the subdifferential of  $f$  at  $x$  is defined by  $\partial f(\underline{x}) := \{\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \forall \underline{z} \in \Omega, f(\underline{z}) - f(\underline{x}) \geq \langle \underline{z} - \underline{x}, \underline{y} \rangle\}$ .

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  can be arbitrary, we have  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) \geq f(x)$ . Therefore,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x) \forall x \in \text{dom } f$ . If  $x \notin \text{dom } f$ , i.e.,  $f(x) = +\infty$ , then the above derivation can show that  $f_n(x)$  also diverges to  $+\infty$ .  $\square$

*Lemma II-G.4:* Let  $\Omega$  be any nonempty, convex, and compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be any  $L$ -Lipschitz convex function on  $\Omega$ . Then  $\partial f(x)$  is nonempty for all  $x \in \Omega$ , and  $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \sup_{y \in \partial f(x)} \|y\| \leq L$ .

*Proof:* From the relationship between the Lipschitz continuity and the dual norm of subgradients of convex functions (e.g., [58, Lem. 2.6]). Here the dual norm of the  $\ell_2$  norm is itself), we have that for any convex  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$f \text{ is } L\text{-Lipschitz on } \Omega \iff \sup_{x \in \Omega} \sup_{y \in \partial f(x)} \|y\| \leq L, \quad (63)$$

and it remains to show  $\partial f(x)$  is nonempty for all  $x \in \Omega$ . This trivially follows if  $\Omega$  only contains one point in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Otherwise, let  $\text{ri}(\Omega)$  and  $\Omega \setminus \text{ri}(\Omega)$  be the relative interior and the relative boundary of  $\Omega$ , respectively, then both  $\text{ri}(\Omega)$  and  $\Omega \setminus \text{ri}(\Omega)$  are nonempty. By a standard result from convex analysis [59, Thm. 23.4],  $\partial f(x)$  is nonempty for any  $x \in \text{ri}(\Omega)$ . We now show that  $\partial f(x)$  is also nonempty for any  $x \in \Omega \setminus \text{ri}(\Omega)$ . Fix any  $x \in \Omega \setminus \text{ri}(\Omega)$ . Since  $\Omega$  is compact, there exists a sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset \text{ri}(\Omega)$  that converges to  $x$ . Since  $\partial f(x_n)$  is nonempty for all  $n$ , we can pick any  $g_n \in \partial f(x_n)$  for each  $n$ , and since  $f$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz, by (63),  $\{g_n\} \subset B(\mathbf{0}, L) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|y\| \leq L\}$ . Since  $B(\mathbf{0}, L)$  is compact, there exists a convergent subsequence  $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  of  $\{g_n\}$  such that  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{K}} g_k = g$  for some  $\|g\| \leq L$ . We now show that  $g$  is a subgradient of  $f$  at  $x$ . Since  $g_k$  is a subgradient of  $f$  at  $x_k$  for all  $k \in \mathcal{K}$ , we have that  $\forall y \in \Omega$

$$f(y) - f(x_k) \geq \langle y - x_k, g_k \rangle \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}.$$

As both  $\{x_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  and  $\{g_k\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}}$  are convergent with limit points  $x$  and  $g$  respectively, and both sides of the above are continuous, taking  $k \in \mathcal{K}, k \rightarrow \infty$ , we obtain that  $f(y) - f(x) \geq \langle y - x, g \rangle$  for all  $y \in \Omega$ , i.e.,  $g \in \partial f(x)$  is a subgradient at  $x \in \Omega \setminus \text{ri}(\Omega)$ . Thus,  $\partial f(x)$  is nonempty for all  $x \in \Omega$ .  $\square$

We first prove  $\text{iii)} \Rightarrow \text{iv)}$  by showing that (regardless of whether  $\text{iii)}$  holds or not)

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)} C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu) \geq \inf_{f \in C_b(\mathcal{S}_q)} \int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2), \quad (64)$$

where  $C_b(\mathcal{S}_q)$  denotes the set of all *bounded convex*  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Given any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)$ , by Theorem II-G.2 2), there exists a solution pair  $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f}^*)$  for  $C(\bar{x}_1, \mu)$  such that  $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  is l.s.c. convex on  $\mathbb{R}^q$ ,  $\tilde{f}^*$  is the convex conjugate of  $f$ , and  $\tilde{f} \in L^1(\bar{x}_1)$ ,  $\tilde{f}^* \in L^1(\mu)$  with  $C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) = \int \tilde{f} d\bar{x}_1 + \int \tilde{f}^* d\mu$ . We claim that

$$C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu) \geq \inf_{f \in C_b(\mathcal{S}_q)} \int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2), \quad (65)$$

then taking the infimum over  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)$  on both sides of (65) yields (64). We now prove (65). Let  $g := \tilde{f}|_{\mathcal{S}_q} : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  be the restricted function of  $\tilde{f}$  on  $\mathcal{S}_q$ . Since  $\tilde{f}$  is l.s.c. convex and thus  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ -measurable,  $g$  is l.s.c. convex on  $\mathcal{S}_q$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ -measurable. By Lemma II-G.3, there exists a sequence of convex Lipschitz  $\{g_n\} \subset C_b(\mathcal{S}_q)$  such that  $g_n \uparrow g$  pointwise. Assume for now that  $\tilde{f}, g \notin L^1(\bar{x}_2)$ , then  $\int g d\bar{x}_2 = +\infty$ . In this case (65) follows since its left side is bounded, whereas its right side, by monotone convergence and the fact that  $\int g d\bar{x}_1 < +\infty$  (recall that  $\tilde{f} \in L^1(\bar{x}_1)$ ),

$$\inf_{f \in C_b(\mathcal{S}_q)} \int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int g_n d\bar{x}_1 - \int g_n d\bar{x}_2 \right) = \int g d\bar{x}_1 - \int g d\bar{x}_2$$

diverges to  $-\infty$ . Next assume that  $\tilde{f}, g \in L^1(\bar{x}_2)$ . Since  $\tilde{f}^* \in L^1(\mu)$  is the convex conjugate of  $\tilde{f}$ , we can use the pair  $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f}^*)$  in the dual problem for  $C(\bar{x}_2, \mu)$ , as shown in Theorem II-G.2 3), to obtain

$$C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu) \geq \int \tilde{f} d\bar{x}_1 + \int \tilde{f}^* d\mu - \left( \int \tilde{f} d\bar{x}_2 + \int \tilde{f}^* d\mu \right) = \int \tilde{f} d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) = \int g d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2).$$

Then by monotone convergence, (65) follows since

$$C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu) \geq \int g d\bar{x}_1 - \int g d\bar{x}_2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int g_n d\bar{x}_1 - \int g_n d\bar{x}_2 \right) \geq \inf_{f \in C_b(\mathcal{S}_q)} \int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2).$$

Assume that  $\text{iii)}$  holds, i.e.,  $\int f d\bar{x}_1 \geq \int f d\bar{x}_2$  for all  $f \in C_b(\mathcal{S}_q)$ , then by (64) we obtain  $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)} C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu) \geq 0$ . This implies that  $C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) \geq C(\bar{x}_2, \mu)$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)$ , which is an equivalent statement of  $\text{iv)}$  as shown in (62).

We next prove  $\text{iv)} \Rightarrow \text{iii)}$  by showing that (regardless of whether  $\text{iv)}$  holds or not)

$$\inf_{f \in C^0(\mathcal{S}_q)} \int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) \geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)} C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu), \quad (66)$$

where  $C^0(\mathcal{S}_q)$  denotes the set of all *continuous convex*  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . By Lemma II-G.3, any function  $f$  in  $C^0(\mathcal{S}_q)$  can be pointwise approximated by a sequence of convex Lipschitz  $f_n \uparrow f$ , then by monotone convergence, (66) is equivalent to

$$\inf_{f \in CLip(\mathcal{S}_q)} \int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) \geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)} C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu), \quad (67)$$

where  $\text{CLip}(\mathcal{S}_q)$  denotes the set of all convex Lipschitz  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Given any convex Lipschitz  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with Lipschitz constant  $L < \infty$ , we pick an arbitrary coupling  $(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$  distributed over  $\mathcal{S}_q \times \mathbb{R}^q$ , such that  $\underline{X} \sim \bar{x}_2$  and  $\underline{Y} \in \partial f(\underline{X})$  a.s. This can always be done since by Lemma II-G.4,  $\partial f(\underline{x})$  is nonempty for all  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ . Again by Lemma II-G.4,  $\|\underline{Y}\| \leq L$  a.s. since  $f$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz. Thus the marginal distribution of  $\underline{Y}$ , denoted by  $\tilde{\mu}$ , must be in  $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)$ . By Theorem II-G.2 2) and 3),  $(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$  is an optimal coupling for  $C(\bar{x}_2, \tilde{\mu})$ , whose dual problem can be achieved by  $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f}^*)$ . Here,  $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  denotes the extended-value function for  $f$ , given by  $\tilde{f}(\underline{x}) = f(\underline{x})$  for  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{S}_q$  and  $\tilde{f}(\underline{x}) = +\infty$  otherwise, and  $\tilde{f}^*$  is the convex conjugate of  $\tilde{f}$ . By construction,  $\tilde{f}$  is l.s.c. convex with  $\text{dom}(\tilde{f}) = \mathcal{S}_q$  and  $\partial \tilde{f}(\underline{x}) = \partial f(\underline{x})$  for all  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{S}_q$ . Moreover,  $\tilde{f}^* \in L^1(\tilde{\mu})$  and

$$C(\bar{x}_2, \tilde{\mu}) = \int \tilde{f} d\bar{x}_2 + \int \tilde{f}^* d\tilde{\mu}.$$

Using the pair  $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{f}^*)$  in the dual problem for  $C(\bar{x}_1, \tilde{\mu})$  as in Theorem II-G.2 3), we obtain

$$\int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) = \left( \int \tilde{f} d\bar{x}_1 + \int \tilde{f}^* d\tilde{\mu} \right) - \left( \int \tilde{f} d\bar{x}_2 + \int \tilde{f}^* d\tilde{\mu} \right) \geq C(\bar{x}_1, \tilde{\mu}) - C(\bar{x}_2, \tilde{\mu}) \geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)} C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) - C(\bar{x}_2, \mu).$$

Taking the infimum over  $f \in \text{CLip}(\mathcal{S}_q)$  establishes (67), thereby establishing (66). Now assume that iv) holds, i.e.,  $C(\bar{x}_1, \mu) \geq C(\bar{x}_2, \mu)$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^q)$ , then by (66)  $\inf_{f \in C^0(\mathcal{S}_q)} \int f d(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) \geq 0$ . This implies that  $\int f d\bar{x}_1 \geq \int f d\bar{x}_2$  for all continuous convex  $f : \mathcal{S}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which is an equivalent statement of iii) as discussed below Theorem II-G.1.

#### H. Proof of Lemma 4.29

For i), suppose  $\mathbf{x}_n \succeq \mathbf{x}_{n-1}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since the kernel  $\|\mathbf{y}\|^2$  of squared norm functional  $Q$  is convex, by Theorem 4.23 iii),  $Q(\mathbf{x}_n) \leq Q(\mathbf{x}_{n-1})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Lemma 4.14,  $Q(\mathbf{x}) \in [\frac{1}{q}, 1]$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , then  $\{Q(\mathbf{x}_n)\}$  is a Cauchy sequence. For any  $m > n$ , since  $\mathbf{x}_m \succeq \mathbf{x}_n$ , it follows from Theorem 4.23 iv) that

$$W_2(\bar{x}_n, \mu)^2 - W_2(\bar{x}_m, \mu)^2 \leq Q(\mathbf{x}_n) - Q(\mathbf{x}_m) \xrightarrow{m > n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

for any probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  with finite second moment, where  $\bar{x}_m = \Psi \mathbf{x}_m, \bar{x}_n = \Psi \mathbf{x}_n$ . Setting  $\mu = \bar{x}_m$  gives

$$d_W(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}_m)^2 = W_2(\bar{x}_n, \bar{x}_m)^2 \xrightarrow{m, n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

i.e.,  $\mathbf{x}_n$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ . From Corollary 4.19,  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  is compact and thus complete. Thus,  $\mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{d_W} \mathbf{x}$  for some  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . We use Theorem 4.23 iv) again to show that  $\mathbf{x} \succeq \mathbf{x}_n$  for any  $n$ : for any probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  with finite second moment, it follows from Theorem 4.23 iv) that

$$Q(\mathbf{x}_m) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{x}_m, \mu)^2 \leq Q(\mathbf{x}_n) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{x}_n, \mu)^2 \quad \forall m \geq n$$

Since both  $Q(\cdot)$  and  $W_2(\Psi \cdot, \mu)$  are continuous on  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ , letting  $m \rightarrow \infty$  gives  $Q(\mathbf{x}) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{x}, \mu)^2 \leq Q(\mathbf{x}_n) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{x}_n, \mu)^2$ , which is equivalent to  $\mathbf{x} \succeq \mathbf{x}_n$  by Theorem 4.23 iv). For  $\mathbf{x}_n \preceq \mathbf{x}_{n-1}$ , the first statement follows similarly.

For ii), we have a similar argument: by Theorem 4.23 iv), for any probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^q$  with finite second moment

$$Q(\mathbf{x}_n) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{x}_n, \mu)^2 \leq Q(\mathbf{y}_n) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{y}_n, \mu)^2 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since  $\mathbf{x}_n \xrightarrow{d_W} \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_n \xrightarrow{d_W} \mathbf{y}$ , and by the continuity of the above functional on  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$ , letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  gives

$$Q(\mathbf{x}) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{x}, \mu)^2 \leq Q(\mathbf{y}) - W_2(\Psi \mathbf{y}, \mu)^2$$

which is equivalent to  $\mathbf{x} \succeq \mathbf{y}$  by Theorem 4.23 iv).

#### I. Implementation of DE in Nonbinary Cases

In binary cases, high-precision DE can be implemented by discretizing the density function of LLR variables on the real line, where density updates at variable nodes are generally implemented using FFT, and updates at check nodes can be achieved via look-up tables or specially designed FFT [25, App. B]. However, for nonbinary cases, the implementation of DE becomes immediately tricky. If the discretization approach is still followed, the required storage grows exponentially with  $q$ , and similar FFT implementations are difficult to extend. These issues have been found in [25], [52], where in [25] Richardson and Urbanke suggested using a sampling method, and in [52] Bennatan *et al.* used a Gaussian-approximation-EXIT iterative procedure rather than DE. Here we briefly introduce a sampling-based implementation for DE in the  $P$ -domain.

A key issue when using the sampling method is sampling efficiency. Since many iterations are typically required, it is difficult to obtain independent samples of the final fixed-point density by sampling messages solely from the channel distribution. Here, we use a mixture of Dirichlet distributions

$$p(\underline{y} | \{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k\}_{k=1}^K) = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \text{Dir}(\underline{y} | \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k), \quad \underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q$$

to model the density of check-node-input messages (in the  $P$ -domain) at each iteration, where the parameters  $\{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K$  satisfy

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k = 1, \pi_k \in [0, 1]; \quad \alpha_k = (\alpha_{k,0}, \alpha_{k,1}, \dots, \alpha_{k,q-1}) \in (0, \infty)^q$$

and  $K$  is the number of Dirichlet components. For  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_q) \in (0, \infty)^q$ , the density function of a Dirichlet distribution parameterized by  $\alpha$  is given by

$$\text{Dir}(\underline{y}|\alpha) = \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i)}{\prod_{i=1}^q \Gamma(\alpha_i)} \prod_{i=1}^q y_i^{\alpha_i-1}, \quad \underline{y} \in \mathcal{S}_q,$$

where  $\Gamma(x) := \int_0^\infty t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt$  is the gamma function. To sample a  $\underline{Y} \sim \text{Dir}(\underline{y}|\alpha)$ , for each component  $i$  we sample a random variable  $Z_i$  from a Gamma distribution with shape parameter  $\alpha_i$  and scale parameter 1, i.e.,  $Z_i \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_i, 1)$ , then  $\underline{Y}$  can be obtained via normalizing  $\underline{Z}$ . If we set  $\alpha = C \cdot \mathbf{p}$  where  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{S}_q$  is a fixed probability vector and let  $C \rightarrow \infty$ , then it can be verified that  $\text{Dir}(\underline{y}|\alpha)$  degenerates to the Dirac function at  $\underline{y} = \mathbf{p}$ . Therefore, the family of all mixture of Dirichlet distributions with finitely many components is dense in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_q)$ , so we can improve the accuracy by choosing a sufficiently large  $K$ .

Our implementation for one DE update  $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell+1)} = \mathbf{T}_s(\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)}; \mathbf{c})$  is described as follows. Assume we have obtained an estimate of the density function of  $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)}$  using the mixture distribution  $p(\underline{y}|\{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K)$ . By sampling a sufficiently large number of independent check-node input messages from this mixture distribution, along with a sufficiently large number of independent change messages from  $\mathbf{c}$ , we can calculate independent samples for  $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell+1)}$  using the message update rules for check nodes and variable nodes. Since all the involved distributions are symmetric, when updating these messages, edge labels can be assumed to be  $1 \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ . With these samples for  $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell+1)}$ , we can employ a machine learning algorithm (e.g., an expectation-maximization algorithm) to learn the new parameters  $(\{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K)$  for the mixture distribution, which serves as an approximation of the density function of  $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell+1)}$ .

After implementing  $\mathbf{T}_s(\cdot; \mathbf{c})$ , we show how to numerically seek nontrivial fixed points of the DE equation  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{T}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c})$  (if they exist). Consider a complete QMSC family  $\{\mathbf{c}_h\}$  parameterized by entropy  $h \in [0, \log q]$  and ordered by degradation. Given a degree profile, when  $h$  is above the corresponding BP threshold, the set of nontrivial fixed points under  $\mathbf{c}_h$  is nonempty, and by run the ordinary DE under  $\Delta_0$ -initialization, we obtain the forward DE fixed point, denoted by  $\mathbf{x}_h^{\text{BP}}$ . There may exist other nontrivial fixed points  $\mathbf{x}_h' \prec \mathbf{x}_h^{\text{BP}}$  which cannot be arrived by running the ordinary DE. To seek these fixed points, we follow the idea in [54, Sec. VIII], that is, we run DE *not* at a fixed channel entropy  $h$ , but at a fixed *fixed-point-entropy*  $H(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ . Define  $\mathbf{T}_h(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{T}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c}_h)$ , and for each  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, \log q]$ , we define the DE operator at a fixed entropy  $\mathbf{x}$  of DE update by

$$R_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{T}_{h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$  denotes the solution of  $H(\mathbf{T}_h(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x}$  solved for  $h$ . If this equation has no solution, then  $R_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x})$  is considered undefined. Note that  $H(\mathbf{T}_h(\mathbf{x}))$  is nondecreasing (strictly increasing if  $\mathbf{x} \neq \Delta_\infty$ ) in  $h$ , and by Lemma 4.31 the map  $h \mapsto \mathbf{c}_h$  is continuous, then  $H(\mathbf{T}_h(\mathbf{x}))$  is also continuous in  $h$ . Thus, the solution  $h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$  can be uniquely found or determined to not exist by bisection. Given any target fixed point entropy  $\mathbf{x} \in (0, \log q]$ , by running  $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell+1)} = R_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)})$  under  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)} = \mathbf{c}_x$  and assuming that  $\mathbf{x}^{(\ell)} \xrightarrow{d_w} \mathbf{x}$  for some  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ , we have that  $\mathbf{x}$  is a nontrivial fixed point at the channel entropy  $h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x})$ , with  $H(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ . The convergence of such a procedure lacks theoretical guarantees, but in the experiment corresponding to Table III, numerical results exhibit rapid convergence. Once we have obtained an approximate density function (of a mixture Dirichlet distribution) for a nontrivial fixed point  $\mathbf{x}_h \in \mathcal{X}_q$  at channel entropy  $h$ , functionals of  $\mathbf{x}_h$ , e.g., the potential functional  $U_s(\mathbf{x}_h; \mathbf{c}_h)$ , can be evaluated through Monte Carlo sampling.

### J. Proof of Theorem 4.35

For i), which is a necessity for the stability of DE, the proof strategy is analogous to that of [25, Thm. 4.127]. Specifically, the idea is to invoke Lemma 4.24, the partial erasure decomposition lemma. Consider a QPEC with erasure size 2 and erasure probability  $2\epsilon$ , where  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ . Its  $P$ -domain message distribution when  $0 \in \mathbb{F}_q$  is transmitted is given by

$$y_0 = y_0(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon \Delta_{\{0,*\}} + (1 - 2\epsilon) \Delta_\infty$$

where  $\Delta_{\{0,*\}} := \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}} \Delta_{\{0,j\}}$  is the distribution corresponding to the partial erasure, and  $\Delta_{\{0,j\}}$  is the distribution so that  $y_0 = y_j = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\{0,j\}}$ -a.e. Note that  $\Delta_{\{0,*\}} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . Consider the linearization of  $y_1 = \mathbf{T}_s(y_0; \mathbf{c})$  around  $\Delta_\infty$ , which is

$$y_1 = 2\epsilon \lambda'(0) \rho'(1) \mathbf{c} \circledast \Delta_{\{0,*\}} + (1 - 2\epsilon \lambda'(0) \rho'(1)) \Delta_\infty + O(\epsilon^2).$$

More generally, for any  $n \geq 1$  and  $y_n = \mathbf{T}_s^{(n)}(y_0; \mathbf{c})$  we have

$$y_n = y_n(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon (\lambda'(0) \rho'(1))^n \mathbf{c}^{\circledast n} \circledast \Delta_{\{0,*\}} + (1 - 2\epsilon (\lambda'(0) \rho'(1))^n) \Delta_\infty + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Note that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$

$$\mathfrak{P}(x \circledast \Delta_{\{0,*\}}) = \frac{1}{2} \int \min \left\{ 1, \frac{y_1 z_1}{y_0 z_0} \right\} x(dy) \Delta_{\{0,*\}}(dz) = \frac{1}{2(q-1)} \int \min \left\{ 1, \frac{y_1}{y_0} \right\} x(dy) = \frac{1}{q-1} \mathfrak{P}(x).$$

By Corollary II-D.5 in Appendix II-D,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathfrak{P}(x^{\circledast n}) = \log \mathfrak{B}(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \{\Delta_\infty\}$ . Therefore, if  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) > 1$ , then by Lemma II-D.1, there exists a sufficiently large  $N > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq N$

$$(\lambda'(0)\rho'(1))^n \mathfrak{P}(c^{\circledast n}) > q-1.$$

Hence, there exists some  $\xi > 0$ , only dependent on  $(\lambda, \rho)$  and  $c$ , such that for all  $n \geq N$

$$\mathfrak{P}(y_n) = \frac{2\epsilon}{q-1} (\lambda'(0)\rho'(1))^n \mathfrak{P}(c^{\circledast n}) + O(\epsilon^2) > 2\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) > \epsilon \quad \forall \epsilon \in (0, \xi].$$

At this point, by Lemma 4.24, for all  $n \geq N$

$$y_n \succeq x_{\text{QPEC}(2\mathfrak{P}(y_n))} \succeq x_{\text{QPEC}(2\epsilon)} = y_0.$$

Then by Lemma 4.31 iv),  $y_n \xrightarrow{d_W} y_\infty(\epsilon)$  for some fixed point  $y_\infty(\epsilon)$ , which satisfies  $y_\infty(\epsilon) \succeq y_0(\epsilon)$  and  $\mathfrak{P}(y_\infty(\epsilon)) > \epsilon$ . Now consider any  $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  such that  $\mathfrak{P}(x_0) = \epsilon \in (0, \xi]$ . Again by Lemma 4.24,  $x_0 \succeq y_0(\epsilon)$ . Then by Lemma 4.31 i),  $x_n \succeq y_n(\epsilon)$  for all  $n$  and therefore

$$\liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{P}(x_\ell) \geq \mathfrak{P}(y_\infty(\epsilon)) > \epsilon. \quad (68)$$

We now demonstrate that for all  $\epsilon \in (0, \xi]$ , the fixed points  $y_\infty(\epsilon)$  are identical, with each being equal to  $y_\infty(\xi)$ . First, if  $\epsilon \leq \xi$ , then  $y_n(\epsilon) \preceq y_n(\xi)$  for all  $n$ , and by Lemma 4.31 ii),  $y_\infty(\epsilon) \preceq y_\infty(\xi)$ . Next, for each  $\epsilon \in (0, \xi]$ , we must have  $\mathfrak{P}(y_\infty(\epsilon)) > \xi$ , or by the above argument,  $y_\infty(\epsilon)$  cannot be a fixed point. Again by Lemma 4.24, this implies  $y_\infty(\epsilon) \succeq y_0(\xi)$ , so

$$y_\infty(\epsilon) = T_s^{(\infty)}(y_\infty(\epsilon); c) \succeq T_s^{(\infty)}(y_0(\xi); c) = y_\infty(\xi)$$

and therefore  $y_\infty(\epsilon) = y_\infty(\xi)$  for all  $\epsilon \in (0, \xi]$ . By (68), for all  $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \{\Delta_\infty\}$  such that  $\mathfrak{P}(x_0) \in (0, \xi]$

$$\liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{P}(x_\ell) \geq \mathfrak{P}(y_\infty(\xi)) > \xi.$$

while for all  $x_0$  with  $\mathfrak{P}(x_0) > \xi$  we have  $x_0 \succeq y_0(\xi)$  and again

$$\liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{P}(x_\ell) \geq \mathfrak{P}(y_\infty(\xi)) > \xi.$$

For ii), which is a sufficiency for the stability, using Lemmas II-D.1 and II-D.3 in  $x_{\ell+1} = T_s(x_\ell; c)$ , we obtain

$$\mathfrak{B}(x_{\ell+1}) \leq \mathfrak{B}(c) \cdot \lambda(1 - \rho(1 - \mathfrak{B}(x_\ell)) + O(\mathfrak{B}(x_\ell)^2)) \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1)\mathfrak{B}(x_\ell) + O(\mathfrak{B}(x_\ell)^2)$$

where in (a), we first use the Taylor expansion of  $\rho(1-x)$  around  $x=0$ , and then use the Taylor expansion of  $\lambda(x)$  around  $x=0$ . Since  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$ , there exists an  $\eta > 0$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) + \eta < 1$ , and from the above bound, there exists a sufficiently small constant  $\kappa > 0$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}(x_\ell) \leq \kappa$  implies

$$\mathfrak{B}(x_{\ell+1}) \leq (\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) + \eta)\mathfrak{B}(x_\ell) \leq \mathfrak{B}(x_\ell) \leq \kappa.$$

Therefore, if  $\mathfrak{B}(x_{\ell_0}) \leq \kappa$  for some  $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{B}(x_\ell) = 0$  and thus  $x_\ell \xrightarrow{d_W} \Delta_\infty$  (this follows from the continuity of  $\mathfrak{B}$ , the compactness of  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  and the fact that  $\mathfrak{B}$  attains 0 only at  $\Delta_\infty$ , so any convergent subsequence of  $x_\ell$  must converge to  $\Delta_\infty$ ). Finally, from the upper bound part in Lemma II-D.2, there is a constant  $\xi > 0$  depending on  $\kappa$ , such that  $\mathfrak{B}(x_{\ell_0}) \leq \xi$  implies  $\mathfrak{B}(x_{\ell_0}) \leq \kappa$ . This completes the proof.

### APPENDIX III THRESHOLD SATURATION OF COUPLED SYSTEMS

#### A. Proof of Theorem 5.1

To simplify the notation, we focus on the case where the underlying ensemble is a  $(d_l, d_r)$  one. The case where the underlying ensemble has a degree profile  $(\lambda, \rho)$  can be handled in the same manner. The proof follows that of the concentration property for the underlying graph ensemble shown in [34, Thm. 2]. By revealing more and more information about the random Tanner graph and the channel output, the random variable  $Z$  of interest (representing the total number of incorrect variable-to-check messages here) forms a martingale process  $Z_0, Z_1, \dots$ . Due to the locality of an  $\ell$ -round message-passing decoding algorithm, i.e., making local changes to the connections in the Tanner graph affects only the corresponding local messages, we can derive  $|Z_t - Z_{t-1}| \leq \gamma_t$ , where  $\gamma_t$  is some constant depending on  $d_l, d_r, \ell$  but not on  $n$ . As a result, the desired concentration property follows from the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality.

We briefly review the construction of the random Tanner graph  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$  of the coupled ensemble in Section III-B. Under any given edge-spreading profile (see Definition 3.10; the specific choice does not affect the proof), at each position from 1 to  $K = 2L + w - 1$ , there are  $d_l n$  variable-node arcs and  $d_l n$  check-node sockets, whose connections and the corresponding  $d_l n$  edge labels in  $\mathbb{F}_q^\times$  are determined by  $K$  independent, uniformly random monomial maps  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Xi_{d_l n}^{(K)}$  (See Definition 3.1 for the definition of a monomial map). Given any monomial map  $\xi_n : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ , we denote  $\xi_n(i) = (j, a)$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n, a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  such that for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$  with  $\mathbf{y} = \xi_n \mathbf{x}$  it holds that  $y_j = a x_i$ . To simplify the notation, we use  $\mathbf{G}$  to denote the random coupled Tanner graph (previously denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}$ ), and  $\mathbf{Y}$  to denote the collection of  $2L n$  random channel outputs. We use  $\mathbf{G}'$ ,  $\mathbf{G}''$  and  $\mathbf{Y}'$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}''$  to represent the random copies of  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$ , respectively.

Let  $Z$  denote the number of incorrect variable-to-check messages among all  $2L d_l n$  variable-to-check node messages passed in the  $\ell$ -th iteration for a  $(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y})$ . Suppose we first reveal the information in the random monomial maps  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}, \dots, \Xi_{d_l n}^{(K)}$ , that is, at step  $1 \leq t \leq K d_l n$ , we expose  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(k+1)}(i)$ , where  $k$  and  $i$  are the quotient and remainder of  $t$  divided by  $d_l n$ , respectively. In the following  $2L n$  steps, we reveal the  $2L n$  received values in  $\mathbf{Y}$ , one at a time. Let  $T := K d_l n + 2L n$  be the total number of the above steps, and  $=_t$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , denote a sequence of partial equivalence relations ordered by refinement, such that  $(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') =_t (\mathbf{G}'', \mathbf{Y}'')$  if and only if the information revealed in the first  $t$  steps is exactly identical for both pairs. Define the random process  $Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_T$  by

$$Z_t(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y}) := \mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') | (\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') =_t (\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y})], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

By construction,  $Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_T$  forms a Doob's martingale. Similar to [34, eq. (14)], we can show that

$$|Z_t(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y}) - Z_{t-1}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y})| \leq \gamma_t \quad \forall 1 \leq t \leq T \quad (69)$$

where  $\gamma_t = 8(d_l d_r)^\ell$  for  $1 \leq t \leq K d_l n$  and  $\gamma_t = 2(d_l d_r)^\ell$  for  $K d_l n + 1 \leq t \leq T$ . Therefore, the claim follows from the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, that is, for any  $\alpha > 0$

$$\Pr\{|Z_T - Z_0| \geq \alpha\} \leq 2e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2\sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_t^2}}.$$

Note that by definition,  $Z_T/2L d_l n = P_{v \rightarrow c}^{\text{MP}}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}, \mathbf{c}, \ell)$  and  $Z_0/2L d_l n = \mathbb{E}[P_{v \rightarrow c}^{\text{MP}}(\mathcal{G}_{d_l, d_r, w, L, n}, \mathbf{c}, \ell)]$ .

It remains to prove (69). To simplify the notation we prove (69) for  $1 \leq t \leq d_l n$ , i.e., for the steps where we reveal the information in  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}$ . For  $t > d_l n$ , (69) can be proven in a similar manner. Let  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t)$  denote the subset of Tanner graphs in the ensemble where the first  $t$  edge connections, along with their labels, are identical to those in  $\mathbf{G}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t) = \{\mathbf{G}' : (\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') =_t (\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y})\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t)$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t)$  consisting of those graphs for which  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(t+1) = (s, a)$ , where  $1 \leq s \leq d_l n$  and  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t) = \bigcup_{1 \leq s \leq d_l n, a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times} \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t)$ . For  $1 \leq t \leq d_l n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{t-1}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y}) &= \mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') | (\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') =_{t-1} (\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{Y})] = \mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)] \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq s \leq d_l n, a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times} \mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)] \Pr\{\mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1) | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove that if  $(s, a) \neq (r, b)$  are such that  $1 \leq s, r \leq d_l n$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ ,  $\Pr\{\mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1) | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)\} > 0$  and  $\Pr\{\mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(r, b)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1) | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)\} > 0$ , then

$$|\mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)] - \mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(r, b)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)]| \leq 8(d_l d_r)^\ell. \quad (70)$$

First, assume that  $s = r$  but  $a \neq b$ . This can happen when  $q \geq 3$ . Define the bijection  $\phi_{a, b} : \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{(s, b)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)$  by

$$\{\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(t) = (s, a)\} \mapsto \{\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(t) = (s, b)\},$$

that is, given  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)$ ,  $\phi_{a, b}(\mathbf{H})$  changes nothing except for replacing the edge label of the  $t$ -th connection of  $\mathbf{H}$  from  $a$  to  $b$ . Since the message along a given edge sent in the  $\ell$ -th round is only a function of the computation graph of height  $\ell$  of this edge, and a change in an edge label can affect at most  $2(d_l d_r)^\ell$  such computation graphs in  $\mathbf{H}$ , we have

$$|Z(\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{Y}) - Z(\phi_{a, b}(\mathbf{H}), \mathbf{Y})| \leq 2(d_l d_r)^\ell \quad \forall \mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1). \quad (71)$$

Moreover, since  $\phi_{a, b}$  is a bijection and preserves probability, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbf{G}', \mathbf{Y}') | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, b)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)] = \mathbb{E}[Z(\phi_{a, b}(\mathbf{G}'), \mathbf{Y}') | \mathbf{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)]. \quad (72)$$

Therefore, at this point ( $s = r$  but  $a \neq b$ ) (70) follows from (71) and (72). We now consider the case where  $s \neq r$ . Define the bijection  $\phi_{(s, a), (r, b)} : \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{(r, b)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)$  by

$$\{\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(t) = (s, a), \Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(k) = (r, c)\} \mapsto \{\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(t) = (r, b), \Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(k) = (s, c)\},$$

that is, given  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{G}_{(s, a)}(\mathbf{G}, t-1)$ , let  $1 \leq k \leq d_l n$  be such that  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(k) = (r, c)$  with  $c \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$  being the corresponding edge label of the  $k$ -th connection of  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\phi_{(s, a), (r, b)}$  defines the corresponding rewire operation, such that  $\phi_{(s, a), (r, b)}(\mathbf{H})$  changes noting

except for replacing the  $t$ -th connection of  $\mathbb{H}$ ,  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(t)$ , with  $(r, b)$ , and the  $k$ -th connection of  $\mathbb{H}$ ,  $\Xi_{d_l n}^{(1)}(k)$ , with  $(s, c)$ .<sup>23</sup> Such a rewire operation can affect at most  $8(d_l d_r)^\ell$  computation graphs in  $\mathbb{H}$  of height  $\ell$ , and thus we have

$$|Z(\mathbb{H}, Y) - Z(\phi_{(s,a),(r,b)}(\mathbb{H}), Y)| \leq 8(d_l d_r)^\ell \quad \forall \mathbb{H} \in \mathcal{G}_{s,a}(\mathbb{G}, t-1). \quad (73)$$

Moreover, since  $\phi_{(s,a),(r,b)}$  is a bijection and preserves probability, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbb{G}', Y') | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(r,b)}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)] = \mathbb{E}[Z(\phi_{(s,a),(r,b)}(\mathbb{G}'), Y') | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s,a)}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)]. \quad (74)$$

Therefore, at this point ( $s \neq r$ ) (70) follows from (73) and (74). By definition,  $Z_t(\mathbb{G}, Y)$  is equal to  $\mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbb{G}', Y') | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{s,a}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)]$  for some  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_l n\}$  and  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ . Hence, using (70) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_t(\mathbb{G}, Y) - Z_{t-1}(\mathbb{G}, Y)| &\leq \max_{(s,a)} |\mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbb{G}', Y') | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{s,a}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)] - Z_{t-1}(\mathbb{G}, Y)| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \max_{(s,a),(r,b)} |\mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbb{G}', Y') | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{s,a}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)] - \mathbb{E}[Z(\mathbb{G}', Y') | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(r,b)}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)]| \leq 8(d_l d_r)^\ell. \end{aligned}$$

In (a), the maximum is over all  $(s, a), (r, b)$  such that  $\Pr\{\mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(s,a)}(\mathbb{G}, t-1) | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)\} > 0$  and  $\Pr\{\mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}_{(r,b)}(\mathbb{G}, t-1) | \mathbb{G}' \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{G}, t-1)\} > 0$ . This proves (69) for  $1 \leq t \leq d_l n$ .

### B. Preliminary Lemmas of Potential Functional

*Lemma III-B.1:* For any  $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q$  with  $\mathbf{c}_1 \succ \mathbf{c}_2$  and  $\mathbf{x} \neq \Delta_\infty$ , we have  $U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c}_1) < U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c}_2)$ .

*Proof:* Since  $\circledast$  preserves strict degradation and the entropy functional  $H$  has a strictly concave kernel, by Lemma 4.26

$$H(\mathbf{c}_1 \circledast \mathbf{y}) > H(\mathbf{c}_2 \circledast \mathbf{y}) \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_q \setminus \{\Delta_\infty\}.$$

$U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c}_1) < U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c}_2)$  follows by setting  $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{x}^{\boxtimes d_r - 1})^{\circledast d_l}$ .  $\square$

*Lemma III-B.2:* For any  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}'_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}'_2 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  with  $\mathbf{x}'_1 \succeq \mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}'_2 \succeq \mathbf{x}_2$ , let  $\mathbf{y}_1 = \mathbf{x}'_1 - \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_2 = \mathbf{x}'_2 - \mathbf{x}_2$ , then

$$H(\mathbf{y}_1 \circledast \mathbf{y}_2) \geq 0, \quad H(\mathbf{y}_1 \boxtimes \mathbf{y}_2) \leq 0.$$

*Proof:* From the second equality in Corollary 4.16,  $H(\mathbf{y}_1 \circledast \mathbf{y}_2) + H(\mathbf{y}_1 \boxtimes \mathbf{y}_2) = 0$ , so it suffices to prove one of the inequalities above. For the binary case,  $H(\mathbf{y}_1 \boxtimes \mathbf{y}_2) \leq 0$  can be easily proven using the power series representation of the entropy functional [9, Prop. 8 iii)]. However, a similar series representation is not well-defined for  $q \geq 3$ , so a more general approach is required. We use an information-theoretic method here to prove  $H(\mathbf{y}_1 \circledast \mathbf{y}_2) \geq 0$ . Consider a coupling of random variables  $(X, Y, Y', Z, Z')$ . For the case where  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Y', X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Z'$  and  $(Y, Y') \rightarrow X \rightarrow (Z, Z')$  form Markov chains, it is proven in [25, Lem. E. 10], [54, Lem. 5] that

$$H(X|Y', Z) - H(X|Y, Z) \leq H(X|Y', Z') - H(X|Y, Z'). \quad (75)$$

Given a random symbol  $X$  uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , consider its *independent* transmission over two QMSCs characterized by  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$ , respectively. Let  $\underline{Y}$  and  $\underline{Z}$  denote the corresponding APP vectors, such that  $\underline{Y}|_{\{X=0\}} \sim \mathbf{x}_1, \underline{Z}|_{\{X=0\}} \sim \mathbf{x}_2$ , and  $\underline{Y} \rightarrow X \rightarrow \underline{Z}$  forms a Markov chain. Since  $\mathbf{x}'_1 \succeq \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}'_2 \succeq \mathbf{x}_2$ , and stochastic degradation implies the existence of physical degradation, there exists random APP vectors  $\underline{Y}', \underline{Z}'$  such that  $\underline{Y}'|_{\{X=0\}} \sim \mathbf{x}'_1, \underline{Z}'|_{\{X=0\}} \sim \mathbf{x}'_2$ , and  $X \rightarrow \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Y}'$  and  $X \rightarrow \underline{Z} \rightarrow \underline{Z}'$  form Markov chains. The three Markov chains

$$\underline{Y} \rightarrow X \rightarrow \underline{Z}, \quad X \rightarrow \underline{Y} \rightarrow \underline{Y}', \quad X \rightarrow \underline{Z} \rightarrow \underline{Z}'$$

implies that  $(\underline{Y}, \underline{Y}')$  and  $(\underline{Z}, \underline{Z}')$  are conditionally independent channel observations given  $X$ , i.e.,  $(\underline{Y}, \underline{Y}') \rightarrow X \rightarrow (\underline{Z}, \underline{Z}')$  forms a Markov chain. Under the above settings and by the definition of the entropy functional, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(X|\underline{Y}, \underline{Z}) &= H(\mathbf{x}_1 \circledast \mathbf{x}_2), \quad H(X|\underline{Y}', \underline{Z}) = H(\mathbf{x}'_1 \circledast \mathbf{x}_2), \\ H(X|\underline{Y}, \underline{Z}') &= H(\mathbf{x}_1 \circledast \mathbf{x}'_2), \quad H(X|\underline{Y}', \underline{Z}') = H(\mathbf{x}'_1 \circledast \mathbf{x}'_2). \end{aligned}$$

Then the claim  $H(\mathbf{y}_1 \circledast \mathbf{y}_2) \geq 0$  follows from substituting the above equalities into (75).  $\square$

*Lemma III-B.3:* Let  $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{T}_s(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{c})$ . If  $\mathbf{x}_2 \succeq \mathbf{x}_1$  or  $\mathbf{x}_2 \preceq \mathbf{x}_1$ , then  $U_s(\mathbf{x}_2; \mathbf{c}) \leq U_s(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{c})$ .

*Proof:* Define  $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\phi(t) = U_s(\mathbf{x}_1 + t(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1); \mathbf{c})$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$ . By [9, Prop. 16],  $\phi$  is a polynomial in  $t$ , with  $\phi(0) = U_s(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{c}), \phi(1) = U_s(\mathbf{x}_2; \mathbf{c})$  and derivative

$$\phi'(t) = d_{\mathbf{x}} U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c})[\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1] \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_1+t(\mathbf{x}_2-\mathbf{x}_1)}.$$

A quick calculation (or see [9, Lem. 23]) shows that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_q, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_d$ , the directional derivative is given by

$$d_{\mathbf{x}} U_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c})[\mathbf{y}] = d_l(d_r - 1)H([\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{T}_s(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{c})] \circledast (\mathbf{x}^{\boxtimes d_r - 2} \boxtimes \mathbf{y})).$$

<sup>23</sup>This is a direct extension of the rewire operation defined in the proof of [34, Thm. 2].

Consider the case where  $x_2 = T_s(x_1; c) \succeq x_1$ . For any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , let  $x = x_1 + t(x_2 - x_1)$ , then  $x_2 \succeq x \succeq x_1$  and thus

$$T_s(x; c) \succeq T_s(x_1; c) = x_2 \succeq x.$$

Therefore, for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the derivative  $\phi'(t)$  is of the form

$$-d_l(d_r - 1)H((x_3 - x_4) \circledast (x_5 - x_6))$$

for some  $x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  with  $x_3 \succeq x_4, x_5 \succeq x_6$ . By Lemma III-B.2,  $\phi'(t) \leq 0$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and thus  $U_s(x_2; c) = \phi(1) \leq \phi(0) = U_s(x_1; c)$ . The case where  $x_2 = T_s(x_1; c) \preceq x_1$  follows similarly.  $\square$

For the coupled system, we have the following similar result to Lemma III-B.3, which holds true for both the standard and the improved ensembles. The proof is similar to that of Lemma III-B.3 (or see the proof of [9, Lem. 46]) and is omitted.

*Lemma III-B.4:* Let  $\underline{x}_1 \in \mathcal{X}_q^K$ ,  $c \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and  $\underline{x}_2 = T_c(\underline{x}_1; c)$ . If  $\underline{x}_2 \succeq \underline{x}_1$  or  $\underline{x}_2 \preceq \underline{x}_1$ , then  $U_c(\underline{x}_2; c) \leq U_c(\underline{x}_1; c)$ .

### C. Proof of Lemma 5.9

Suppose  $\mathcal{F}(c)$  is nonempty. Since  $(\mathcal{X}_q, d_W)$  is compact and  $\mathcal{F}(c) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_q$ , it is sufficient to show that  $\mathcal{F}(c)$  is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{X}_q$ . Pick any sequence  $\{x_n\} \subset \mathcal{F}(c)$  and assume  $x_n \xrightarrow{d_W} x^*$  for some  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . Our aim is to show  $x^* \in \mathcal{F}(c)$ . By the continuity of  $\circledast, \boxplus$  (see Lemma 4.20), the map  $x \mapsto T_s(x; c)$  is continuous and thus  $T_s(x_n; c) \xrightarrow{d_W} T_s(x^*; c)$ . Since  $x_n = T_s(x_n; c)$  for all  $n$ , we have  $x_n \xrightarrow{d_W} x^*$  and  $x_n \xrightarrow{d_W} T_s(x^*; c)$ . It follows from the uniqueness of limit in a metric space that  $x^* = T_s(x^*; c)$ . It remains to show  $x^* \neq \Delta_\infty$ . From  $d_l \geq 3$  (or  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$  for a  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble) and Theorem 4.35 ii), there exists a strictly positive constant  $\xi$  such that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$  with  $\mathfrak{E}(x) < \xi$ , it holds that  $T_s^{(\infty)}(x; c) = \Delta_\infty$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{E}(x) \geq \xi$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{F}(c)$ . By the continuity of  $\mathfrak{E}$  and  $x_n \xrightarrow{d_W} x^*$ , it follows that  $\mathfrak{E}(x^*) \geq \xi > 0$ . Hence,  $x^* \neq \Delta_\infty$  and thus  $x^* \in \mathcal{F}(c)$ .

### D. Proof of Lemma 5.10

The conditions  $c_1 \succ c_2$  and  $\mathcal{F}(c_2) \neq \emptyset$  imply that  $\mathcal{F}(c_1) \neq \emptyset$ , since given any  $x_2 \in \mathcal{F}(c_2)$  such that  $x_2 = T_s(x_2; c_2)$  and  $x_2 \neq \Delta_\infty$ , by Corollary 4.27 we have  $x_2 = T_s(x_2; c_2) \prec T_s(x_2; c_1)$ , then initializing with  $x_2$ ,  $T_s^{(\ell)}(x_2; c_1)$  forms a monotonic sequence that converges to some nontrivial  $x_1 \succ x_2$  as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ . Clearly,  $x_1 \in \mathcal{F}(c_1)$ . Therefore, by condition, both  $\mathcal{F}(c_1)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(c_2)$  are nonempty, and due to the boundedness of  $U_s$ ,  $\Delta E(c_1)$  and  $\Delta E(c_2)$  are bounded. The claim  $\Delta E(c_1) \leq \Delta E(c_2)$  can be shown using the above procedure: given any  $x_2 \in \mathcal{F}(c_2)$ , we have  $x_1 = T_s^{(\infty)}(x_2; c_1) \in \mathcal{F}(c_1)$ , and by Lemmas III-B.1, III-B.3 and the continuity of  $U_s$ , we have

$$U_s(x_2; c_2) > U_s(x_2; c_1) \geq U_s(T_s(x_2; c_1); c_1) \geq U_s(T_s^{(2)}(x_2; c_1); c_1) \geq \cdots \geq U_s(x_1; c_1). \quad (76)$$

Taking the infimum over  $x_1 \in \mathcal{F}(c_1), x_2 \in \mathcal{F}(c_2)$  proves that  $\Delta E(c_1) \leq \Delta E(c_2)$ . Finally, if the underlying system is stable, i.e.,  $d_l \geq 3$  (or  $\mathfrak{B}(c)\lambda'(0)\rho'(1) < 1$  for a  $(\lambda, \rho)$  ensemble), then by Lemma 5.9, both  $\mathcal{F}(c_1)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(c_2)$  are nonempty compact. At this point, by the continuity of  $U_s$ , both infima in  $\Delta E(c_1)$  and  $\Delta E(c_2)$  can be attained. Let  $\Delta E(c_2) = U_s(x_2^*; c_2)$  where  $x_2^* \in \mathcal{F}(c_2)$  is any global minimizer, and let  $x_1 = T_s^{(\infty)}(x_2^*; c_1) \in \mathcal{F}(c_1)$ . Then by (76), we have

$$\Delta E(c_2) = U_s(x_2^*; c_2) > U_s(x_1; c_1) \geq \min_{x \in \mathcal{F}(c_1)} U_s(x; c_1) = \Delta E(c_1).$$

### E. Proof of Lemmas 5.17 and 5.18

For the standard  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, the derivation of the directional derivative follows that of [9, Eq. (8)], so we only calculate the directional derivative for the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble. By the linearity of the entropy functional and [9, Prop. 14], we can write

$$d_{\underline{x}} U_c(\underline{x}; c)[\underline{y}] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_c} d_{x_i} U_c(x_i; c)[y_i]$$

Using the basic formula for calculating the directional derivative [9, Prop. 14], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{x_i} H(x_i^{\boxplus d_r})[y_i] &= d_r H(x_i^{\boxplus d_r - 1} \boxplus y_i), \\ d_{x_i} H(x_i^{\boxplus d_r - 1})[y_i] &= (d_r - 1)H(x_i^{\boxplus d_r - 2} \boxplus y_i). \end{aligned}$$

In the last term of (24),  $\sum_{i' \in \mathcal{N}_v} H(c \circledast g(x_{i'}, \dots, x_{i'+w-1}))$ , note that if  $w \leq i \leq 2L$ , there are exactly  $w$  components containing  $x_i$ , i.e.,  $i' = i - w + 1, i - w + 2, \dots, i$ . For each  $i' = i - k, 0 \leq k \leq w - 1$ , the part of the component that exactly contains  $x_i$  can be expressed as (see Lemma 5.2 for the definition of  $\mathcal{C}_k$ )

$$\frac{1}{\binom{w}{d_l}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k} H \left( c \circledast x_i^{\boxplus d_r - 1} \circledast \binom{d_l - 1}{d_l} x_{i-k+j}^{\boxplus d_r - 1} \right)$$

Calculate its directional derivative with respect to  $x_i$  and sum over  $0 \leq k \leq w-1$ , we obtain that for all  $w \leq i \leq 2L$ , the directional derivative of the last term with respect to  $x_i$  in the direction  $y_i$  is given by

$$\frac{d_r - 1}{\binom{w}{d_l}} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k} H \left( c \circledast \left( \bigcirc_{d=1}^{d_l-1} x_{i-k+jd}^{\boxtimes d_r-1} \right) \circledast \left( x_i^{\boxtimes d_r-2} \boxtimes y_i \right) \right)$$

If we set  $c_i$  such that for all  $i \in \mathcal{N}_v$   $c_i = c$  and otherwise  $c_i = \Delta_\infty$ , then it can be verified that the above result can be extended for all  $i \in \mathcal{N}_c$ , which is given by

$$\frac{d_r - 1}{\binom{w}{d_l}} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k} H \left( c_{i-k} \circledast \left( \bigcirc_{d=1}^{d_l-1} x_{i-k+jd}^{\boxtimes d_r-1} \right) \circledast \left( x_i^{\boxtimes d_r-2} \boxtimes y_i \right) \right)$$

By the DE update for the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble in (18), the above can be written more compactly as

$$d_l(d_r - 1) H \left( T_c(\underline{x}; c)_i \circledast \left( x_i^{\boxtimes d_r-2} \boxtimes y_i \right) \right)$$

Combining all the directional derivative results above and using the duality rule of the entropy functional (see Corollary 4.16), we obtain the desired result.

The second-order directional derivative can be expressed as

$$d_{\underline{x}}^2 U_c(\underline{x}; c)[\underline{y}, \underline{z}] = \sum_{m=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^K d_{x_m} (d_{x_i} U_c(\underline{x}; c)[y_i])[\underline{z}_m].$$

By identifying all components within each  $d_{x_i} U_c(\underline{x}; c)[y_i]$  that involve  $x_m$  for every possible  $m$ , and then applying the formula for calculating the directional derivative in [9, Sec. II-E], we obtain (26).

#### F. Proof of Lemma 5.20

The proof follows that of [9, Lem. 41]. For both the standard and the improved coupled ensemble, due to the constraints  $x_i = x_{i_0}$  for  $i_0 \leq i \leq K$  and by the definition of  $\underline{S}(\underline{x})$ , the only terms contributing to  $U_c(\underline{S}(\underline{x}); c) - U_c(\underline{x}; c)$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} & U_c(\underline{S}(\underline{x}); c) - U_c(\underline{x}; c) \\ &= - \left( \frac{d_l}{d_r} - d_l \right) H(x_K^{\boxtimes d_r}) - d_l H(x_K^{\boxtimes d_r-1}) + H(c \circledast g(x_{2L}, \dots, x_K)) - H(c \circledast g(x_0, \dots, x_{w-1})) \end{aligned}$$

where  $x_0 := [\underline{S}(\underline{x})]_1 = \Delta_\infty$  and  $g$  is the APP operator in (24) corresponding to either the standard or the improved coupled ensemble. Since  $x_{i_0} = x_K \succeq x_{2L+j}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq w-1$  and the last term above is nonpositive, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & U_c(\underline{S}(\underline{x}); c) - U_c(\underline{x}; c) \\ &\leq - \left( \frac{d_l}{d_r} - d_l \right) H(x_{i_0}^{\boxtimes d_r}) - d_l H(x_{i_0}^{\boxtimes d_r-1}) + H(c \circledast g(x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_0})) \\ &= - \left( \frac{d_l}{d_r} - d_l \right) H(x_{i_0}^{\boxtimes d_r}) - d_l H(x_{i_0}^{\boxtimes d_r-1}) + H(c \circledast (x_{i_0}^{\boxtimes d_r-1})^{\circledast d_l}) = -U_s(x_{i_0}; c). \end{aligned}$$

#### G. Proof of Lemma 5.21

The proof follows that of [9, Lem. 42]. Since  $\underline{x}$  is a fixed point of the modified system, we have

$$x_i = T_c(\underline{x}; c)_i \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq i_0$$

and  $x_i = x_{i_0}$  for all  $i_0 < i \leq K$ . Thus, for each  $i \in \mathcal{N}_c$  either  $x_i = T_c(\underline{x}; c)_i$  or  $[\underline{S}(\underline{x})]_i = x_i$ , and it follows from (25) that

$$d_{\underline{x}} U_c(\underline{x}; c)[\underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}] = d_l(d_r - 1) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_c} H((T_c(\underline{x}; c)_i - x_i) \boxtimes x_i^{\boxtimes d_r-2} \boxtimes ([\underline{S}(\underline{x})]_i - x_i)) = 0.$$

We now show that  $x_{i_0} \preceq T_s(x_{i_0}; c)$ . By condition,  $\underline{x} \succ \Delta_\infty$ , and by Lemma 5.6,  $x_i \succeq x_{i-1}$ , we have  $x_{i_0} \succ \Delta_\infty$  and  $x_{i_0} \succeq x_i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{N}_c$ . Then for either the standard or the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, we have

$$x_{i_0} = T_c(\underline{x}; c)_{i_0} = \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} c_{i_0-k} \circledast h(x_{i_0-k}, \dots, x_{i_0-k+(w-1)}) \preceq \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} c \circledast h(x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_0}) = T_s(x_{i_0}; c).$$

where  $h$  denotes the corresponding APP operator in the DE update in (17) or (18).

### H. Proof of Lemma 5.22

The proof follows that of [9, Lem. 43]. Define  $\underline{y} := \underline{S}(\underline{x}) - \underline{x}$ , then  $y_i = x_{i-1} - x_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq K$ , with  $x_0 = \Delta_\infty$ . Since  $\underline{x}$  is a fixed point of the modified system, we have  $x_i = x_{i_0}$  for  $i_0 < i \leq K$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq i_0$ , by the DE updates in (17) and (18)

$$x_{i-1} - x_i = \frac{1}{w} c_{i-w} \circledast \left( \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} x_{i-w+j}^{\boxplus d_r-1} \right)^{\circledast d_l-1} - \frac{1}{w} c_i \circledast \left( \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} x_{i+j}^{\boxplus d_r-1} \right)^{\circledast d_l-1}$$

for the standard  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, and

$$x_{i-1} - x_i = \frac{1}{w} c_{i-w} \circledast \frac{1}{\binom{w-1}{d_l-1}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_{w-1}} \sum_{d=1}^{d_l-1} x_{i-w+j}^{\boxplus d_r-1} - \frac{1}{w} c_i \circledast \frac{1}{\binom{w-1}{d_l-1}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_0} \sum_{d=1}^{d_l-1} x_{i+j}^{\boxplus d_r-1}$$

for the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble. Thus, for both coupled ensembles,  $y_i = x_{i-1} - x_i$  is of the form  $\frac{1}{w} a_i - \frac{1}{w} b_i$  for some  $a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{X}_q$  for all  $i$  ( $a_i = b_i$  for  $i > i_0$ ). From (26), observe that the first two terms of the second-order directional derivative along the direction  $[\underline{y}, \underline{y}]$  are of the form

$$H(d \boxtimes y_i \boxtimes y_i) = \frac{1}{w} H(d \boxtimes (b_i - a_i) \boxtimes (x_i - x_{i-1}))$$

for some  $d \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . From Lemma 5.6,  $x_i \succeq x_{i-1}$  for all  $i$ , then by Proposition 4.28, each of all these terms can be absolutely upper bounded by

$$|H(d \boxtimes y_i \boxtimes y_i)| \leq \frac{1}{w} H(x_i - x_{i-1}).$$

Observe that the final term in (26) is of the form

$$H(d_1 \circledast (d_2 \boxtimes y_m) \circledast (d_3 \boxtimes y_i))$$

for some  $d_1, d_2, d_3 \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . By Corollary 4.16 and Proposition 4.28, the above term can be absolutely upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |H(d_1 \circledast (d_2 \boxtimes y_m) \circledast (d_3 \boxtimes y_i))| &= |H([d_1 \circledast (d_2 \boxtimes y_m)] \boxtimes (d_3 \boxtimes y_i))| \\ &= |H(d_3 \boxtimes [d_1 \circledast (d_2 \boxtimes y_m)] \boxtimes y_i)| \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{w} |H(d_3 \boxtimes (d_4 - d_5) \boxtimes (x_i - x_{i-1}))| \leq \frac{1}{w} H(x_i - x_{i-1}). \end{aligned}$$

In (a),  $d_4, d_5 \in \mathcal{X}_q$  and we use the fact that  $y_m = \frac{1}{w}(a_m - b_m)$  for some  $a_m, b_m \in \mathcal{X}_q$ . By telescoping

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_c} H(x_i - x_{i-1}) = H(x_K - \Delta_\infty) \leq \log q.$$

Substituting the above inequalities into (26) and applying the triangle inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| d_{x_1}^2 U_c(x_1; c)[\underline{y}, \underline{y}] \right| \\ & \leq d_l(d_r - 1) \left( \frac{d_r - 2}{w} + \frac{d_r - 1}{w} + \frac{1}{w} 2w^2 \frac{(d_l - 1)(d_r - 1)}{w^2} \right) \log q \\ & = \frac{d_l(d_r - 1)(2d_l d_r - 2d_l - 1)}{w} \log q \end{aligned}$$

for the standard  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble, and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| d_{x_1}^2 U_c(x_1; c)[\underline{y}, \underline{y}] \right| \\ & \leq d_l(d_r - 1) \left( \frac{d_r - 2}{w} + \frac{d_r - 1}{w} + \frac{1}{w} 2(w-1)w \frac{(d_r - 1)(\binom{w-2}{d_l-2})}{w \binom{w-1}{d_l-1}} \right) \log q \\ & = \frac{d_l(d_r - 1)(2d_l d_r - 2d_l - 1)}{w} \log q \end{aligned}$$

for the improved  $(d_l, d_r, w, L)$  ensemble.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. J. Felström and K. S. Zigangirov, "Time-varying periodic convolutional codes with low-density parity-check matrices," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 2181–2191, Sep. 1999.
- [2] A. Sridharan, M. Lentmaier, D. J. Costello, Jr., and K. Zigangirov, "Convergence analysis for a class of LDPC convolutional codes on the erasure channel," in *Proc. Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control, Comput.*, Monticello, IL, USA, Oct. 2004, pp. 953–962.
- [3] M. Lentmaier, A. Sridharan, K. S. Zigangirov, and D. J. Costello, "Terminated LDPC convolutional codes with thresholds close to capacity," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, Adelaide, Australia, Sep. 2005, pp. 1372–1376.
- [4] M. Lentmaier and G. P. Fettweis, "On the thresholds of generalized LDPC convolutional codes based on protographs," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, Austin, TX, USA, Jun. 2010, pp. 709–713.
- [5] M. Lentmaier, A. Sridharan, K. S. Zigangirov, and D. J. Costello, Jr., "Iterative decoding threshold analysis for LDPC convolutional codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 5274–5289, Oct. 2010.
- [6] S. Kudekar, T. J. Richardson, and R. L. Urbanke, "Threshold saturation via spatial coupling: Why convolutional LDPC ensembles perform so well over the BEC," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 803–834, Feb. 2011.
- [7] S. Kudekar, T. Richardson, and R. Urbanke, "Spatially coupled ensembles universally achieve capacity under belief propagation," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 7761–7813, Dec. 2013.
- [8] A. Yedla, Y.-Y. Jian, P. S. Nguyen, and H. D. Pfister, "A simple proof of Maxwell saturation for coupled scalar recursions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 11, pp. 6943–6965, Nov. 2014.
- [9] S. Kumar, A. J. Young, N. Macris, and H. D. Pfister, "Threshold saturation for spatially-coupled LDPC and LDGM codes on BMS channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 7389–7415, Dec. 2014.
- [10] D. G. M. Mitchell, M. Lentmaier, and D. J. Costello Jr., "On the minimum distance of generalized spatially coupled LDPC codes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, Istanbul, Turkey, Jul. 2013, pp. 1874–1878.
- [11] ———, "Spatially coupled LDPC codes constructed from protographs," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 4866–4889, Dec. 2015.
- [12] D. G. M. Mitchell, P. M. Olmos, M. Lentmaier, and D. J. Costello Jr., "Spatially coupled generalized LDPC codes: Asymptotic analysis and finite length scaling," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 3708–3723, Jun. 2021.
- [13] D. G. M. Mitchell, A. E. Pusane, and D. J. Costello Jr., "Minimum distance and trapping set analysis of protograph-based LDPC convolutional codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 254–281, Jan. 2013.
- [14] D. J. Costello, Jr., L. Dolecek, T. Fuja, J. Kliewer, D. Mitchell, and R. Smarandache, "Spatially coupled sparse codes on graphs: Theory and practice," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 168–176, Jul. 2014.
- [15] P. M. Olmos and R. L. Urbanke, "A scaling law to predict the finite-length performance of spatially-coupled LDPC codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 3164–3184, Jun. 2015.
- [16] M. Stinner and P. M. Olmos, "On the waterfall performance of finite-length SC-LDPC codes constructed from protographs," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 345–361, Feb. 2016.
- [17] R. Sokolovskii, A. Graell i Amat and F. Bränström, "Finite-length scaling of SC-LDPC codes with a limited number of decoding iterations," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 4869–4888, Aug. 2023.
- [18] M. C. Davey and D. MacKay, "Low-density parity check codes over  $GF(q)$ ," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 165–167, Jun. 1998.
- [19] A. Piemontese, A. Graell i Amat, and G. Colavolpe, "Nonbinary spatially-coupled LDPC codes on the binary erasure channel," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC)*, Budapest, Hungary, Jun. 2013, pp. 3270–3274.
- [20] L. Wei, T. Koike-Akino, D. G. M. Mitchell, T. E. Fuja, and D. J. Costello, Jr., "Threshold analysis of non-binary spatially-coupled LDPC codes with windowed decoding," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, Honolulu, HI, USA, Jul. 2014, pp. 881–885.
- [21] I. Andriyanova and A. Graell i Amat, "Threshold saturation for nonbinary SC-LDPC codes on the binary erasure channel," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2622–2638, May 2016.
- [22] K. Huang, D. G. M. Mitchell, L. Wei, X. Ma, and D. J. Costello, Jr., "Performance comparison of LDPC block and spatially coupled codes over  $GF(q)$ ," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 592–604, Mar. 2015.
- [23] J. Zhang, B. Bai, D. Deng, M. Zhu, H. Xu and M. Guan, "Non-uniform spatially-coupled LDPC codes over  $GF(2^m)$ ," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, Vail, CO, USA, Jun. 2018, pp. 816–820.
- [24] A. Hareedy, C. Lanka, N. Guo, and L. Dolecek, "A combinatorial methodology for optimizing non-binary graph-based codes: Theoretical analysis and applications in data storage," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 2128–2154, Apr. 2019.
- [25] T. J. Richardson and R. Urbanke, *Modern Coding Theory*. Cambridge U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008.
- [26] A. Montanari, "Tight bounds for LDPC and LDGM codes under MAP decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 3221–3246, Sep. 2005.
- [27] N. Macris, "Griffith–Kelly–Sherman correlation inequalities: A useful tool in the theory of error correcting codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 664–683, Feb. 2007.
- [28] S. Kudekar and N. Macris, "Sharp bounds for optimal decoding of low-density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp. 4635–4650, Oct. 2009.
- [29] J. Barbier, C. L. Chan and N. Macris, "Adaptive path interpolation method for sparse systems: Application to a censored block model," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 2093–2114, Apr. 2021.
- [30] C. Villani, *Optimal Transport, Old and New*. NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [31] R. G. Gallager, *Low-Density Parity-Check Codes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1963.
- [32] D. J. C. MacKay, "Good error correcting codes based on very sparse matrices," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 399–431, Mar. 1999.
- [33] M. Luby, M. Mitzenmacher, A. Shokrollahi, and D. A. Spielman, "Improved low-density parity-check codes using irregular graphs," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 585–598, Feb. 2001.
- [34] T. Richardson and R. Urbanke, "The capacity of low-density parity check codes under message-passing decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 599–618, Feb. 2000.
- [35] G. A. Margulis, "Explicit constructions of graphs without short cycles and low density codes," *Combinatorica*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 71–78, 1982.
- [36] B. Vasic and O. Milenkovic, "Combinatorial constructions of low-density parity-check codes for iterative decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1156–1176, Jun. 2004.
- [37] A. Bennatan and D. Burshtein, "On the application of LDPC codes to arbitrary discrete-memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 417–437, Mar. 2004.
- [38] G. Como and F. Fagnani, "Average spectra and minimum distances of low-density parity-check codes over abelian groups," *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 19–53, 2008.
- [39] S. Yang, T. Honold, Y. Chen, Z. Zhang, and P. Qiu, "Weight distributions of regular low-density parity-check codes over finite fields," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 7507–7521, Nov. 2011.
- [40] C. Di, D. Proietti, I. E. Telatar, T. J. Richardson, and R. L. Urbanke, "Finite-length analysis of low-density parity-check codes on the binary erasure channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1570–1579, Jun. 2002.
- [41] A. Orlitsky, K. Viswanathan, J. Zhang, "Stopping set distribution of LDPC code ensembles," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 929–953, Mar. 2005.

- [42] G. Miller and D. Burshtein, "Bounds on the maximum-likelihood decoding error probability of low-density-parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 2696–2710, Nov. 2001.
- [43] A. Sridharan and D. Truhachev and M. Lentmaier and D. J. Costello and K. S. Zigangirov, "Distance bounds for an ensemble of LDPC convolutional codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 4537–4555, Dec. 2007.
- [44] D. Truhachev and K. S. Zigangirov and D. J. Costello, "Distance bounds for periodically time-varying and tail-biting LDPC convolutional codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4301–4308, Sep. 2010.
- [45] D. Burshtein and G. Miller, "Asymptotic enumeration methods for analyzing LDPC codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1115–1131, Jun. 2004.
- [46] J. Nocedal and S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2006.
- [47] R. G. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- [48] A. J. Viterbi and J. K. Omura, *Principle of Digital Communication and Coding*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.
- [49] R. Cohen and Y. Cassuto, "Iterative decoding of LDPC codes over the  $q$ -ary partial erasure channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 2658–2672, May 2016.
- [50] A. Kavcic, X. Ma, and M. Mitzenmacher, "Binary intersymbol interference channels: Gallager codes, density evolution and code performance bounds," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1636–1652, Jul. 2003.
- [51] J. Hou, P. H. Siegel, L. B. Milstein, and H. D. Pfister, "Capacity-approaching bandwidth-efficient coded modulation schemes based on low density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 2141–2155, Sep. 2003.
- [52] A. Bennatan and D. Burshtein, "Design and analysis of nonbinary LDPC codes for arbitrary discrete-memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 549–583, Feb. 2006.
- [53] T. Richardson, A. Shokrollahi, and R. Urbanke, "Design of capacity-approaching irregular low-density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 619–637, Feb. 2001.
- [54] C. Méasson, A. Montanari, T. J. Richardson, and R. Urbanke, "The generalized area theorem and some of its consequences," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 4793–4821, Nov. 2009.
- [55] A. Orlitsky, K. Viswanathan and J. Zhang, "Stopping set distribution of LDPC code ensembles," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 929–953, Mar. 2005.
- [56] V. Strassen, "The existence of probability measures with given marginals," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 423–439, Apr. 1965.
- [57] L. Rüschendorf, "A characterization of random variables with minimum  $l^2$ -distance," *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, vol. 32, pp. 48–54, 1990.
- [58] S. Shalev-Shwartz, "Online learning and online convex optimization," *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 107–194, 2012.
- [59] R. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1970.