

A Short Proof of Coding Theorems for Reed-Muller Codes

Xiao Ma, *Member, IEEE*

School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, P. R. China
Guangdong Key Laboratory of Information Security Technology, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, P. R. China
Email: maxiao@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Abstract—In this paper, we present a short proof that Reed-Muller (RM) codes are entropy-achieving as source coding for Bernoulli sources and capacity-achieving as channel coding for binary memoryless symmetric (BMS) channels, also known as memoryless binary-input output-symmetric (BIOS) channels, in terms of bit error rate (BER) under maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding.

Index Terms—Coding theorem, error exponents, Reed-Muller (RM) codes.

I. INTRODUCTION

Reed-Muller (RM) codes are named after Reed and Muller [1], [2], which were introduced in 1954 and are one of the oldest families of codes. Although a sequence of RM codes with a fixed rate has a vanishing relative distance ratio, it was believed, in Shannon's setting [3], that RM codes are good enough for correcting random errors. In 1993, Shu Lin gave a talk, entitled “RM Codes are Not So Bad” [4], and then gave the transparencies to Forney¹. In an invited paper [5], Costello and Forney in 2007 wrote that “Indeed, with optimum decoding, RM codes may be good enough to reach the Shannon limit on the AWGN channel”. Shortly after the polar code breakthrough [6], there is a growing conviction that RM codes can achieve capacity on any binary memoryless symmetric (BMS) channels, given the close relationship between polar codes and RM codes and that the RM codes typically have larger minimum Hamming distance. Arkan pointed out in a survey [7] that whether RM codes are capacity-achieving under maximum-likelihood (ML) decoding is a fundamental open problem in coding theory. Most recently, Reeves and Pfister [8] proved that RM codes achieve the capacity of the BMS channels in terms of bit error rate (BER), while Abbe and Sandon [9] proved that RM codes are also capacity-achieving on symmetric channels in terms of block error rate (BLER).

In this paper, we present a short proof for coding theorems of RM codes.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND MAIN RESULTS

A. System Model

Recently, a new framework to prove coding theorems for linear codes has been proposed [10], as depicted in Fig. 1, where $U^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is a segment of a Bernoulli process with a




Fig. 1. System model.

success probability of $\theta = P_U(1) \leq 1/2$ and referred to as the message bits to be transmitted, G is a binary matrix of size $n \times \ell$ and $X^\ell = U^n G \in \mathbb{F}_2^\ell$ is referred to as parity-check bits corresponding to U^n . The message bits U^n and the parity-check bits X^ℓ are transmitted through two (possibly different) binary-input output-symmetric (BIOS) channels, resulting in V^n and Y^ℓ , respectively. A BIOS channel is characterized by an input $x \in \mathcal{X} = \mathbb{F}_2$, an output set \mathcal{Y} (discrete or continuous), and a conditional probability mass (or density) function $\{P_{Y|X}(y|x) | x \in \mathbb{F}_2, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ which satisfies the symmetric condition that $P_{Y|X}(y|1) = P_{Y|X}(\pi(y)|0)$ for some bijective mapping $\pi : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ with $\pi^{-1}(\pi(y)) = y$. For simplicity, we assume that the BIOS channels are memoryless, meaning that $P_{V|U}(u|v) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} P_{V|U}(v_i|u_i)$

and $P_{Y|X}(y|x) = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell-1} P_{Y|X}(y_i|x_i)$. This model is also known as a BMS channel. The entropy of a Bernoulli source is defined as $H(U) = -\theta \log_2(\theta) - (1-\theta) \log_2(1-\theta)$, while the channel capacity of a BIOS channel is given by $C = I(X; Y)$ with $I(X; Y)$ being the mutual information and X being a uniform binary random variable with $P_X(0) = P_X(1) = 1/2$.

The task of the receiver is to recover U^n from (V^n, Y^ℓ) . This can be done by a two-step decoding algorithm as follows. First, based on V^n , the receiver finds a list of size at most $2^{n(H(U|V)+\epsilon)}$ which contains U^n with high probability. Second, based on Y^ℓ , the receiver selects \hat{U}^n from the list as the estimate such that $\hat{X}^\ell = \hat{U}^n G$ is the most likely one. This two-step decoding reveals a new mechanism pertained to systematic linear codes, where the information part and the parity-check part can play different roles. Specifically,

¹Personal communication with Prof. Shu Lin, Mar., 2025.

the noisy information part helps to limit the list size of the candidate codewords, while the noisy (or noiseless) parity-check part is used to identify the ML codeword from the list. The BLER is defined as $\Pr\{\hat{\mathbf{U}}^n \neq \mathbf{U}^n\}$, while the BER is defined simply as $\mathbb{E}[W_H(\hat{\mathbf{U}}^n - \mathbf{U}^n)]/n$ with $W_H(\cdot)$ denoting the Hamming weight.

We are primarily concerned with the following question: for sufficiently large n , how many parity-check bits are required for reliably transmitting \mathbf{U}^n ? Intuitively, the reliable transmission of \mathbf{U}^n can be achieved if $nH(U|V) < \ell I(X;Y)$. The limit of the ratio ℓ/n as n goes to infinity is considered in this paper, which represents the average number of parity-check bits required per message bit for reliable transmission. The framework unifies the following problems in coding theory.

- If BIOS 1 and BIOS 2 are the same, and U is uniform (i.e., $\theta = 1/2$), the problem is equivalent to the channel coding problem. From $nH(U|V) < \ell I(X;Y)$, we have $\ell/n > H(U|V)/I(X;Y)$, which is equivalent to $n/(n + \ell) < C$ and $n/(n + \ell)$ is the code rate for channel coding. This can be verified by noting that $C = 1 - H(X|Y)$ and $H(U|V) = H(X|Y)$.
- If BIOS 1 is a totally erased channel (meaning that \mathbf{U}^n is not transmitted) and BIOS 2 is noiseless, the problem is equivalent to the source coding problem. From $nH(U|V) < \ell I(X;Y)$, we have $\ell/n > H(U)$ and ℓ/n is the code rate for the source coding. This can be verified by noting that $H(U|V) = H(U)$ and $I(X;Y) = 1$.
- If BIOS 1 is a totally erased channel, and BIOS 2 has noise, the problem can be viewed as the joint source channel coding (JSCC) problem for Bernoulli sources. From $nH(U|V) < \ell I(X;Y)$, we have $\ell/n > H(U)/I(X;Y)$, where ℓ/n is the transmission ratio and the limit of the minimum transmission ratio (LMTR) is $H(U)/C$ [11].
- If the source is uniform (i.e., $\theta = 1/2$) and BIOS 1 is a noisy channel while BIOS 2 is a noiseless channel, the problem is equivalent to transmit the uniform sources with the parity-check codes specified by the parity-check matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}^T$. From $nH(U|V) < \ell I(X;Y)$, we have $\ell/n > H(U|V)$ for $I(X;Y) = 1$. Equivalently, we have $(n - \ell)/n < C$, where $(n - \ell)/n$ is the design code rate of the parity-check code.

B. Reed-Muller Codes

A Reed-Muller code of length $n = 2^m$ and order r , denoted by $\text{RM}(r, m)$, has dimension $\ell = \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i}$ and minimum distance $d_{\min} = 2^{m-r}$. A codeword can be specified by evaluating a Boolean function $f(\mathbf{v}) = f(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m)$ of degree not greater than r with $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m)$ ranging over \mathbb{F}_2^m . The $\text{RM}(r, m)$ code can be generated by all monomials of degree not greater than r . We have the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *Let $R \in (0, 1)$ be fixed. For a positive integer m , let $n = 2^m$ and r be the minimum integer such that $\sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i} \geq nR$. Then $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (m - r) = \infty$ and hence $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d_{\min} = \infty$.*

Proof. This can be proved by contradiction. If this is not the case, there exists a subsequence (m, r) such that $m - r < t$ for some fixed t . Then we have

$$R > \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \binom{m}{i}}{2^m} = \frac{2^m - \sum_{i=r}^m \binom{m}{i}}{2^m} \quad (1)$$

$$> 1 - \frac{t \binom{m}{t}}{2^m} \stackrel{(*)}{\geq} 1 - \frac{t \cdot 2^{mH(t/m)}}{2^m} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the inequality $(*)$ follows from the fact that $\binom{m}{t} \leq 2^{mH(t/m)}$ with $H(\cdot)$ being the entropy function [12, Example 11.1.3]. This contradicts the assumption that $R < 1$, completing the proof. \square

C. Main Results

In the following theorems, by an RM matrix \mathbf{G} , we mean the matrix \mathbf{G} whose columns are linearly independent codewords selected from the $\text{RM}(r, m)$ code.

Theorem 1. *Consider the BIOS 1 channel as a totally erased channel and the BIOS 2 channel as a noiseless channel. Let $R > H(U)$ be fixed. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can always find a sufficiently large integer m_0 such that, for all $m \geq m_0$, $n = 2^m$ and $r < m$ be the minimum integer with $\sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i} \geq nR$, the BER of the linear code specified by an RM matrix \mathbf{G} of size $n \times \ell$ with $\ell = \lceil nR \rceil$ is upper bounded by ε under maximum likelihood decoding.*

Theorem 2. *Consider the BIOS 1 channel as a noisy channel and the BIOS 2 channel as a noiseless channel. Let $R > H(U|V)$ be fixed. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, one can always find a sufficiently large integer m_0 such that, for all $m \geq m_0$, $n = 2^m$ and $r < m$ be the minimum integer with $\sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i} \geq nR$, the BER of the linear code specified by the parity-check (RM) matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}^T$ of size $\ell \times n$ with $\ell = \lceil nR \rceil$ is upper bounded by ε under maximum likelihood decoding.*

Remark 1. *Theorems 1 and 2 definitely hold if we choose $\ell = \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i}$ instead of $\ell = \lceil nR \rceil$, in which case the codes are exactly the same as the RM codes but defined by the parity-check matrices. Notice that the channel codes defined by the parity-check matrices in Theorem 2 have a code rate $(n - \lceil nR \rceil)/n$, which achieves the capacity $C = 1 - H(U|V)$. Also notice that the parity-check code defined by the RM matrix \mathbf{G} of size $n \times \ell$ associated with the $\text{RM}(r, m)$ code is the $\text{RM}(m - r - 1, m)$ code [13, Theorem 4, Ch. 13].*

III. PROOF OF CODING THEOREMS

A. Proof of Theorem 1

For a fixed positive real number $R < 1$, define for each positive integer m that $n = 2^m$ and $\ell = \lceil nR \rceil$ as the minimum integer not less than nR . Let $\mathbf{G}_{n \times \ell}$ be a full-rank binary RM matrix of size $n \times \ell$.

Let $\mathbf{u}^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a source sequence, and $\mathbf{x}^\ell = \mathbf{u}^n \mathbf{G}$ is the parity-check vector, also known as syndrome. Upon receiving \mathbf{x}^ℓ , the ML decoding finds $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^n$ with $\hat{\mathbf{u}}^n \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{x}^\ell$ such that

$P(\hat{\mathbf{u}}^n) > P(\mathbf{w}^n)$ for all $\mathbf{w}^n \neq \hat{\mathbf{u}}^n$ and $\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{x}^\ell$. If no such solution exists (in the case of ties), the ML decoding simply reports an error. To analyze the probability of decoding error, we consider an RM code ensemble by replacing the RM matrix \mathbf{G} by $\mathbf{\Pi G}$, where $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is drawn uniformly at random from all permutation matrices of order n . Defining

$$E(\mathbf{u}^n) = \{\mathbf{w}^n | \mathbf{w}^n \neq \mathbf{u}^n, p(\mathbf{w}^n) \geq p(\mathbf{u}^n), (\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{0}\},$$

a decoding error occurs if $E(\mathbf{u}^n)$ is non-empty, i.e., $|E(\mathbf{u}^n)| \geq 1$. The BLER, denoted by $\Pr\{E\}$, keeps unchanged after introducing $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and is then upper bounded by, for any $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{E\} &= \sum_{\mathbf{u}^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n} P(\mathbf{u}^n) \cdot \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}(|E(\mathbf{u}^n)| \geq 1)] \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{u}^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n} P(\mathbf{u}^n) \left(\sum_{\mathbf{w}^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n} \left(\frac{P(\mathbf{w}^n)}{P(\mathbf{u}^n)} \right)^{1/(1+\gamma)} \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0})] \Big)^{\gamma}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where we use $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ to represent the indicator function. This bounding technique is similar to that used by [14, Chapter 5.6 and Exercise 5.16], where the indicator function is introduced to limit the number of terms in the inner summation. Also notice that, to prove the coding theorems in terms of BER, only those \mathbf{w}^n with $W_H(\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \geq n\epsilon$ need to be included in the inner summation. This simplifies much the argument.

Defining the error exponent

$$\begin{aligned} E(\gamma, n, \ell) &= -\frac{1}{n} \log \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{u}^n} P(\mathbf{u}^n)^{1/(1+\gamma)} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{w}^n} P(\mathbf{w}^n)^{1/(1+\gamma)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0})] \Big)^{\gamma} \Big\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where \log and \exp are both taking base 2, we have

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \exp\{-nE(\gamma, n, \ell)\}. \quad (4)$$

Noticing that $E(0, n, \ell) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial E(\gamma, n, \ell)}{\partial \gamma} \right|_{\gamma=0} &= -H(U) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{u}^n} P(\mathbf{u}^n) \log \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{w}^n} P(\mathbf{w}^n) \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0})] \Big\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

we see that the key is to prove that $\left. \frac{\partial E(\gamma, n, \ell)}{\partial \gamma} \right|_{\gamma=0} > 0$. The difficulty lies in the fact that $\mathbb{I}((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0})$ is a product of ℓ binary random variables $\mathbb{I}((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \mathbf{\Pi G}_i = \mathbf{0})$ that are typically not independent, where \mathbf{G}_i is the i -th column of \mathbf{G} . Nevertheless, we have the following lemma that ensures, for any \mathbf{w}^n and \mathbf{u}^n such that $n\epsilon \leq W_H(\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \leq n(1-\epsilon)$ with a given $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{u}^n) \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0})] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta \right)^{\ell(1-\delta)} \quad (6)$$

as n goes to infinity. If so, we have

$$\left. \frac{\partial E(\gamma, n, \ell)}{\partial \gamma} \right|_{\gamma=0} \geq \frac{\ell(1-\delta)}{n} - H(U) > 0 \quad (7)$$

for $R > H(U)$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 1. Let $\mathbf{w}^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a vector of Hamming weight w and δ be an arbitrarily small positive number. We have

- 1) $w \in \{0, n\}$, $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0}) = 1$ since both $\mathbf{w}^n = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{w}^n = \mathbf{1}$ are codewords in the $RM(m-r-1, m)$ code.
- 2) $w \in \{i : 1 < i < 2^{r+1}\} \cup \{i : n - 2^{r+1} < i < n\} \cup \{i : i \bmod 2 = 1\}$, $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0}) = 0$ since all codewords must have even weights at least 2^{r+1} .
- 3) $w \in \{i : n\epsilon \leq i \leq n(1-\epsilon)\}$ with ϵ being fixed as any arbitrarily small positive real number, $\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0})] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta \right)^{\ell(1-\delta)}$.

Proof. To derive the upper bound, we construct a random matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ with independent and identically distributed columns such that $\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0}$ implies $\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi \tilde{G}} = \mathbf{0}$. If so, we have

$$\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0}) \leq \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi \tilde{G}} = \mathbf{0}). \quad (8)$$

For each i , $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we take randomly at uniform a non-zero codeword of Hamming weight not greater than 2^{m-1} as the i -th column $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_i$. This is feasible since, if a drawn non-zero codeword has a weight greater than 2^{m-1} but less than n , we simply use its complementary counterpart since $\mathbf{1}$ is a codeword. Without loss of generality, we write $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_1 = [\mathbf{1}^{b_1}, \mathbf{0}^{b_2}, \mathbf{0}^{b_3}]^T$ with $b_1 = b_2$ and $b_3 = 2^m - 2b_1$. We consider a model in which we throw an even number $w \geq 2^{r+1}$ balls into $n = 2^m$ bins uniformly at random. These bins are divided into three groups according to the column $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_1$ of size b_1, b_2 and b_3 . Then $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi \tilde{G}}_1 = \mathbf{0}) = 1$ is equivalent to that the first bin has an even number of balls.

Let w_1, w_2 and w_3 be the number of balls contained in the three sub-bins. Since $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 = w$ is even, we have $P(w_1 \text{ is even} | w_3 \text{ is odd}) = P(w_1 \text{ is odd} | w_3 \text{ is odd})$ by anti-symmetry and

$$|P(w_1 \text{ is even} | w_3 \text{ is even}) - P(w_1 \text{ is odd} | w_3 \text{ is even})| \leq \delta$$

for sufficiently large n and $n\epsilon \leq w \leq n(1-\epsilon)$. Notice that this bound does not always hold for $w = 2^{r+1}$, which, however, contributes to the BER little. The detailed argument is omitted here. By total probability law, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi \tilde{G}}_1 = \mathbf{0})] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \delta. \quad (9)$$

Since the columns of \mathbf{G} are independent and identically distributed and $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ has a rank at least $\ell(1-\delta)$ for sufficiently large n , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi G} = \mathbf{0})] \leq \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{w}^n \mathbf{\Pi \tilde{G}} = \mathbf{0})] \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \delta \right)^{\ell(1-\delta)}. \quad (10)$$

□

B. Proof of Theorem 2

It is well known that compressing a Bernoulli source with success probability θ can be viewed as protecting the all-zero codeword over a binary symmetric channel (BSC) with a cross error probability θ . Now we show that the channel coding for BIOS channels can be transformed into the source coding, completing the proof of Theorem 2.

Suppose that \mathbf{U}^n with $\mathbf{U}^n \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{0}$ is transmitted over BIOS1, resulting in \mathbf{V}^n . Then the log-likelihood ratio (LLR) vector \mathbf{r}^n is calculated as

$$r_i = \ln \frac{P_{V|U}(V_i|U_i = 0)}{P_{V|U}(V_i|U_i = 1)}, \quad 0 \leq i < n. \quad (11)$$

Given the LLR vector \mathbf{r}^n , the hard-decision vector $\mathbf{Z}^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is calculated as

$$Z_i = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } r_i > 0 \\ 0 \text{ or } 1 \text{ with probability } 1/2, & \text{if } r_i = 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } r_i < 0 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

for $0 \leq i < n$.

Then the channel can be transformed into a possibly time-varying BSC channel,

$$\mathbf{Z}^n = \mathbf{U}^n + \mathbf{E}^n, \quad (13)$$

where \mathbf{E}^n is the error pattern with

$$\theta_i = P(E_i = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(|r_i|)} \quad (14)$$

for $0 \leq i < n$.

Since $\mathbf{Z}^n \mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{U}^n + \mathbf{E}^n) \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{E}^n \mathbf{G}$, the decoding problem is equivalent to finding \mathbf{E}^n from its compressed version $\mathbf{X}^\ell = \mathbf{Z}^n \mathbf{G}$ (called the syndrome). The slight difference from the source coding is that the error pattern \mathbf{E}^n may have time-varying θ_i depending on V_i . This, however, does not preclude we define $H(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} H(E_t) = H(U|V)$. Hence, we can derive similarly an error exponent,

$$E(\gamma, n, \ell) = -\frac{1}{n} \log \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{e}^n} P(\mathbf{e}^n)^{1/(1+\gamma)} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{w}^n \in \mathbb{F}_2^n} P(\mathbf{w}^n)^{1/(1+\gamma)} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{I} \left((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{e}^n) \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{0} \right) \right]^\gamma \right) \right\}, \quad (15)$$

and

$$\Pr\{E\} \leq \exp\{-nE(\gamma, n, \ell)\}. \quad (16)$$

Therefore, we have $E(0, n, \ell) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{\partial E(\gamma, n, \ell)}{\partial \gamma} \right|_{\gamma=0} \\ &= -H(U|V) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\mathbf{e}^n} P(\mathbf{e}^n) \\ & \quad \cdot \log \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{w}^n} P(\mathbf{w}^n) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{I} \left((\mathbf{w}^n - \mathbf{e}^n) \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{0} \right) \right] \right\} \\ & \geq \frac{\ell(1-\delta)}{n} - H(U|V) > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

for $R > H(U|V)$. This holds for all typical receiving sequences \mathbf{V}^n as defined in [12], completing the proof.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have proved the coding theorems for RM codes, in terms of BER. The proof could be extended to the coding theorems in terms of BLER if new techniques [15], [16] are introduced.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank Mr. Jifan Liang, Mr. Yixin Wang and Ms. Xiangping Zheng for their helpful discussions, who helped programming to verify some intuitive ideas. This paper was typed by Ms. Xiangping Zheng.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. E. Muller, "Application of Boolean algebra to switching circuit design and to error detection," *IRE Trans. Electronic Computers*, vol. EC-3, no. 3, pp. 6–12, 1954.
- [2] I. Reed, "A class of multiple-error-correcting codes and the decoding scheme," *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 38–49, 1954.
- [3] C. E. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 379–423, 1948.
- [4] S. Lin, "RM codes are not so bad," in *Proc. IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop*, Jun. 1993.
- [5] D. J. Costello and G. D. Forney, "Channel coding: The road to channel capacity," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 6, pp. 1150–1177, 2007.
- [6] E. Ankan, "Channel polarization: A method for constructing capacity-achieving codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 3051–3073, 2009.
- [7] E. Ankan, "A survey of Reed-Muller codes from polar coding perspective," in *Proc. IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [8] G. Reeves and H. D. Pfister, "Reed-Muller codes on BMS channels achieve vanishing bit-error probability for all rates below capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 920–949, 2023.
- [9] E. Abbe and C. Sandon, "A proof that Reed-Muller codes achieve Shannon capacity on symmetric channels," in *Proc. IEEE Annu. Symp. Foundations Comput. Sci. (FOCS)*, 2023, pp. 177–193.
- [10] X. Ma, Y. Wang, and T. Zhu, "A new framework for proving coding theorems for linear codes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2022, pp. 2768–2773.
- [11] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems (Second edition)*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [12] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory (Second edition)*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [13] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The theory of error-correcting codes*. Elsevier, 1977.
- [14] R. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.
- [15] Y. Wang and X. Ma, "Coding theorems for repetition and superposition codes over binary-input output-symmetric channels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13603*, 2024.
- [16] Y. Wang, F. Meng, and X. Ma, "Systematic Bernoulli generator matrix codes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.13731*, 2025.