

## A. Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof:* Based on (7), the perturbed received LLRs can be denoted as  $\mathcal{L}'(y_0) = \mathcal{L}(y_0) + \mathcal{L}(n'_0)$  and  $\mathcal{L}'(y_1) = \mathcal{L}(y_1) + \mathcal{L}(n'_1)$ . Based on the  $f$ -function of (5), we have

$$\mathcal{L}'(u_0) = \text{sign}(\mathcal{L}'(y_0) \cdot \mathcal{L}'(y_1)) \cdot \min(|\mathcal{L}'(y_0)|, |\mathcal{L}'(y_1)|).$$

According to [18], [23], the magnitude of artificial noise  $n'_i$  should be significantly smaller than that of the channel noise  $n_i$ , i.e.,  $|n'_i| \ll |n_i|$ . Consequently,  $|n'_i| \ll |y_i|$  and

$$\text{sign}(\mathcal{L}'(y_0) \cdot \mathcal{L}'(y_1)) = \text{sign}(\mathcal{L}(y_0) \cdot \mathcal{L}(y_1)). \quad (18)$$

Based on Taylor's formula,  $|\mathcal{L}(y_i) + \mathcal{L}(n'_i)|$  can be expressed as

$$|\mathcal{L}(y_i) + \mathcal{L}(n'_i)| = |\mathcal{L}(y_i)| + \text{sign}(\mathcal{L}(y_i)) \cdot \mathcal{L}(n'_i) + o(\mathcal{L}(n'_i)), \quad (19)$$

where  $o(\mathcal{L}(n'_i))$  denotes the Peano remainder term. In this paper, the remainder term can be omitted, as its contribution is negligible. Based on (19), if  $|\mathcal{L}(y_0)| \leq |\mathcal{L}(y_1)|$ ,

$$\min(|\mathcal{L}'(y_0)|, |\mathcal{L}'(y_1)|) = |\mathcal{L}(y_0)| + \text{sign}(\mathcal{L}(y_0)) \cdot \mathcal{L}(n'_0).$$

Otherwise,

$$\min(|\mathcal{L}'(y_0)|, |\mathcal{L}'(y_1)|) = |\mathcal{L}(y_1)| + \text{sign}(\mathcal{L}(y_1)) \cdot \mathcal{L}(n'_1).$$

Hence, it can be obtained that

$$\min(|\mathcal{L}'(y_0)|, |\mathcal{L}'(y_1)|) = \min(|\mathcal{L}(y_0)|, |\mathcal{L}(y_1)|) + \text{sign}(\mathcal{L}(y_i)) \cdot \mathcal{L}(n'_i), \quad (20)$$

where  $i = \arg \min(|\mathcal{L}(y_0)|, |\mathcal{L}(y_1)|)$ . Based on eqs. (5), (18) and (20), we have

$$\mathcal{L}'(u_0) = \mathcal{L}(u_0) + \mathcal{L}(n_0^*),$$

where  $n_0^* = \text{sign}(\mathcal{L}(y_i)) \cdot n'_i$ . Since  $\{n'_0, n'_1\} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_p^2)$  and  $\text{sign}(\mathcal{L}(y_i)) \in \{-1, 1\}$ , it follows that  $n_0^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_p^2)$ .

Based on the  $g$ -function of (6), we have

$$\mathcal{L}'(u_1) = (1 - 2\hat{u}_0) \cdot \mathcal{L}'(y_0) + \mathcal{L}'(y_1).$$

Since  $\hat{u}_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}'(u_1) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(y_1) + \mathcal{L}(y_0) + \mathcal{L}(n'_1 + n'_0), & \text{if } \hat{u}_0 = 0; \\ \mathcal{L}(y_1) - \mathcal{L}(y_0) + \mathcal{L}(n'_1 - n'_0), & \text{if } \hat{u}_0 = 1. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

For the conventional SC decoding, it follows that

$$\mathcal{L}(u_1) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(y_1) + \mathcal{L}(y_0), & \text{if } \hat{u}_0 = 0; \\ \mathcal{L}(y_1) - \mathcal{L}(y_0), & \text{if } \hat{u}_0 = 1. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Based on (21) and (22), we have

$$\mathcal{L}'(u_1) = \mathcal{L}(u_1) + \mathcal{L}(n_1^*),$$

where  $n_1^* \in \{n'_1 + n'_0, n'_1 - n'_0\}$ . Since  $\{n'_0, n'_1\} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_p^2)$ , it can be obtained that  $n_1^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 2\sigma_p^2)$ .  $\square$

## B. Proof of Corollary 2

*Proof:* As mentioned in Sec. II-B, the SC decoding is performed by recursively invoking the  $f$  and the  $g$  functions. Based on Theorem 1, the perturbation power doubles only when performing the  $g$ -function. Otherwise, it stays the same. Therefore, it can be concluded that the power of  $n_i^*$ , i.e.,  $\sigma_i^2$ , is  $2^{\delta_i}$  times that of the original perturbation power  $\sigma_p^2$ , whose artificial noise is applying on the received LLRs. Note that  $\delta_i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  denotes the number of required  $g$ -functions for estimating  $u_i$ . That says

$$n_i^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2),$$

where  $\sigma_i^2 = 2^{\delta_i} \sigma_p^2$ . Thus, based on (8), it can be obtained that

$$\mathcal{L}'(u_i) = \mathcal{L}(u_i) + \mathcal{L}(n_i^*),$$

where  $n_i^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$ , and  $\mathcal{L}(u_i)$  denotes the decoding  $a$  posteriori LLR obtained from the SC decoding.  $\square$

## C. Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof:* Let  $P_c^{\text{SC}}$  denote the correct probability of SC decoding, i.e., the decoding accuracy, which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} P_c^{\text{SC}} &= \Pr(\hat{u}_0^{N-1} = u_0^{N-1}) \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^{N-1} \Pr(\hat{u}_i = u_i \mid \hat{u}_0 = u_0, \hat{u}_1 = u_1, \dots, \hat{u}_{i-1} = u_{i-1}) \\ &= \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^c} (1 - P_e(u_i)), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $1 - P_e(u_i)$  denotes the probability that  $u_i$  has been correctly estimated, and  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^c = \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$ .

For polar codes, frozen bits are fixed as zero and known to the polar decoder [1]. Thus, the error probability of frozen bits is zero, i.e.,  $P_e(u_i) = 0$  for  $\forall i \in \mathcal{A}^c$ . That says

$$\prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}^c} (1 - P_e(u_i)) \triangleq 1. \quad (24)$$

Substituting (24) into (23), we obtain

$$P_c^{\text{SC}} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}} (1 - P_e(u_i)). \quad (25)$$

Thus, based on (25), the error probability of SC decoding under GA can be computed by

$$\begin{aligned} P_e^{\text{SC}} &= 1 - P_c^{\text{SC}} \\ &= 1 - \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}} (1 - P_e(u_i)). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

When computing  $P_e^{\text{LRP}}$ , it is assumed that the erroneous bit estimations occur only in the set of LRPs, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}$ . Therefore, it follows that  $P_e(u_i) = 0$  for  $\forall i \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ . That says

$$\prod_{i \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{D}} (1 - P_e(u_i)) \triangleq 1 \quad (27)$$

Combining (23), (24), and (27), using the SC decoding, the decoding accuracy of LRPs can be defined as

$$P_c^{\text{LRP}} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{D}} (1 - P_e(u_i)). \quad (28)$$

Based on (28), under GA, the error probability of LRPs, i.e.,  $P_e^{\text{LRP}}$ , can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} P_e^{\text{LRP}} &= 1 - P_c^{\text{LRP}} \\ &= 1 - \prod_{i \in \mathcal{D}} (1 - P_e(u_i)). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

□