

On the Minimum Energy of Sending Correlated Sources over the Gaussian MAC

Nan Jiang, Yang Yang, Anders Høst-Mandsen, and Zixiang Xiong

Abstract

In this work, we investigate the minimum energy of transmitting correlated sources over the Gaussian multiple-access channel (MAC). Compared to other works on joint source-channel coding, we consider the general scenario where the source and channel bandwidths are not naturally matched. In particular, we proposed the use of hybrid digital-analog coding over to improve the transmission energy efficiency. Different models of correlated sources are studied. We first consider lossless transmission of binary sources over the MAC. We then treat lossy transmission of Gaussian sources over the Gaussian MAC, including CEO sources and multiterminal sources. In all cases, we show that hybrid transmission achieves the best known energy efficiency.

Index Terms

Correlated sources, joint source-channel coding, minimum energy, MAC.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this work, we study the minimum energy of sending correlated sources over the Gaussian MAC – a problem often referred to as the MAC with correlated sources. On the minimum energy, we study the general scenario where the source and channel bandwidths are not matched, and if advantageous for energy efficiency, the channel bandwidth can be as large as necessary.

The general problem of finding the capacity region of the MAC with arbitrarily correlated sources is still open, only a few special setups have been studied. For lossless transmission of discrete messages, Han

Work was supported in part by NSF grants 1017823 & 1017829 and by the Qatar National Research Fund, and presented in part at Forty-Ninth Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing, Monticello, Illinois, September, 2011. N. Jiang, Y. Yang, and Z. Xiong are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77840 (e-mail: {nanjiang, yangyang}@tamu.edu, zx@ece.tamu.edu). A. Høst-Madsen is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96813 (e-mail: ahm@hawaii.edu)

[1] found the exact capacity region when the messages observed by each user is a subset of independent messages; by exploring the message structure, Gündüz and Simeone [2] were able to reduce the needed number of auxiliary random variables to describe the capacity region. Another well-known result is the single-letter sufficient condition for asymptotically lossless transmission given by Cover et al. [3]. In the lossy scenario, Gastpar [4] considered Gaussian CEO sources and showed that analog transmission is exactly optimal when the source and channel bandwidths are matched; in addition, for the bandwidth matched case, Lapidoth and Tinguely [5] studied the case of bivariate Gaussian sources.

Several examples have been given in the literature (see [3], [6]) to show that separate source channel coding is sub-optimal in network communications. Recent studies [4], [5], [7]–[11] thus have considered joint source-channel coding and the general approach is to use either pure analog/digital transmission or their hybrids. Hybrid transmission has been shown to be exactly optimum in some cases [9] and better than either pure analog or digital transmission in others [5], [10], [12].

Most existing results are for the case with matched sources and channels, i.e., one channel use for each source sample (bandwidth matched) and the source type matched to the channel type (e.g., Gaussian sources over Gaussian channels or binary sources over binary channels), and moderate (or finite) bandwidth expansion was considered only in a few works [7], [10]. However, when we use energy as the cost measure, the sources and channels cannot be easily matched. For example, it is well known that in a point-to-point AWGN channel [13], the minimum energy per bit is achieved when the bandwidth approaches infinity. With possibly infinite bandwidth, energy efficiency was studied for lossy transmission of correlated CEO and bivariate Gaussian sources in [14]–[16], where an energy lower bound was derived using cut-set arguments before comparison to analog transmission and separate source-channel coding.

In this paper we study the minimum energy of sending correlated information over the Gaussian MAC. Of both theoretical and practice interests, we consider three source models of correlation:

- 1) The multi-terminal Gaussian sources under MSE distortion constraint: we extend our results to an arbitrary number of Gaussian sources that have never been treated before as a joint source-channel coding problem (see bivariate Gaussian results in [5], [16]). For an arbitrarily number of terminals including the bivariate case, we provide the best known upper and lower bounds on the minimum energy.
- 2) The Gaussian CEO sources under MSE distortion constraint: we give upper and lower bounds on the minimum energy of sending the Gaussian CEO sources over the Gaussian MAC.
- 3) Lossless transmission of correlated binary source: we propose that the hybrid digital/analog transmission is also energy efficient for the discrete case, and it tends to approach the lower we gives

as the number of sources increases.

For all three source models, we lower bound the minimum energy using a cut-set argument (see also in [16]), and by taking both transmission and distortion correlation into account we improve the lower bound in the low-energy region. For the achievable schemes, we study the energy-distortion functions of uncoded transmission and separate source and channel coding scheme as benchmarks. And the hybrid digital/analog scheme is proposed to achieve the best known energy efficiency.

II. MULTITERMINAL GAUSSIAN SOURCES

A. Problem Setup

We consider the problem in which M distributed encoders observe different components of a memory-less multiterminal Gaussian source and communicate with a decoder via a Gaussian MAC. The decoder attempts to reproduce the source subject to MSE distortion constraints on individual components. We provide upper and lower bounds on the minimum transmission energy such that the target communication quality is satisfied.

We describe the setup as follows.

1) *Sources*: Let (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_M) be a joint Gaussian random vector with zero mean and a circulant covariance matrix¹

$$\Sigma_S = \sigma_0^2 \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho & \cdots & \rho \\ \rho & 1 & \cdots & \rho \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho & \rho & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \sigma_0^2 \mathbf{C}(1, \rho, M).$$

$\{(S_1[k], S_2[k], \dots, S_M[k])\}_{k=1}^K$ be i.i.d. drawings of (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_M) . We assume that $\sigma_0^2 = 1$ and $\rho \in \left(-\frac{1}{M-1}, 0\right) \cup (0, 1)$ without loss of generality, since the cases of $\sigma_0^2 \neq 1$ can be reduce to this one by normalizing the sources, and the cases of $\rho = 1$ or $\rho = -\frac{1}{M-1}$ can be resolved with special transmission techniques. For source coding problems of this class of Gaussian multiterminal sources, Wagner et al. [17] proved sum-rate tightness for $\rho \in (0, 1)$; for the cases of negative correlation, *i.e.*, $\rho \in \left(-\frac{1}{M-1}, 0\right)$, Wang et al. [18] and Yang and Xiong [19] proved it using two different approaches. An extension of the exchangeable sources we considered here is the bi-eigen equal-variance (BEEV) case treated by Yang and Xiong [19].

¹We denote by $\mathbf{C}(a, b, M)$ a symmetric circulant matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ with diagonal elements a and off diagonal elements b .

2) *Encoders*: In each epoch indexed by k , transmitter m observes a drawing of one component $S_m[k]$ and describes the observed source to the decoder over the noisy channel. Denote the encoding function at transmitter m by $f_m^{(K,N)}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, that maps the source sequences $\mathbf{S}_m^{(K)} = (S_m[1], \dots, S_m[K])$ to channel sequences $\mathbf{X}_m^{(N)} = (X_m[1], \dots, X_m[N])$. The cost measurement is the transmission energy (individually measured at each transmitter) defined as the expected power of channel inputs per source sample

$$\frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbf{X}_m^{(N)}|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(X_m^2[n]).$$

3) *The channel*: We consider the Gaussian MAC for both practical and theoretical interests and assume channel symmetry and channel state information (CSI) at the receiver. Under these assumptions, the channel output at time n is

$$Y[n] = \sum_{m=1}^M X_m[n] + Z[n],$$

where $Z[n] \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) that is independent of the sources. Note that there is no loss of generality assuming $\mathbb{E}[(Z[n])^2] = 1$ (with double-sided power spectrum density 1 W/Hz), since normalizing transmitted signals can reduce other cases to this one.

4) *The decoder*: The decoder reconstructs the source sequences $\mathbf{S}_m^{(K)}$ from the observed channel outputs $\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}$ using decoding functions $g_m^{(K,N)}(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$, yielding $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_m^{(K)} = g_m^{(K,N)}(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)})$. The communication quality is measured by the MSE on individual sources, i.e.,

$$d_m^{(K)} = \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E} \left[|\hat{\mathbf{S}}_m^K - \mathbf{S}_m^K|^2 \right] = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[(S_m[k] - \hat{S}_m[k])^2 \right].$$

5) *Achievability*: We are interested in the achievable energy region $\mathcal{E}(D_1, \dots, D_M)$, defined as the convex hull of achievable energy tuples (E_1, \dots, E_M) such that the given distortion constraint (D_1, \dots, D_M) is satisfied on the sources. We define the achievability more formally as follows.

Definition 1. For a given distortion constraint (D_1, \dots, D_M) , an energy tuple (E_1, \dots, E_M) is achievable if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist encoding functions $(f_1^{(K,N)}, \dots, f_M^{(K,N)})$ and decoding functions $(g_1^{(K,N)}, \dots, g_M^{(K,N)})$ such that for $m = 1, \dots, M$

$$\frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathbf{X}_m^{(N)}|^2 \right] \leq E_m + \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

$$d_m^{(K)} \leq D_m + \epsilon. \quad (2)$$

To simplify analysis and representation, we give results for the *symmetric* case, in which the distortion constraints on individual components are equal, and we study the minimum achievable energy

$\underline{E}(D) \triangleq \min\{E|(E, \dots, E) \in \mathcal{E}(D, \dots, D)\}$, where the line $E_1 = \dots = E_M$ intersects the boundary of achievable energy region. We note that our results should apply to the asymmetric case as well.

B. Lower Bound

For the two-terminal case with matched bandwidth, a lower bound on \underline{E} was derived by assuming joint encoding and maximum correlation between the transmitted signals in [5]. However, unlike the Gaussian CEO problem over the MAC, where the lower bound in [4] is always tight, the lower bound of [5] becomes loose when the target distortion is smaller than a threshold. The main reason is because in the low-distortion regime, joint encoding requires transmission of the difference between the two sources, which conflicts with the maximum correlation assumption. For the two-terminal case with infinite bandwidth, Jain *et al.* [16] provided a composite lower bound using a cut-set argument. The lower bound is given by solving a minimization problem over the actual correlation between the transmitted signals. However, only the individual distortion constraint D was taken into account. In the following theorem, we present an improved lower bound using ideas from [20] by optimizing over the distortion matrix, which is defined as

$$\mathbf{D} \triangleq \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{D}[k], \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{D}[k] \triangleq \text{cov}(S_1[k] - \hat{S}_1[k], \dots, S_M[k] - \hat{S}_M[k]). \quad (4)$$

Theorem 1. *The minimum energy $\underline{E}(D)$ of sending multi-terminal Gaussian sources over the Gaussian MAC is lower bounded by*

$$\underline{E}(D) \geq E^{lb}(D) \triangleq \frac{2\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)}{M^2} \left[\frac{(M-1)^2 \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1)}{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) - \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1)} + 1 \right] \quad (5)$$

where

$$\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{(1-\rho)^M \phi(M, \rho)}{D^M (1-\theta^*)^M \phi(M, \theta^*)}, \quad (6)$$

$$\theta^* \triangleq \frac{1}{D} \max(0, D + \rho - 1), \quad (7)$$

$$\phi(L, x) \triangleq \frac{1 + (M-1)x}{1 + (M-L-1)x}. \quad (8)$$

Before proving the lower bound, we give a lemma stating that there is no performance loss in assuming that the resultant distortion matrix is circulant.

Lemma 1. Let $\tilde{E}(D)$ be the minimum energy achieved by a set of encoding functions $(f_1^{(K,N)}, \dots, f_M^{(K,N)})$ and decoding functions $(g_1^{(K,N)}, \dots, g_M^{(K,N)})$ such that the distortion matrix is circulant, $\mathbf{D} = d \cdot \mathbf{C}(1, \theta, M)$, with $\theta \in \left(-\frac{1}{M-1}, 1\right]$ and $d \leq D + \epsilon$. The circulant distortion matrix is optimal, i.e.,

$$\underline{E}(D) = \tilde{E}(D). \quad (9)$$

Proof: The optimality of circulant distortion matrix can be proved by a permutation and time-sharing argument using source symmetry and channel symmetry. \square

Proof of Theorem 1: For any nontrivial cut of the MAC, which only needs to be distinguished by the size of cut L ($L = 1, \dots, M$) due to symmetry, we first upper bound $I(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}; \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)} | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)})$ by (see an alternative proof for the two-terminal case in [16])²

$$I(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}; \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)} | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}) \leq I(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}; \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(N)} | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}) \quad (10)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^N I(Y[n]; \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(N)} | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}, Y[1] \cdots Y[n-1], X_{\mathcal{L}^c}[n]) \quad (11)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^N I(Y[n]; X_{\mathcal{L}}[n] | X_{\mathcal{L}^c}[n]) \quad (12)$$

$$\leq \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \log \left[1 + \text{var} \left(\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} X_l[n] \middle| X_{\mathcal{L}^c}[n] \right) \right] \quad (13)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \text{var} \left(\sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} X_l[n] \middle| X_{\mathcal{L}^c}[n] \right) \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N L(1 - \hat{\rho}_n) \phi(L, \hat{\rho}_n) \text{var}(X_m[n]) \quad (15)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} L(1 - \hat{\rho}) \phi(L, \hat{\rho}) \sum_{n=1}^N \text{var}(X_m[n]) \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} KL(1 - \hat{\rho}) \phi(L, \hat{\rho}) \underline{E}(D), \quad (17)$$

where

- (10) follows from the Markov chain of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(N)} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Y}^{(N)}$;
- (11) follows from the chain rule of mutual information, and $X_{\mathcal{L}^c}[n]$ are functions of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}$.
- (12) follows since the channel is memoryless;
- (13) follows from the Gaussian MAC channel model and the maximum entropy theorem;

²We define $\mathcal{L} \triangleq \{1, \dots, L\}$ and $\mathcal{L}^c \triangleq \{L, \dots, M\}$. With abuse of notation, we denote a set of variables by subscripting the set of their indices, for example, we denote $S_1^{(K)}, \dots, S_L^{(K)}$ by $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)}$.

- (14) is due to $\log(1+x) \leq x$ ($x \geq 0$);
- (15) follows by proving transmitted signals are symmetric due to the symmetry of sources and channel, $\text{cov}(X_1[n] \cdots X_M[n]) = \text{var}(X_m[n]) \mathbf{C}(1, \hat{\rho}_n, M)$, and some calculations on this circulant matrix. The transmission correlation at time n , $\hat{\rho}_n \triangleq \frac{\text{E}(X_1[n]X_2[n])}{\sqrt{\text{var}(X_1[n])\text{var}(X_2[n])}}$ is bounded by the maximum correlation theory, $\hat{\rho}_n \in \left(\max\left(-\frac{1}{M-1}, -\rho\right), \rho\right)$ (cf. [5, Lemma B.2]).
- (16) follows from the concavity on $\text{var}(X_m[n])$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$, which literally results from mutual information's concavity on the marginal distribution of (X_1, \dots, X_M) . We define $\hat{\rho} \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{N=1}^n \hat{\rho}_n$ which falls in the same range of $\hat{\rho}_n$;
- (17) uses the achievability definition after ignoring the ϵ in the asymptotical argument.

On the other hand, we lower bound $I(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}; \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)} | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)})$ by

$$I(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}; \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)} | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}) \geq Kh(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}) - \sum_{k=1}^K h(S_{\mathcal{L}}[k] | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(N)}) \quad (18)$$

$$= Kh(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}) - \sum_{k=1}^K h(S_{\mathcal{L}}[k] | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}, \mathbf{Y}^{(N)}, \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}}[k], \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}[k]) \quad (19)$$

$$\geq Kh(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}) - \sum_{k=1}^K h(S_{\mathcal{L}}[k] | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}[k], \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}}[k], \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}[k]) \quad (20)$$

$$\geq Kh(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}) - Kh(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}, \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}}, \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}) \quad (21)$$

$$= Kh(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}) - Kh(S'_{1,L}(\gamma) - \hat{S}'_{1,L}(\gamma), \dots, S'_{l,L}(\gamma) - \hat{S}'_{l,L}(\gamma) | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}, \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}}, \hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}) \quad (22)$$

$$\geq Kh(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c}) - Kh(S'_{1,L}(\gamma) - \hat{S}'_{1,L}(\gamma), \dots, S'_{l,L}(\gamma) - \hat{S}'_{l,L}(\gamma)) \quad (23)$$

$$\geq \frac{K}{2} \log \frac{|\text{cov}(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c})|}{|\mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{\Gamma}^T|}, \quad (24)$$

in which

- (18) is due to the independence bound on entropy;
- (19) follows since $\hat{S}_1[k], \dots, \hat{S}_M[k]$ are functions of $\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}$;
- (20) and (23) follow from conditioning reduces entropy;
- (21) follows from entropy is concave on distributions (we omit time index k in the single-letter characterization that follows);
- In (22), we introduce $S'_{l,L}(\gamma) \triangleq S_l - \gamma \sum_{m=L+1}^M S_m$ and $\hat{S}'_{l,L}(\gamma) \triangleq \hat{S}_l - \gamma \sum_{m=L+1}^M \hat{S}_m$ ($l = 1, \dots, M$; $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$);
- (24) is due to the maximum entropy theorem with $\mathbf{\Gamma} = [\mathbf{I}_{L \times L} \quad -\gamma \mathbf{1}_{L \times (M-L)}]$.

Since the inequalities hold for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, we maximize (23) over γ , which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}; \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}}^{(K)} | \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}^{(K)}) &\geq \max_{\gamma} \frac{K}{2} \log \frac{|\text{cov}(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c})|}{|\mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{\Gamma}^T|} \\ &= \frac{K}{2} \log \frac{|\text{cov}(S_{\mathcal{L}} | S_{\mathcal{L}^c})|}{|\mathbf{\Gamma} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{\Gamma}^T|} \Bigg|_{\gamma = \frac{\theta}{1 + (M-L-1)\theta}} = K \bar{R}(d, \theta, L), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

with

$$\bar{R}(d, \theta, L) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{(1-\rho)^L \phi(L, \rho)}{d^L (1-\theta)^L \phi(L, \theta)}. \quad (26)$$

By augmenting the conditioning with $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}$ in (21), we are able to improve the lower bound over that in [16]. However, we only gain when $D \geq 1 - \rho$ such that $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}^c}$ are correlated with $\hat{S}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

By connecting (24) and (25) and noting that

- the bound is valid for $L = 1, \dots, M$ and the maximum over all cut-sets applies to the minimum energy,
- any feasible schemes are subject to the constraints of $\hat{\rho} \in \left(\max\left(-\frac{1}{M-1}, -\rho\right), \rho \right)$, $0 \leq D \leq \Sigma_S$, $d \leq D$,

we lower bound the minimum energy by

$$\underline{E}(D) \geq \inf_{\substack{0 \leq D \leq \Sigma_S, d \leq D \\ \hat{\rho} \in \left(\max\left(-\frac{1}{M-1}, -\rho\right), \rho\right)}} \max_L \left\{ \frac{2 \bar{R}(d, \theta, L)}{L(1-\hat{\rho}) \phi(L, \hat{\rho})} \right\}. \quad (27)$$

In the sequel, we evaluate the min-max by optimizing over d, θ , and $\hat{\rho}$.

We first optimize over θ and d . It can be verified that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \bar{R}(d, \theta, L) = \theta \cdot \frac{L[(M-1)(1+(M-L-1)\theta) + M-L]}{2(1-\theta)[1+(M-1)\theta][1+(M-L-1)\theta]}, \quad (28)$$

which has the same sign as θ , i.e., $\bar{R}(d, \theta, L)$ is minimized by the minimum nonnegative θ that is allowable in (29), and $\bar{R}(d, \theta, L)$ is monotonically decreasing in d . Using Lemma 1, we are ready to translate the positive semi-definite constraint to one on the eigenvalues, which yields

$$\max \left[-\frac{1}{M-1}, 1 - \frac{1-\rho}{d} \right] \leq \theta \leq \min \left[1, \frac{1-d}{(M-1)d} + \frac{\rho}{d} \right]. \quad (29)$$

Those properties are independent of L , and hence the optimality holds at $d = D$, $\theta = \frac{1}{D} \max(0, D + \rho - 1)$.

The next step is to optimize over $\hat{\rho}$. We denote the cut-set bounds (component objective functions) by

$$\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L) \triangleq \frac{2 \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)}{L(1-\hat{\rho}) \phi(L, \hat{\rho})}. \quad (30)$$

As a numerical example, the individual cut-set bounds are evaluated over all $\hat{\rho} \in [0, \rho]$ in Fig. 1 for the case $M = 10$, $\rho = 0.5$ and $D = 0.5$ (we only plot over positive $\hat{\rho}$, because all $\hat{E}(D, L, \hat{\rho})$'s monotonically




Figure 1. $\hat{E}(D, L, \hat{\rho})|_{D=0.5}$ for the case $M = 10$ and $\rho = 0.5$.

and rapidly increase to infinity with negative $\hat{\rho}$, and moreover we will show that the min-max is always achieved by positive transmission correlation).

In the sequel, we prove that there exists a unique transmission correlation in $[0, \rho]$ achieving the min-max,

$$\hat{\rho}^*(D) = \frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) - M\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1)}{M(M-2)\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1) + \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)}. \quad (31)$$

which is the intersection $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, 1) = \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M)$.

1) When $\hat{\rho} < \hat{\rho}^*(D)$, we observe that

$$\max_L \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L) \geq \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M) \geq \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*, M), \quad (32)$$

where we use that $\hat{E}(\hat{\rho}, M, D)$ monotonically decreases with $\hat{\rho}$.

2) When $\hat{\rho} \geq \hat{\rho}^*$,

$$\max_L \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L) \geq \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, 1) \geq \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*, 1) = \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*, M), \quad (33)$$

noticing that $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ increases with $\hat{\rho}$.

3) When $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}^*$, we need the following lemma, whose proof will be given in Appendix A.

Lemma 2. When $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}^*(D)$,

$$\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), L) \leq \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), M) \quad (\forall L \neq 1 \text{ or } M). \quad (34)$$

Therefore,

$$\max_L \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), L) = \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), M). \quad (35)$$

Combining (32), (33), and (35), it holds that

$$\inf_{\hat{\rho} \in (\max(-\frac{1}{M-1}, -\rho), \rho)} \max_L \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L) = \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), M). \quad (36)$$

The proof is now complete by the existence and uniqueness of $\hat{\rho}^*(D)$ proved in the following lemma, whose proof will be given in Appendix B.

Lemma 3. For any fixed D , there exists one and only one point in $[0, \rho]$,

$$\hat{\rho}^*(D) = \frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) - M\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1)}{M(M-2)\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1) + \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)} \quad (37)$$

such that $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, 1) = \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M)$, which achieves the min-max. \square

The objective function $\max_L \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L)$ is shown in Fig. 2 over $0 \leq \hat{\rho} \leq \rho$ and $0 \leq D \leq 1$ for the case $M = 10$, $\rho = 0.5$. In order to offset changes along with D , we normalize the objective function with $\max_{0 \leq \hat{\rho} \leq \rho} \max_L \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L)$. The optimal transmission correlation $\hat{\rho}^*(D)$ is also shown in the figure, which indeed achieves the min-max.

At last, we make an observation on the optimal transmission correlation dictated by the lower bound for the limit cases of $D = 0$ and $D = 1$.

Proposition 1. The optimal transmission correlation for the limit cases is

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \hat{\rho}^*(D) = 0, \quad (38)$$

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \hat{\rho}^*(D) = \rho. \quad (39)$$

that is, in the low-energy regime the optimal transmission correlation tends to the maximum correlation ρ , whereas in the low-energy regime the optimal transmitted signals tends to be uncorrelated.

Proof: When $D \rightarrow 0$, $\theta^* = 0$,

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \hat{\rho}^*(D) = \lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \frac{\frac{1}{M} \log \phi(M, \rho) - \log \phi(1, \rho)}{\log [(1 - \rho)^{M-1} \phi(M, \rho) \phi(1, \rho)^{M-2}] - (M-1) \log D} = 0. \quad (40)$$




Figure 2. $\max_L \hat{E}(D, L, \hat{\rho})$ plotted over D and $\hat{\rho}$ for the case $M = 10$ and $\rho = 0.5$.

When $D \rightarrow 1$, we have $\theta^* = 1 - \frac{1-\rho}{D}$, and $\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\phi(L, \rho)}{\phi(L, \theta^*)}$. Noting that $\lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \theta^* = \rho$, it follows that

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \hat{\rho}^*(D) = \lim_{\theta^* \rightarrow \rho} \frac{\frac{d}{d\theta^*} \left[\frac{1}{M} \log \phi(M, \theta^*) - \log \phi(1, \theta^*) \right]}{\frac{d}{d\theta^*} \left[\frac{1}{M} \log \phi(M, \theta^*) + (M-2) \log \phi(1, \theta^*) \right]} = \rho. \quad (41)$$

□

C. Uncoded Transmission

An upper bound on the minimum energy is given by the uncoded transmission. The consideration of uncoded transmission is motivated by its low complexity and by its optimality (or partial optimality) shown in related joint source-channel coding problems [4], [5]. In [5] and [16], a bandwidth-matched uncoded scheme is considered, in which each encoder only sends a scaled version of its observed source, and thus the decoder received a noisy sum of the sources.

We consider a new uncoded transmission scheme, in which each encoder sends M scaled versions of the source over M orthogonal subchannels. The motivation is to improve energy efficiency by utilizing a larger bandwidth ratio (number of channel uses per source sample). The scheme is described as follows. Denote the coefficient matrix by $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ with $(\mathbf{A})_{ij}$ being the coefficient used by the j th encoder

over the i th subchannel, and we only consider the non-degenerate case where \mathbf{A} is non-singular. The base station receives

$$[Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_M]^T = \mathbf{A} \cdot [S_1, S_2, \dots, S_M]^T + [Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_M]^T,$$

where $[Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_M]$ are i.i.d. unit-variance Gaussian noises over subchannels.

Theorem 2. *In uncoded transmission of M -terminal Gaussian sources, it is sufficient that each encoder transmits M scaled version of the source over M subchannels. The optimal uncoded transmission achieves*

$$E^u(D) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{D} - \frac{[1+(M-2)\rho]}{(1-\rho)[1+(M-1)\rho]}, & D \leq 1 - \rho; \\ \frac{1-D}{[1+(M-1)\rho][MD-(M-1)(1-\rho)]}, & D > 1 - \rho. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

giving an upper bound on the minimum energy.

Proof: Using the received signals, the receiver makes MMSE estimation of the sources from the received signals,

$$[\hat{S}_1, \hat{S}_2, \dots, \hat{S}_M]^T = \mathbf{\Sigma}_S \mathbf{A}^T (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{\Sigma}_S \mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{I})^{-1} [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_M]^T \quad (43)$$

and achieves a distortion matrix

$$\mathbf{D} = \text{cov}([S_1, S_2, \dots, S_M] | [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_M]) = (\mathbf{\Sigma}_S^{-1} + \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A})^{-1}. \quad (44)$$

Minimizing the transmission energy under a symmetric distortion constraint can be described by an optimization problem,

$$\min \quad \frac{1}{M} \text{trace}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}) = \frac{1}{M} \text{trace}(\mathbf{D}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_S^{-1}), \quad (45)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad 0 \preceq \mathbf{D} \preceq \mathbf{\Sigma}_S, \quad (46)$$

$$(\mathbf{D})_{ii} \leq D, \quad (i = 1, \dots, M). \quad (47)$$

Before solving the problem, we first prove that it is optimal to transmit M linear combinations of the sources, *i.e.*, to use a scale matrix with M rows. Suppose that a matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{M' \times M}$ ($M' > M$) is optimal. We note that the distortion (44) and energy (45) only depends on $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, which is an $M \times M$ matrix. There must exist some coefficient matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$ *s.t.* $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, and hence the optimal energy-distortion performance is achieved.

We assume $\mathbf{D}^* = \mathbf{C}(d, d\theta, M)$ without loss of optimality (cf. Lemma 1), and it is equivalently transformed to the one below using symmetric circulant matrices' properties,

$$\min \quad \frac{1}{M} \text{trace}(\mathbf{D}^{-1}) = \frac{1 + (M-2)\theta}{d(1-\theta)[1 + (M-1)\theta]}, \quad (48)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \max \left[-\frac{1}{M-1}, 1 - \frac{1-\rho}{d} \right] \leq \theta \leq \min \left[1, \frac{1-d}{(M-1)d} + \frac{\rho}{d} \right], \quad (49)$$

$$d \leq D. \quad (50)$$

Therefore, the optimal distortion matrix is

$$d^* = D, \quad (51)$$

$$\theta^* = \frac{1}{D} \max(0, D + \rho - 1), \quad (52)$$

where we use that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \text{trace}(\mathbf{D}^{-1}) = \theta \cdot \frac{(M-1)[(M-2)\theta + 2]}{d(\theta-2)^2[(M-2)\theta + 1]^2}, \quad (53)$$

has the same sign as θ , and d^*, θ^* lead to the energy distortion function in (42).

We assume that the coefficient matrix is also circulant and symmetric, $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{C}(a, b, M)$, that is, over the m -th channel use, only encoder m takes the coefficient a , and all the rest take b . Therefore, under the symmetric and circulant constraint, we can solve find an optimal coefficient matrix. ■

The uncoded transmission with bandwidth expansion is compared to that without bandwidth expansion in Fig. 3. It improves energy efficiency in the high-energy region ($D \leq 1 - \rho$). In the uncoded without bandwidth expansion the distortion cannot go lower than $\frac{(M-1)(1-\rho)}{M}$ even with infinite power due to the interference from the encoders (see also [5]). Whereas in the uncoded with bandwidth expansion, arbitrarily small distortion can be achieved with large enough energy.

As shown in the Fig. 3, the uncoded is asymptotically optimal (approaching the lower bound with the same slope) in the low-energy region, which we rigorously prove in the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *The uncoded transmission achieves the same energy-distortion slope as the lower bound does in the low-energy region.*

Proof: In the low-energy region, $\theta^* = \frac{D+\rho-1}{D}$, and it holds,

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \frac{d}{dD} E^{lb}(D) = \lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \frac{2 \frac{d}{dD} \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)}{M[1 + (M-1)\hat{\rho}^*(D)]} = -\frac{1}{[1 + (M-1)\rho]^2}, \quad (54)$$




Figure 3. Uncoded transmissions.

where we use $\lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) = 0$ and $\lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \frac{d\hat{\rho}^*(D)}{dD} < \infty$. By differentiating the uncoded energy-distortion function in (42), we verify that

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \frac{d}{dD} E^{lb}(D) = \lim_{D \rightarrow 1} \frac{d}{dD} E^u(D). \quad (55)$$

□

D. Separation Scheme

Motivated by its optimality in the point-to-point scenario, another achievable scheme is separate source and channel coding. In this scheme, the Gaussian multi-terminal sources are first compressed to the minimum sum rate, and then the encoded bits are transmitted over the MAC with the minimum transmission energy $E_{b \min}$ per bit.

Theorem 3. *The separation scheme can achieve the following energy distortion function*

$$E^s(D) = \frac{1}{M} \log \left[\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{q(D)} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{q(D)} \right)^{M-1} \right], \quad (56)$$

with

$$\lambda_1 \triangleq 1 + (M - 1)\rho, \quad (57)$$

$$\lambda_2 \triangleq 1 - \rho, \quad (58)$$

$$q(D) = \frac{\beta(D) + \sqrt{\beta(D)^2 + 4\lambda_1\lambda_2D(1-D)}}{2(1-D)}, \quad (59)$$

$$\beta(D) = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)D - \lambda_1\lambda_2, \quad (60)$$

which upper bounds the minimum energy $\underline{E}(D)$.

Proof: In [17]–[19], the sum rate tightness is proved for the Gaussian multi-terminal source coding such that the distortion constraint (on individual source) is satisfied. The encoded bits can be transmitted with the minimum energy N_0 joules per bit, since the indices of source coding are independent [13]. Hence, the separation scheme can achieve the following energy-distortion function,

$$\min \frac{1}{M} \log \frac{|\Sigma_S|}{|\mathbf{D}|}, \quad (61)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{D} = \left(\Sigma_S^{-1} + \frac{1}{q} \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1}, \quad (62)$$

$$(\mathbf{D})_{ii} \leq D \quad (i = 1, \dots, M), \quad (63)$$

$$q \geq 0. \quad (64)$$

The optimal solution of q can be found as given in (59). Note that the distortion matrix achieved by the separation scheme is always circulant, and in the optimal case, it is $\mathbf{D} = D \mathbf{C}(1, \theta^*, M)$ with

$$\theta^* = \frac{\rho q}{q + \lambda_1 \lambda_2}. \quad (65)$$

□

The separation scheme is compared to the uncoded transmission and to the lower bound in Fig. 4. It improves energy efficiency in the high-energy regime. As shown in the Fig. 4, in the high-energy regime, the uncoded scheme, $E^u(D) \approx \frac{1}{D}$, has infinitely gap from the lower bound, *i.e.*, $\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} [E^u(D) - E^{lb}(D)] = \infty$; in contrast, the separation scheme, $E^s(D) \approx \log \frac{1}{D}$, can keep the gap from the lower bound finite, although both of them tend to infinity, which we rigorously prove in the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *In the high-energy regime ($D \rightarrow 0$), the gap between the separation and the lower bound is finite,*

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} [E^s(D) - E^{lb}(D)] = \frac{1}{M} \log \frac{(\lambda_1 - \rho)^M}{\lambda_1^{M-1} \lambda_2}. \quad (66)$$




Figure 4. Separation scheme.

As the number of terminals increases, the gap tends to zero, i.e., the separate scheme is asymptotically optimal,

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{D \rightarrow 0} [E^s(D) - E^{lb}(D)] = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \log \frac{(\lambda_1 - \rho)^M}{\lambda_1^{M-1} \lambda_2} = 0. \quad (67)$$

Proof: We first prove that as $D \rightarrow 0$ the separation approaches $\frac{2}{M} \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)$,

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \left[E^s(D) - \frac{2}{M} \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) \right] = \frac{1}{M} \lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \log \frac{(q(D) + \lambda_1)(q(D) + \lambda_2)^{M-1}}{\lambda_1^{M-1} \lambda_2} - \lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \log \frac{q(D)}{D} = 0, \quad (68)$$

in which we use $\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} q(D) = 0$ and $\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \frac{q(D)}{D} = \lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \frac{dq(D)}{dD} = 1$ (see (59)).

In addition, we prove that the lower bound keeps a finite gap away from $\frac{2}{M} \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)$, which is a cut-set bound of a size- M cut with transmission correlation restricted to be zero,

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{2}{M} \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) - E^{lb}(D) \right] = \lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \frac{2(M-1)(\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) - M\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1))}{M^2 \left(1 - \frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1)}{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)} \right)} = \frac{1}{M} \log \frac{(\lambda_1 - \rho)^M}{\lambda_1^{M-1} \lambda_2} \quad (69)$$

where we use

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow 0} (\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) - M\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1)) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{(\lambda_1 - \rho)^M}{\lambda_1^{M-1} \lambda_2}, \text{ and } \lim_{D \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1)}{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)} = \frac{1}{M}.$$

Adding up (68) and (69) completes the proof of (66).

As M increases, one can verify that the separation scheme is asymptotically optimal in the high-energy region, $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \log \frac{(\lambda_1 - \rho)^M}{\lambda_1^{M-1} \lambda_2} = 0$. \square

E. Hybrid Digital/Analog Scheme

We propose the following hybrid scheme, in which each encoder first transmits αS_m using an identical scale factor $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the decoder receives the sum of sources plus channel noise. Using that received signal as receiver side information, we employ Gaussian quantization and Slepian-Wolf coding to transmit the remaining fine information to meet the target distortion.

Theorem 4. *The minimum energy is upper bounded by*

$$\underline{E}(D) \leq E^h(D) = \min_{\alpha, q: \alpha \geq 0, q \geq 0, \left[(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_S^{-1} + \alpha^2 \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{q} \mathbf{I})^{-1} \right]_{ii} \leq D (i=1, \dots, M)} \alpha^2 + \frac{1}{M} \log \left| \mathbf{I} + \frac{1}{q} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_S^{-1} + \alpha^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \right|, \quad (70)$$

which is achieved by the proposed hybrid digital/analog scheme.

Proof: In the hybrid scheme, analog and digital signals are transmitted over separate sub-channels. For the analog transmission, each encoder sends a scaled version of the source, and hence, the decoder receives

$$Y_a = \alpha \sum_{m=1}^M S_m + Z.$$

In the digital transmission, Y_a is used as side information, and the minimum achievable sum rate is

$$R_{sum} = I(S_1 \cdots S_M; \tilde{S}_1 \cdots \tilde{S}_M | Y_a) = h(S_1 \cdots S_M | Y_a) - h(S_1 \cdots S_M | Y_a \tilde{S}_1 \cdots \tilde{S}_M). \quad (71)$$

where \tilde{S}_m is the quantized version of the source, $\tilde{S}_m = S_m + Q_m$. The covariance matrix is given by

$$\text{cov}(S_1 \cdots S_M \tilde{S}_1 \cdots \tilde{S}_M | Y_a) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M) & \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M) \\ \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M) & \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta + q, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (72)$$

with

$$\delta \triangleq \frac{[\mathbb{E}(S_m Y_a)]^2}{\mathbb{E}(Y_a^2)} = \frac{[1 + (M-1)\rho]^2 \alpha^2 \sigma_0^4}{M[1 + (M-1)\rho] \alpha^2 \sigma_0^2 + N_0/2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h(S_1 \cdots S_M | Y_a) &= \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e)^M |\mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M)| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{(2\pi e \sigma_0^2)^M (1-\rho)^{M-1} [1 + (M-1)\rho] N_0}{2M[1 + (M-1)\rho] \alpha^2 \sigma_0^2 + N_0} \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& h(S_1 \cdots S_M | Y_a \tilde{S}_1 \cdots \tilde{S}_M) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e)^M \left| \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M) \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 + q - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M)^{-1} \mathbf{C}(\sigma_0^2 - \delta, \rho\sigma_0^2 - \delta, M) \right| \quad (74)
\end{aligned}$$

The decoder can recover $\tilde{S}_1 \cdots \tilde{S}_M$ with vanishing probability of error, and use $\tilde{S}_1 \cdots \tilde{S}_M$ and Y_a to estimate the source S_m . Equivalently, the MMSE estimation is made from \tilde{S}_m , $\sum_{m'=1, m' \neq m}^M \tilde{S}'_{m'}$, and Y_a , and the minimum achievable distortion is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(S_m - \zeta_1 \tilde{S}_m - \zeta_2 \sum_{m'=1, m' \neq m}^M \tilde{S}'_{m'} - \zeta_3 Y_a \right)^2 \\
&= \sigma_0^2 q \frac{(1-\rho)[1+(M-1)\rho][2(M-1)\alpha^2 q + N_0]\sigma_0^2 + qN_0}{[(1-\rho)\sigma_0^2 + q][(1+(M-1)\rho)(2M\alpha^2 q + N_0)\sigma_0^2 + qN_0]} \quad (75)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\zeta_1 = \sigma_0^2 \frac{(1-\rho)[1+(M-1)\rho][2(M-1)\alpha^2 q + N_0]\sigma_0^2 + qN_0}{[(1-\rho)\sigma_0^2 + q][(1+(M-1)\rho)(2M\alpha^2 q + N_0)\sigma_0^2 + qN_0]}, \quad (76)$$

$$\zeta_2 = \sigma_0^2 q \frac{\rho N_0 - 2(1-\rho)[1+(M-1)\rho]\alpha^2 \sigma_0^2}{[(1-\rho)\sigma_0^2 + q][(1+(M-1)\rho)(2M\alpha^2 q + N_0)\sigma_0^2 + qN_0]}, \quad (77)$$

$$\zeta_3 = \frac{2[1+(M-1)\rho]\alpha q \sigma_0^2}{[1+(M-1)\rho](2M\alpha^2 q + N_0)\sigma_0^2 + qN_0}. \quad (78)$$

■

The energy-distortion function of hybrid digital/analog scheme is plotted in Fig. 5. We observe from the numerical result that the maximum gap between the upper and lower bounds happens at $D = 1 - \rho$. Without a close-form energy-distortion function of the hybrid scheme (the best upper bound), we cannot prove it rigorously; however it is indeed the case as shown numerically. For the case of $M = 10$ and $\rho = 0.5$, the maximum gap is

$$E^h(D) - E^{lb} \leq E^h(D) - E^{lb}(D) \Big|_{D=1-\rho} = 0.0586 \text{ Joules}; \quad (79)$$

and for the case of $M = 20$ and $\rho = 0.3$, the maximum gap is

$$E^h(D) - E^{lb} \leq E^h(D) - E^{lb}(D) \Big|_{D=1-\rho} = 0.0142 \text{ Joules}. \quad (80)$$

III. GAUSSIAN CEO SOURCES

In this section, we study lossy transmission of the Gaussian CEO sources over the Gaussian MAC.




Figure 5. Upper and lower bounds on $\underline{E}(D)$.

A. Problem Setup

The well known Gaussian CEO problem is that a CEO, the central decoder, is interested in a remote Gaussian source $S_0[k]$ i.i.d. $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2)$, and deploys M agents (encoders) to observe a noisy version of $S_0[k]$,

$$S_m[k] = S_0[k] + W_m[k],$$

where observation noises $W_m[k]$'s are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{W_m}^2)$, and independent of the remote sources $S_0[k]$. In the source coding literatures, of interests is the rate distortion region, defined as the set of achievable rate tuples at the encoders such that the distortion constraint on S_0 is satisfied. In this setup, we study the problem where those encoders convey information to the decoder over the Gaussian MAC. We denote the encoder as a coding function $f_m(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, which is a mapping of source sequences $\mathbf{S}_m^{(K)}$ to channel codewords $\mathbf{X}_m^{(N)}$. Hence, instead of rates, transmission energy is the appropriate cost measure, and the energy of individual encoder (per source sample) is defined as

$$E_m = \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}_m^{(N)}\|_2^2]. \quad (81)$$

The decoder reconstructs $S_0[k]$ from the received signal $\mathbf{Y}^{(N)}$ from the MAC. For each source sample (indexed by k), we denote the decoder mapping as a reconstruction function, $g_k(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, the performance is measured with the mean squared error (MSE)

$$d(S_0[k], \hat{S}_0[k]) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{[S_0[k] - g_k(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)})]^2\}.$$

Hereinafter, we use the *symmetric* case with $\sigma_{W_m}^2 = \sigma_W^2$ for all $1 \leq m \leq M$ to illustrate the results. And for the symmetric case, we study the achievable sum energy for a given distortion constraint, and the achievability is defined rigorously in the following.

Definition 2. *For the symmetric Gaussian CEO problem with the Gaussian MAC, a sum transmission energy E is achievable for a given distortion constraint D if there exist a sequence of $f_m(\cdot)$ and a sequence of $g_k(\cdot)$ such that*

$$\limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}[\|f_m(\mathbf{S}_m^{(K)})\|_2^2] \leq E, \quad (82)$$

and

$$\limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K d(S_0[k], g_k(\mathbf{Y}^{(N)})) \leq D. \quad (83)$$

Before presenting our results, we show that, without loss of generality and optimality, the encoder functions and transmitted signals can be restricted to be the following simpler forms, which would simplify derivations of our results.

Lemma 4. *For the symmetric Gaussian CEO problem, there is no performance loss using encoding functions and signals that satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_m[n]] = 0, \quad (84)$$

$$K_1 = \dots = K_M \triangleq K, \quad (85)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[(X_1[n])^2] = \dots = \mathbb{E}[(X_M[n])^2], \quad (86)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{m_1}[n] \cdot X_{m_2}[n]] = \hat{\rho}_n \mathbb{E}[(X_1[n])^2], \quad (87)$$

$$0 \leq \hat{\rho}_n \leq \rho \triangleq \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_W^2}, \quad (88)$$

$$1 \leq m_1, m_2 \leq M, \text{ and } m_1 \neq m_2.$$

Proof: (84) is true due to the fact that the mean value does not carry any information, and hence can be subtracted from the encoded signals without performance loss.

The symmetry of encoding functions and outputs in (85)–(87) can be proved by a permutation argument using the symmetric properties of the observation processes and the MAC.

Finally we can change the sign of each encoded signal and assume $\hat{\rho}_n \geq 0$ without any performance loss; the second inequality in (88) follows from the maximum correlation theorem [21], since $X_m[n]$ is a function of S_m^K . ■

Lemma 5. If (S_0, S_1, \dots, S_M) are zero-mean joint Gaussian random variables that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}[S_{m_1}] &= \text{var}[S_{m_2}], \\ \text{E}[S_{m_1}S_0] &= \text{E}[S_{m_2}S_0], \\ \text{E}[S_{m_1}S_{m_2}] &= \text{E}[S_{m_3}S_{m_4}]\end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \leq m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4 \leq M$ and $m_1 \neq m_2, m_3 \neq m_4$, then $\sum_{m=1}^M S_m$ is a sufficient statistic for S_0 relative to (S_1, \dots, S_M) .

Proof: It can be verified that $I(S_0; S_1, \dots, S_M) = I\left(S_0; \sum_{m=1}^M S_m\right)$. ■

B. Lower Bound

A lower bound on the transmission energy is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 5. For the symmetric Gaussian CEO problem over the Gaussian MAC, the energy $E_s(N_0, \sigma_0^2, \sigma_W^2, M, D)$ is lower bounded by

$$E \geq \min_{0 \leq \hat{\rho}_n \leq \rho} \max_{L \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \frac{MN_0 R_L(D)}{h_L(\rho)}, \quad (89)$$

where

$$R_L(D) \triangleq \begin{cases} +\infty, & D \in [0, \delta(M)]; \\ -\frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left[\frac{D - \frac{\sigma_W^2}{L} \left(1 - \frac{D}{\delta(M-L)}\right)}{\delta(M-L)} \right], & D \in (\delta(M), \delta(M-L)]; \\ 0, & D \in (\delta(M-L), \infty); \end{cases} \quad (90)$$

$$\delta(x) \triangleq \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{x}{\sigma_W^2} \right)^{-1}, \quad (91)$$

$$h_L(\hat{\rho}_n) \triangleq L + L(L-1)\hat{\rho}_n - L^2 \frac{(M-L)\hat{\rho}_n^2}{1 + (M-L-1)\hat{\rho}_n}. \quad (92)$$

Proof: Following standard arguments [4], [6], [16], we have

$$KR_L(D) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{1}_L^T \text{E}[\mathbf{X}_1^L[n] \mathbf{X}_1^L[n]^T | \mathbf{X}_{L+1}^M[n]] \mathbf{1}_L}{N_0/2} \right),$$

where $\mathbf{1}_L$ is an all one $L \times 1$ vector, and $\mathbf{X}_1^L[n]$ denotes $(X_1[n], \dots, X_L[n])^T$ (similarly for $\mathbf{X}_{L+1}^M[n]$). Note that $R_L(D)$ is the rate-distortion function of jointly encoding $S_1^K \dots S_L^K$ for the remote source S_0^K with $S_{L+1}^K \dots S_M^K$ available at both the encoder and the decoder (cf. [22]). $R_L(D)$ can be easily calculated using lemma 5.

By lemma 4, the covariance matrix of $(X_1[n] \cdots, X_M[n])$ is circulant symmetric with diagonal elements $\text{var}(X_m[n])$ and off-diagonal elements $\hat{\rho}_n \text{var}(X_m[n])$. It can be calculated explicitly that

$$\mathbf{1}_L^T \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{X}_1^L[n] \mathbf{X}_1^L[n]^T | \mathbf{X}_{L+1}^M[n]] \mathbf{1}_L = \text{var}(X_m[n]) h_L(\hat{\rho}_n)$$

We continue the inequalities above with

$$K R_L(D) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{N}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{2K E_s h_L(\rho)}{NMN_0} \right) \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{K E_s h_L(\rho)}{MN_0}. \quad (93)$$

where (a) follows from concavity of the logarithmic function and (b) is due to $\log(1+x) \leq x$ when $x \geq 0$.

For any $\hat{\rho}_n$, the inequality holds for all $1 \leq L \leq M$, and each L gives a lower bound on the minimum energy. Hence, the energy is lower bounded by the maximum of them. The proof of the lower bound can be concluded by noting that transmitted signals' correlation must satisfy $0 \leq \hat{\rho}_n \leq \rho$ (cf. Lemma 4). ■

Note that tightness of the lower bound in Theorem 5 requires

- 1) Joint encoding, i.e., full transmitter cooperation,
- 2) That for all n , $\hat{\rho}_n$ minimizes $\max_L \frac{MN_0 R_L(D)}{h_L(\rho)}$,
- 3) $\frac{K E_s}{NMN_0} \rightarrow 0$: $\frac{N}{K} \rightarrow \infty$ (wideband), and/or $\frac{E_s}{N_0} \rightarrow 0$ (low SNR), and/or $M \rightarrow \infty$ (large number of users).

C. Uncoded Transmission

For the symmetric CEO problem over the Gaussian MAC with matched bandwidth, Gastpar [4] proved that analog transmission is optimum – it matches a low bound on the transmission energy, which is a special case of Theorem 5 with $N = K$. In the analog scheme, each encoder transmits a scaled version of its observation according to the distortion constraint; the decoder makes a minimum MSE (MMSE) estimation of the remote source using the received signal. We restate the energy performance of the analog scheme in the following theorem.

Theorem 6. [4, Theorem 1] *For the symmetric Gaussian CEO problem with the Gaussian MAC, the energy (E_s^a satisfying*

$$\frac{E_s^a}{N_0} = \frac{(\sigma_0^2 - D)(\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_W^2)}{2[\sigma_0^2(MD - \sigma_W^2) + D\sigma_W^2]}, \quad (94)$$

is achieved with analog transmission.

The optimality of analog transmission is due to the fact that scaled observations add up to a sufficient statistic at the receiver, which is equivalent to joint encoding, and they achieve the maximum correlation, which leads to a beamforming gain while satisfying individual energy constraints.

In the general setup where source and channel bandwidths are not matched, the analog transmission is not optimal anymore, since it does not make full use of the channel bandwidth resources. Nevertheless, we have the following proposition that analog transmission is asymptotically optimal as the distortion goes to the source variance.

Proposition 4. *For the symmetric Gaussian CEO problem over the Gaussian MAC, analog transmission is asymptotically optimal in the high-distortion (low-energy) regime in the sense that it achieves the same slope as the lower bound in (89) when the distortion goes to the source variance.*

Proof: As $D \rightarrow \sigma_0^2$, and thus $D > \delta(M-L)$, $R_L(D) = 0$, for all $L < M$. Hence in the high-distortion regime, the lower bound in (89) reduces to $\frac{MR_M(D)}{\bar{h}_M(\rho) \log_2 e}$. Then

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow \sigma_0^2} \frac{d}{dD} \frac{E_s^a}{N_0} = \lim_{D \rightarrow \sigma_0^2} \frac{d}{dD} \frac{MR_M(D)}{\bar{h}_M(\rho) \log_2 e} = -\frac{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_W^2}{2M\sigma_0^4}.$$

■

D. Separation Scheme

Assuming separate source and channel coding, Oohama [23] found the optimal rate region, defined as the set of achievable rate tuples at the encoders such that the distortion constraint on S_0 is satisfied. The energy achieved by the separation scheme is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 7. *For the symmetric Gaussian CEO problem over the Gaussian MAC, the energy $E_s^d(N_0, \sigma_0^2, \sigma_W^2, M, D)$ satisfying*

$$\frac{E_s^d}{N_0} = \begin{cases} 0, & D \geq \sigma_0^2, \\ -\frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{D}{\sigma_0^2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_W^2}{M} \left(\frac{1}{D} - \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} \right) \right)^M \right], & \delta(M) < D < \sigma_0^2, \\ +\infty, & D \leq \delta(M), \end{cases} \quad (95)$$

(see (91) for the definition of $\delta(M)$) is achieved by separate source and channel coding.

Proof: The minimum sum-rate of Gaussian CEO source coding is found by Oohama [23]. Optimum channel codes, asymptotically achieving the capacity of the MAC with independent sources, are applied to the encoder outputs which are now independent (after binning/compression) and the minimum energy of transmitting one bit information through the MAC is $\frac{N_0}{\log_2 e}$, which can be achieved when infinite channel bandwidth is used [13]. Therefore, an equivalence can be built between the sum-rate of source coding and sum-energy consumption. ■

E. Hybrid Digital/Analog Transmission

We now propose an energy-efficient hybrid transmission scheme whose achievable energy is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 8. *For the symmetric Gaussian CEO over the Gaussian MAC, the energy $E_s^h(N_0, \sigma_0^2, \sigma_W^2, M, D)$ satisfying*

$$\frac{E_s^h}{N_0} = \min_{\left(\frac{E_a}{N_0}, q\right) \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{E_a}{N_0} + \frac{E_d}{N_0}. \quad (96)$$

is achieved by our proposed hybrid analog and digital transmission scheme, where E_a is the energy of analog transmission, E_d is that of digital transmission, and q is the quantization noise power. The digital energy is a function of E_a and q ,

$$\frac{E_d}{N_0} = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left| \text{cov} \left(\tilde{S}^M \mid Y_a \right) \right| - \frac{M}{2} \ln q, \quad (97)$$

where $\text{cov} \left(\tilde{S}^M \mid Y_a \right)$ is the covariance matrix of \tilde{S}^M given Y_a ,

$$\left| \text{cov} \left(\tilde{S}^M \mid Y_a \right) \right| = M \left[\sigma_0^2 - \frac{\left(\sigma_0^2 + \frac{\sigma_W^2}{M} \right)^2}{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_a^2} \right] (\sigma_W^2 + q)^{M-1} + (\sigma_W^2 + q)^M, \quad (98)$$

and σ_a^2 is the variance of the (observation and channel) noise in Y_a ,

$$\sigma_a^2 = \frac{\sigma_W^2}{M} + \frac{\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_W^2}{2M} \left(\frac{E_a}{N_0} \right)^{-1}. \quad (99)$$

The energy of hybrid transmission is optimized with respect to $\left(\frac{E_a}{N_0}, q \right)$ over the region

$$\mathcal{A} \triangleq \left\{ \left(\frac{E_a}{N_0}, q \right) \mid \underline{d} \left(\frac{E_a}{N_0}, q \right) = D, E_a \geq 0, q \geq 0 \right\} \quad (100)$$

where

$$\underline{d} \left(\frac{E_a}{N_0}, q \right) = \frac{\sigma_0^2 \left[\sigma_0^2 + \left(1 + 2 \frac{E_a}{N_0} (1 - \rho) \right) q \right]}{\left[M(1 - \rho) + 1 \right] \sigma_W^2 + \left[1 + 2 \frac{E_a}{N_0} (M\rho - \rho + 1) \right] q}. \quad (101)$$

Proof: Each user transmits the uncoded analog signal $X_m = \alpha S_m^3$ with $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{E_a}{M(\sigma_0^2 + \sigma_W^2)}}$. The base station receives

$$Y_a = S_0 + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M W_m + \frac{1}{\alpha M} Z,$$

after normalization, which is the source and an orthogonal noise with variance σ_a^2 (cf. (99)).

³Without ambiguity, we will drop indices k and n when discussing single-letter relations.

In addition to the analog transmission, $\frac{E_d}{N_0}$ is used to transmit digital (encoded) signals. Without loss of generality, we can assume orthogonal transmission using the bandwidth resource, such that digital and analog transmissions will not interfere with each other. We assume optimal quantization in the sense that each user is able to quantize its observation S_m to \tilde{S}_m so that the quantization error $Q_m = S_m - \tilde{S}_m$ is independent of the observations at all users and of the remote source S_0 , and $Q_m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, q)$. Note that, due to symmetry, q is identical for all users. Then, with Y_a as the receiver side information, the sum-rate of the quantized bits $R_d = I(S^M; \tilde{S}^M | Y_a)$ is achievable with arbitrarily small probability of encoding failure, as coding block length $K \rightarrow \infty$ [24]. With infinite bandwidth ($\frac{N}{K} \rightarrow \infty$), the minimum energy needed to transmit R_d bits through the MAC is $\frac{R_d}{\log_2 e}$ as (97). Note that the conditional covariance of \tilde{S}^M given Y_a is a circulant matrix and its determinant can be calculated explicitly as (98).

As $K, N \rightarrow \infty$, there exist source and channel codes such that the base station can decode \tilde{S}^M with arbitrarily small probability of error. Therefore, the minimum distortion \underline{d} is the MMSE between S_0 and $\tilde{S}_0 = E(S_0 | \mathbf{W})$ given $\mathbf{W} \triangleq \left(Y_a, \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \tilde{S}_m \right)^T$ (cf. lemma 5)

$$\underline{d} = \sigma_0^2 - E[S_0 \mathbf{W}^T] E[\mathbf{W} \mathbf{W}^T]^{-1} E[\mathbf{W} S_0],$$

as given in (101).

Consequently, for a given distortion D , the energy of hybrid transmission is minimized on the boundary with $\underline{d} = D$, as stated in the theorem. ■

Remark 1. *The analog energy decays as $\frac{1}{M}$ (cf. (94)). However, a digital scheme (see (95)) does not make good use of user number in the sense that when M is large enough,*

$$\frac{E_s^d}{N_0} \approx \frac{1}{2} \sigma_W^2 \left(\frac{1}{D} - \frac{1}{\sigma_0^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\sigma_0^2}{D},$$

which does not depend on the number of users M any more. When M is large, an alternative hybrid transmission scheme with lower complexity and negligible performance loss is to have only a part of M users transmit digital signals. The energy-distortion function of such hybrid schemes can be easily found following the proof of Theorem 8.

F. Numerical Results

Fig. 6 shows the energy vs. distortion of analog, digital, hybrid schemes as well as the lower bound on the entire range of achievable distortion. The parameters for the CEO problem are $\sigma_0^2 = 1$, $\sigma_W^2 = 0.001$, $M = 40$. In the high-distortion regime, analog transmission is optimal, as shown in Proposition 4. However, a digital scheme can use all the bandwidth resources, hence it outperforms in the low-distortion

regime. A hybrid scheme can take advantage of both the correlation and bandwidth, and therefore can achieve better energy efficiency. In addition, the hybrid scheme is much better than time-sharing of analog and digital schemes (which is also plotted in the figure for comparison purposes) because in a hybrid scheme, digital coding uses the analog signal as side information and only transmits the most useful information incrementally.




Figure 6. Energy per sample vs. desired distortion for the CEO problem over the MAC .

IV. CORRELATED BINARY SOURCES

In this section, we study an example of binary sources using hybrid transmission for energy efficiency.

A. Problem Setup

We consider a symmetric Slepian-Wolf problem with binary sources. We assume that each node observes an identically and independently distributed (i.i.d.) Bernoulli($\frac{1}{2}$) source with independent errors of probability P_c at the nodes. Therefore, the joint distribution of $(S_1 \cdots, S_M) \in \{-1, +1\}^M$ is

$$p(s_1 \cdots, s_M) = \frac{1}{2} [P_c^\eta (1 - P_c)^{M-\eta} + P_c^{M-\eta} (1 - P_c)^\eta],$$

where $\eta \triangleq |\{s_m | s_m = +1\}|$ is the number of +1's among the sources. The base station desires to reconstruct all the sources with vanishing probability of error.

B. Lower Bound

Theorem 9. *The individual transmission energy is lower bounded by*

$$\underline{E} = \min_{\hat{\rho}} \max_L \frac{2[1 + (M - L - 1)\hat{\rho}]}{L(1 - \hat{\rho})[1 + (M - 1)\hat{\rho}]} H(S_1 \cdots S_L | S_{L+1} \cdots S_M), \quad (102)$$

Proof:

$$KH(S_1 \cdots S_L | S_{L+1} \cdots S_M) \quad (103)$$

$$= H(\mathbf{S}_1^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_L^{(K)} | \mathbf{S}_{L+1}^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_M^{(K)}) \quad (104)$$

$$= I(\mathbf{S}_1^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_L^{(K)}; \mathbf{Y}^{(N)} | \mathbf{S}_{L+1}^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_M^{(K)}) + H(\mathbf{S}_1^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_L^{(K)} | \mathbf{S}_{L+1}^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_M^{(K)} \mathbf{Y}^{(N)}) \quad (105)$$

$$\leq I(\mathbf{S}_1^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_L^{(K)}; \mathbf{Y}^{(N)} | \mathbf{S}_{L+1}^{(K)} \cdots \mathbf{S}_M^{(K)}) + KLP_e^{(K,N)} \quad (106)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2}KL(1 - \hat{\rho})\phi(L, \hat{\rho})\underline{E} + KLP_e^{(K,N)}, \quad (107)$$

$$H(S_1 \cdots S_L | S_{L+1} \cdots S_M) = H(S_1 \cdots S_M) - H(S_{L+1} \cdots S_M) \quad (108)$$

Bound the correlation,

$$0 \leq \hat{\rho} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(S_1 S_2)}{\mathbb{E}(S_1^2)\mathbb{E}(S_2^2)} = (1 - 2P_c)^2, \quad (109)$$

or conditioned on $X_1 \leftrightarrow S_1 \leftrightarrow S_2 \leftrightarrow X_2$, and (X_1, X_2) are joint Gaussian,

$$0 \leq \hat{\rho} \leq \sqrt{1 - e^{-2I(S_1; S_2)}} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{4}[P_c^2 + (1 - P_c)^2]^{2[P_c^2 + (1 - P_c)^2]} [2P_c(1 - P_c)]^{4P_c(1 - P_c)}}, \quad (110)$$

□

C. Separation Scheme

The baseline scheme is the separate source and channel coding: the sources are encoded using Slepian-Wolf coding, and the Slepian-Wolf coding indexes are then transmitted over the MAC channel in the wideband regime. The Slepian-Wolf coding indexes are independent, and hence the following transmission energy is achievable using infinite channel bandwidth [13],

$$E^s = H(S_1, S_2, \cdots, S_M) \cdot N_0. \quad (111)$$

D. Hybrid Digital/Analog Transmission

In the sequel, we present a hybrid scheme to achieve better energy efficiency.

In the hybrid scheme, the sources are first transmitted directly over the analog channel using BPSK, *i.e.*, each transmitter sends αS_m ($m = 1, 2, \dots, M$, $\alpha \geq 0$). The received (and normalized by α) analog signal is

$$Y_a = \sum_{m=1}^M S_m + \frac{1}{\alpha} Z, \quad (112)$$

where Z is additive Gaussian noise with variance $N_0/2$. Given a source realization (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_M) , $Y_a \sim \mathcal{N}(2\eta - M, \frac{N_0}{2\alpha^2})$, hence the marginal distribution of Y_a is

$$f(y_a) = \sum_{\eta=0}^M \frac{\alpha \cdot p(\eta, M)}{\sqrt{\pi N_0}} \exp\left[-\frac{\alpha^2 (y_a - 2\eta + M)^2}{N_0}\right].$$

where $p(\eta, M) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \binom{M}{\eta} [P_e^\eta (1 - P_e)^{M-\eta} + P_e^{M-\eta} (1 - P_e)^\eta]$. Pure analog transmission is not enough for lossless reconstruction, so it must be followed by modified Slepian-Wolf encoding of some additional information. We use the following result.

Lemma 6. [*Slepian-Wolf with analog side information*] Consider the Slepian-Wolf problem, but assume that the receiver has the analog side-information Y_a . Then the sources can be recovered with probability of error that can be made arbitrarily small if ⁴

$$\sum_{m \in T} R_m \geq H(S_T | Y_a, S_{T^c}), \quad \forall T \subset \{1, 2, \dots, M\}.$$

Proof: The proof in digital side information case is a slight modification of the proof of the Slepian-Wolf achievability result [6]. For the analog case, the result can be proven by quantizing the analog information and letting the quantization step size approach zero. We hence omit the details here. ■

By lemma 6, we need to transmit $H(S_1, \dots, S_M | Y_a)$ nats in addition to analog transmission, such that all sources can be reconstructed with vanishing probability of error. The achievable energy is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 10. For (asymptotically) lossless transmission of all binary sources, the proposed hybrid scheme can achieve transmission energy

$$E^h = \min_{\alpha \geq 0} H(S_1, \dots, S_M | Y_a) \cdot N_0 + M\alpha^2. \quad (113)$$

⁴With abuse of notation, we denote a set of sources $\{S_m | m \in T\}$ by S_T .

The conditional entropy can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} H(S_1, \dots, S_M | Y_a) &= H(S_1, \dots, S_M) + h(Y_a | S_1, \dots, S_M) - h(Y_a) \\ &= - \sum_{\eta=0}^M p(\eta, M) \log p(\eta, M) + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\pi e N_0}{\alpha^2} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y_a) \log f(y_a) dy_a. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

$$(115)$$

The energy of hybrid scheme is upper bounded by that of the separation scheme in (111), in which case no energy is allocated to the analog transmission ($\alpha = 0$).

E. Numerical Results

Fig. 8 shows the energy for pure digital transmission and hybrid transmission with $P_c = 0.001$. For pure digital transmission the energy per sample increases with the number of nodes, as more information needs to be transmitted. But for the hybrid transmission energy decreases with the number of nodes initially. This is due to the beamforming gain: for small P_c the sources are almost identical and add up coherently at the destination, which is very energy efficient. Eventually, hybrid transmission is also affected by the increase in information from the (small) differences of the sources, and the energy increases with the number of nodes.




Figure 7. Energy per sample vs. number of nodes M for $P_c = 0.001$.




Figure 8. Energy per sample vs. number of nodes M for $P_c = 0.1$.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF LEMMA 2

In order to prove Lemma 2, we need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 7. $\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)/L$ (cut-set rate per encoder) increases with cut-set size L .

Proof: It holds,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial L} \frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)}{L} = \frac{[\phi(L, \rho) - \log \phi(L, \rho)] - [\phi(L, \theta^*) - \log \phi(L, \theta^*)]}{2L^2} \geq 0, \quad (116)$$

since $\theta^* \leq \rho$ and thus $\phi(L, \rho) \geq \phi(L, \theta^*) \geq 1$ and we also use that $(x - \log x)$ monotonically increases when $x \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 8. $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L)$ monotonically decreases with $\hat{\rho}$ for any $L < M$.

Proof: It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} [\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L)] &\leq \frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)}{L} \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \left[\frac{2}{(1 - \hat{\rho})\phi(M, \hat{\rho})} - \frac{2}{(1 - \hat{\rho})\phi(L, \hat{\rho})} \right] \\ &= -\frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)}{L} \frac{[1 + (M - 1)\hat{\rho}^2](M - L)}{(1 - \hat{\rho})^2[1 + (M - 1)\hat{\rho}]} \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where in the first step we use Lemma 7, i.e., $\frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M)}{M} \geq \frac{\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)}{L} \geq 0$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{\rho}} \frac{2}{(1-\hat{\rho})\phi(M, \hat{\rho})} \leq 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2: Denote the root of $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M) = \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L)$ ($L \neq M$) by

$$\hat{\rho}_0(D, L) = \frac{L\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) - M\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)}{L\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M) + M(M-L-1)\bar{R}(D, \theta^*, L)}. \quad (117)$$

One can verify that $\hat{\rho}_0(D, L)$ increases with L ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial L} \hat{\rho}_0(D, L) \geq 0, \quad (118)$$

using Lemma 7. Therefore, it holds that

$$\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), M) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), L) \geq \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}_0(D, L), M) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}_0(D, L), L) = 0, \quad (119)$$

since $\hat{\rho}^*(D) = \hat{\rho}_0(D, 1) \leq \hat{\rho}_0(D, L)$, and $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, L)$ monotonically decreases with $\hat{\rho}$ (Lemma 8). That is, at $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}^*(D)$, $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), L) \leq \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), M)$ ($\forall L \neq 1$ or M). \square

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Proof: We first prove the existence of intersection point by continuity of $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, 1) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M)$.

To the end of $\hat{\rho} = 0$, by Lemma 7 it holds that

$$\hat{E}(D, 0, 1) = \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, 1) \leq \hat{E}(D, 0, M) = \frac{1}{M} \bar{R}(D, \theta^*, M). \quad (120)$$

To the other end of $\hat{\rho} = \rho$,

$$\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, 1) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M) = \frac{1}{DM(1-\rho)[1+(M-1)\rho]} \log \frac{(1-\rho)^{M(M-1)\rho} \psi(\rho)}{[D(1-\theta^*)]^{M(M-1)\rho} \psi(\theta^*)}, \quad (121)$$

where

$$\psi(x) \triangleq \frac{(1-x)^{1-\rho} [1+(M-1)x]^{(M-1)[1+(M-1)\rho]}}{[1+(M-2)x]^{M[1+(M-2)\rho]}}. \quad (122)$$

and we use the monotonicity $\frac{d\psi(x)}{dx} \geq 0$ in $x \in [0, \rho]$, and $\theta^* \leq \rho$, to verify that for all $D \in [0, 1]$,

$\hat{E}(D, \rho, 1) - \hat{E}(D, \rho, M) \geq 0$:

- When $D \leq 1 - \rho$,

$$\frac{(1-\rho)^{M(M-1)\rho} \psi(\rho)}{[D(1-\theta^*)]^{M(M-1)\rho} \psi(\theta^*)} = \psi(\rho) \left(\frac{1-\rho}{D} \right)^{M(M-1)\rho} \geq \psi(\rho) \geq \psi(0) \geq 1; \quad (123)$$

- When $D > 1 - \rho$, we have

$$\frac{(1-\rho)^{M(M-1)\rho} \psi(\rho)}{[D(1-\theta^*)]^{M(M-1)\rho} \psi(\theta^*)} = \frac{\psi(\rho)}{\psi(\theta^*)} \geq 1. \quad (124)$$

By continuity, there exists one point $\hat{\rho}^*(D)$ in $[0, \rho]$ such that $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), 1) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}^*(D), M) = 0$.

By monotonicity of $\hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, 1) - \hat{E}(D, \hat{\rho}, M)$ proved in Lemma 8, $\hat{\rho}^*(D)$ is unique. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] T. S. Han, “The capacity region of general multiple-access channel with certain correlated sources,” *Inform. and Cont.*, vol. 40, pp. 37–60, January 1979.
- [2] D. Gündüz and O. Simeone, “On the capacity region of a multiple access channel with common messages,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT 2010)*, 2010, pp. 470–474.
- [3] T. Cover, A. El Gamal, and M. Salehi, “Multiple access channels with arbitrarily correlated sources,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 26, pp. 648–657, November 1980.
- [4] M. Gastpar, “Uncoded transmission is exactly optimal for a simple Gaussian ‘sensor’ network,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 54, pp. 5247–5251, November 2008.
- [5] A. Lapidoth and S. Tinguely, “Sending a bivariate Gaussian over a Gaussian MAC,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 2714–2752, June 2010.
- [6] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd Ed., John Wiley, 2006.
- [7] B. Nazer and M. Gastpar, “Computation over multiple-access channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 53, pp. 3498–3516, October 2007.
- [8] W. Liu and B. Chen, “Communicating correlated sources over interference channels: The lossy case,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT) 2010*, 2010, pp. 345–349.
- [9] C. Tian, S. N. Diggavi, and S. Shamai, “The achievable distortion region of bivariate Gaussian source on Gaussian broadcast channel,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT) 2010*, pp. 146–150.
- [10] Z. Reznic, M. Feder, and R. Zamir, “Distortion bounds for broadcasting with bandwidth expansion,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 3778–3788, August 2006.
- [11] I. E. Aguerri and D. Gündüz, “Hybrid digital-analog transmission for the Gaussian one-helper problem,” in *Proc. IEEE Global Telecommun. Conf. (GLOBECOM) 2010*, 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [12] V. M. Prabhakaran, R. Puri, and K. Ramchandran, “Hybrid digital-analog codes for source-channel broadcast of Gaussian sources over Gaussian channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 4573–4588, July 2011.
- [13] S. Verdú, “On channel capacity per unit cost,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 1019–1030, May 1990.
- [14] A. Jain, D. Gündüz, S. R. Kulkarni, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú, “Energy efficient lossy transmission over sensor networks with feedback,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP) 2010*, 2010, pp. 5558–5561.
- [15] —, “Energy-distortion tradeoffs in multiple-access channels with feedback,” in *Proc. IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW) 2010*, 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [16] A. Jain, D. Gündüz, S. Kulkarni, H. Poor, and S. Verdú, “Energy-distortion tradeoffs in gaussian joint source-channel coding problems,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3153–3168, May 2012.
- [17] A. Wagner, S. Tavildar, and P. Viswanath, “Rate region of the quadratic Gaussian two-encoder source-coding problem,” arXiv:cs.IT/0510095, Feb. 2008.
- [18] J. Wang, J. Chen, and X. Wu, “On the sum rate of Gaussian multiterminal source coding: new proofs and results,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 3946–3960, Aug. 2010.
- [19] Y. Yang and Z. Xiong, “The sum-rate bound for a new class of quadratic Gaussian multiterminal source coding problems,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 693–707, Feb. 2012.
- [20] A. Wagner, S. Tavildar, and P. Viswanath, “The rate region of quadratic Gaussian two-terminal source coding problem,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 54, pp. 1938–1961, May 2008.

- [21] H. S. Witsenhausen, "On sequences of pairs of dependent random variables," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 28, pp. 100–113, January 1975.
- [22] H. Yamamoto and K. Itoh, "Source coding theory for multiterminal communication systems with a remote source," *Trans. IEICE of Japan*, vol. E63, no. 10, pp. 700–706, October 1980.
- [23] Y. Oohama, "Rate-distortion theory for Gaussian multiterminal source coding systems with several side informations at the decoder," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 2577–2593, 2005.
- [24] T. Berger, "Multiterminal source coding," *The Inf. Theory Approach to Communications*, G. Longo, Ed., New York, NY: Springer-Verlag, 1977.