

On the Secrecy Exponent of the Wire-tap Channel

Mani Bastani Parizi and Emre Telatar
 Information Theory Laboratory (LTHI), EPFL, Lausanne, Switzerland
 {mani.bastaniparizi,emre.telatar}@epfl.ch

Abstract—We derive an exponentially decaying upper-bound on the unnormalized amount of information leaked to the wire-tapper in Wyner’s wire-tap channel setting. We characterize the exponent of the bound as a function of the randomness used by the encoder and show examples for which this exponent is larger than those that exist in [7].

I. INTRODUCTION

Wyner [1] introduced the notion of the wire-tap channel (Fig. 1) in 1975: Alice wants to communicate a message $W \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ to Bob through a communication channel $V: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. Eve also has access to what Alice transmits via a wire-tapper’s channel $W: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ and the aim of Alice is to keep the message hidden from her while maximizing the rate of information transmitted to Bob, $R \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \log M$.




Fig. 1. The Wire-Tap Channel

To this end, Alice encodes W as a codeword $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and sends it via n consecutive uses of the channel. Bob observes the output sequence of V , $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ and estimates W given \mathbf{Y} . On the other side, Eve has access to $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ (the output sequence of W), given which, she attempts to infer about W .

Wyner (in case when W is degraded with respect to V) [1] and later Csiszár and Körner (in a more general context of V being more capable than W) [2] showed that, given any input distribution P_X , Alice can communicate reliably to Bob at any rate R up to

$$I(X; Y) - I(X; Z), \quad (1)$$

(when $(X, Y) \sim P_X(x)V(x|y)$ and $(X, Z) \sim P_X(x)W(z|x)$) while keeping the rate of information leaked to Eve about W as small as desired; i.e. guaranteeing

$$\frac{1}{n} I(W; \mathbf{Z}) \leq \epsilon, \quad (2)$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, using sufficiently large n .

Wyner’s measure of secrecy allows one to investigate the trade-off between the message rate and the information leakage rate but is too weak from the security point of view; even if the amount of information Eve learns about the message W normalized to the number of channel uses vanishes asymptotically, the amount itself can grow unboundedly as the

block-length increases. Therefore, it is natural to remove the normalization factor in (2) and ask for *strong secrecy*:

$$I(W; \mathbf{Z}) \leq \epsilon. \quad (3)$$

Maurer and Wolf showed that, the highest achievable rate (1) under *strong secrecy* requirement does not change [3].

Classical achievability constructions [1], [4] are based on associating each message $w \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ with a sub-code of rate R' and transmitting a randomly chosen codeword from that sub-code to communicate w . The reliability of the code is guaranteed by keeping the total rate $R' + R$ below $I(X; Y)$. Furthermore, by varying the sub-codes’ rate R' from 0 to $I(X; Z)$, the upper-bound on the information leakage rate, $\frac{1}{n} I(W; \mathbf{Z})$, is controlled. Particularly, by choosing the rate R' just below $I(X; Z)$, the weak secrecy is established.

An alternative way to approach the secrecy problem is to establish secrecy through *channel resolvability* [5]–[7]. The *resolvability* of a channel $W: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ is the minimum entropy rate required at its input such that its output distribution approximates a desired (product) distribution Q_Z^n and is equal to $I(X; Z)$ if $Q_Z \equiv P_Z$, the distribution induced by the input distribution P_X [5], [8]–[10].

For any fixed message $w \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ the output of Eve’s channel has distribution $P_{Z|W=w}$. It is not difficult to see that the secrecy is guaranteed if $P_{Z|W=w}$ ‘well approximates’ the product distribution P_Z^n by setting the sub-code rates R' just above $I(X; Z)$. In particular, if we measure the quality of approximation by asking the unnormalized Kullback-Leibler divergence between $P_{Z|W=w}$ and P_Z^n to be small, *strong secrecy* will be established. Indeed in [5], [7] it has been shown (using random coding arguments) that the information leakage, $I(W; \mathbf{Z})$ will be exponentially small in n provided that R' is above the resolvability of wiretapper’s the channel $I(X; Z)$.

Definition 1. Given R, R' and W , a number E is a *secrecy exponent* for the wire-tapper channel W , if there exist a sequence of reliable coding schemes of rate R , requiring the entropy rate R' at the encoder, for which $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log[I(W; \mathbf{Z})] \geq E$.

Contribution: In this paper, we derive an exponentially decaying upper-bound on $\mathbb{E}[D(P_{Z|W=w} \| P_Z^n)]$, where the expectation is taken over the i.i.d. random coding ensemble, by analyzing the concentration properties of $P_{Z|W=w}$. It then follows (by standard expurgation arguments) that for $\forall \epsilon > 0$, there exist a code of essentially the same rate R , using which $\max_w D(P_{Z|W=w} \| P_Z^n) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \mathbb{E}[D(P_{Z|W=w} \| P_Z^n)]$. As already noted in [7], this is a *worst-case* measure of secrecy in contrast to $I(W; \mathbf{Z})$ which is an average-case measure of

secrecy. We finally show examples for which our lower-bound on $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n)]$ is greater than that of [7].

II. NOTATION

We use uppercase letters (like X) to denote a random variable and corresponding lowercase version (x) for a realization of that random variable. The boldface letters denote sequences of length n . The i -th element of a sequence \mathbf{x} is denoted as x_i . We denote finite sets by script-style uppercase letters like \mathcal{S} . The cardinality of set \mathcal{S} is denoted by $|\mathcal{S}|$. For a positive integer m , $\llbracket m \rrbracket \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. \mathbb{R} denotes the set of real numbers and $\bar{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ is the set of *extended* real numbers. We write $f(n) \doteq g(n)$ (resp. $f(n) \lesssim g(n)$) if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 0$ (resp. ≤ 0).

We denote the set of distributions on alphabet \mathcal{X} as $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. If $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, $P^n \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n)$ denotes the product distribution $P^n(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i)$. Likewise, if $V : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a conditional distribution $V^n : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^n$ denotes the conditional distribution $V^n(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n V(y_i|x_i)$. If $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, $P \ll Q$ means $\text{supp}(P) \subseteq \text{supp}(Q)$.

We denote the *type* of a sequence $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ by $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and the *conditional type* of $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ by $\hat{V}_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ (see [11, Chapter 2] for formal definitions).

A distribution $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is an n -*type* if $n\hat{P}(x) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ for $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$. We denote the set of n -types on \mathcal{X} as $\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{X}) \subsetneq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and use the fact that $|\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{X})| = O(n^{|\mathcal{X}|})$ [11, Lemma 2.2] repeatedly.

If $\hat{P} \in \hat{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, we denote the set of all sequences of type \hat{P} as $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{P}} \subset \mathcal{X}^n$. If $\hat{V} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ is a conditional distribution, the \hat{V} -*shell* of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$, is denoted as $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{V}}(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathcal{Y}^n$.

III. MAIN RESULT

In the rest of the paper $(X, Z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z}$ denotes the pair of random variables whose joint distribution is $P_{X,Z}(x, z) = P_X(x)W(z|x)$ where P_X is a fixed input distribution. For simplicity (and with no essential loss of generality) we assume the $\text{supp}(P_X) = \mathcal{X}$. We also define

$$\mathcal{X}_z \triangleq \{x \in \mathcal{X} : W(z|x) > 0\}, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (4)$$

and assume $\mathcal{X}_z \neq \emptyset$ for $\forall z \in \mathcal{Z}$. This implies $\text{supp}(P_Z) = \mathcal{Z}$ and $\text{supp}(P_{X|Z=z}) = \mathcal{X}_z$.

Definition 2 (Uniform Erasure Channel). We say that W is a *uniform erasure channel* if for $\forall z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$W(z|x) = \epsilon_z \leq 1, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_z. \quad (5)$$

Following [4] we consider the following random code construction: for every message $w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, a codebook of size $M' \triangleq \exp(nR')$, denoted by \mathcal{C}_w , is constructed by sampling M' codewords, $\mathbf{X}_{w,w'}, w' \in \llbracket M' \rrbracket$ independently from the product distribution P_X^n . In order to communicate the message w , Alice picks $w' \in \llbracket M' \rrbracket$ uniformly at random and transmits $\mathbf{X}_{w,w'}$. Given such a construction, for every $w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$, the conditional output distribution of W is

$$P_{\mathbf{Z}|W}(\mathbf{z}|w) = \frac{1}{M'} \sum_{w'=1}^{M'} W^n(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{X}_{w,w'}), \quad (6)$$

which is an average of i.i.d. random variables and

$$\mathbb{E}[P_{\mathbf{Z}|W}(\mathbf{z}|w)] = P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z}), \quad \forall w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket. \quad (7)$$

Theorem 1. *Using the construction described above, for $\forall w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n)] \lesssim \exp[-nE_s(P_X, W, R')].$$

with

$$E_s(P_X, W, R') = \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}} \{\lambda R' - F_0(P_X, W, \lambda)\}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$F_0(P_X, W, \lambda) \triangleq \log \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z) \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} P_X(x)^{\frac{-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1-4\lambda}{2}} \right].$$

If W is a *uniform erasure channel*, we may take

$$E_s(P_X, W, R') = \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}} \{\lambda R' - F_0^e(P_X, W, \lambda)\}, \quad (9)$$

where

$$F_0^e(P_X, W, \lambda) \triangleq \log \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z) \exp[\lambda D(P_{X|Z=z} \| P_X)] \right],$$

which is a *larger exponent compared to* (8).

Remark. $F_0(P_X, W, \lambda)$ and $F_0^e(P_X, W, \lambda)$ are both convex functions of λ (cf. Appendices G-D and G-A) passing through the origin with the slope

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} F_0(P_X, W, \lambda) \Big|_{\lambda=0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} F_0^e(P_X, W, \lambda) \Big|_{\lambda=0} = I(X; Z).$$

Hence $E_s(P_X, W, R') \geq 0$ with equality iff $R' \leq I(X; Z)$.

The only random quantity involved in the divergence $D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n)$ is the conditional distribution $P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w}$ whose expectation is $P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n$ as shown in (7). To prove Theorem 1 we will show that the random variables $P_{\mathbf{Z}|W}(\mathbf{z}|w)$ concentrate around their mean, $P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z})$, in Section IV. Using the concentration results, we then prove the claim in Section V.

As an immediate corollary to Theorem 1 we have:

Corollary 2. *For any input distribution P_X and a pair of rates R and R' such that $R + R' < I(X; Y)$, there exists a reliable code of rate R using which,*

$$I(W; \mathbf{Z}) \lesssim \exp[-nE_s(P_X, W, R')],$$

for any message distribution P_W . Hence, the E_s in Theorem 1 is a *secrecy exponent*.

Corollary 2 is proved in Appendix B.

IV. CONCENTRATION RESULTS

For $\forall w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$ and $\forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ let

$$U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \triangleq \frac{P_{\mathbf{Z}|W}(\mathbf{z}|w)}{P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z})}. \quad (10)$$

Using (7), it is easy to see that $\mathbb{E}[U_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] = 1$.

Theorem 3. If W is a uniform erasure channel, for any $\eta > 0$, $\mathbb{P}[|U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) - 1| \geq \exp(-\eta n)] \leq 2e^{-\frac{1}{3} \exp[\alpha(P_{X,Z}, R', \hat{P}_z, \eta)n]}$, for $\forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ and $\forall w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$, where

$$\alpha(P_{X,Z}, R', \hat{P}_z, \eta) \triangleq R' - D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P}_z) - 2\eta. \quad (11)$$

Proof: Pick any $\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(\mathcal{Z})$ and observe that for $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{T}_{\hat{P}}$,

$$\frac{W^n(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x})}{P_{\mathcal{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z})} = \exp[n(D(\hat{V}_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}} \| P_X | \hat{P}) - D(\hat{V}_{\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{z}} \| P_X | \hat{P}))].$$

For every $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ and stochastic matrix $Q : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ define

$$A_{X,Z}(P; Q) \triangleq D(Q \| P_X | P) - D(Q \| P_X | Z). \quad (12)$$

Thus, using (6),

$$U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) = \frac{1}{M'} \sum_{w'=1}^{M'} \exp[nA_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{V}_{\mathbf{x}_{w,w'}|\mathbf{z}})] \quad (13)$$

Since W is a uniform erasure channel, one can check that

$$A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; Q) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \hat{P}(z) \log(P_X(\mathcal{X}_z)), & \text{if } \hat{P}Q \ll \hat{P}P_{X|Z}, \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Hence the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \triangleq \{A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q}) \text{ for all conditional types } \hat{Q}\} \subset \bar{\mathbb{R}}, \quad (15)$$

contains only two elements: $-\infty$ and

$$a = a(\hat{P}) = -\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \hat{P}(z) \log(P_X(\mathcal{X}_z)).$$

Define

$$\mathcal{T}_a(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \bigcup_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} \mathcal{T}_{\hat{Q}}(\mathbf{z}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{Q}}(\mathbf{z})$ is the \hat{Q} -shell of \mathbf{z} and the union is over conditional types $\hat{Q} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ (thus contains $O(n^{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Z}|})$ shells). We can hence rewrite (13) as

$$U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) = \frac{1}{M'} N_a \exp(na), \quad (17)$$

where $N_a \triangleq |\{w' : \mathbf{x}_{w,w'} \in \mathcal{T}_a(\mathbf{z})\}|$ denotes the number of codewords in \mathcal{C}_w in $\mathcal{T}_a(\mathbf{z})$. Since the codewords are independent we can conclude that N_a is a Binomial random variable with parameters M' and success probability

$$\begin{aligned} p &= P_X^n(\mathcal{T}_a(\mathbf{z})) = \sum_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} P_X^n(\mathcal{T}_{\hat{Q}}(\mathbf{z})) \\ &\doteq \exp\left[-n \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P})\right] \\ &= \exp\left[-nD(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In the above, second equality follows since \hat{Q} -shells are disjoint, the third equality follows from [11, Lemma 2.6] and (18) follows easily by adding and subtracting a $D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P})$ (see Appendix C for details).

We then observe that $|N_a - \mathbb{E}[N_a]| \leq \exp(-\eta n) \mathbb{E}[N_a]$ implies

$$|U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) - 1| \leq \exp(-\eta n).$$

Since $N_a \sim \text{Binomial}(M', p)$, using the Chernoff bound of [12, Corollary 4.6], we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|N_a - \mathbb{E}[N_a]| \geq \exp(-\eta n) \mathbb{E}[N_a]\right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{M' p \exp(-2\eta n)}{3}}.$$

The claim follows by observing that

$$M' p \exp(-2\eta n) \doteq \exp[n(R' - D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P}) - 2\eta)]. \quad \blacksquare$$

Remark. W being a uniform erasure channel is sufficient but not a necessary condition for Theorem 3 to hold. The argument is valid as long as (5) holds for $\forall \mathbf{z} \in \text{supp}(\hat{P}_z)$.

Theorem 4. For every $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ let,

$$E_c(P_{X,Z}, P, \tau) \triangleq \max_{0 \leq \mu \leq 1} \{\mu\tau - K_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \mu)\}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \mu) &\triangleq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) \log\left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1}{1-\mu}} P_X(x)^{\frac{\mu}{1-\mu}}\right)^{1-\mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Then, for $\forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n$ and $\forall w \in \llbracket M \rrbracket$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[|U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) - 1| \geq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}_z, \tau)n\right)\right] \\ \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}_z, \tau)n\right), \end{aligned}$$

for any τ satisfying

$$\tau + E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}_z, \tau) < R'. \quad (21)$$

Remark. The function $K_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \mu)$ is convex in μ for $\mu \leq 1$ (cf. Appendix G-C) and passes through the origin with the slope $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} K_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \mu)|_{\mu=0} = D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | P)$. Therefore, it is easy to see that Theorem 4 gives a non-trivial result only when $D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P}_z) < R'$ because of (21).

Proof: Pick $\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(\mathcal{Z})$ and assume $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{T}_{\hat{P}}$. If $E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) = 0$ the claim is trivial. Thus, we assume $E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) > 0$ which implies $\tau > D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})$.

The proof goes along the same lines as that of Theorem 3, except that now the set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ defined in (15) contains $O(n^{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Z}|})$ elements (instead of only two). Let $\mathcal{A} \triangleq \{a \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}} : a > -\infty\}$ and for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ define $\mathcal{T}_a(\mathbf{z})$ as in (16). Now we can rewrite (13) as

$$U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) = \frac{1}{M'} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} N_a \exp(na), \quad (22)$$

with $N_a \triangleq |\{w' : \mathbf{x}_{w,w'} \in \mathcal{T}_a(\mathbf{z})\}|$. As before, N_a has a Binomial distribution with parameters M' and success probability

$$\begin{aligned} p_a &= P_X^n(\mathcal{T}_a(\mathbf{z})) = \sum_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} P_X^n(\mathcal{T}_{\hat{Q}}(\mathbf{z})) \\ &\doteq \exp\left[-n \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P})\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Let

$$\mathcal{A}_\tau \triangleq \left\{ a \in \mathcal{A} : \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P}) \leq \tau \right\}, \quad (24)$$

and split (22) as

$$U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{M'} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau} N_a \exp(na)}_{\triangleq T_n} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{M'} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau} N_a \exp(na)}_{\triangleq S_n}.$$

Let $\delta_n \triangleq \exp(-\frac{1}{2} E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau)n)$ for the sake of brevity. Since both T_n and S_n are non-negative, $T_n < \frac{1}{2}\delta_n$ and $|S_n - 1| < \frac{1}{2}\delta_n$ imply $|U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) - 1| < \delta_n$. We will show

$$\mathbb{P}\left[T_n \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_n\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[|S_n - 1| \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta_n\right] \leq \delta_n, \quad (25)$$

to complete the proof. We, firstly, have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T_n] &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau} p_a \exp(na) \\ &\doteq \exp\left[-n \min_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau} \left\{ \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P}) - a \right\}\right], \end{aligned}$$

using (23). It can be shown (cf. Appendix D) that

$$\min_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau} \left\{ \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P}) - a \right\} \geq E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau). \quad (26)$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}[T_n] \leq \delta_n^2$, and (by Markov inequality),

$$\mathbb{P}[T_n \geq 1/2 \delta_n] \leq \delta_n. \quad (27)$$

Secondly, $|\mathbb{E}[S_n] - 1| = |\mathbb{E}[T_n]| \leq \delta_n^2$ and

$$|S_n - 1| \leq |S_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n]| + |\mathbb{E}[S_n] - 1| \leq |S_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n]| + \delta_n^2.$$

Hence if $|S_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n]| \leq \frac{1}{4}\delta_n$, then $|S_n - 1| < \frac{1}{2}\delta_n$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|S_n - 1| \geq 1/2 \delta_n] &\leq \mathbb{P}[|S_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n]| \geq 1/4 \delta_n] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[\exists a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau : |N_a - \mathbb{E}[N_a]| > 1/4 \delta_n \mathbb{E}[N_a]], \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Since $N_a \sim \text{Binomial}(M', p_a)$, the Chernoff bound of [12, Corollary 4.6] implies,

$$\mathbb{P}[|N_a - \mathbb{E}[N_a]| \geq 1/4 \delta_n \mathbb{E}[N_a]] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{48} M' p_a \delta_n^2}. \quad (29)$$

Using (23) and (24) one can verify that for $a \in \mathcal{A}_\tau$,

$$\mathbb{P}[|N_a - \mathbb{E}[N_a]| \geq \delta_n \mathbb{E}[N_a]] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{48} \exp[(R' - \tau - E_c(\hat{P}, \tau))n]},$$

which, due to (21), decays doubly exponentially in n . Thus, as $|\mathcal{A}| = O(n^{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Z}|})$, the upper-bound of (28) decays faster than any exponential in n . This, together with (27) shows (25). ■

V. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Using the linearity of expectation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n)] &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n} \mathbb{E}\left[P_{\mathbf{Z}|W}(\mathbf{z}|w) \log\left(\frac{P_{\mathbf{Z}|W}(\mathbf{z}|w)}{P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z})}\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n} P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z}) \mathbb{E}[U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \log(U_n(\mathbf{z}|w))]. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Furthermore, since $\mathbb{E}[U_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \log U_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\underbrace{U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \log U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) + (U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) - 1) \log P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z})}_{\triangleq V_n(\mathbf{z}|w)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \leq 1/P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z})$,

$$V_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \leq -\log P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z}) = O(n). \quad (31)$$

Now we can rewrite (30) as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^n} P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z}) \mathbb{E}[U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \log(U_n(\mathbf{z}|w))] &= \sum_{\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(\mathcal{Z})} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{T}_{\hat{P}}} P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n(\mathbf{z}) \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{z}|w)]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

To prove the theorem, we shall first upper-bound

$$\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] \leq \exp[-n E_t(P_{X,Z}, R', \hat{P})], \quad (33)$$

for $\forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{T}_{\hat{P}}$. The theorem, then, follows by using the above in (32) and [11, Lemma 2.6] to conclude

$$\mathbb{E}[D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_{\mathbf{Z}}^n)] \leq \exp[-n E_s(P_X, W, R')],$$

where

$$E_s(P_X, W, R') \triangleq \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} \{D(P \| P_Z) + E_t(P_{X,Z}, R', P)\}. \quad (34)$$

A. Uniform Erasure Channels

Pick $\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\eta > 0$, define the event

$$\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \triangleq \{|U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) - 1| \leq \exp(-\eta n)\},$$

and split

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] &= \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{z}|w) | \mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{z}|w) | \overline{\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)}] \mathbb{P}[\overline{\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)}]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Conditioned on $\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)$, $V_n(\mathbf{z}|w) = O(n \exp(-\eta n))$, hence

$$\mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{z}|w) | \mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)] \leq \exp(-\eta n). \quad (36)$$

Additionally, since $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{T}_{\hat{P}}$, using (31) and Theorem 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[V_n(\mathbf{z}|w) | \overline{\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)}] \mathbb{P}[\overline{\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)}] &\leq \mathbb{P}[\overline{\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w)}] \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{1}{3} \exp(\alpha(P_{X,Z}, R', \hat{P}, \eta)n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Combining (36) and (37) we can see

$$E_t(P_{X,Z}, R', \hat{P}) = \max_{\eta > 0} \begin{cases} \eta, & \text{if } \alpha(P_{X,Z}, R', \hat{P}, \eta) > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Consequently, using (11) we can conclude that¹

$$E_t(P_{X,Z}, R', \hat{P}) = \max\left\{\frac{1}{2}[R' - D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})], 0\right\}. \quad (38)$$

Using (38), the equivalence of (34) and (9) is shown in Appendix E-A. ■

¹Set $\eta = \frac{R' - D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})}{2} - \frac{\log(n^2)}{n}$ if $R' > D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})$.

B. General Channels

The proof for general channels is very much similar to that of uniform erasure channels we discussed in Section V-A, except that we shall use the weaker concentration result of Theorem 4. For a fixed $\hat{P} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(\mathcal{Z})$ and τ satisfying (21), define the event

$$\mathcal{K}_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \triangleq \left\{ |U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) - 1| \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau)n\right) \right\}.$$

Following the same steps as in (35), (36), and (37) and using Theorem 4 we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[U_n(\mathbf{z}|w) \log(U_n(\mathbf{z}|w))] \leq \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau)n\right]$$

Therefore,

$$E_t(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, R') = \max_{\tau: E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) + \tau < R'} \frac{1}{2}E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau). \quad (39)$$

Using (39), the equivalence of (34) and (8) is shown in Appendix E-B. Furthermore, since $E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) = 0$ for $\tau \leq D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})$, for a particular \hat{P} the value of (39) is always smaller than that of (38). Hence the of exponent (9) is always larger than (8). ■

VI. EXAMPLES

Example 1 (BSC Wire-tapper Channel). Suppose W is a BSC (p) and the input distribution P_X is uniform. Then,

$$F_0(p, \lambda) = \frac{1 - 4\lambda}{2} \log_2 \left((1-p)^{\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} + p^{\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} \right) + \lambda.$$

Example 2 (BEC Wire-tapper Channel). If W is a BEC (p) and the input distribution P_X is uniform,

$$F_0^e(p, \lambda) = \log_2((1-p)2^\lambda + p).$$

In Fig. 2 we have plotted $E_s(P_X, W, R')$, defined in (8) and (9), versus R' for the two examples and compared it with the exponent of [7] which we denote by E_H .²




Fig. 2. Comparison of the secrecy exponent E_s with that of [7].

²See Appendix F for details on computing the best exponent of [7].

VII. CONCLUSION

We derived a lower-bound on the secrecy exponent of the wire-tap channel using i.i.d. random codes. It is an open question whether random constant-composition codes [11] will lead to better secrecy exponents.

As shown in [2], for general channels V and W , any message rate up to

$$I(Q; Y) - I(Q; Z),$$

where $Q \text{---} X \text{---} (Y, Z)$ form a Markov chain, is achievable. Our results are straightforwardly extensible to the case when the auxiliary random variable Q is used.

In preparing this manuscript it came to our attention that applying the method described in [10, Section III-B] to the wire-tap setting results in a secrecy exponent that agrees with (9) for the uniform erasure channels and is larger than (8) in general. Nevertheless, we believe that the method described here has merit in showing the doubly exponential nature of the concentration of the output distribution, and being easily adaptable to other types of random coding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Swiss NSF under grant number 200020_146832.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. D. Wyner, "The wire-tap channel," *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1355–1387, 1975.
- [2] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, "Broadcast channels with confidential messages," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 339–348, 1978.
- [3] U. Maurer and S. Wolf, "Information-theoretic key agreement: From weak to strong secrecy for free," in *Advances in Cryptology — EUROCRYPT 2000*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, B. Preneel, Ed., vol. 1807. Springer-Verlag, May 2000, pp. 351–368.
- [4] J. L. Massey, "A simplified treatment of wyner's wire-tap channel," in *Proceedings of 21st Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 1983, pp. 268–276.
- [5] M. Hayashi, "General nonasymptotic and asymptotic formulas in channel resolvability and identification capacity and their application to the wiretap channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1562–1575, Apr. 2006.
- [6] M. R. Bloch and J. N. Laneman, "Strong secrecy from channel resolvability," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 8077–8098, Dec. 2013.
- [7] J. Hou and G. Kramer, "Effective secrecy: Reliability, confusion and stealth," in *Proceedings of 2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Jun. 2014, pp. 601–605.
- [8] A. D. Wyner, "The common information of two dependent random variables," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 163–179, Mar. 1975.
- [9] T. Han and S. Verdú, "Approximation theory of output statistics," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 752–772, May 1993.
- [10] J. Hou and G. Kramer, "Informational divergence approximations to product distributions," in *Proceedings of 13th Canadian Workshop on Information Theory (CWIT)*, Jun. 2013, pp. 76–81.
- [11] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [12] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Upfal, *Probability and computing: Randomized algorithms and probabilistic analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [13] R. G. Gallager, *Information Theory and Reliable Communication*. New York, NY, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF (7)

The right-hand-side of (6) is the average of identically distributed random variables. The mean of each of them is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n W(z_i|X_i)\right] &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X} [W(z_i|X)] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_X(x) W(z_i|x) \right] = \prod_{i=1}^n P_Z(z_i)\end{aligned}$$

In the above, the first equality follows since the codewords are sampled from the product distribution P_X^n . ■

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

Let $M \triangleq \exp(NR)$ and construct $2M$ i.i.d. codebooks of size $M' \triangleq \exp(nR')$, $\mathcal{C}_w, w \in \llbracket 2M \rrbracket$ by sampling each codeword independently from the product distribution P_X^n . As we already described, in order to communicate $w \in \llbracket 2M \rrbracket$, Alice picks $w' \in \llbracket M' \rrbracket$ uniformly at random and transmits $\mathbf{X}_{w,w'}$ over the channel. The union of this codebooks $\mathcal{C} \triangleq \bigcup_{w \in \llbracket 2M \rrbracket} \mathcal{C}_w$ is a random i.i.d. codebook of rate $R' + R + \frac{\log(2)}{n}$. Hence, using this ensemble for communicating over \mathcal{V} , as long as $R' + R < I(X; Y)$, Bob can decode both W and W' reliably. More precisely, for each $w \in \llbracket 2M \rrbracket$, the expected decoding error probability is upper-bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\Pr[\hat{W} \neq W | W = w]] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}[\Pr[\hat{W} \neq W \text{ or } \hat{W}' \neq W' | W = w]] \\ \leq \exp[-nE_r(P_X, \mathcal{V}, R + R' + o(1))].\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

In the above, \hat{W} and \hat{W}' denote, respectively, the maximum likelihood estimations of W and W' given \mathbf{Y} , the output sequence of \mathcal{V} , and E_r is Gallager's random coding exponent (see [13, Chapter 5] for details). Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} \Pr[\hat{W} \neq w | W = w]\right] \\ \leq \exp[-nE_r(P_X, \mathcal{V}, R + R')].\end{aligned}\quad (41)$$

Likewise, Theorem 1 implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_Z^n)\right] \\ \leq \exp[-nE_s(P_X, \mathcal{W}, R')].\end{aligned}\quad (42)$$

Therefore, there exists a code $\mathcal{C}^* = \bigcup_{w \in \llbracket 2M \rrbracket} \mathcal{C}_w^*$ in the ensemble using which we simultaneously have³:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} \Pr[\hat{W} \neq w | W = w] \\ \leq \exp[-nE_r(P_X, \mathcal{V}, R + R')].\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_Z^n) \\ \leq \exp[-nE_s(P_X, \mathcal{W}, R')].\end{aligned}\quad (44)$$

Since each of the summands in (43) is positive, there exist a subset $\mathcal{W}_1 \subset \{1, \dots, 2M\}$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{W}_1| \geq \frac{2}{3}M$ such that, for $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}_1$,

$$\Pr[\hat{W} \neq w | W = w] \leq 4 \exp[-nE_r(P_X, \mathcal{V}, R + R')].\quad (45)$$

Similarly since the summands in (44) are positive, there exists a subset $\mathcal{W}_2 \subset \{1, \dots, 2M\}$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{W}_2| \geq \frac{2}{3}M$ such that, for $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}_2$,

$$D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_Z^n) \leq 4 \exp[-nE_s(P_X, \mathcal{W}, R')].\quad (46)$$

Since $|\mathcal{W}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2| \geq M$ there exist a subset $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{W}| = M$. The sub-code defined by the messages in \mathcal{W} , $\bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathcal{C}_w^*$ has rate R and, using that, for any message distribution P_W on \mathcal{W} , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}P_e = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \Pr[\hat{W} \neq w | W = w] \\ \leq \exp[-nE_r(P_X, \mathcal{V}, R + R')]\end{aligned}$$

due to (45) which is exponentially small in n since $R + R' < I(X; Y)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}I(W; \mathbf{Z}) = D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W} \| P_Z^n | P_W) - D(P_{\mathbf{Z}} \| P_Z^n) \\ \leq \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_Z^n) \\ \leq \exp[-nE_s(R', P_X, \mathcal{W})],\end{aligned}$$

due to (46). ■

³Markov inequality implies for at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the codes in the ensemble,

$$\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} \Pr[\hat{W} \neq w | W = w] \leq 3 \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} \Pr[\hat{W} \neq w | W = w]\right].$$

Similarly for at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the codes in the ensemble,

$$\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_Z^n) \leq 3 \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{w=1}^{2M} D(P_{\mathbf{Z}|W=w} \| P_Z^n)\right].$$

Therefore, for at least $\frac{1}{3}$ of the codes in the ensemble both (43) and (44) hold simultaneously.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF (18)

Since $A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; Q) = a$ iff $Q\hat{P} \ll P_{X|Z}P$ (cf. (14)),

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P}) &= \min_{\hat{Q}: \hat{Q}\hat{P} \ll P_{X|Z}P} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P}) \\ &= \min_{\hat{Q}: \hat{Q}\hat{P} \ll P_{X|Z}P} \left\{ D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | \hat{P}) - D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | \hat{P}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | \hat{P}) \right\} \\ &= a + \min_{\hat{Q}: \hat{Q}\hat{P} \ll P_{X|Z}P} D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) = a \end{aligned}$$

which is attained if $\hat{Q} \equiv P_{X|Z}$. \blacksquare

APPENDIX D
DERIVATION OF E_c (PROOF OF (26))

To prove (26) we first need to compute the value of

$$E_b(P_{X,Z}, P, a) \triangleq \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(\hat{P}; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | P). \quad (47)$$

For $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$, let

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \rho) \\ \triangleq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) \log \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{1+\rho} P_X(x)^{-\rho} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The function G_0 is convex in ρ (cf. Appendix G-B).

Proposition 5.

$$E_b(P_{X,Z}, P, a) = a + \max_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \rho a - G_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \rho) \}.$$

Proof: Let

$$\iota_{X,Z}(x, z) \triangleq \log \left(\frac{P_{X,Z}(x, z)}{P_X(x)P_Z(z)} \right), \quad \forall (x, z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z},$$

denote the information density function for the joint distribution $P_{X,Z}$ for the sake of brevity.

Using (12),

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_X | P) \\ = a + \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{Q}: A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q})=a} D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) \\ = \min_{\hat{Q}} \left\{ D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) + \max_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}} \rho (a - A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q})) \right\} \\ = \min_{\hat{Q}} \max_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) + \rho (a - A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q})) \right\} \\ \stackrel{(*)}{=} \max_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \min_{\hat{Q}} \left\{ D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) - \rho A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q}) \right\} + \rho a \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where (*) follows since $D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P)$ is a convex function of \hat{Q} and $A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q})$ is a linear function of \hat{Q} . Therefore,

$D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) - \rho A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q})$ is also a convex function of \hat{Q} and we can swap the min and the max. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) - \rho A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q}) \\ = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \hat{Q}(x|z) \log \left(\frac{\hat{Q}(x|z)}{P_{X|Z}(x|z) \exp[\rho \iota_{X,Z}(x, z)]} \right) \\ \geq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) \log \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z) \exp[\rho \iota_{X,Z}(x, z)]} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with equality iff $\hat{Q}(x|z) \propto P_{X|Z}(x|z) \exp[\rho \iota_{X,Z}(x, z)]$ (using the concavity of logarithm). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{Q}} \left\{ D(\hat{Q} \| P_{X|Z} | P) - \rho A_{X,Z}(P; \hat{Q}) \right\} + \rho a = \rho a \\ - \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z) \exp[\rho \iota_{X,Z}(x, z)] \right). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Remark. It is easy to verify that $E_b(P_{X,Z}, P, a)$ is a convex function of a . Furthermore, (48) implies $E_b(P_{X,Z}, P, a) \geq \max\{a, 0\}$ with equality at $a = D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | P)$ and $a = -D(P_X \| P_{X|Z} | P)$.

Proof of (26): Since $E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \geq \max\{0, -a\}$,

$$\min_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau} \{ E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \} = 0, \quad \text{if } \tau < D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P}).$$

Otherwise, let $\mathcal{I}_\tau \triangleq \{a \in \mathbb{R} : E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) \leq \tau\}$ and observe that \mathcal{I}_τ is a convex subset of \mathbb{R} (i.e. it is an interval). We also have $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau = \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{I}_\tau$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau} \{ E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \} \\ = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{I}_\tau} \{ E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \} \\ \geq \min_{a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{I}_\tau} \{ E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \} \\ = \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}: E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) = \tau} \{ E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \} \quad (49) \\ = \tau + \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}: E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) = \tau} \{ -a \} \\ = \tau + \min_{a \in \mathcal{I}_\tau} \{ -a \}. \quad (50) \end{aligned}$$

In the above, (49) follows since the convex function $E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a$ attains its global minimum at $a = D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})$ inside the convex set \mathcal{I}_τ . Thus, the minimum outside \mathcal{I}_τ must occur on the boundaries of the set. Furthermore, (50) follows since the minimum of a linear function ($-a$) inside a convex set \mathcal{I}_τ must happen on the boundaries. Continuing (50) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau + \min_{a \in \mathcal{I}_\tau} \{ -a \} \\ = \tau + \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{ -a + \max_{\mu \geq 0} \{ \mu (E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - \tau) \} \} \\ = \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \max_{\mu \geq 0} \{ (1 - \mu)\tau - a + \mu E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) \} \\ = \max_{\mu \geq 0} \left\{ \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \mu E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \} + (1 - \mu)\tau \right\} \quad (51) \\ = \max_{\mu \leq 1} \left\{ \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{ (1 - \mu)E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a \} + \mu\tau \right\}, \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

where (51) follows since $\mu E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a$ is convex in a for $\mu \geq 0$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{(1 - \mu) E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a\} \\ &= \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{(1 - \mu) \max_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}} \{\rho a - G_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \rho)\} - \mu a\} \\ &= \max_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{(\rho - \mu - \mu \rho) a\} - (1 - \mu) G_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \rho) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where again the last equality follows by convexity of G_0 in ρ . We now note that the minimum of the linear term $(\rho - \mu - \mu \rho) a$ is always $-\infty$ unless $\rho = \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{(1 - \mu) E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a\} \\ &= -(1 - \mu) G_0\left(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \frac{\mu}{1 - \mu}\right) = -K_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\tau} \{E_b(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, a) - a\} \\ & \begin{cases} = 0 & \tau < \tau_0, \\ \geq \max_{\mu \leq 1} \{\mu \tau - K_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \mu)\} & \tau \geq \tau_0, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_0 = D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P})$. (26) now follows by observing that K_0 is a convex in μ for $\mu \leq 1$ (cf. Appendix G-C) passing through the origin with slope τ_0 . ■

APPENDIX E DERIVATION OF E_s

A. Uniform Erasure Channels

We can write (38) as

$$E_t(P_{X,Z}, R', P) = \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}} \lambda [R' - D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | P)] \quad (53)$$

Plugging the above into (34) we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_s(P_X, W, R') &= \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} \left\{ D(P \| P_Z) + \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}} \lambda [R' - D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | P)] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \lambda R' \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} \left\{ D(P \| P_Z) - \lambda D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | P) \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where (*) follows since $D(P \| P_Z) - \lambda D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | P)$ is convex in P . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & D(P \| P_Z) - \lambda D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P}) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \hat{P}(z) \log \left(\frac{\hat{P}(z)}{P_Z(z) \exp[\lambda D(P_{X|Z=z} \| P_X)]} \right) \\ &\geq \log \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z) \exp[\lambda D(P_{X|Z=z} \| P_X)]} \right) \end{aligned}$$

with equality iff $P(z) \propto P_Z(z) \exp[\lambda D(P_{X|Z=z} \| P_X)]$ (using the concavity of logarithm). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} \left\{ D(P \| P_Z) - \lambda D(P_{X|Z} \| P_X | \hat{P}) \right\} \\ &= -\log \left(\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z) \exp[\lambda D(P_{X|Z=z} \| P_X)] \right). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

B. General Channels

Proposition 6. Define $E_t(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, R')$ as in (39). Then,

$$E_t(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, R') = \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}} \left\{ \lambda R' - \tilde{K}_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \lambda) \right\}, \quad (54)$$

where

$$\tilde{K}_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \lambda) \triangleq \frac{1 - 2\lambda}{2} K_0\left(P_{X,Z}, P, \frac{2\lambda}{1 - 2\lambda}\right) \quad (55)$$

with K_0 is defined as in (20).

Proof: Since the function $E_c(P_{X,Z}, P, \tau)$ is convex in τ ,

$$\max_{\tau: E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) + \tau \leq R'} \frac{1}{2} E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) \quad (56)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \min_{\tau: E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) + \tau \geq R'} \frac{1}{2} E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) \\ &= \min_{\tau: E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) + \tau = R'} \frac{1}{2} E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) \quad (57) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \min_{\tau: E_c(P_{X,Z}, P, \tau) + \tau = R'} \frac{1}{2} (R' - \tau) \\ &= \min_{\tau: E_c(P_{X,Z}, P, \tau) + \tau \leq R'} \frac{1}{2} (R' - \tau) \quad (58) \end{aligned}$$

We then have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tau: E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) + \tau \leq R'} \frac{1}{2} (R' - \tau) = \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (R' - \tau) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda (E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) + \tau - R') \right\} \\ &= \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) R' + \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \right) \tau + \lambda E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \lambda E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) + \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \right) \tau \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) R' \right\} \\ &= \max_{\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \min_{\tau} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) - \lambda \tau \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \lambda R' \right\} \quad (59) \end{aligned}$$

where (*) follows by convexity of $E_c(P_{X,Z}, P, \tau)$ in τ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) - \lambda \tau \right\} \\ &= \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) \max_{0 \leq \mu \leq 1} \left\{ \mu \tau - K_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \mu) \right\} - \lambda \tau \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \max_{0 \leq \mu \leq 1} \left\{ \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} \mu - \lambda \mu - \lambda \right) \tau \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) K_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \mu) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where again (*) follows by convexity of $\left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) K_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \mu)$ in μ (cf. Appendix G-C). The minimum of the linear term $\left(\frac{1}{2} \mu - \lambda \mu - \lambda \right) \tau$ over the choices of $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ is $-\infty$ unless $\mu = \frac{\lambda}{\frac{1}{2} - \lambda}$ (in which case the minimum is 0).

This is possible only if $\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) E_c(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \tau) - \lambda \tau \right\} \\ &= \begin{cases} -\left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) K_0(P_{X,Z}, \hat{P}, \frac{\lambda}{\frac{1}{2} - \lambda}), & \lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{4}] \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above into (59) completes the proof. ■

Derivation of E_s :

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} \{ E_t(P_{X,Z}, P, R') + D(P \| P_Z) \} \\ &= \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}} \{ \lambda R' - \tilde{K}_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \lambda) \} + D(P \| P_Z) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \max_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}} \left\{ \lambda R' + \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})} \{ D(P \| P_Z) - \tilde{K}_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \lambda) \} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where (*) follows since K_0 (and hence \tilde{K}_0) is a linear function of P (cf. (20) and (55)) while $D(P \| P_Z)$ is convex in P and we can swap the min and the max. The claim follows then by observing that

$$\begin{aligned} & D(P \| P_Z) - \tilde{K}_0(P_{X,Z}, P, \lambda) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) \left[\log \left(\frac{P(z)}{P_Z(z)} \right) - \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} P_X(x|z)^{\frac{2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1-4\lambda}{2}} \right] \\ &\geq \log \left[\frac{1}{\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z) \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} P_X(x|z)^{\frac{2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1-4\lambda}{2}}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

with equality if

$$P(z) \propto P_Z(z) \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} P_X(x|z)^{\frac{2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1-4\lambda}{2}},$$

using the concavity of logarithm. ■

APPENDIX F

THE BEST POSSIBLE EXPONENT OF [7]

To compare the exponent with that of [7] we note that combining [10, Equations (12)–(14)] we have

$$D(P_Z |_{W=w} \| P_Z^n) \leq \exp[-n E_H(P_X, W, R')]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & E_H(P_X, W, R') \\ &= \min \{ R' - I(X; Z) - 2\epsilon H(Z), \log(e) 2\epsilon^2 \mu_{X,Z}^2 \} \end{aligned}$$

with $\mu_{X,Z} = \min_{(x,z) \in \text{supp}(P_{X,Z})} P_{X,Z}(x, z)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Thus, the best possible value of E_H is obtained by choosing ϵ such that

$$R' = I(X; Z) + 2\epsilon H(Z) + \log(e) 2\epsilon^2 \mu_{X,Z}^2 \quad (60a)$$

resulting in

$$E_H(P_X, W, R') = \log(e) \epsilon^2 \mu_{X,Z}^2. \quad (60b)$$

APPENDIX G CONVEXITY PROOFS

Lemma 7. Let $a_i > 0$, and $b_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, k$ be arbitrary real numbers. Then,

- (i) The function $f(s) \triangleq \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^s \right)$ is convex in s for $\forall s \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) The function $g(s) \triangleq \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{\frac{1}{s}} \right)^s$ is convex in s for $s > 0$.

Proof: Pick $s_1 < s_2$ and $t \in (0, 1)$. Let $\bar{t} \triangleq 1 - t$ and $\bar{s} \triangleq t s_1 + \bar{t} s_2$. Then, Hölder's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^s &= \sum_{i=1}^k \left(a_i^t b_i^{t s_1} \times a_i^{\bar{t}} b_i^{\bar{t} s_2} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{s_1} \right)^t \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{s_2} \right)^{\bar{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the $\log(\cdot)$ of both sides of the above proves (i).

Now assume $s_2 > s_1 > 0$ and let $\alpha \triangleq \frac{t s_1}{t s_1 + \bar{t} s_2} \in (0, 1)$ and $\bar{\alpha} \triangleq 1 - \alpha$. Once again Hölder's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{\frac{1}{s}} &= \sum_{i=1}^k \left(a_i^\alpha b_i^{t/s} \times a_i^{\bar{\alpha}} b_i^{\bar{t}/s} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{t/(\alpha s)} \right)^\alpha \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{\bar{t}/(\bar{\alpha} s)} \right)^{\bar{\alpha}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{\frac{1}{s_1}} \right)^\alpha \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i^{\frac{1}{s_2}} \right)^{\bar{\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

Raising both sides to the power $s = t s_1 + \bar{t} s_2$ and taking the logarithm proves (ii). ■

Lemma 8. Suppose $f_i(s), i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ are convex functions in s and $a_i > 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ is a sequence of real numbers. Then,

- (i) $f(s) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^k a_i f_i(s)$ is convex in s .
- (ii) $g(s) \triangleq \log \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \exp[f_i(s)] \right)$ is convex in s .

Proof: The convexity of $f(s)$ is trivial. To prove the convexity of $g(s)$, let $s_1 < s_2$ and $s = t s_1 + \bar{t} s_2$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$ (where $\bar{t} \triangleq 1 - t$). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \exp[f_i(s)] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \exp[t f_i(s_1) + (1-t) f_i(s_2)] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \left(a_i^t \exp[t f_i(s_1)] \times a_i^{\bar{t}} \exp[\bar{t} f_i(s_2)] \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \exp[f_i(s_1)] \right)^t \left(\sum_{i=1}^k a_i \exp[f_i(s_2)] \right)^{\bar{t}} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by Hölder's inequality. Taking the logarithm of both sides of the above proves (ii). ■

Convexity of the functions F_0^e, F_0, G_0, K_0 , and \tilde{K}_0 is established using the above two lemmas as follows:

A. Convexity of F_0^e

Take $a_i = P_Z(z)$ and $b_i = \exp[D(P_{X|Z=z} \| P_X)]$ in Lemma 7 part (i). ■

B. Convexity of G_0

Set $a_i = P_{X|Z}(x|z)$ and $b_i = \frac{P_{X|Z}(x|z)}{P_X(x)}$ in Lemma 7 part (i) and then using Lemma 8 part (i). ■

C. Convexity of K_0

The claim is proved by first letting $s \triangleq 1 - \mu$, then taking $a_i = P_X(x)$ and $b_i = \frac{P_{X|Z}(x|z)}{P_X(x)}$ in Lemma 7 part (ii), and finally using Lemma 8 part (i). ■

D. Convexity of \tilde{K}_0 and F_0

Take $s = \frac{1-4\lambda}{2}$, $a_i = \sqrt{P_{X|Z}(x|z)P_X(x)}$ and $b_i = \frac{P_{X|Z}(x|z)}{P_X(x)}$. Then, Lemma 7 part (ii) implies the function

$$s \mapsto \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{s}} P_X(x)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{s}} \right)^s$$

is convex in s . So is the function

$$s \mapsto \frac{1}{4} \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4s}} P_X(x)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4s}} \right)^{4s}$$

Replacing the value of s and noting that it is a linear function of λ we can see that the function

$$\lambda \mapsto \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Z}(x|z)^{\frac{1-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} P_X(x)^{\frac{-2\lambda}{1-4\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{1-4\lambda}{2}}$$

is convex in λ . Taking $a_i = P(z)$ in Lemma 8 part (i) proves the claim on \tilde{K}_0 while setting $a_i = P_Z(z)$ in Lemma 8 part (ii) proves the claim on F_0 . ■