

On the Capacity of the Carbon Copy onto Dirty Paper Channel

Stefano Rini * and Shlomo Shamai (Shitz)[†]

* National Chiao-Tung University, Hsinchu, Taiwan

E-mail: stefano@nctu.edu.tw

[†] Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

E-mail: sshlomo@ee.technion.ac.il

Abstract—The “Carbon Copy onto Dirty Paper” (CCDP) channel is the compound “writing on dirty paper” channel in which the channel output is obtained as the sum of the channel input, white Gaussian noise and a Gaussian state sequence randomly selected among a set possible realizations. The transmitter has non-causal knowledge of the set of possible state sequences but does not know which sequence is selected to produce the channel output. We study the capacity of the CCDP channel for two scenarios: (i) the state sequences are independent and identically distributed, and (ii) the state sequences are scaled versions of the same sequence. In the first scenario, we show that a combination of superposition coding, time-sharing and Gel’fand-Pinsker binning is sufficient to approach the capacity to within three bits per channel use for any number of possible state realizations. In the second scenario, we derive capacity to within four bits-per-channel-use for the case of two possible state sequences. This result is extended to the CCDP channel with any number of possible state sequences under certain conditions on the scaling parameters which we denote as “strong fading” regime. We conclude by providing some remarks on the capacity of the CCDP channel in which the state sequences have any jointly Gaussian distribution.

Index Terms—Gel’fand-Pinsker Channel; Compound State-dependent Channel; Compound Channels with Side Information at the Transmitter; Carbon Copying onto Dirty Paper; Quasi-static Fading; Costa Pre-coding;

INTRODUCTION

The Gel’fand-Pinsker (GP) channel [1] is the point-to-point channel in which the channel output is obtained as a random function of the input and a state sequence which is provided non-causally to the encoder but is unknown at the decoder. Costa’s “Writing on Dirty Paper” (WDP) channel [2] is the Gaussian version of the GP channel in which the channel output is equal to the sum of the input, a channel state and white Gaussian noise. In [2] Costa proved that the transmitter can fully pre-code its transmissions against the channel state so that the capacity of the WDP channel is equal to the capacity of the Gaussian point-to-point channel. Unfortunately, the performance of the capacity-achieving transmission scheme in [2] quickly degrades in the presence of uncertainty in the

channel knowledge: for this reason, it is of great interest to extend Costa’s result to models in which only partial channel knowledge is available at the users.

In the following, we investigate the compound version of the WDP channel, the CCDP channel [3]. This channel models the WDP channel in which the channel state sequence is randomly drawn among a set possible realizations, all anti-causally known only at the transmitter. The CCDP channel is obtained from the compound channel model [4] by letting the output at each compound receiver equal the sum of the channel input, white Gaussian noise and a Gaussian state known only at the transmitter. The CCDP channel is also equivalent to a Gaussian broadcast channel with a common message and with channel states known only at the transmitter [5].

Related Results: The compound GP channel is the discrete memoryless compound channel in which the output at each compound receiver is a random function of the channel input and a state sequence non-causally known at the encoder. An achievable region for the two-receiver compound GP channel is presented in [6], [7] where it is shown that using a common message improves over the coding scheme in which the transmitter simultaneously bins against both state realizations¹. In [3] the authors introduce the CCDP channel as the compound GP channel with additive Gaussian state and additive Gaussian noise and derive the first inner and outer bounds for to capacity.

The CCDP channel can be used to model the WDP channel affected by slow fading and with receiver side information. This is obtained by letting the channel states be a scaled version of the same state sequence: we term this model “Writing on Slow Fading Dirt” (WSFD) channel. The fast fading counterpart of the WSFD channel, in which the state is multiplied by a fast fading process, is known as the “Writing on Fast Fading Dirt” (WFFD) channel². The WFFD channel was first studied in [10] for the case in which an *i.i.d.* phase fading process affects the channel state. In [11], the same authors derive upper and lower bounds to the outage probability for this model. Achievable rates under Gaussian signaling are derived in [12] for the channel in which the state is multiplied by a Gaussian fast fading process. The authors of [13] consider the case in which both the input and the state

The work of S. Rini was funded by the Ministry Of Science and Technology (MOST) under the grant 103-2218-E-009-014-MY2. The work of S. Shamai was supported by the European FP7 NEWCOM#, and the Heron Consortium 5G Technologies, Israel Ministry of Science. Part of this work has been presented at the 2014 Information Theory Workshop (ITW), Hobart, Australia and at the 2016 International Conference on the Science of Electrical Engineering (ICSEE), Eilat, Israel.

¹Note that the capacity for this model was incorrectly claimed in [8], [9].

²This model is also known as “writing on faded dirt” channel, “fading dirty paper” channel or “dirty paper channel with fading dirt”.

sequences are multiplied by the fading process. For this model, it is shown that the rate loss from full state pre-cancellation is vanishing in both the ergodic and quasi-static fading case and at both high and low SNRs. This result holds because fading affects the sum of state and input and thus Costa pre-coding as in the WDP channel is still effective. The model above is further investigated in [14], which also considers the multi-antenna setting. In [14] algorithms are also proposed to determine the optimal linear pre-coding strategies which are shown to outperform Costa's linear assignment in the multiple antenna setting. In [15], we derive the capacity to within a constant gap for the channel in which the fading only takes two possible values: this result is extended in [16] to include more general fading distribution and to consider the case in which the fading sequence is not known either at the transmitter or at the receiver.

A model which encompasses the CCDP channel as a special case is the state-dependent broadcast channel with a common message. This model is obtained from the CCDP channel by introducing an additional private message to be communicated between the transmitter and each receiver. A first achievable region for this channel is derived in [17] by combining coding strategies for the GP channel and the Gaussian broadcast channel. The approximate capacity for the case of two receivers is determined in [18]. The authors of [19] point out how the study of the Gaussian state-dependent broadcast channel with a common message appears more arduous than the study of the state-dependent broadcast channel with independent messages. This is due to the fact that the former model is not degraded and thus the capacity region with a common message cannot be directly deduced from the capacity region of the channel with independent messages.

Contributions: In the following, we investigate the capacity of the M -receiver CCDP channel. We focus, in particular, on two classes which we term (i) the "Writing on Random Dirty Paper" (WRDP) channel and (ii) the "Writing on Slow Fading Dirt" (WSFD) channel. The WRDP channel corresponds to the CCDP channel with *i.i.d.* channel state sequences while the WSFD channel is the CCDP channel in which the state sequences are scaled versions of the same sequence. We also consider a third model: (iii) the CCDP with "Equivalent States" (CCDP-ES) channel in which the channel states have the same variance and the same pairwise correlation.

For the models above, we characterize the approximate capacity³ in the following classes:

Sec. III– WRDP channel: For this model, we determine the approximate capacity for all parameter regimes and any number of compound receivers; we begin by considering the case of $M = 2$ receivers and successively extend this result to any value of M . Capacity is approached by having the transmitter send the superposition of two codewords: the bottom codeword treats the state as noise and is decoded by all the users. The top codeword, instead, is time-shared among all




Fig. 1: The "Carbon Copying onto Dirty Paper" (CCDP) channel.

receivers as it is pre-coded against the state in the m^{th} channel output for a portion $1/M$ of the time.

Sec. IV– WSFD channel: For this channel, we determine the approximate capacity for the case $M = 2$ and generalize this result to the case any value M only under some additional conditions on the channel parameters which we term "strong fading" conditions. As for the WRDP channel, the achievable strategies rely on superposition coding and state pre-cancellation with time-sharing among the different receivers. In the WSFD channel, though, simultaneous state pre-cancellation at multiple receivers is also necessary when channel states have high correlation.

Sec. V– CCDP-ES channel: Here, as in the previous sections, we first derive the approximate capacity for the case of $M = 2$ compound receivers and then generalize this result to any value of M . For the CCDP-ES, we show that the channel state sequences can be decomposed in a common part, as in the WFD channel, and in an independent part, as in the WRDP channel, so that a combination of the results in Sec. IV and Sec. IV are sufficient to approach capacity.

Paper Organization

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: in Sec. I we introduce the CCDP channel and specialize this model to obtain the WRDP, the WSFD, and the CCDP-ES channels. Sec. II presents the relevant results available in the literature. In Sec. III we study the WRDP channel while, in Sec. IV, we investigate the WSFD channel. The CCDP-ES is considered in Sec. V. Finally, Sec. VI concludes the paper.

I. CHANNEL MODEL

The M -receiver CCDP channel, also depicted in Fig. 1, is the compound channel with states known at the transmitter in which the output at the m^{th} compound receiver is obtained as

$$Y_m^N = X^N + cS_m^N + Z_m^N, \quad m \in [1 \dots M], \quad (1)$$

³In the following, for brevity, we use the term "approximate capacity" in lieu of "capacity to within a constant gap". A precise definition of "approximate capacity" is provided in Def. 2.

where X^N is the channel input, S_m^N the channel state sequence, Z_m^N a white Gaussian noise sequence with zero mean and unitary variance and $c \geq 0$ without loss of generality. The transmitter, having knowledge of the state sequences, wishes to reliably communicate the message $W \in \mathcal{W} = [1 \dots 2^{NR}]$ to each of the M compound receivers, despite the presence of the additive state and the additive noise. The channel input X^N is subject to the average power constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [|X_i|^2] \leq NP. \quad (2)$$

For each channel use i , $[S_{1i} \dots S_{Mi}]$ is an *i.i.d.* jointly Gaussian random vector with zero mean and covariance matrix Σ_S^4 .

Depending on the structure of the covariance matrix Σ_S , the CCDP channel specializes in the following models:

- **The WRDP channel:** Corresponding to

$$\Sigma_S = \mathbf{I}_M, \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{I}_M is the identity matrix of length M , that is, the channel states are independent white Gaussian sequences with zero mean and unitary variance.

- **The WSFD channel:** Corresponding to

$$\Sigma_S = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{a}, \quad (4)$$

for $\mathbf{a} = [a_1 \dots a_M]$, that is, each channel state sequence is equal to $S_m = a_m S^N$ where S^N is a white Gaussian sequence with zero mean and unitary variance. For this model, we further assume $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_M$ without loss of generality.

- **The CCDP-ES channel:** Corresponding to

$$\Sigma_S = (1 - \rho) \mathbf{I}_M + \rho \mathbf{1}_M^T \mathbf{1}_M, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_M$ is the all-one row vector of size M , that is, the channel states are Gaussian sequences with zero mean, unitary variance and pairwise correlation ρ (the range of feasible values of ρ is discussed later in Lem. I.3).

In the following, we assume standard definitions of code, probability of error, achievable rate and capacity.

Definition 1. Code and probability of error. A $(2^{NR}, N)$ code for the CCDP channel is defined by an encoding function $f(\cdot)$ with

$$X^N = f(W, [S_1^N \dots S_M^N]), \quad (6)$$

for $W \in \mathcal{W}$, and M decoding functions $g_m(\cdot)$ for

$$\widehat{W}_m = g_m(Y_m^N), \quad m \in [1 \dots M]. \quad (7)$$

The probability of error P_e of a $(2^{NR}, N)$ code for the CCDP channel is defined as

$$P_e = \max_{m \in [1 \dots M]} \frac{1}{2^{NR}} \sum_{w=1}^{2^{NR}} P_e(w) \quad (8)$$

$$P_e(w) = \mathbb{P} [g_m(Y_m^N) \neq w | X^N = f(w, [S_1^N \dots S_M^N])].$$

⁴In the following, we use the short-hand notation $[S_1^N \dots S_M^N] \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_S, \Sigma_S)$.

Note that the error probability in (8) is also averaged over all possible realizations of the state sequence vector $[S_1^N \dots S_M^N]$.

Definition 2. Achievable rate, capacity, and approximate capacity. A rate R is said to be achievable on the CCDP channel if, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a code $(2^{NR'}, N)$ such that $R' \geq R$ while $P_e \leq \epsilon$. The capacity \mathcal{C} is defined as the supremum of all the achievable rates. An inner bound $R^{\text{IN}} \leq \mathcal{C}$ and an outer bound $R^{\text{OUT}} \geq \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$R^{\text{OUT}} - R^{\text{IN}} \leq \Delta, \quad (9)$$

for all channel parameters and for some constant $\Delta > 0$ are said to determine the capacity to within an additive gap of Δ bits-per-channel-use (bpcu) or, for brevity, to characterize the approximate capacity to within Δ bpcu.

In the following, we focus on determining the approximate capacity for the CCDP channel to within a small gap for various parameter regimes. Although partial, these results provide a tight characterization of capacity at high SNR.

The channel model in (1) actually encompasses a larger class of compound channels with additive Gaussian states and additive Gaussian noise, as shown by the next lemma.

Lemma I.1. Generalized channel model. An M -receiver compound GP channel in which the output at the m^{th} compound receiver is obtained as

$$Y_m^N = X^N + S_m^N + Z_m^N, \quad m \in [1 \dots M], \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_m^N &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_Z, \sigma^2) \\ [S_1^N \dots S_M^N] &\sim i.i.d. \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_S, \Sigma_S), \end{aligned}$$

while the input is subject to a power in (2) can be reduced to the form of (1) without loss of generality.

Proof: The proof is provided in App. A. ■

In the following, we refer to the term c in (1) as “state gain”: although this term can be incorporated into the state covariance matrix Σ_S , it is convenient to use this parameter to scale the variance of the state sequence across all outputs.

A simple but important observation is as follows.

Lemma I.2. The capacity of the CCDP channel is decreasing in the state gain c .

Proof: The proof is provided in App. C. ■

The next lemma establishes the valid range of pairwise correlation for the CCDP-ES channel.

Lemma I.3. Feasible correlation for the CCDP-ES channel. Let the matrix Σ_S be defined as in (5): then Σ_S is positive defined for $-1/(M-1) \leq \rho \leq 1$.

Proof: See App. B. ■

II. RELATED RESULTS

This section briefly reviews the results available in the literature which are relevant to the study of the CCDP channel.

• **Gel'fand-Pinsker (GP) channel:** The capacity for the GP channel [1, Th. 1] is obtained as

$$\mathcal{C} = \max_{P_{U,X|S}} (I(Y;U) - I(U;S)). \quad (11)$$

The expression in (11) is convex in $P_{X|S,U}$ for a fixed $P_{U|S}$ which implies that X can be chosen to be a deterministic function of U and S . On the other hand, this expression is neither convex nor concave in $P_{U|S}$ for a fixed $P_{X|S,U}$: for this reason, it is not easy to obtain a closed-form expression of capacity or to evaluate it numerically.

• **Writing on Dirty Paper (WDP) channel:** One of the few channel models for which the maximization in (11) is known in closed-form is the WDP channel [2]. For this model the assignment

$$\begin{aligned} X &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, P), \quad X \perp S \\ U &= X + \frac{P}{P+1}S, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

in (11) recovers the point-to-point capacity. This implies that full state pre-cancellation is possible regardless of the distribution of S .

• **Carbon Copy onto Dirty Paper (CCDP) channel:** The CCDP channel is the compound extension of the WDP channel. In [3] the following bounds on the capacity of the 2-receiver WRDP channel are shown.

Theorem II.1. Inner and outer bounds for the 2-receiver WRDP channel [3, Th. 3, Th. 4].

Consider the 2-receiver WRDP channel: the capacity of this model is upper bounded as

$$R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} \log \left(\frac{1+P}{c^2/4+1} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1+P+c^2+2c\sqrt{P}}{c^2/4+1} \right) & c^2 < 4 \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(1+P) \\ \quad + \frac{1}{4} \log(1+P+c^2+2c\sqrt{P}) \\ \quad - \frac{1}{4} \log(c^2) & c^2 \geq 4, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

and lower bounded as

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{P}{c^2/2+1} \right) & c^2/2 \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{P+c^2/2+1}{c^2} \right) \\ \quad + \frac{1}{4} \log \left(\frac{c^2}{2} \right) & 1 \leq c^2/2 < P+1 \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P+1) & c^2/2 \geq P+1. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The inner bound in (14) is derived using a common codeword treating the channel state as noise and a private codeword for each user. The private codewords employ lattice codes to pre-code the transmitted message against a linear combination of the two state sequences.

The results in Th. II.1 are also extended in [3] to the case of any number of compound receivers.

Theorem II.2. Outer bounds for the M -receiver WRDP channel [3, Eq. (31)].

Consider the M -receiver WRDP channel: the capacity of this model is upper bounded as

$$\mathcal{C} \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(P + c^2 + 2c\sqrt{P} \right) - \frac{M-1}{2M} \log c^2$$

$$- \frac{1}{2M} \log M - \left[\frac{1}{2M} \log \left(\frac{c^2}{M(P+1)} \right) \right]^+. \quad (15)$$

• **“Writing on Fast Fading Dirt” (WFFD) channel:** In the WSFD channel, the output at each receiver contains the same state sequence S^N multiplied by a different scaling factor: this models a WDP channel in which the channel state is affected by a slow fading process known at the receiver. The WFFD channel is the fast fading counterpart to the WSFD channel in which the channel output is obtained as

$$Y^N = X^N + cA^N \circ S^N + Z^N, \quad (16)$$

where \circ indicates the Hadamard product, with

$$\begin{aligned} S^N &\sim \text{i.i.d. } \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \\ A^N &\sim \text{i.i.d. } P_A, \end{aligned}$$

and where A^N is known only at the receiver. The terms X^N and Z^N in (16) are defined as in (1). The capacity of the model in (16) is a special case of the capacity of the GP channel in (11). In [20], we derived alternative inner and outer bounds to the expression in (11) and show the approximate capacity for the case of antipodal fading realizations.

Theorem II.3. Approximate capacity for the WFFD channel with Gaussian state and antipodal fading [20].

Consider the WFFD channel in (16) for the case in which P_A is the uniform distribution over the set $\{-1, +1\}$: the capacity for this model is upper bounded as

$$\mathcal{C} \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log(P+1) & c^2 \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log(P+c^2+1) \\ \quad - \frac{1}{4} \log(c^2+1) + \frac{3}{2} & 1 < c^2 < P+1 \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P+1) + 2 & c^2 \geq P+1, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

and the capacity lies to within a gap of 2 bpcu from the outer bound in (17).

The outer bound in (17) can be approached by a transmission scheme in which the channel input is the superposition of two codewords: the base codeword treats the channel state as noise while the top codeword is pre-coded against $+S^N$.

III. THE WRITING ON RANDOM DIRTY PAPER CHANNEL

In this section we derive the capacity of the M -receiver WRDP channel to within 2.25 bpcu: we begin by considering the case of two compound receivers and successively extend this result for any number of compound receivers.

Theorem III.1. Approximate capacity for the 2-receiver WRDP channel.

Consider the 2-receiver WRDP channel: the capacity of this model is upper bounded as

$$\mathcal{C} \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log(P+1) & c^2 \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log(P+c^2+1) \\ \quad - \frac{1}{4} \log(c^2+1) + \frac{1}{2} & 1 < c^2 < P+1 \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P+1) + 1 & c^2 \geq P+1, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

and the capacity lies to within a gap of 1 bpcu from the outer bound in (18).

Proof: When $c^2 \leq 1$, treating the channel states as additional noise attains the point-to-point capacity to within 1 bpcu. When $P \leq 1$, the point-to-point capacity is necessarily smaller than 1 bpcu and thus the capacity of the WRDP channel is also smaller than 1 bpcu. The proof for $c^2 > 1$ and $P > 1$ is as follows.

Converse: Using Fano's inequality and similarly to [3, Th. 3], we upper bound capacity as

$$\begin{aligned} N(R - \epsilon_N) &\leq \min_{m \in \{1,2\}} I(Y_m^N; W) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (H(Y_1^N) + H(Y_2^N) \\ &\quad - H(Y_1^N|W) - H(Y_2^N|W)). \end{aligned} \quad (19a)$$

$$(19b)$$

The positive entropy terms in (19a) are bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &H(Y_1^N) + H(Y_2^N) \\ &\leq \frac{N}{2} \log(P + c^2 + 2c\sqrt{P} + 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{N}{2} \log(P + c^2 + 2c\sqrt{P} + 1) + N \log 2\pi e \end{aligned} \quad (20a)$$

$$\leq N \log(P + c^2 + 1) + N \log 2\pi e + 1, \quad (20b)$$

where (20a) follows from the Gaussian Maximizes Entropy (GME) property and (20b) follows from the fact that $2(P + c^2) \geq (\sqrt{P} + c)^2$. The negative entropy terms in (19b) are bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} &-H(Y_1^N|W) - H(Y_2^N|W) \\ &\leq -H(Y_1^N, Y_2^N|W) \\ &= -H(Y_2^N - Y_1^N, Y_2^N|W) \end{aligned} \quad (21a)$$

$$= -H(c(S_2^N - S_1^N) + Z_2^N - Z_1^N, Y_2^N|W), \quad (21b)$$

where the change in variable in (21a) has unitary Jacobian. We continue the series of inequalities in (21) as

$$(21b) = -H(c(S_2^N - S_1^N) + Z_2^N - Z_1^N|W) \\ - H(Y_2^N|S_2^N - S_1^N + Z_2^N - Z_1^N, W) \quad (22a)$$

$$\leq -H(c(S_2^N - S_1^N) + Z_2^N - Z_1^N) \\ - H(Z_2^N|Z_2^N - Z_1^N) \quad (22b)$$

$$\leq -\frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e(2c^2 + 2) - \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e \frac{1}{2}. \quad (22c)$$

Combining (20b) and (22c) and for $c^2 > 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\text{OUT}} &= \frac{1}{2} \log(P + c^2 + 1) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \log(c^2) + \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The expression in (23) is convex in c^2 with a minimum in $c^{2*} = P + 1$: following Lem. I.2, decreasing the value of c^2 yields a channel with larger capacity. For this reason, substituting c^2 in (23) with $\min\{c^2, P + 1\}$ yields the tighter outer bound. This substitution produces the outer bound in (18).

Achievability: Consider the achievable strategy schematically presented in Fig. 2. The channel input is obtained as the




Fig. 2: A graphical representation of the capacity approaching scheme in Th. III.1.

superposition of a bottom codeword and two top codewords. The bottom codeword, X_{SAN}^N (SAN for *State As Noise*) with power αP , carries the message W_{SAN} with rate R_{SAN} . This codeword treats the state sequences as additional noise and is decoded at both receivers. The two top codewords, $X_{\text{PAS}-1}^N$ and $X_{\text{PAS}-2}^N$ (PAS for *Pre-coded Against State*), both have power $\bar{\alpha}P$ for $\bar{\alpha} = 1 - \alpha$ and carry the message W_{PAS} at rate R_{PAS} . These two codewords are transmitted using time-sharing, each sent for half of the channel uses. The codeword $X_{\text{PAS}-1}^N$ is pre-coded against the state sequence S_1^N as in the classical WDP channel and is decoded only at receiver 1. Similarly, $X_{\text{PAS}-2}^N$ is pre-coded against S_2^N and decoded only at receiver 2. Since the private codewords carry the same message, each compound receiver is able to decode both W_{SAN} and W_{PAS} , thus attaining the rate

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha P}{c^2 + \bar{\alpha}P + 1} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \log(1 + \bar{\alpha}P). \quad (24)$$

The expression in (24) can be maximized over α , the ratio between the power of the common and the private codewords. When $P + 1 \geq c^2$, the optimal value of $\bar{\alpha}$ yields $\bar{\alpha}P + 1 = c^2 S_i$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. When $c^2 \geq P + 1$, the optimal allocation yields $\alpha P = 0$ and the transmission scheme reduces to pre-coding for each receiver for half of the time. As a result of the optimization over α in (24), we obtain the inner bound

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{P}{c^2 + 1} \right) & c^2 < 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + c^2 + P) \\ \quad - \frac{1}{4} \log(c^2) - \frac{1}{2} & 1 \leq c^2 < P + 1 \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P + 1) & c^2 \geq P + 1. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

By comparing the expression in (18) and (25), we conclude that the outer bound can be attained to within 1 bpcu. ■

Next, we extend the result in Th. III.1 to the case of any number of compound receivers.

Theorem III.2. Approximate capacity for the M -receiver WRDP channel.

Consider the M -receiver WRDP channel: the capacity for this

model is upper bounded as

$$\mathcal{C} \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2} \right) + 2.25 & M-1 > c^2 \\ \frac{1}{2M} \log(1+P) + & M-1 \leq c^2 < (M-1)(P+1) \\ \quad + \frac{M-1}{2M} \log(c^2) + 1.5 & \\ \frac{1}{2M} \log(1+P) + 2 & c^2 \geq (M-1)(P+1), \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

and the capacity lies to within a gap of 2.25 bpcu from the outer bound in (26).

Proof: The converse proof is established using a recursion which extends on the outer bound derivation in the proof of Th. III.1. The inner bound has the same spirit as the inner bound in Th. III.1: the channel input is obtained as the superposition of M private codewords over a common codeword. The common codeword treats the channel states as noise and is decoded at all receivers, while the private codewords are transmitted using time-sharing. Additionally, the m^{th} private codeword is pre-coded against the channel state at the m^{th} compound receiver and all convey the same message. Similarly to (24), the rate attainable with this strategy is

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha P}{c^2 + \bar{\alpha} P + 1} \right) + \frac{1}{2M} \log(1 + \bar{\alpha} P), \quad (27)$$

which can again be maximized over the power allocation parameter α . The full proof is provided in App. D. ■

The result in Th. III.2 essentially shows that it is not possible to effectively pre-code against multiple independent channel state realizations. Instead, a simple combination of time-sharing, superposition coding, and dirty paper coding is sufficient to closely approach capacity and other, more complex, transmission strategies such as joint binning, non-unique decoding and structure codes provide no substantial improvements.

Remark III.3. Time-sharing VS code-sharing. The achievable strategy in the proof of Th. III.2 can be improved upon by using code-sharing instead of time-sharing as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\text{SAN}}^N &\rightarrow X_{\text{PAS-1}}^N \\ X_{\text{SAN}}^N &\rightarrow X_{\text{PAS-2}}^N \\ S_1^N &\dashrightarrow X_{\text{PAS-1}}^N \\ S_2^N &\dashrightarrow X_{\text{PAS-2}}^N \\ X_{\text{PAS-1}}^N &\cdots X_{\text{PAS-2}}^N, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $U^N \rightarrow V^N$ indicates that V^N is superimposed U^N and $U^N \dashrightarrow V^N$ indicates that V^N is binned against U^N as in [21]. As in the Gaussian broadcast channel, in which superposition coding performs at most 1 bpcu better than time-sharing, the achievable strategy in (28) provides a bounded performance improvement over the time-sharing strategy used in the achievability proof of Th. III.2. On the other hand, the simpler achievable strategy of Th. III.2 can be more easily optimized as a function of the channel parameters.

Remark III.4. Non-unique decoding. Indirect or non-unique decoding as in [7] is not necessary for the result in Th. III.2. As argued in [22], joint (unique) decoding is sufficient to approach

capacity to within a small gap. It can be shown that also for the scheme in Rem. III.3, non-unique decoding does not provide rate improvements over unique decoding.

A. Discussion

The relatively simple expression of the result in Th. III.2 is made possible by the assumption that the channel states all have equal variance. When the states have the same variance, treating the channel state as noise attains the same rate at all compound receivers. If the state sequences had different variance, we could improve upon the achievable scheme in Th. III.2 by employing partially common codewords, i.e. codewords which are decoded by a subset of receivers. As an example consider the case of $M = 3$ with channel states of increasing variance, i.e. $\text{Var}[S_1] < \text{Var}[S_2] < \text{Var}[S_3]$. In this case, a codeword treating the channel state at user 2 as additional noise can also be decoded at receiver 1 but it cannot be decoded at receiver 3. The use of partially common codeword necessarily introduces further constraints in the derivation of inner and outer bounds, leading to a more complex expression of the approximate capacity.

IV. WRITING ON SLOW FADING DIRT CHANNEL

This section investigates the capacity of the M -receiver WSFD channel: as in Sec. III, we begin by considering the case of two compound receivers and successively extend the analysis to the case of any M . For the 2-receiver WSFD channel we show the approximate capacity in all parameter regimes while, for the case of any number of compound receivers, we are able to show capacity only under some additional conditions on the set of scaling coefficients $[a_1 \dots a_M]$. Since the WSFD channel models the WDP channel in which the channel state is multiplied by a slow fading process, we refer to the term $ca_m S^N$ as the *fading-times-state term* at the m^{th} receiver⁵. For the 2-receiver WSFD channel, we simplify the notation in (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1^N &= X^N + cS^N + Z_1^N \\ Y_2^N &= X^N + caS^N + Z_2^N, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $|a| \geq 1$ without loss of generality.

Theorem IV.1. Approximate capacity for the 2-receiver WSFD channel.

Consider the 2-receiver WSFD channel in (29): the capacity for this model is upper bounded as

$$\mathcal{C} \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log(P+1) & 1 \leq a < 1 + \frac{1}{\min\{\sqrt{P}, c\}} \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P+1) + \frac{1}{4} \log(\min\{P, c^2\}(a-1)^2 + 1) & 1 + \frac{1}{\min\{\sqrt{P}, c\}} \leq a \leq 2 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log(P + 2c^2(a-1)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \log(c^2(a-1)^2 + 1) & a \leq -1, a > 2, c^2 a^2 \leq P+1 \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P+1) + \frac{1}{2} & a \leq -1, a > 2, c^2 a^2 > P+1, \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

and the capacity lies to within a gap of 4 bpcu from the outer bound in (30).

⁵Note that this terminology is not coherent with the model definition in Sec. I but substantially facilitates the exposition of the results.

Proof: The proof requires a number of algebraic manipulations to simplify and compare inner and outer bound expressions: these details are omitted for brevity.

Converse: With a derivation similar to the converse proof in Th. III.1, we obtain the outer bound

$$R^{\text{OUT}} = \frac{1}{4} \log(P + c^2 + 1) + \frac{1}{4} \log(P + c^2 a^2 + 1) - \frac{1}{4} \log(c^2(a-1)^2 + 1) + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (31)$$

The outer bound in (31) is close to capacity for $a \leq -1$ and $a > 2$: in this regime, Lem. I.2 can be used to tightened the expression in (31) by substituting c^2 with $\min\{c^2, c'^2\}$ in (31) for

$$c'^2 = \frac{1+P^2}{a} \leq c^2. \quad (32)$$

Further bounding of the expression (31) in the interval $a \in [1, 2]$ yields the expression in (30).

Achievability: For the model in (29), the achievable strategy employed in Th. III.1 can be enhanced by pre-coding the common codeword against the state sequence S^N as in the GP channel. Let U_{SAN} be the random variable corresponding to the binned codeword and X_{SAN} the random variable associated with the transmitted codeword: this strategy attains the rate R^{SAN} for

$$R^{\text{SAN}} = H(U_{\text{SAN}}|S) - \max\{H(U_{\text{SAN}}|Y_1), H(U_{\text{SAN}}|Y_2)\}. \quad (33)$$

For the expression in (33), we consider the assignment

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\text{SAN}} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, P), \quad X_{\text{SAN}} \perp S \\ U_{\text{SAN}} &= X_{\text{SAN}} + kS, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

with $k \in \mathbb{R}$. A partial optimization over k in (34) yields the inner bound

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\alpha P + 1}{\frac{\alpha P c^2 (1-a)^2}{P+c^2+1} + 1 + \bar{\alpha} P} + 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4} \log(\bar{\alpha} P) - 1. \quad (35)$$

As for the expression in (24), the expression in (35) can be optimized over α , the power allocation parameter.

Gap to capacity: We separately consider three regimes of the fading coefficient a : a weak, medium and strong fading.

- *Weak fading* – $a \in [1, 1 + 1/\min\{\sqrt{P}, c\}]$: Coding as in the WDP channel for the first compound receiver attains the rate

$$R^{\text{IN-WDP}} = \frac{1}{2} \log(P+1) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{Pc^2}{P+c^2+1} (1-a)^2 + 1 \right), \quad (36)$$

at the second compound receiver. In the given parameter regime, (36) is to within 1/2 bpcu from the point-to-point capacity.

- *Strong fading* – $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus [-1, 2)$: When $c^2 a^2 > P + 1$, setting $\alpha = 0$ in (35) attains the outer bound in (30) to within

1/2 bpcu. When $c^2 a^2 \leq P + 1$, instead, the inner bound in (35) for the assignment

$$\alpha = \frac{P+1-c^2 a^2}{P}, \quad (37)$$

is to within 3 bpcu from the outer bound in (30).

- *Medium fading* – $a \in [1 + 1/\min\{\sqrt{P}, c\}, 2]$: When either $P \leq 3$ or $c^2 \leq 3$, capacity can be attained to within 3 bpcu by treating the channel states as noise. For $P > 3$ and $c^2 > 3$, consider the achievable scheme in (35) for $\alpha = a - 1$ which yields the inner bound

$$R^{\text{IN}} \geq \frac{1}{4} \log(P) + \frac{1}{4} \log \left(\frac{P(a'P+1)}{(P(-a'^3+a'^2+a')+1)^2} \right), \quad (38)$$

where $a' = a - 1$. The inner bound in (38) is to within 3 bpcu from the outer bound in (30). ■

The result in Th. IV.1 highlights the relationship between the WSFD channel, the WRDP channel and the WDP channel. For small positive values of a , i.e. $1 < a < 1 + 1/\min\{\sqrt{P}, c\}$, the WSFD channel behaves essentially as a WDP channel since binning as in the WDP channel performs close to the AWGN capacity. When $a \leq -1$ or $a > 2$, instead, the WSFD channel behaves similarly to the WRDP channel and the coding strategy in Th. III.1 is sufficient to approach capacity. This implies that the correlation between the channel states cannot be exploited to improve the communication rates in this regime. For the remaining values of a , i.e. $1 + 1/\min\{\sqrt{P}, c\} \leq a \leq 2$, the achievable scheme in (30) is necessary to approach capacity, as it allows for partial state pre-cancellation at both compound receivers simultaneously.

Remark IV.2. As for Rem. III.3, in Th. IV.1 a very simple transmission strategy is sufficient to closely approach capacity. Although many coding techniques have been proposed for simultaneous state pre-cancellation, such as joint binning [6] non-unique decoding [7], lattices codes [3], multiple description codes [23], Th. IV.1 shows that these strategies do not provide substantial improvements at high SNR.

Let us return to the strong fading conditions in Th. IV.1: when $c^2 a^2 > P + 1$, capacity can be approached by transmitting toward each compound receiver as in the WDP channel for half of the time. The next theorem extends this result to the case of any number of compound receivers.

Theorem IV.3. Outer bound and approximate capacity for the “strong fading” regime and $a_1 = 0$.

Consider the M -receiver WSFD channel with $a_1 = 0$, $P \geq 1$ and

$$c^2 a_2^2 > P + 1 \quad (39a)$$

$$\frac{a_m^2}{a_{m-1}^2} \geq P + 1, \quad m \in [3 \dots M], \quad (39b)$$

the capacity for this model is upper bounded as

$$C \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \frac{1}{2M} \log(1+P) + \frac{1}{2} \log(M) + 2, \quad (40)$$

and the capacity lies to within a gap of $\frac{1}{2} \log(M) + 2$ bpcu from the outer bound in (40).




Fig. 3: The linear deterministic approximation of the WSFD channel.

Proof: The converse proof extends the outer bound in Th. IV.1 in the strong fading regime to the case of any number of receivers M by determining conditions under which a recursion similar that in Th. III.2 can be established. In the achievability proof, the encoder transmits toward each compound receiver as in the WDP channel for a portion $1/M$ of the time. The full proof is provided in App. E. ■

The strong fading conditions in Th. IV.3 are intuitively understood through the deterministic binary linear approximation of [24] of a Gaussian network: this model is particularly useful in understanding the interaction between the different signals producing a channel output through a powerful visualization. We briefly introduce this model here, solely for illustrative purposes: more details can be found in [24] and in the related literature. Consider the binary vector channel

$$\bar{Y}_m^N = \mathbf{S}^{k-n_p} \bar{X}_k^N + \mathbf{S}^{k-n_{a_m}} \bar{S}_k^N, \quad (41)$$

where \mathbf{S} is a binary matrix with $\mathbf{S}_{ij} = \delta_{i-1,j}$ for $(i,j) \in [1 \dots m]^2$ and \bar{X}_k^N and \bar{S}_k^N are the first k bits of the binary expansion of X^N and S^N respectively. Also let $n_p = \lceil \log(P) \rceil$ and $n_{a_m} = \lceil \log(ca_m) \rceil$ and $k = \max\{n_p, n_{a_m}\}$ so that the multiplication by \mathbf{S}^{k-n_p} erases all but the n_p most significant bits of the binary vector \bar{X}_k^N , $k \in [1 \dots N]$. Similarly, the multiplication $\mathbf{S}^{k-n_{a_m}} \bar{S}_k^N$ erases all but the n_{a_m} most significant bits of \bar{S}_k^N .

The model in (41) is also represented Fig. 3: from a high-level perspective, it approximates the behaviour of its Gaussian counterpart with a binary deterministic channel by replacing the additive noise with erasures and approximating the sum over \mathbb{R} with the XORing of binary vectors.

Through the approximation in Fig. 3 we can better visualize the strong fading conditions in Th. IV.3. Consider Fig. 4 which represents, in vertical sections, the output at each compound receiver in the linear deterministic approximation of the 4-receiver WSFD. Each output is obtained from a different set of bits in the vector \bar{S}_k : as m increases, the value of a_m increases and more bits of \bar{S}_k appear above the noise floor. When two coefficients a_m and a_{m+1} are sufficiently close,




Fig. 4: The linear deterministic approximation of the 4-receiver WSFD channel in the “strong fading” regime.

the channel input sums with similar portions of the vector \bar{S}_k and the encoder is potentially able to pre-code its transmitted codeword for these two receivers simultaneously. When a_m and a_{m+1} are sufficiently different, instead, the channel input sums with two independent portions of the sequence S_k and the channel substantially reduces to a WRDP channel. This occurs when the ratio of a_{m+1} and a_m is larger than the magnitude of the channel input, as illustrated in Fig. 4, which approximatively corresponds to the conditions in (39).

The condition $a_1 = 0$ in Th. IV.3 is imposed only in order to obtain a relatively intuitive expression for the “strong fading” regime as in Fig. 4. The next theorem presents a more general version of Th. IV.3.

Lemma IV.4. Outer bound and approximate capacity for the “strong fading” regime.

Consider a M -receiver WSFD channel and let $\Delta_m = a_m - a_1$ for $m \in [2 \dots M]$: if

$$c^2 \Delta_2^2 > \max\{P + 1, a_2^2\} \quad (42a)$$

$$c^2 \Delta_i^2 > 1, \quad i > 2 \quad (42b)$$

$$\sum_{i=2}^{m-1} \Delta_i^2 \geq \gamma a_m^2, \quad m \in [2 \dots M] \quad (42c)$$

$$\Delta_m^2 \geq \gamma P \sum_{i=2}^{m-1} \Delta_i^2, \quad m \in [3 \dots M], \quad (42d)$$

for some $\gamma > 0$, then the capacity is upper bounded as

$$C \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \frac{1}{2M} \log(1 + P) + \frac{1}{2} \log(M) + \frac{1}{2} \log(\gamma) + 2, \quad (43)$$

and the capacity lies to within a gap of $\frac{1}{2} \log(M) + \frac{1}{2} \log(\gamma) + 2$ bpcu from the outer bound in (43).

Proof: The complete proof is provided in App. F. ■

It can be verified that the conditions in (42) reduce to the conditions in (39) when letting $a_1 = 0$.

A. Discussion

In [20] we determine the approximate capacity of the WFFD channel with antipodal fading: it is interesting to compare the

different effects of slow and fast fading on the capacity of the WDP channel for the antipodal fading distribution. By letting $a = -1$ in Th. IV.1 and comparing the resulting expression with (17) in Th. II.3, we see that the two regions are substantially identical. This equivalence is rather interesting as one would not expect fast and slow fading to have roughly the same effect on the capacity of the WDP channel. In the WFFD channel, from a high-level perspective, each typical realization of the fading distribution can be thought of as corresponding to a compound receiver. Accordingly, the number of compound receivers in the WFFD channel can be imagined as growing exponentially with the blocklength. In the WSFD channel, instead, the number of compound receivers is fixed.

In the capacity approaching inner bound in Th. IV.1, the transmitter pre-codes against the sequence $+S^N$ half of the time and against the sequence $-S^N$ for the other half of the time. On the other hand, in the capacity approaching inner bound in Th. II.3, the transmitter pre-codes against the realization $+S^N$ and each compound receiver observes $+S^N$ half of the time and $-S^N$ the other half of the time on average. In this sense, then, both capacity approaching schemes for the WSFD and WFFD channel serve half of the compound receivers at each time instance on average, so that the two schemes attain the same overall performance.

V. CARBON COPY ONTO DIRTY PAPER CHANNEL WITH EQUIVALENT STATES

In this section we derive the approximate capacity for the M -receiver CCDP-ES: as for the previous sections, we begin by studying the case of two compound receivers and successively investigate the general case.

Consider 2-receiver CCDP channel in (1) and let the state covariance matrix Σ_S be parameterized as

$$\Sigma_S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho\sqrt{Q} \\ \rho\sqrt{Q} & Q \end{bmatrix}, \quad (44)$$

for some $Q \geq 1$ and $-1 \leq \rho \leq 1$: the channel input/output relationship can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1^N &= X^N + cS_1^N + Z_1^N \\ &= X + c \left(\kappa S_c^N + \sqrt{1 - \kappa} \tilde{S}_1^N \right) + Z_1^N \end{aligned} \quad (45a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2^N &= X^N + cS_2^N + Z_2^N \\ &= X + c\sqrt{Q} \left(\frac{\rho}{\kappa} S_c^N + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\rho^2}{\kappa^2}} \tilde{S}_2^N \right) + Z_2^N, \end{aligned} \quad (45b)$$

for some $S_c^N, \tilde{S}_1^N, \tilde{S}_2^N \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and any $\kappa \in [\rho, 1]$.

The expression in (45) shows how the CCDP channel can be treated as a combination of WRDP and WSFD channels: part of the state, S_c^N is a common state while part of the state is independent from the state of the other user \tilde{S}_1^N and \tilde{S}_2^N respectively.

Theorem V.1. Approximate capacity for a class of 2-receiver CCDP-ES channel. Consider the 2-receiver CCDP-

ES channel: the capacity for this model can be upper bounded as

$$C \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log(P+1) & c^2 \bar{\rho}^+ \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log(P+c^2+1) & 1 < c^2 \bar{\rho}^+ < P+1 \\ -\frac{1}{4} \log(c^2) + \frac{1}{2} & c^2 \bar{\rho}^+ \geq P+1, \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

for $\bar{\rho}^+ = 1 - \max\{0, \rho\}$ and the capacity is to within 1 bpcu from the outer bound in (46).

Proof: From (45), we see that the CCDP-ES channel output can be rewritten as

$$Y_m^N = X^N + c \left(\sqrt{\rho} S_c^N + \sqrt{1-\rho} \tilde{S}_m^N \right) + Z_m^N, \quad (47)$$

with $m \in \{1, 2\}$ by letting $Q = 1$ and fixing $k = \sqrt{\rho}$ in (45).

The achievability in Th. V.1 follows the achievability in Th. III.1 by additionally pre-coding the codeword X_{SAN}^N against the common state sequence S_c^N in (47). The converse is similarly obtained from the converse of Th. V.1 by additionally providing the common state sequence S_c^N as a genie-aided side information to all the receivers. The complete proof is provided in App. G. ■

Note that the result in Th. V.1 coincides with the results in Th. III.1 when ρ is negative. This shows that the capacity of the channel with negative correlation is substantially the same as the capacity of the channel with independent channel states.

The result in Th. V.1 can be extended to the case of any number of receivers M when the channel states have the same variance and the same pairwise correlation.

Theorem V.2. Approximate capacity for a class of M -receiver CCDP-ES channel. Consider the M -receiver CCDP-ES: then capacity of this model is upper bounded as

$$C \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2} \right) + \frac{9}{4} & M-1 \geq c^2 \bar{\rho}^+ \\ \frac{1}{2M} \log(1+P) & M-1 < c^2 \bar{\rho}^+ \leq (M-1)(P+1) \\ + \frac{M-1}{2M} \log(c^2) + \frac{3}{2} & \\ \frac{1}{2M} \log(1+P) + 2 & c^2 \bar{\rho}^+ > (M-1)(P+1), \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

for $\bar{\rho}^+ = 1 - \max\{0, \rho\}$ and the capacity is to within 2.25 bpcu from the outer bound in (49).

Proof: As in (45) and for $\rho > 0$, each channel output can be rewritten as

$$Y_m^N = X^N + c(S_c^N + \tilde{S}_m^N) + Z_m^N, \quad (50)$$

for $S_c, \tilde{S}_m \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, $m \in [1 \dots M]$. The capacity result in Th. V.2 is obtained by adapting the derivation in Th. III.2 as follows: for the achievability part, the common codeword is pre-coded against the common component of the state sequence S_c^N . In the converse, S_c^N is provided as genie-aided side information to all the receivers. ■

When $\rho < 0$, the channel output of the CCDP-ES can be

equivalently expressed as

$$Y_m^N = X^N + Z_m^N + c \left(-\sqrt{|\rho|} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \tilde{S}_{jm}^N + \sqrt{|\rho|} \sum_{j=m+1}^M \tilde{S}_{mj}^N + \sqrt{1 - (M-1)|\rho|} \tilde{S}_{mm}^N \right), \quad (51)$$

for $\tilde{S}_{i,q} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, $i, q \in [1 \dots M]^2$. Note that each term \tilde{S}_{mj} appears with a negative sign in the expression of Y_m and with a negative sign in the expression of Y_j , thus yielding a negative correlation among each two state terms S_m and S_j . The expression in (51) intuitively shows why no common channel state term emerges from negatively correlated channel states. Note that the decomposition in (51) also ostensibly motivates why the minimum negative correlation ρ is $-1/(M-1)$ as in Lem I.3, since \tilde{S}_m must contain $M-1$ terms to be negatively correlated with all the remaining channel states.

We conclude by showing the approximate capacity of the 2-receiver CCDP channel with independent states with unequal variance, obtained by setting $\rho = 0$ in (44).

Theorem V.3. 2-receiver CCDP channel with independent states with unequal variance.

Consider 2-receiver CCDP, the capacity for this model can be upper bounded as

$$\mathcal{C} \leq R^{\text{OUT}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log(P+1) & c^2 \sqrt{Q} \leq 1 \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(1+P+c^2) + \frac{1}{4} \log(1+P+c^2Q) & 1 < c^2 \sqrt{Q} < P+1 \\ -\frac{1}{4} \log(c^2(1+Q)+1) + \frac{3}{2} & \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P+1) + 2 & c^2 \sqrt{Q} \geq P+1, \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

and the capacity \mathcal{C} is to within a gap of 2 bpcu from R^{OUT} in (52) for $c^2 \sqrt{Q} \geq P+1$.

Proof: The proof follows the same lines as the proof of Th. III.1. ■

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we investigate the capacity of the ‘‘Carbon Copying onto Dirty Paper’’ (CCDP) channel, the compound version of the classic ‘‘Writing on Dirty Paper’’ (WDP) channel in which the channel output at each compound receiver is obtained as the sum of the input, Gaussian noise and one of M possible channel Gaussian state sequences. The state sequences are anti-causally known the transmitter but unknown at the receivers. For this model, we focus on two scenarios: the case *i.i.d.* state sequences and the case in which the state sequences are scaled versions of a given sequence.

The case of *i.i.d.* state sequences arises from the WDP channel in which multiple interferers have the potential of affecting the transmission but the transmitter has no knowledge of which one eventually appears in the channel output. The case of states being different scaling of the same sequence models the WDP channel in which the state sequence is multiplied by a slow fading coefficient which is known at the receiver but unknown at the transmitter.

For the case of *i.i.d.* state sequences, we derive capacity to within a constant gap for any number of compound receivers and any channel parameter. In particular, we show that capacity can be approached with a rather simple strategy in which the input is composed of the superposition of two codewords: a bottom codeword treating the channel states as noise and the top codeword pre-coded against the channel state experienced at each compound receiver for a portion $1/M$ of the time.

For the case in which the state sequences are scaled version of the same sequence, we derive the capacity to within a constant gap for the case of two compound receivers and extend this result to the case of any number of receivers under some conditions on the scaling coefficients which we denote as ‘‘strong fading’’ regime. In this parameter regime, the scaling coefficients are exponentially spaced apart and the encoder is unable to simultaneously pre-code against multiple scaling coefficients. The capacity of the CCDP channel in which the state have any jointly Gaussian distribution remains an interesting open problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Gel'fand and M. Pinsker, ‘‘Coding for channel with random parameters,’’ *Probl. Contr. Inform. Theory*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 19–31, 1980.
- [2] M. Costa, ‘‘Writing on dirty paper,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 439–441, 1983.
- [3] A. Khisti, U. Erez, A. Lapidoth, and G. Wornell, ‘‘Carbon copying onto dirty paper,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 1814–1827, May 2007.
- [4] A. Lapidoth and I. E. Telatar, ‘‘The compound channel capacity of a class of finite-state channels,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 973–983, 1998.
- [5] Y. Steinberg and S. Shamai, ‘‘Achievable rates for the broadcast channel with states known at the transmitter,’’ in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2005.
- [6] P. Piantanida and S. Shamai, ‘‘On the capacity of compound state-dependent channels with states known at the transmitter,’’ in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2010, pp. 624–628.
- [7] C. Nair, A. E. Gamal, and Y.-K. Chia, ‘‘An achievability scheme for the compound channel with state noncausally available at the encoder,’’ *arXiv preprint arXiv:1004.3427*, 2010.
- [8] P. Piantanida and S. Shamai, ‘‘Capacity of compound state-dependent channels with states known at the transmitter,’’ in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2009, pp. 1968–1972.
- [9] P. Moulin and Y. Wang, ‘‘Capacity and random-coding exponents for channel coding with side information,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1326–1347, 2007.
- [10] P. Grover and A. Sahai, ‘‘On the need for knowledge of the phase in exploiting known primary transmissions,’’ in *Proc. IEEE New Frontiers in Dynamic Spectrum Access Networks (DySPAN)*, 2007, pp. 462–471.
- [11] —, ‘‘Writing on Rayleigh faded dirt: a computable upper bound to the outage capacity,’’ in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2007, pp. 2166–2170.
- [12] Y. Avner, B. M. Zaidel, S. Shamai, and U. Erez, ‘‘On the dirty paper channel with fading dirt,’’ in *Proc. IEEE Electrical and Electronics Engineers in Israel (IEEEI)*, 2010 IEEE 26th Convention of, 2010, pp. 525–529.
- [13] W. Zhang, S. Kotagiri, and J. N. Laneman, ‘‘Writing on dirty paper with resizing and its application to quasi-static fading broadcast channels,’’ in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2007, pp. 381–385.
- [14] C. S. Vaze and M. K. Varanasi, ‘‘Dirty paper coding for fading channels with partial transmitter side information,’’ in *Proc. IEEE Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, 2008, pp. 341–345.
- [15] S. Rini and S. Shamai, ‘‘The impact of phase fading on the dirty paper channel,’’ in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2014, pp. 2287–2291.
- [16] —, ‘‘On the dirty paper channel with fast fading dirt,’’ in *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 2286–2290.

- [17] Y. Steinberg, "Coding for the degraded broadcast channel with random parameters, with causal and noncausal side information," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 2867–2877, 2005.
- [18] L. Ghabeli and S. Rini, "On the capacity of the Gaussian broadcast channel with states known at the transmitter," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on the Science of Electrical Engineering (ICSEE)*, 2016, pp. 1–5.
- [19] E. Biglieri and L. Györfi, "Coding for single and multi user channels with constrained and unconstrained side information," *Multiple Access Channels: Theory and Practice*, vol. 10, p. 115, 2007.
- [20] S. Rini and S. Shamai, "On capacity of the dirty paper channel with fading dirt in the strong fading regime," in *Proc. IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2014, pp. 561–565.
- [21] S. Rini and A. Goldsmith, "A unified graphical approach to random coding for single-hop networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 56–88, 2016.
- [22] S. S. Bidokhti and V. M. Prabhakaran, "Is non-unique decoding necessary?" *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2594–2610, 2014.
- [23] M. Benammar, P. Piantanida, and S. Shamai, "Multiple description coding for the compound broadcast channel," in *Proc. IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2014, pp. 566–570.
- [24] G. Bresler and D. Tse, "The two-user Gaussian interference channel: A deterministic view," *European Transactions in Telecommunications*, pp. 333–354, Apr. 2008.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEM. I.1

The mean of the noise and the channel states can be removed from the channel outputs and each output can be scaled so that the noise variance becomes unitary, i.e.

$$Y_m^N = \frac{1}{\sigma} \left(Y_m'^N - \mu_S - \mu_m \right). \quad (53)$$

Since the transformation in (53) is a one-to-one transformation, it does not affect capacity. The scaling of the channel input in (53) can be incorporated into the power constraint in (2) by defining

$$X^N = \frac{1}{\sigma} X'^N, \quad (54)$$

and letting $P = P'/\sigma^2$. Similarly, the parameter c and the S_m^N can be defined as

$$c = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}[S'_{\min}]}{\sigma^2}} \quad (55a)$$

$$S_m^N = \frac{S_m'^N}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[S'_{\min}]}} \quad (55b)$$

where S'_{\min} is the state with the smallest variance, to match the CCDP channel definition in (1). Finally, since the state distribution is symmetric around the mean, we can take c to be positive without loss of generality.

APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEM. I.3

For the matrix in (5), the leading principal minor of order m can be obtained through the matrix determinant lemma as

$$\det((1 - \rho)\mathbf{I}_m + \rho \mathbf{1}_m \mathbf{1}_m^T) = (1 - \rho)^m \left(1 + \frac{m\rho}{1 - \rho} \right), \quad (56)$$

which is non-negative defined for

$$-\frac{1}{m-1} \leq \rho \leq 1. \quad (57)$$

Consequently, all the leading principal minors of the matrix in (5) are all positive when

$$\min_m \left\{ -\frac{1}{m-1} \right\} = -\frac{1}{M-1} \leq \rho \leq 1. \quad (58)$$

APPENDIX C PROOF OF LEM. I.2.

The state sequence vector $\bar{S}^N = [S_1^N \dots S_M^N]$ can be expressed as

$$\bar{S}^N = \bar{S}_1^N + \bar{S}_2^N, \quad (59)$$

where

$$\bar{S}_1^N \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{N}(0, \gamma \Sigma_S) \quad (60a)$$

$$\bar{S}_2^N \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{N}(0, \bar{\gamma} \Sigma_S), \quad (60b)$$

for $\bar{S}_1^N \perp \bar{S}_2^N$ and $\bar{\gamma} = 1 - \gamma$. Consider now the CCDP channel in which \bar{S}_2^N is provided as a genie-aided side information to the transmitter and all the compound receivers: the capacity of this channel is necessarily larger than the capacity of the original channel since this extra knowledge can be ignored. The m^{th} compound receiver in the enhanced channel can produce the equivalent channel output

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_m^N &= Y_m^N - c S_{2,m}^N \\ &= X^N + c S_{1,m}^N + Z_m^N. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

For the CCDP channel with outputs as in (61), \bar{S}_2^N acts as a common information, independent from the all other random variables, and thus the knowledge of \bar{S}_2^N at all terminals does not increase capacity. From Lem. I.1, we have that the CCDP channel with channel outputs as in (61) is statistically equivalent to the CCDP channel with state gain

$$\tilde{c} = c\sqrt{\gamma} \leq c, \quad (62)$$

and covariance matrix Σ_S . We thus conclude that the capacity of the CCDP channel with state gain c and common information \bar{S}_2^N is equivalent to the capacity of the CCDP channel with state gain is \tilde{c} in (62). Accordingly, capacity is decreasing in c .

APPENDIX D PROOF OF TH. III.2.

As for the proof of Th. III.1, when $P \leq 3$ and $c^2 \leq 3$ capacity can be attained to within 2 bpcu. For $P > 3$ and $c^2 > 3$, achievability and converse proofs are derived as follows.

Converse: As in [3, App. 3.C], we write

$$N(R - \epsilon) \leq \min_{m \in [1 \dots M]} I(Y_m^N; W) \quad (63a)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M I(Y_m^N; W) \quad (63b)$$

$$\leq \max_{m \in [1 \dots M]} H(Y_m^N) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M H(Y_m^N | W) \quad (63c)$$

$$\leq \frac{N}{2} \log(P + c^2 + 2c\sqrt{P} + 1) \quad (63d)$$

$$+ \frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi e) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M H(Y_m^N | W).$$

The negative entropy terms in (63d) are bounded through recursion: we begin by defining two terms involved in the recursion:

$$T_m = \sum_{i=m}^M H(Y_i^N | W) \quad (64a)$$

$$\Delta_m^N = S_m^N - S_{m+1}^N, \quad m \in [1 \dots M]. \quad (64b)$$

In order to simplify the derivation, we also set the noise terms to be identical, i.e.

$$Z_1^N = Z_2^N = \dots = Z_M^N. \quad (65)$$

Eq. (65) follows because the compound receivers are not allowed to cooperate and thus the joint distribution of the noise terms $\{Z_m, m \in [1 \dots M]\}$ does not affect capacity.

With a derivation similar to that in (20) and using the assumption in (65), we write

$$-T_1 = -H(Y_1^N | W) - H(Y_2^N | W) - T_3 \quad (66a)$$

$$\leq -H(c(S_1^N - S_2^N) + Z_2^N - Z_1^N, Y_2^N | W) - T_3 \quad (66b)$$

$$= -H(c\Delta_1) - H(Y_2^N | \Delta_1, W) - T_3. \quad (66c)$$

The passage in (66) can be recursively repeated M times where, at K^{th} recursion step with $K \in [2, \dots M]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -T_1 &\leq - \sum_{m=1}^K H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad - H(Y_K^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{K-1}^N, W) - T_{K+1} \\ &= - \sum_{m=1}^K H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad - H(Y_K | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{K-1}^N, W) \\ &\quad - H(Y_{K+1} | W) - T_{K+2} \\ &\leq - \sum_{m=1}^K H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad - H(Y_K, Y_{K+1} | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{K-1}^N, W) - T_{K+2} \\ &= - \sum_{m=1}^{K+1} H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad - H(Y_{K+1} | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_K^N, W) - T_{K+2}. \end{aligned}$$

By proceeding in this manner up to $K = M$, we come to the bound

$$\begin{aligned} -T_1 &\leq \sum_{m=2}^M -H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad - H(Y_M^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_M^N, W) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=2}^M -H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) - H(Z_M^N) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=2}^M -H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) - \frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi e). \quad (67) \end{aligned}$$

We next evaluate the different terms in the summation (67),

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} H(c\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) &= \\ &\frac{1}{2} \log(c^2) + H(\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N), \end{aligned}$$

the correlation matrix of the vector $\Delta^N = [\Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_M^N]$ is

$$\Sigma_{\Delta^N} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & 0 & -1 & 2 & -1 \\ 0 & \dots & & & & 0 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and thus we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &-H(\Delta_m^N | \Delta_1^N \dots \Delta_{m-1}^N) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \log \left(2 - [-1 \dots -1] \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & \ddots & \ddots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ \vdots \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \log \left(2 - \frac{i-1}{i} \right) \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \log 1 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where (68) follows from properties of symmetric tri-diagonal matrices. With the bounding in (68), we obtain the outer bound

$$R^{\text{OUT}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + P + c^2) - \frac{M-1}{2M} \log c^2 + \frac{3}{2}. \quad (69)$$

As for the expression in (23), the outer bound in (69) is convex in c^2 with a minimum in

$$c^{2*} = (M-1)(P+1). \quad (70)$$

Using Lem. I.2 to substitute c^2 with $\min\{c^2, (M-1)(P+1)\}$ in the expression of (69), together with some further bounding, yields the outer bound in (18).

• *Achievability:* The value of $\bar{\alpha}$ which maximizes (71) is

$$\bar{\alpha}^* = \max \left\{ 0, \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c^2 + 1 - M}{P(M-1)} \right\} \right\}, \quad (71)$$

and the above scheme reduces to simple time-sharing and state pre-cancellation when $c^2 > (M-1)(P+1)$. Using the optimal power allocation in (71), we obtain the inner bound

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\text{IN}} &= \\ &\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2} \right) & M-1 > c^2 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log(P + c^2 + 1) & M-1 \leq c^2 \leq (M-1)(P+1) \\ -\frac{M-1}{2M} \log(c^2) - \frac{1}{2} & c^2 > (M-1)(P+1). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

• *Gap to capacity:* Compare the expression in (69) and in (72) for $M > 2$: the largest gap between inner and outer bound is 2.25 bpcu and is attained for $M-1 \leq c^2$. In all other regimes is at most 2 bpcu.

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF TH. IV.3.

The derivation of the outer bound involves extending the bounding in Th. IV.1 in the strong fading regime to the case of any number of possible fading realization. The key in the derivation is a careful choice of the genie-aided side information provided at each compound receiver.

Converse: The derivation employs a recursion involving a number of algebraic derivations: we first establishing this recursion for $M = 3$, then consider the case of any M .

• *Case for $M = 3$:* Consider a 3-receiver WSFD channel for which the conditions in (39) hold, then

$$I(Y_1^N; W) + I(Y_2^N; W) = H(Y_1^N) + H(Y_2^N) - H(ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N, Y_1^N | W) \quad (73a)$$

$$= H(Y_1^N) + H(Y_2^N) - H(ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) - H(Y_1^N | W, ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) \quad (73b)$$

$$= \frac{N}{2} \log(1+P) + \frac{N}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2a_2^2}\right) - H(Y_1^N | W, ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) + 2N + N \log 2\pi e, \quad (73c)$$

where (73a) follows from the assumption that $a_1 = 0$ and by letting $\tilde{Z}_2^2 = Z_2^N - Z_1^N$.

Using Fano's inequality, the capacity can be bounded as

$$3N(R - \epsilon) \leq I(Y_1^N; W) + I(Y_2^N; W) + I(Y_3^N; W) \leq I(Y_1^N; W) + I(Y_2^N; W) + I(Y_3^N, ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N; W) \quad (74a)$$

$$= I(Y_1^N; W) + I(Y_2^N; W) + I(Y_3^N; W | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) \quad (74b)$$

$$= \frac{N}{2} \log(1+P) + \frac{N}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2a_2^2}\right) + H(Y_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) - \left(H(Y_3^N | W, ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_1^N) - H(Y_1^N | W, ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N)\right) + 2N + N \log(2\pi e) \quad (74c)$$

$$= \frac{N}{2} \log(1+P) + \frac{N}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2a_2^2}\right) + H(Y_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) - \left(H(Y_3^N, Y_1^N | W, ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N)\right) + 2N + N \log(2\pi e), \quad (74d)$$

where (74a) follows by providing $ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N$ as a side information to the third compound receiver and (74b) follows from the independence of the message from the channel state and (74c) from (73).

Continuing the series of inequalities in (74):

$$(74d) \leq \frac{N}{2} \log(1+P) + \frac{N}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2a_2^2}\right) + H(Y_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) - H(ca_3S^N + \tilde{Z}_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_3^N)$$

$$+ H(Z_1^N | Z_3^N - Z_1^N, Z_2^N - Z_1^N) + 2N + N \log(2\pi e) \quad (75a)$$

$$\leq \frac{N}{2} \log(1+P) + \frac{N}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2a_2^2}\right) + H(Y_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) - NH(ca_3S_i + \tilde{Z}_{3i} | ca_2S_i + \tilde{Z}_{3i}) + NH(Z_{1i} | Z_{3i} - Z_{1i}, Z_{2i} - Z_{1i}) + 2N + N \log(2\pi e), \quad (75b)$$

where (75a) follows from letting $\tilde{Z}_3^N = Z_3^N - Z_1^N$. The entropy term $H(Y_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N)$ in (75b) can be bounded using the conditional version of the GME property as follows

$$H(Y_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) \leq \max_{\rho_{XS}} \frac{N}{2} \log\left(P + c^2a_3^2 + 2ca_3\rho_{PS}\sqrt{P} + 1 - \frac{c^2a_2^2}{ca_2^2 + 2} \left(\rho_{XS}\sqrt{P} + ca_3\right)^2\right) + \frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi e), \quad (76)$$

where the covariance between the *i.i.d.* Gaussian version of X and S is $\rho_{XS}\sqrt{P}$. The expression in (76) attains a maximum in ρ_{XS} for

$$\rho_{XS}^* = \frac{2a_3}{c\sqrt{P}a_2^2}, \quad (77)$$

yielding the bound

$$H(Y_3^N | ca_2S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) \leq \frac{N}{2} \log\left(P + 1 + 2\frac{a_3^2}{a_2^2}\right) + \frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi e). \quad (78)$$

By evaluating the entropy expressions $H(a_3S_i + \tilde{Z}_{3i} | ca_2S_i + \tilde{Z}_{2i})$ and $H(Z_{1i} | Z_{3i} - Z_{1i}, Z_{2i} - Z_{1i})$, we finally come to the outer bound

$$3N(R - \epsilon) \leq \frac{N}{2} \log(1+P) + \frac{N}{2} \log\left(\frac{1+P}{1+c^2a_2^2}\right) + \frac{N}{2} \log\left(\frac{c^2a_2^2 + 2(P+1)a_2^2 + 2a_3^2}{c^2a_2^2} \frac{a_3^2 + a_2^2}{a_3^2 + a_2^2}\right) - \frac{N}{2} \log\left(\frac{1}{3}\right). \quad (79)$$

Since $c^2a_2^2 \geq P \geq 1$ and $a_3^2 \geq Pa_2^2$, we have that

$$\frac{c^2a_2^2 + 2(P+1)a_2^2 + 2a_3^2}{c^2a_2^2} \frac{a_3^2 + a_2^2}{a_3^2 + a_2^2} \geq \frac{9}{2}, \quad (80)$$

and moreover

$$\frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 + \frac{P}{1+c^2a_2^2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (81)$$

so that we obtain the outer bound

$$R^{\text{OUT}} = \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log(P+1) + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{9}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \log 3 \right) = \frac{1}{6} \log(P+1) + 1. \quad (82)$$

• *Case for a general M :* Next we wish to generalize the deriva-

tion in (82) to the case of any M : this can be accomplished by providing each user with the appropriate side information and employing a recursion as in the converse proof in Th. III.2.

We begin by bounding the capacity as in (63d) to obtain

$$N(R - \epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{N}{2} \log(P + c^2 a_m^2 + 2ca_m^2 \sqrt{P} + 1) + \frac{N}{2M} \log(2\pi e) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M H(Y_m^N | W). \quad (83)$$

Next, we define

$$\tilde{Z}_m^N = Z_m^N - Z_1^N \quad (84a)$$

$$V_2^N = \emptyset \quad (84b)$$

$$V_m^N = [V_{m-1}^N, a_{m-1} S^{cN} + \tilde{Z}_{m-1}^N], \quad (84c)$$

for $m > 1$. Using the definitions in (84), we continue the bounding in (83) as

$$(83) \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M I(Y_m^N, V_m^N; W) \quad (85a)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M I(Y_m^N; W | V_m^N), \quad (85b)$$

where (85b) follows from the fact that the state sequences are independent from the message W .

Let K_m be defined as

$$K_m = \sum_{j=m}^M I(Y_j^N, W | V_j^N), \quad (86)$$

and rewrite (85) as

$$M(NR - \epsilon) \leq I(Y_1^N; W) + I(Y_2^N; W) + K_3 \quad (87a)$$

$$\leq \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e (1 + P) + \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(1 + \frac{P}{1 + c^2 a_2^2}\right) - H(Y_1^N | W, ca_2 S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) + K_3 \quad (87b)$$

$$\leq \frac{N}{2} \log(1 + P) + \frac{N}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{P}{1 + c^2 a_2^2}\right) + N \log(2\pi e) - H(Y_1^N | W, ca_2 S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) + I(Y_3^N; W | V_3^N) + K_4, \quad (87c)$$

where (87b) follows from the bound in (74). With a derivation similar to (79) and given the conditions in (39), we obtain

$$K_4 - H(Y_1^N | W, ca_2 S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N) + I(Y_3^N; W | V_3^N) \leq K_4 - H(Y_1^N | W, ca_2 S^N + \tilde{Z}_2^N, ca_3 S^N + \tilde{Z}_3^N) + \frac{N}{2} \log(9/2) \quad (88a)$$

$$= K_4 - H(Y_1^N | W, V_4^N) + \frac{N}{2} \log(9/2). \quad (88b)$$

The bounding in (88) can be recursively repeated as

$$K_m - H(Y_1^N | W, V_m^N) = K_{m+1} - H(Y_1^N | W, V_m^N) + I(Y_m^N; W | V_m^N) \quad (89a)$$

$$\leq K_{m+1} - H(Y_1^N | W, V_{m+1}^N) + \kappa_m, \quad (89b)$$

for κ_m defined as

$$\kappa_m = H(Y_m^N | V_m^N) - H(ca_m S^N + \tilde{Z}_m | W, V_m^N) = H(Y_m^N | V_m^N) - H(V_{m+1}^N | V_m^N). \quad (90)$$

By repeating the recursion step in (89) $M - 2$ times, we come to the outer bound

$$M(NR - \epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e (P + 1) + \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(1 + \frac{P}{c^2 a_2^2 + 1}\right) + \sum_{m=2}^M \kappa_m - H(Y_1^N | W, V_{M+1}^N). \quad (91)$$

We next wish to show that the terms κ_m and $H(Y_1^N | W, V_{M+1}^N)$ in the RHS of (91) are bounded by a constant for all parameter regimes and for a given value M .

Let's begin by bounding the term $H(Y_m | V_m)$ in (90):

$$\begin{aligned} H(Y_m^N | V_m^N) &= H(Y_m^N | V_m^N, Z_1^N) + I(Y_m^N; Z_1^N | V_m^N) \\ &\leq H(Y_m^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N, ca_3 S^N + Z_3^N \dots ca_{m-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N, Z_1^N) \\ &\quad + H(Z_1^N) - H(Z_1^N | V_m^N, Y_m^N) \\ &\leq H(Y_m^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N, ca_3 S^N + Z_3^N \dots ca_{m-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad + H(Z_1^N) - H(Z_1^N | \tilde{Z}_2^N, \tilde{Z}_3^N \dots \tilde{Z}_{m-1}^N, S^N) \\ &\leq H(Y_m^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N, ca_3 S^N + Z_3^N \dots ca_{i-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad - H\left(Z_1^N | Z_1^N + \frac{\sum_{i=2}^{m-1} Z_i}{q-2}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi e) \\ &\leq H(Y_m^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N, ca_3 S^N + Z_3^N \dots ca_{i-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N) \\ &\quad + \frac{N}{2} \log(m-1). \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Consider the term $H(Y_m^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N \dots ca_{m-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N)$: the random variables in the conditioning are noisy version of S^N and thus a sufficient statistic can be obtained by applying the maximal ratio combining principle. This yields the estimate $S^N + \hat{Z}_i$ of S^N for

$$\hat{Z}_m = \frac{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} ca_j Z_j}{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}^2), \quad (93)$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2}, \quad (94)$$

so that

$$H(Y_m^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N \dots ca_{m-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N) = H(Y_m^N | S + \hat{Z}_m). \quad (95)$$

As for the bounding in (78), we have that (95) can be bounded using the GME property and by optimizing over the correlation between the Gaussian version S_m and X_m . Again through the

GME property, we obtain the outer bound

$$\begin{aligned} & H(Y_m^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N \dots ca_{m-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N) \\ & \leq \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(1 + P + \frac{a_m^2}{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} a_j^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where, in (96), we have used again an optimization similar to (77) yielding the optimal correlation

$$\rho_{XS}^* = \frac{ca_m \hat{\sigma}^2}{\sqrt{P}}. \quad (97)$$

Next, we bound the term $H(V_{m+1}^N | V_m^N)$ in (90):

$$\begin{aligned} & H(V_{m+1}^N | V_m^N) \\ & \leq -H(V_{m+1}^N | V_m^N, Z_1^N) \\ & \leq -H(ca_m S^N + Z_i^N | ca_2 S^N + Z_2^N \dots ca_{m-1} S^N + Z_{m-1}^N) \\ & = -H(ca_m S^N + Z_i^N | S^N + \hat{Z}^N) \\ & = \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(c^2 a_m^2 + 1 - \frac{c^2 a_m^2}{1 + \hat{\sigma}^2} \right) \\ & = \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(c^2 a_m^2 + 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2} \right) \\ & = \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{j=2}^m c^2 a_j^2}{1 + \sum_{q=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_q^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

Combining the results in (92), (96) and (98), we can bound the κ_m in (89) as

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_m & = \frac{N}{2} \log \left(1 + P + \frac{c^2 a_m^2}{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2} \right) + \frac{N}{2} \log(m-1) \\ & \quad - \frac{N}{2} \log \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{j=2}^m c^2 a_j^2}{1 + \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2} \right) - \frac{N}{2} \log(2\pi e) \end{aligned} \quad (99a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \frac{N}{2} \log \left(\left(\frac{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2 + 1}{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left(\frac{(P+1) \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 a_j^2 + c^2 a_m^2}{\sum_{j=2}^m c^2 a_j^2} \right) \right) + \frac{N}{2} \log(m-1). \end{aligned} \quad (99b)$$

Using the conditions in (39), we have that the bound in (99) can be further loosened as

$$\kappa_m \leq N \left(2 + \frac{1}{2} \log(m-1) \right), \quad (100)$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=2}^M k_i \leq M + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{M!}{M} \leq \frac{M-1}{2} \log M + 2M. \quad (101)$$

The term $H(Y_1^N | W, V_{M+1}^N)$ in (91) can be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} & -H(Y_1^N | W, V_{M+1}^N) \leq -H(Y_1^N | W, V_{M+1}^N, X^N, S^N) \\ & = \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi e M. \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

Substituting the bounds in (102) and (101) in (91) we obtain the expression in (40).

• **Capacity inner bound and approximate capacity:** Consider the scheme in which the encoder transmits to the m^{th}

compound receiver as in the WDP channel for a portion $1/M$ of the time: this scheme attains

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \frac{1}{2M} \log(1+P). \quad (103)$$

The gap between inner bound in (103) and outer bound in (40) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi e \left(1 + \frac{P}{c^2 a_2^2 + 1} \right) + \sum_{m=2}^M \kappa_m \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{N} H(Y_1^N | W, V_{M+1}^N) - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e) \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log M + 2. \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX F PROOF OF LEM. IV.4

This Lemma is shown by adapting the derivation of the outer bound in Th. IV.3 : the inner bound derivation is not affected by these more general conditions.

• **Capacity outer bound:** If $a_1 \neq 0$, (91) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\text{OUT}} & = \frac{1}{2} \log(P+1+c^2 a_1^2) + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{P+c^2 a_2^2+1}{c^2 (a_2-a_1)^2+1} \right) \\ & \quad + \sum_{m=2}^M \kappa_m + \sum_{m=2}^M -H(Y_1 | ca_2 S^N + \tilde{Z}_2 \dots ca_M S^N + \tilde{Z}_M), \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

while (99) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_m & = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + P + \frac{c^2 a_m^2}{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 \Delta_j^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(m-1) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{j=2}^m c^2 \Delta_j^2}{1 + \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 \Delta_j^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (105a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 \Delta_j^2}{\sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 \Delta_j^2} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left(\frac{(P+1) \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} c^2 \Delta_j^2}{1 + \sum_{j=2}^m c^2 \Delta_j^2} + \frac{c^2 a_m^2}{1 + \sum_{j=2}^m c^2 \Delta_j^2} \right) \right) \\ & \leq 2 + \frac{1}{2} \log(\gamma) + \frac{1}{2} \log(m). \end{aligned} \quad (105b)$$

From conditions on a_2 and Δ_2 in (42), we come to the outer bound in (43).

The inner bound derivation is not affected by the assumption that $a_1 \neq 0$ and thus the gap from capacity is adjusted by adding the term $1/2 \log(\gamma)$.

APPENDIX G PROOF OF TH. V.1

• **Capacity outer bound:** Consider the outer bound in (18) obtained by providing S_c to both decoders. The receivers can remove this sequence from the channel output: the corresponding output is the same model as in Th. III.1 but with a state with smaller variance, that is $1-\rho$ instead of ρ . By absorbing this factor in c , we obtain the outer bound in (46).

• **Capacity inner bound and approximate capacity:** The inner bound for this scenario is again an extension of the inner bound in Fig. 2 with the difference that the base codeword now

pre-codes against the sequence S_c^N : the attainable rate for each user is

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{\alpha P}{1 + \bar{\alpha} P + c^2(1 - \rho)} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \log(1 + \bar{\alpha} P).$$

By optimizing over the parameter α we obtain the inner bound

$$R^{\text{IN}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \frac{P}{c^2(1-\rho)+1} \right) & c^2(1 - \rho) < 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + c^2(1 - \rho) + P \right) & 1 \leq c^2(1 - \rho) < P + 1 \\ -\frac{1}{4} \log(c^2(1 - \rho)) - \frac{1}{2} & \\ \frac{1}{4} \log(P + 1) & c^2(1 - \rho) \geq P + 1. \end{cases} \quad (106)$$

The expression in (106) is to within 1 bpcu from the outer bound in (46).