

Multipath Stealth Communication with Jammers

Jianhan Song* Qiaosheng (Eric) Zhang† Swanand Kadhe‡ Mayank Bakshi§ Sidharth Jaggi†

Abstract

We consider the problem of *stealth communication* over a *multipath network* in the presence of an active adversary. The multipath network consists of multiple parallel noiseless links, and the adversary is able to eavesdrop and jam a subset of links. We consider two types of jamming — *erasure jamming* and *overwrite jamming*. We require the communication to be both stealthy and reliable, i.e., the adversary should be unable to detect whether or not meaningful communication is taking place, while the legitimate receiver should reconstruct any potential messages from the transmitter with high probability simultaneously. We provide inner bounds on the robust stealth capacities under both adversarial erasure and adversarial overwrite jamming.

I. INTRODUCTION

Suppose an activist (Alice) *occasionally* wishes to communicate with a news agency, say BBC (Bob), and can use several social media accounts she has to do so. However, the government James is eavesdropping on some of these accounts (Alice and Bob do not know which ones), and is able to jam (i.e., erase or corrupt) information on these. The goal is to ensure that (i) the activist Alice can communicate with the BBC Bob even if the government James attempts to disrupt communication, and (ii) Alice’s communication should be stealthy — any communication posted on the social media that James observes should be explainable as “innocent behaviour”.

The classical information-theoretic security problem aims to hide the *content* of communication. However, in certain scenarios the mere *fact* that communication is taking place should also be hidden. Stealth communication, first studied in [1] for Discrete Memoryless Channels (DMCs), requires that the transmitter Alice should be able to reliably communicate with the legitimate receiver Bob, and simultaneously ensure the communication is undetectable by a malicious adversary James. The work [2] generalizes the communication medium from classical DMCs to networks, and particularly studies stealth communication over a noiseless *multipath network* wherein James is able to eavesdrop on a subset of links.

Stealth communication is closely related to the well-studied *covert communication* problem. The major difference lies in the assumptions on the *innocent distribution* (when no communication happens) — covert communication requires that, under innocent transmission, the channel inputs must be the “zero symbols”, while stealth communication allows the inputs to follow a non-zero innocent distribution. Prior work has successfully investigated the fundamental limits of covert communication under different settings, including AWGN channels [3], DMCs [4], [5], Binary Symmetric Channels (BSCs) [6], *etc.* In particular, instead of the broadly studied *random noise* channels, the work [7] shifts the focus to the *adversarial noise* channels, i.e., the channel between Alice and Bob can be maliciously jammed by James, and the coding scheme there should be resilient to every possible (including even the worst) jamming strategy induced by James.

This paper builds upon the insights obtained in [7], [2]. Suppose Alice and Bob communicate over a multipath network, which consists of C parallel noiseless links. Unlike [2] wherein James is only able to eavesdrop on a subset of links *passively*, this work considers the situation in which James also has the ability to jam the same subset of links to disturb any potential communication (even if he cannot detect the existence of communication). When Alice does not wish to communicate with Bob, her transmissions on the C links are sampled according to an innocent distribution (known *a priori* to Bob and James). When she is communicating with Bob, her transmissions are chosen from a codebook (also known *a priori* to Bob and James). In both scenarios, James is able to control (eavesdrop on/jam) at most Z out of C links (where¹ $Z < C/2$), but which subset of links is controlled is not known to Alice and Bob. Note that using “conventional” error-correcting codes does not suffice — the correlations introduced across links by such codes may reveal to James that Alice is indeed actively communicating.

James first estimates whether or not Alice is transmitting by observing the transmission patterns on the links he controls. The stealth is measured via a *hypothesis-testing metric* — the communication is deemed to be stealthy if regardless of James’ estimator, his probability of *false alarm* plus his probability of *missed detection* always approaches one asymptotically. Afterwards, on the basis of his observations, James tries to adversarially jam the links he controls. We consider two types of jamming — *erasure jamming* and *overwrite jamming*. Erasure jamming means that James can erase everything on the links he controls, while overwrite jamming allows him to replace the original transmission with his carefully designed transmission patterns.

*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Texas at Austin, jianhansong@utexas.edu

†Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, {zq015, jaggi}@ie.cuhk.edu.hk

‡Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Texas A&M University, swanand.kadhe@tamu.edu

§Institute of Network Coding, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, mayank@inc.cuhk.edu.hk

¹It is impossible to communicate stealthily and reliably when $Z \geq C/2$, since James can always “symmetrize” — send a fake message pretending to be Alice (and using her codebook) on the (at least) half of the links he controls.

A. Comparison with Related Work

Since stealth communication allows a non-degenerate innocent distribution, the throughputs with guarantees on both stealth and reliability, in this work and also in [1], [2], scale linearly in the blocklength (rather than being restricted by the *square-root law*² in usual covert communication setups). Another, somewhat technical difference, is that in our setup, the channel from Alice to James is not known *a priori* to Alice and Bob because of James' flexibility in choosing which subset of Z links to sit on, as opposed to a fixed channel from Alice to James in most relevant work (other than [2], [8]).

This work inherits the *eavesdrop-and-jam* framework studied in [7] for covert communication. In both scenarios, the jammer may cleverly design its jamming strategy based on his observations to disturb any potential communication, hence the communication scheme should be robust to all possible jamming strategies. Without the stealth/covertiness constraint, the eavesdrop-and-jam framework has been investigated in myopic adversarial channels [9]–[11], correlated jamming channels [12], and multipath networks [13].

Stealth communication over multipath networks is also studied in [2], however, the adversary there is passive. This work builds on [2] by considering an active adversary, who can maliciously disturb the transmission. We provide achievability schemes robust to active jamming for a subset of the parameter space. The rate achievable by these schemes is in general smaller than in [2] since the links being controlled do not carry information anymore (under erasure jamming), or may even carry misleading information (under overwrite jamming). Furthermore, we point out that the functionalities of the jammer in this work is fundamentally different from [14], wherein the jammer is present to help Alice and Bob by sending “artificial noise” to the eavesdropper (similar to the *cooperative jamming* [15] for security problem).

Reliable communication (without the stealth constraint) over a multipath network in the presence of a jammer has been well-studied in the past. The work [16] shows that as long as $Z < C/2$, Alice and Bob can fully utilize the rest of links to communicate, regardless of the types of jamming (either erasure or overwrite). Robustness against erasure jamming is relatively straightforward while robustness against overwrite jamming requires non-trivial coding schemes (such as *pairwise hashing* [16]). Similar results are obtained in this work while also taking stealth into account.

B. Our Contributions and High-level Intuition

Firstly, we provide an inner bound on the robust stealth capacity under erasure jamming. The channel between Alice and James can be viewed as an aggregation of all the links controlled by James, while the channel between Alice and Bob can be viewed as an aggregation of the complement of these links (since James erases everything on the links he controls). The stealth constraint imposes a lower bound on the rate (as a consequence of the *channel resolvability* [4]), while the reliability constraint imposes an upper bound. Moreover, as is standard in wiretap secrecy problems, creating an artificial noisy channel at the encoder (or equivalently, adding an auxiliary random variable) may hurt James more than Bob, and in turn lead to a higher throughput.

Coding against an overwrite jammer is significantly more non-trivial since all possible jamming strategies should be considered. In this work we prove that there exists a coding scheme with positive rate that is resilient to every (including even the worst-case) jamming strategy. The crux of our proof, as explained in Section IV-B, is to take advantage of James' uncertainty about the message/codeword conditioned on his observations. This is inspired by the novel ideas in [10] for reliable communication over myopic adversarial channels.

From a stealth perspective, the major challenge in this work is to design communication schemes that introduce redundancy across the C links (so as to enable resilience to James' jamming) without allowing the resulting correlation across links to reveal to James that Alice is actually communicating.

While the focus of this work is on robustness to active jamming, it has not escaped our attention that composing our schemes with well-known techniques in the information-theoretic literature allows us to get schemes that are secure against both information leakage and active jamming attacks in this stealth communication setting. A full characterization of this communication setting with trifold objectives is a source of ongoing investigation.

II. MODEL

Random variables and their realizations are respectively denoted by uppercase letters and lowercase letters, e.g., X and x . Sets are denoted by calligraphic letters, e.g., \mathcal{X} . Vectors of length- n are denoted by boldface letters, e.g., \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{x} . If the single-letter distribution on X is P_X , then the corresponding n -letter product distribution $\prod_{i=1}^n P_X$ is denoted by $P_{\mathbf{X}}$.

The multipath network consists of C parallel links L_1, L_2, \dots, L_C , each link L_i carries a symbol from the alphabet \mathcal{X}_i per time instant. The alphabet for all the links taken together is denoted by $\mathcal{X} = \prod_{i=1}^C \mathcal{X}_i$. Alice's transmission status is denoted by $T \in \{0, 1\}$ — $T = 0$ if Alice is innocent, whereas $T = 1$ if Alice is active. The message M is either 0 (if Alice is innocent) or uniformly distributed over $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ (if Alice is active). Note that no prior distribution is assigned to T and only Alice knows T and M *a priori*. Let n be the blocklength (number of time instants). The length- n vector transmitted on the j -th link is denoted by \mathbf{x}_j , and the collection of vectors on C links is denoted by $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1^T \ \mathbf{x}_2^T \ \dots \ \mathbf{x}_C^T]^T$. Note that \mathbf{x} can also be viewed as a length- n vector over \mathcal{X} . The system diagram is illustrated in Figure 1.

²The square-root law states that one can only transmit $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n})$ bits covertly and reliably over n channel uses.




Fig. 1: System diagram

Innocent distribution: When Alice is innocent ($T = 0$), at each time instant t ($1 \leq t \leq n$), an innocent transmission pattern on the C links is sampled according to the time-independent innocent distribution $P_{\mathbf{X}}^{inn} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the set of all distributions on \mathcal{X} . For any subset $J \subseteq \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_C\}$, the *marginal innocent distribution* is denoted by $P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}$. Over n time instants, the corresponding n -letter *innocent distribution* (resp. n -letter *marginal innocent distribution*) is a product distribution with the form $P_{\mathbf{X}}^{inn} = \prod_{t=1}^n P_{\mathbf{X}}^{inn}$ (resp. $P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn} = \prod_{t=1}^n P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}$).

Encoder: Alice's encoder $\Psi(\cdot, \cdot)$ takes the transmission status T and the message M as input, and outputs a length- n vector \mathbf{X} . If $T = 1$ and message m is transmitted, the encoder $\Psi(1, m)$ outputs the corresponding length- n codeword $\mathbf{X}(m)$. The codebook \mathcal{C} is the collection of all codewords $\mathbf{X}(m)$, $\forall m \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and the rate is defined as $R \triangleq (\log N)/n$. If $T = 0$ (hence $M = 0$), the encoder $\Psi(0, 0)$ outputs an innocent vector \mathbf{X} according to the innocent distribution. We assume that the codebook \mathcal{C} is public, i.e., it is known to all parties, including the jammer.

Active distribution: The active distribution, averaged over all the codewords $\mathbf{X}(m)$ in the codebook \mathcal{C} , is denoted by $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$. Similarly, for any subset $J \subseteq \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_C\}$, the *marginal active distribution* is denoted by $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}$.

James' estimation and jamming: James is able to control any subset of links of size at most Z , and let \mathfrak{J} be the class of all possible subsets of size at most Z . James selects a specific subset $J \in \mathfrak{J}$, which is unknown to both Alice and Bob *a priori*. On the basis of his observation \mathbf{X}_J and his knowledge about the codebook \mathcal{C} , James estimates Alice's transmission status T , and also non-causally jams the subset J to prevent reliable communication irrespective of his estimation.

Estimation: James' estimator $\Phi(\cdot)$ outputs a single bit $\hat{T} = \Phi(\mathbf{X}_J)$ to estimate Alice's transmission status T . The stealth is measured by the hypothesis-testing metric. Let $\alpha(\Phi) = \Pr_{\mathbf{X}}(\hat{T} = 1 | T = 0)$ and $\beta(\Phi) = \Pr_{M, \mathbf{X}}(\hat{T} = 0 | T = 1)$ respectively be the probability of false alarm and the probability of missed detection of an estimator Φ . Stealth communication requires that regardless of which estimator Φ is chosen, $\alpha(\Phi) + \beta(\Phi)$ should approach one asymptotically.³ A classical result on hypothesis testing [17] shows that the optimal estimator Φ^* satisfies $\alpha(\Phi^*) + \beta(\Phi^*) = 1 - \mathbb{V}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}, P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn})$, where $\mathbb{V}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}, P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J} |\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) - P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J)|$ is the *variational distance* between the marginal active distribution and the marginal innocent distribution. Hence we say the communication is stealth if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V}(\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}, P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}) = 0$.

Jamming: James can also jam the subset J that he controls. Under erasure jamming, the transmission \mathbf{X}_J (on the subset J) is completely replaced by the erasure symbols ' \perp ', while under overwrite jamming, \mathbf{X}_J is replaced by a carefully designed \mathbf{Y}_J . In particular, James is able to choose the jamming vector \mathbf{Y}_J stochastically according to *any* conditional distribution $P_{\mathbf{Y}_J | \mathbf{X}_J, \mathcal{C}}$, since he knows \mathbf{X}_J and the codebook.

Decoder: Bob receives \mathbf{Y} through the multipath network.

- 1) Under erasure jamming, $\mathbf{Y}_{J^c} = \mathbf{X}_{J^c}$ on the subset J^c (where J^c denotes the complement of set J), and \mathbf{Y}_J equals the erasure symbols ' \perp ' on the subset J .
- 2) Under overwrite jamming, $\mathbf{Y}_{J^c} = \mathbf{X}_{J^c}$ on the subset J^c , and \mathbf{Y}_J is arbitrarily chosen by James.

Note that Bob can easily figure out the subset J under erasure jamming due to the appearance of ' \perp ', while it is not the case under overwrite jamming. Bob reconstructs the message \hat{M} by applying his *decoding function* $\Gamma(\cdot)$ to his observation. The

³Note that even if James ignores the knowledge of \mathbf{X}_J , a naive estimator $\tilde{\Phi}$ (which always outputs $T = 0$ or $T = 1$) can also guarantee $\alpha(\tilde{\Phi}) + \beta(\tilde{\Phi}) = 1$. Therefore, the definition for stealth communication implies that James' optimal estimator Φ^* cannot be much better than the naive estimator $\tilde{\Phi}$.

probabilities of error under erasure and overwrite jamming are respectively defined as

$$P_e^\perp(\Psi, \Gamma) \triangleq \max_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} \sum_{t \in \{0,1\}} \Pr(\hat{M} \neq M | T = t),$$

$$P_e^{ow}(\Psi, \Gamma) \triangleq \max_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} \max_{P_{Y_J | X_J, C}} \sum_{t \in \{0,1\}} \Pr(\hat{M} \neq M | T = t).$$

Achievable rate: A rate R is said to be *achievable under erasure jamming* (resp. *achievable under overwrite jamming*) if there exists an infinite sequence of codes (Ψ_n, Γ_n) such that each code in the sequence has rate at least R , and ensures $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V}(\hat{P}_{X_J}, P_{X_J}^{inn}) = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_e^\perp(\Psi_n, \Gamma_n) = 0$ (resp. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_e^{ow}(\Psi_n, \Gamma_n) = 0$).

III. MAIN RESULTS

To facilitate the statement of our results, we first define an optimization problem (A), which includes an auxiliary random variable U , for a fixed innocent distribution P_X^{inn} and a non-negative integer $Z < C/2$ as follows:

$$(A) \quad \sup_{P_U, P_{X|U}} \min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} I(U; X_{J^c})$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad P_{X_J}^{inn} = \sum_u P_U \cdot P_{X_J|U}, \quad \forall J \in \mathfrak{J}, \quad (1)$$

$$\max_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} I(U; X_J) < \min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} I(U; X_{J^c}). \quad (2)$$

The optimal value of (A) is denoted by $\bar{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z)$. Consider another optimization

$$(B) \quad \sup_{P_X} \min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(P_{X_{J^c}})$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad P_{X_J}^{inn} = P_{X_J}, \quad \forall J \in \mathfrak{J}, \quad (3)$$

$$\max_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(P_{X_J}) < \min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(P_{X_{J^c}}), \quad (4)$$

and let the optimal value be $\underline{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z)$. It is worth noting that $\underline{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z)$ is always bounded from above by $\bar{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z)$, since (A) is equivalent to (B) by restricting $U = X$. As is usual in wiretap secrecy problems, Theorem 1 below shows that a higher rate $\bar{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z) - \epsilon$ is achieved by introducing an auxiliary variable U .

Theorem 1 (Erasure jamming). *For any P_X^{inn} and non-negative integer $Z < C/2$, the rate $R = \bar{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z) - \epsilon$ is achievable under erasure jamming for any small $\epsilon > 0$.*

Remark 1 (Cardinality Bound). *Bounding the cardinality of the auxiliary variable U is possible. Following standard cardinality bound arguments (c.f. [18]), given any feasible (U, X) in (A), there always exists a feasible (U', X) with $|\mathcal{U}'| \leq |\mathcal{X}| + 2|\mathfrak{J}| - 1$ that yields the same objective value. The detailed proof can be found in Appendix D.*

Compared with erasure jamming, dealing with overwrite jamming is much more challenging due to the fact that James, knowing Alice's codebook, may attempt to "spoo" Alice's transmissions. Bob's decoder should be robust to any jamming strategy $P_{Y_J | X_J, C}$, including the one that maximizes his probability of decoding error. However, our next result shows that stealth communication is still possible.

Theorem 2 (Overwrite jamming). *For any P_X^{inn} and non-negative integer $Z < C/2$, the rate $R = \underline{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z) - \epsilon$ is achievable under overwrite jamming for any small $\epsilon > 0$.*

IV. PROOF SKETCHES OF THEOREMS 1 & 2

A. Erasure jamming (Theorem 1)

We point out that one can use either *random binning* (as proposed in [2]) or *random coding* to prove Theorem 1. We choose the latter one to sketch the proof, and defer the detailed proof to Appendix B. The optimal distributions in optimization (A) are denoted by P_U and $P_{X|U}$.

Encoder: Let $R = \min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} I(U; X_{J^c}) - \epsilon$ (for any small $\epsilon > 0$). For each message $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, where $N = 2^{nR}$, the intermediate codeword $\mathbf{u}(m)$ is generated according to the n -letter distribution P_U . To transmit m , Alice chooses $\mathbf{u}(m)$ and stochastically maps $\mathbf{u}(m)$ to $\mathbf{x}(m)$ with probability $P_{X|U}(\mathbf{x}(m) | \mathbf{u}(m))$. The length- n codeword $\mathbf{x}(m)$ is transmitted over the multipath network.

Decoder: Bob first determines the subset J (controlled by James) based on the erasure symbol ' \perp ', and then applies *typicality decoding* based on \mathbf{y}_{J^c} . Note that $\mathbf{y}_{J^c} = \mathbf{x}_{J^c}$ since the subset J^c is not controlled by James. He decodes to $\hat{T} = 1$ and $\hat{M} = m$ if there exists a unique m such that $(\mathbf{u}(m), \mathbf{y}_{J^c})$ are jointly typical, whereas $\hat{T} = 0$ and $\hat{M} = 0$ if there does not exist any m such that $(\mathbf{u}(m), \mathbf{y}_{J^c})$ are jointly typical.

Analysis: To satisfy the stealth constraint, one should guarantee that no matter which subset J is controlled by James, the marginal active distribution $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}$ is indistinguishable from the marginal innocent distribution $P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}$. Note that

$$\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) = \sum_{m=1}^N \frac{1}{N} P_{\mathbf{X}_J|\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m)), \quad (5)$$

$$P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) = \sum_{\mathbf{u}} P_{\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|\mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}), \quad (6)$$

Equation (6) follows from the constraint in (1), which ensures that the stochastic process $\sum_{\mathbf{u}} P_{\mathbf{U}} \cdot P_{\mathbf{X}_J|\mathbf{U}}$ simulated by the encoder Ψ is identical to the marginal innocent distribution $P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}$. The constraint in (2) ensures the size of the codebook to be large enough so that with high probability (w.h.p.) the active distribution $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}$ is sufficiently close to $\sum_{\mathbf{u}} P_{\mathbf{U}} \cdot P_{\mathbf{X}_J|\mathbf{U}}$ — it turns out that $R > I(U; X_J)$ is sufficient, as noticed in [4], from a channel resolvability perspective. To prove it, we first denote the *typical set* of X_J by $\mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}$, and the *jointly typical set* (resp. *joint type class*) of U with respect to a typical \mathbf{x}_J by $\mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}$). Recall that proving stealth is equivalent to bounding the variational distance $\mathbb{V}(P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}, \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J} |P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) - \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J)|$. For any typical \mathbf{x}_J , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) - \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) \right| \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\approx} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}} P(\mathbf{u}) P(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}} \frac{1}{N} P(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m)) \right| \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{\mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}} P(\mathbf{u}) P(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}} \frac{P(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m))}{N} \right| \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}} P(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) \left| P(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}) - \frac{|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}|}{N} \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the approximation (a) is obtained by discarding negligible atypical events, (b) is obtained by dividing the typical set $\mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}$ into typical type classes $\mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}$, and (c) follows since $P(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u})$ is identical for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}$. Note that

$$\mu \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} (|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}|) = N \cdot P(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}), \quad (8)$$

which is exponentially large since $P(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}) \doteq 2^{-nI(U;X_J)}$ and $N > 2^{nI(U;X_J)}$. One can apply the *Chernoff bound* to show that with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\frac{1}{3}\mu\epsilon_n^2}$ over the code design (super-exponentially close to one),

$$\left| P(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}) - \frac{|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}|}{N} \right| \leq \epsilon_n P(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}), \quad (9)$$

where $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, by substituting (9) for (7), and taking a union bound over exponentially many $\mathcal{T}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}$ and \mathbf{x}_J , we prove that $\mathbb{V}(P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}, \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}) \leq f(\epsilon_n)$ with high probability for some function $f(\cdot)$.

To guarantee reliability, we note that the effective channel between Alice and Bob is $P_{X_{J^c}|\mathbf{U}}$ under erasure jamming, since Bob has access to $\mathbf{Y}_{J^c} = \mathbf{X}_{J^c}$ noiselessly. Hence, random codes of rate $R < \min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} I(U; X_{J^c})$ naturally ensure reliability. Finally, we point out that the above analysis holds for every possible subset $J \in \mathfrak{J}$ that James may choose. \square

B. Overwrite jamming (Theorem 2)

We first highlight two challenges for reliable decoding under overwrite jamming: **1)** In contrast to erasure jamming, it is not trivial for Bob to figure out which subset $J \in \mathfrak{J}$ is controlled by James. In fact, our coding scheme described below requires Bob to try every possible choice of J . **2)** Though James can only control set J , he is not “completely blind” for the complement set J^c . This is because Alice is constrained to using a stealth codebook, and hence any set of Z links must have marginal distributions that look innocent. For instance, if James controls 2 out of 5 links (say links 1 and 2), he knows that Alice’s transmissions on any other link $j \notin \{1, 2\}$ must have joint distribution with links in $\{1, 2\}$ according to the innocent distribution. Based on his observation \mathbf{X}_J , James may learn something about the message M as well as the transmission \mathbf{X}_{J^c} on J^c . The ability to overwrite \mathbf{X}_J , together with the partial knowledge about \mathbf{X}_{J^c} , may make it possible for James to fool Bob.

Nonetheless, as shown in Theorem 2, it is still possible for Alice and Bob to communicate at a positive rate, and we sketch the proof as follows. Let P_X be the optimal distribution in (B).

Encoder: Let $R = \min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(X_{J^c}) - \epsilon$ (for any small $\epsilon > 0$). For each message m , the codeword $\mathbf{x}(m)$ is generated according to the n -letter distribution P_X . Alice encodes m to $\mathbf{x}(m)$, and transmits $\mathbf{x}(m)$ over the multipath network. The codebook $\mathcal{C} \triangleq \{\mathbf{x}(m)\}_{m=1}^N$.

Decoder: Since Bob does not know the set J controlled by James *a priori*, he attempts to decode based on every possible choice of $\hat{J} \in \mathfrak{J}$ and applies an *erasure-like decoding* on its corresponding *decoding set* \hat{J}^c . For a specific \hat{J} , Bob outputs a

message m to his list \mathcal{L} if there is a unique m such that $\mathbf{x}_{\hat{J}^c}(m) = \mathbf{y}_{\hat{J}^c}$, where $\mathbf{x}_{\hat{J}^c}(m)$ is the sub-codeword of $\mathbf{x}(m)$ on set \hat{J}^c . This procedure is repeated for every $\hat{J} \in \hat{\mathfrak{J}}$. Bob decodes to $\hat{T} = 1$ and $\hat{M} = m$ if the list \mathcal{L} contains a unique message m , decodes to $\hat{T} = 0$ and $\hat{M} = 0$ if the list \mathcal{L} is empty, and declares an error otherwise.

Analysis: The proof for stealth is similar to that in Section IV, hence we focus on reliability only. When Alice is active ($T = 1$), we assume $M = m$ is transmitted and the subset J is controlled by James. First note that when Bob decodes according to the ‘‘correct’’ decoding set $\hat{J}^c = J^c$, the transmitted message $m \in \mathcal{L}$ w.h.p., since J^c is noiseless and the rate $R < H(P_{X_{J^c}})$. Secondly, we argue that w.h.p., no other message $m' \neq m$ falls into \mathcal{L} if Bob decodes according to any other \hat{J}^c ($\hat{J} \neq J$). For any $\hat{J} \neq J$, we partition \hat{J}^c into disjoint subsets \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{B} , where $\mathcal{G} = \hat{J}^c \cap J^c$ is the ‘‘good set’’, while $\mathcal{B} = \hat{J}^c \cap J$ is the ‘‘bad set’’. For convenience we consider the worst case wherein $\mathcal{B} = J$ (the decoding set \hat{J}^c contains all the links controlled by James). James is able to replace \mathbf{x}_J with \mathbf{y}_J according to an arbitrary distribution $P_{\mathbf{Y}_J|\mathbf{X}_J, \mathcal{C}}$, hence the probability of error with respect to set \hat{J}^c and $P_{\mathbf{Y}_J|\mathbf{X}_J, \mathcal{C}}$ is given as

$$\sum_{m=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_J} P(\mathbf{y}_J|\mathbf{x}_J(m), \mathcal{C}) \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{G}}(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\}, \quad (10)$$

where the indicator function equals one if there exists a message $m' \neq m$ such that the sub-codewords of m' on sets \mathcal{G} and J equals $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{G}}(m)$ and \mathbf{y}_J respectively. By considering typical events only and gathering all messages with the same sub-codeword on J together, we approximate (10) by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \sum_{m: \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_J} P(\mathbf{y}_J|\mathbf{x}_J, \mathcal{C}) \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{G}}(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_J} P(\mathbf{y}_J|\mathbf{x}_J, \mathcal{C}) \sum_{m: \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{G}}(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_J} P(\mathbf{y}_J|\mathbf{x}_J, \mathcal{C}) \cdot |m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cap (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{G}}(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}|. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Lemma 1. For any \mathbf{y}_J and typical \mathbf{x}_J , with probability $1 - 2^{-\omega(n)}$ over the code design (super-exponentially close to one), a randomly chosen code \mathcal{C} satisfies

$$\frac{|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cap (\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{G}}(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}|}{|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J|} \leq \varepsilon'_n, \quad (12)$$

where $\varepsilon'_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 1 is the crux of our proof. It is relatively straightforward to show that on expectation the ratio between the numerator and the denominator in (12) is a decaying function of n . One can use the Chernoff bound to concentrate $|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J|$, since the generation of each codeword is independent. However, it is trickier to concentrate the numerator because of the complicated dependencies among different codewords. To solve this problem, we construct a function with small *Lipschitz coefficients*, and apply the *McDiarmid’s inequality* [19]. A detailed proof can be found in Appendix C.

We also need to take a *union bound* over exponentially many \mathbf{x}_J and \mathbf{y}_J . This implies no matter which \mathbf{x}_J is received and which \mathbf{y}_J is overwritten by James, the induced probability of error is always bounded from above by ε'_n . By applying Lemma 1 and the union bound, with probability $1 - 2^{-\omega(n)}$, we can bound (11) from above by

$$\frac{\varepsilon'_n}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_J} P(\mathbf{y}_J|\mathbf{x}_J, \mathcal{C}) \cdot |m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J| \leq \varepsilon'_n.$$

Finally, we need to consider all possible $\hat{J} \neq J$. A union bound over all $\hat{J} \in \hat{\mathfrak{J}}$ shows that w.h.p., there does not exist a fake message $m' \neq m$ falling into \mathcal{L} , which in turn implies the list \mathcal{L} contains the correct message m uniquely.

When Alice is innocent ($T = 0$), a similar proof technique shows that \mathcal{L} is empty with high probability. This concludes the proof sketch for Theorem 2. \square

Remark 2. It would be interesting to see if it is possible to modify the proof technique above to show that the rate $\bar{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z) - \epsilon$ is also achievable. The main challenge is to deal with the complicated joint typicality relationship among $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}_J, \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{G}})$, since we introduce an auxiliary variable U and use typicality decoding. We believe that this proof strategy likely works and conjecture the following achievability.

Conjecture 1. For any P_X^{inn} and non-negative integer $Z < C/2$, the rate $R = \bar{K}(P_X^{inn}, Z) - \epsilon$ is also achievable under overwrite jamming for any small $\epsilon > 0$.

APPENDIX A
PRELIMINARIES

Definition 1. The γ -strongly typical set $\mathcal{A}_{X^n}^{\gamma}$ with respect to P_X is the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^n$ such that $N(x; \mathbf{x}) = 0$ if $P_X(x) = 0$, and

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{N(x; \mathbf{x})}{n} - P_X(x) \right| \leq \gamma, \quad (13)$$

where $N(x; \mathbf{x})$ is the number of occurrences of x in \mathbf{x} .

The γ -strongly typical sets $\mathcal{A}_U^{n, \gamma}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}$ (with respect to P_U and P_{X_J} respectively) are defined in a similar way.

Definition 2. The γ -strongly jointly typical set $\mathcal{A}_{UX}^{n, \gamma}$ with respect to P_{UX} is the set of $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{U}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n$ such that $N(u, x; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = 0$ if $P_{UX}(u, x) = 0$, and

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \frac{N(u, x; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x})}{n} - P_{UX}(u, x) \right| \leq \gamma, \quad (14)$$

where $N(u, x; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x})$ is the number of occurrences of (u, x) in (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) .

Definition 3. For any fixed typical \mathbf{x} , We say $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}}^{n, \gamma}$ if $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{A}_{UX}^{n, \gamma}$.

Remark 3. (a) we define the γ -strongly typical sets $\mathcal{A}_U^{n, \gamma}$, $\mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}$, $\mathcal{A}_{X_G}^{n, \gamma}$, and γ -strongly jointly typical set $\mathcal{A}_{UX_J}^{n, \gamma}$, $\mathcal{A}_{X_G X_J}^{n, \gamma}$ in a similar way.

(b) It is worth noting that if $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{A}_{UX}^{n, \gamma}$, then both $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_U^{n, \gamma}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}_X^{n, \gamma}$.

APPENDIX B

Note that the n -letter innocent distribution $P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J)$ on the subset J equals the stochastic processes P_U and $P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}$ simulated by the encoder Ψ . For a fixed \mathbf{x}_J , by considering conditionally typical \mathbf{u} and atypical \mathbf{u} , we have

$$P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) = \sum_{\mathbf{u}} P_U(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) \quad (15)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}} P_U(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}} P_U(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}). \quad (16)$$

The active distribution $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J)$ on the subset J (induced by the intermediate code \mathcal{C}) equals

$$\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) = \sum_{i=1}^N P_M(m) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m)) \quad (17)$$

$$= \sum_{m: \mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}} P_M(m) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m)) + \sum_{m: \mathbf{u}(m) \notin \mathcal{A}_{U\mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}} P_M(m) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m)). \quad (18)$$

By definition, the variational distance between $P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J)$ and $\hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J)$ equals

$$\mathbb{V} \left(P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}, \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J} \left| P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) - \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) \right| \quad (19)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \left| P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) - \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) \right| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \notin \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \left| P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) - \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) \right| \quad (20)$$

$$\leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \left| P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) - \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) \right|}_{\text{Term (A)}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \notin \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J)}_{\text{Term (B)}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \notin \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n, \gamma}} \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J)}_{\text{Term (C)}}, \quad (21)$$

where (20) is obtained by dividing \mathbf{x}_J into typical \mathbf{x}_J and atypical \mathbf{x}_J , and (21) follows from the triangle inequality. Note that term (A) can further be divided into

$$(A) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \left| P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}(\mathbf{x}_J) - \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{x}_J) \right| \quad (22)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \left| \underbrace{\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}^{n,\gamma}} P_U(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{A}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}^{n,\gamma}} P_M(m) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m))}_{\text{Term (A}_1)}} \right| \quad (23)$$

$$+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \notin \mathcal{A}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}^{n,\gamma}} P_U(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u})}_{\text{Term (A}_2)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \sum_{m:\mathbf{u}(m) \notin \mathcal{A}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}^{n,\gamma}} P_M(m) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m))}_{\text{Term (A}_3)} \quad (24)$$

Term (B) and term (A₂) correspond to $\mathbf{X}_J \notin \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{U} \notin \mathcal{A}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}^{n,\gamma}$ (for a typical \mathbf{x}_J) respectively, hence both of the two terms goes to zero as n goes to infinity. Term (C) and term (A₃) correspond to similar atypical events but depends on the specific codebook \mathcal{C} . Prior work [6] shows that with high probability over the code design, both of the two terms approach to zero as well as n goes to infinity. Hence we focus on term (A₁) in the following.

$$(A_1) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}^{n,\gamma}} P_U(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{A}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}^{n,\gamma}} P_M(m) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m)) \right| \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \left| \sum_{\mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} P_U(\mathbf{u}) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{\mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} \sum_{m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} P_M(m) P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}(m)) \right| \quad (26)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \left| \sum_{\mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) \left(P_U(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}) - \frac{|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}|}{N} \right) \right| \quad (27)$$

Due to the linearity of expectation, we have

$$\mu \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} (|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}|) = N \cdot P_U(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}), \quad (28)$$

which is exponentially large since $N = 2^{nR} > 2^{nI(U;X_J)}$ and $P_U(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}) \approx 2^{nH(U|X_J)}/2^{nH(U)} = 2^{-nI(U;X_J)}$. Since the codewords $\mathbf{u}(m)$ are chosen independently, we can use the Chernoff bound to concentrate $|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}|$ around its expectation:

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\left| \frac{|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}|}{\mu} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon_1(n) \right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{3} \mu \varepsilon_1^2(n) \right), \quad (29)$$

where $\varepsilon_1(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For instance, we set $\varepsilon_1(n) = n^{-1}$. Hence

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\left| P_U(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}) - \frac{|m:\mathbf{u}(m) \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}|}{N} \right| \leq \varepsilon_1(n) P_U(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}) \right) \geq 1 - 2 \exp \left(-\frac{1}{3} \mu \varepsilon_1^2(n) \right). \quad (30)$$

Replacing (30) into (27), we have

$$(A_1) \stackrel{w.h.p.}{=} \frac{\varepsilon_1(n)}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \left| \sum_{\mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) P_U(\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}) \right| \quad (31)$$

$$= \frac{\varepsilon_1(n)}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J \in \mathcal{A}_{X_J}^{n,\gamma}} \sum_{\mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_{U_{\mathbf{x}_J}}} P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) P_U(\mathbf{u}) \quad (32)$$

$$\leq \frac{\varepsilon_1(n)}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_J} \sum_{\mathbf{u}} P_{\mathbf{X}_J|U}(\mathbf{x}_J|\mathbf{u}) P_U(\mathbf{u}) \quad (33)$$

$$\leq \frac{\varepsilon_1(n)}{2} = \frac{1}{2n}. \quad (34)$$

By combining terms (A₁), (A₂), (A₃), (B) and (C), we are able to prove that with high probability over the code design, a randomly chosen code \mathcal{C} satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V}(P_{\mathbf{X}_J}^{inn}, \hat{P}_{\mathbf{X}_J}) = 0$ (for every $J \in \mathfrak{J}$).

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF LEMMA 1

By the *strong asymptotic equipartition property* (strong AEP), we know that for any typical \mathbf{x}_J , there exists $\eta(\gamma) > 0$ such that $\eta(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and

$$2^{-n(H(X_J)+\eta(\gamma))} \leq P_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{X}_J = \mathbf{x}_J) \leq 2^{-n(H(X_J)-\eta(\gamma))}. \quad (35)$$

Since P_X satisfies equation (4) in optimization (B), we have

$$\min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(X_{J^c}) > \max_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(X_J) \geq H(X_J). \quad (36)$$

Hence there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(X_{J^c}) - H(X_J) = \delta$. We let $\epsilon \ll \delta$ and $\eta(\gamma) \ll \delta$.

Claim 1. For any typical \mathbf{x}_J , with probability $1 - 2^{-\omega(n)}$ over the code design,

$$|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J| \geq (1 - n^{-1}) \cdot 2^{n(\delta - \epsilon - \eta(\gamma))}. \quad (37)$$

Proof: The expected number of codewords such that their sub-codeword on J equals \mathbf{x}_J is given as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}}(|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J|) = 2^{nR} \cdot P_{\mathbf{X}_J}(\mathbf{X}_J = \mathbf{x}_J) \geq 2^{n(\min_{J \in \mathfrak{J}} H(X_{J^c}) - \epsilon)} \cdot 2^{-n(H(X_J) + \eta(\gamma))} \quad (38)$$

$$= 2^{n(\delta - \epsilon - \eta(\gamma))}, \quad (39)$$

which is exponentially large since $\epsilon \ll \delta$ and $\eta(\gamma) \ll \delta$. Note that each of the codeword is chosen independently, hence by the Chernoff bound,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\left(|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J| \geq (1 - n^{-1})2^{n(\delta - \epsilon - \eta(\gamma))}\right) \quad (40)$$

$$\geq \Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\left(|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J| \geq (1 - n^{-1})\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}}(|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J|)\right) \quad (41)$$

$$\geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{3}n^{-2}2^{n(\delta - \epsilon - \eta(\gamma))}\right) = 1 - 2^{-\omega(n)}. \quad (42)$$

□

Claim 2. For any \mathbf{y}_J and typical \mathbf{x}_J , with probability $1 - 2^{-\omega(n)}$ over the code design,

$$|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cap (\mathbf{x}_G(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}| \leq (1 + n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta - 2\epsilon - 2\eta(\gamma) + 3\nu(\gamma))} \quad (43)$$

Proof: Let $S = \{m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cup \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{y}_J\}$ be a subset of messages such that each $m \in S$ satisfies $\mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J$ or $\mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{y}_J$. Note that the size of S is tightly concentrated around $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}}(|S|) = 2 \times 2^{n(\delta - \epsilon - \eta(\gamma))}$ by the Chernoff bound. In particular, we have

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\left(|S| > 2(1 + n^{-1})2^{n(\delta - \epsilon - \eta(\gamma))}\right) \leq 2^{-\omega(n)}. \quad (44)$$

It is worth noting that

$$|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cap (\mathbf{x}_G(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}| = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\}, \quad (45)$$

hence we have

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\left(|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cap (\mathbf{x}_G(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}| > (1 + n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta - 2\epsilon - 2\eta(\gamma) + 3\nu(\gamma))}\right) \quad (46)$$

$$= \Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} > (1 + n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta - 2\epsilon - 2\eta(\gamma) + 3\nu(\gamma))}\right) \quad (47)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^N \Pr(|S| = i) \Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} > (1 + n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta - 2\epsilon - 2\eta(\gamma) + 3\nu(\gamma))} \mid |S| = i\right) \quad (48)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=0}^{2(1+n^{-1})2^{n(\delta - \epsilon - \eta(\gamma))}} \Pr(|S| = i) \Pr_{\mathcal{C}}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} > (1 + n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta - 2\epsilon - 2\eta(\gamma) + 3\nu(\gamma))} \mid |S| = i\right) + 2^{-\omega(n)} \quad (49)$$

Without loss of generality, suppose $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S$ and $m_{i+1}, \dots, m_N \notin S$ if $|S| = i$. Note that

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} > (1+n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta-2\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))} \Big| |S| = i \right) \quad (50)$$

$$= \Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} > (1+n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta-2\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S, m_{i+1}, \dots, m_N \notin S \right) \quad (51)$$

$$= \Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} > (1+n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta-2\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right). \quad (52)$$

Equation (52) follows since the indicator function $\mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is independent of the messages that does not belong to S (for any $m \notin S$, $\mathbf{x}_J(m)$ neither equals \mathbf{x}_J nor equals \mathbf{y}_J). Let's first consider the expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \quad (53)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \quad (54)$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \quad (55)$$

$$\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_G \in \mathcal{A}_{X_G \mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}} \Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \quad (56)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}_G \in \mathcal{A}_{X_G \mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}} \Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right). \quad (57)$$

Equation (56) follows from the negligibility of conditionally atypical \mathbf{x}_G , and inequality (57) is due to the fact that if one codeword is fixed (and not equals $(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J)$), the probability that the codebook contains $(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J)$ decreases. Note that for $\mathbf{x}_G \in \mathcal{A}_{X_G \mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}$, there exists a $\nu(\gamma) > 0$ such that $\nu(\gamma) \rightarrow 0$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{-n(H(X_G|X_J) - \nu(\gamma))} \right)^i \quad (58)$$

$$\leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{-n(H(X_G|X_J) - \nu(\gamma))} \right)^{2(1+n^{-1})2^{n(\delta-\epsilon-\eta(\gamma))}} \quad (59)$$

$$\leq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{-n(\delta-\nu)} \right)^{2(1+n^{-1})2^{n(\delta-\epsilon-\eta)}} \quad (60)$$

$$= 1 - e^{-(1+n^{-1})2^{n(\delta-\epsilon-\eta(\gamma)-H(X_G|X_J)+\nu(\gamma))}} \quad (61)$$

$$= (1+n^{-1})2^{n(\delta-\epsilon-\eta(\gamma)-H(X_G|X_J)+\nu(\gamma))}. \quad (62)$$

Similarly,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{C}} \left((\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \leq (1+n^{-1})2^{n(\delta-\epsilon-\eta(\gamma)-H(X_G|X_J)+\nu(\gamma))}. \quad (63)$$

Combining (57), (62), and (63), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} \Big| m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i \in S \right) \quad (64)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}_G \in \mathcal{A}_{X_G \mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}} (1+n^{-1})^2 \cdot 2^{2n(\delta-\epsilon-\eta(\gamma)-H(X_G|X_J)+\nu(\gamma))} \quad (65)$$

$$\leq (1+n^{-1})^2 \cdot 2^{n(H(X_G|X_J)+\nu(\gamma))} 2^{2n(\delta-\epsilon-\eta(\gamma)-H(X_G|X_J)+\nu(\gamma))} \quad (66)$$

$$\leq (1+n^{-1})^2 \cdot 2^{n(\delta-2\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))}, \quad (67)$$

where (66) is obtained by noting $|\mathcal{A}_{X_G \mathbf{x}_J}^{n, \gamma}| \leq 2^{n(H(X_G|X_J)+\nu(\gamma))}$, and inequality (67) follows since $H(X_G|X_J) = H(X_G X_J) - H(X_J) \geq \min_{J \in \mathcal{J}} H(X_{J^c}) - H(X_J) = \delta$. We now use the McDiarmid's inequality to concentrate $\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

Lemma 2 (McDiarmid's inequality). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables taking values in ranges R_1, \dots, R_n , and let $F : R_1 \times \dots \times R_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function with the property that if one freezes all but the i -th coordinate of $F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, then F only fluctuates by most $c_i > 0$, i.e.,*

$$|F(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) - F(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x'_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)| \leq c_i, \quad (68)$$

then for any $\lambda > 0$, one has

$$\Pr(|F(X) - \mathbb{E}F(X)| \geq \lambda\sigma) \leq K \exp(-k\lambda^2) \quad (69)$$

for some constants $K, k > 0$, where $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2$.

Let $\mathbf{X}_1 \sim P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{x} \in S}$, $\mathbf{X}_2 \sim P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{x} \in S}$, \dots , $\mathbf{X}_i \sim P_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{x} \in S}$ be the independent random variables corresponding to m_1, m_2, \dots, m_i . Let $F(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_i) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\}$. Note that $\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_i) \leq (1+n^{-1})^2 \cdot 2^{n(\delta-2\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))}$ by (67), and $c_j = 1 \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, i\}$ since changing one codeword \mathbf{X}_j only can at most fluctuate the function $F(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_i)$ by one. Therefore, by letting $\lambda = \frac{(1+n^{-1})^{3/2}}{\sqrt{2n}} 2^{n(\frac{1}{2}\delta-\frac{3}{2}\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))}$, we have

$$\Pr(F(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_i) \geq (1+n^{-1})\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_i)) \leq K \exp(-k\lambda^2) = 2^{-\omega(n)}. \quad (70)$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\Pr\left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbb{1}\{(\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{x}_J) \in \mathcal{C} \cap (\mathbf{x}_G, \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}\} > (1+n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta-2\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))} \middle| |S| = i\right) \leq 2^{-\omega(n)}. \quad (71)$$

Substituting (71) into (49) and taking a union bound over all typical size of $|S|$, we have

$$\Pr\left(|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cap (\mathbf{x}_G(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}| > (1+n^{-1})^3 \cdot 2^{n(\delta-2\epsilon-2\eta(\gamma)+3\nu(\gamma))}\right) \leq 2^{-\omega(n)}. \quad (72)$$

□

Finally, by combining Claims 1 and 2 and setting $\eta(\gamma), \nu(\gamma) \ll \epsilon$, we obtain

$$\frac{|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J \cap (\mathbf{x}_G(m), \mathbf{y}_J) \in \mathcal{C}|}{|m : \mathbf{x}_J(m) = \mathbf{x}_J|} \leq (1+n^{-1})^2 \cdot 2^{-n(\epsilon+\eta(\gamma)-\nu(\gamma))} = \varepsilon'_n, \quad (73)$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 1.

APPENDIX D CARDINALITY BOUND

We show that it suffices to give a finite cardinality bound to the auxiliary random variable U introduced in optimization (A).

Lemma 3 (Cardinality Bound). *Bounding the cardinality of the auxiliary variable U is possible. Following standard cardinality bound arguments (c.f. [18]), given any feasible (U, X) in (A), there always exists a feasible (U', X) with $|U'| \leq |\mathcal{X}| + 2|\mathfrak{J}| - 1$ that yields the same objective value.*

Proof: We use the support lemma [18] to give the proof. Given any (U, X) defined over $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{X}$ that satisfies the constraints, let \mathcal{P} be the set of all pmfs on \mathcal{X} and $P_{X|U=u} \in \mathcal{P}$, indexed by $u \in \mathcal{U}$, be a collection of conditional pmfs on \mathcal{X} . We have the following $|\mathcal{X}| + 2|\mathfrak{J}| - 1$ continuous functions on \mathcal{P}

$$g_j(\pi) = \begin{cases} \pi(j) & j = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{X}| - 1 \\ H(X_J), \forall J \in \mathfrak{J} & j = |\mathcal{X}|, \dots, |\mathcal{X}| + |\mathfrak{J}| - 1 \\ H(X_{J^c}), \forall J \in \mathfrak{J} & j = |\mathcal{X}| + |\mathfrak{J}|, \dots, |\mathcal{X}| + 2|\mathfrak{J}| - 1 \end{cases} \quad (74)$$

Clearly the first group of functions are continuous. The last two groups of functions are also continuous in π due to the continuity of entropy function and the linearity of marginal probabilities, i.e., $P_{X_J}(x_J) = \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_J = \mathbf{x}_J} \pi(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$ and $P_{X_{J^c}}(x_{J^c}) = \sum_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{J^c} = x_{J^c}} \pi(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$.

Now by the support lemma, there exists a random variable U' taking at most $|\mathcal{X}| + 2|\mathfrak{J}| - 1$ values such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} P_{X|U}(x|u) dF_U(u) = P_X(x) = \sum_{u'} P_{X|U'}(x|u') P_{U'}(u') \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X} \quad (75)$$

$$H(X_J|U) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} H(X_J|U=u) dF_U(u) = \sum_{u'} H(X_J|U'=u') P_{U'}(u') = H(X_J|U') \quad \forall J \in \mathfrak{J} \quad (76)$$

$$H(X_{J^c}|U) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} H(X_{J^c}|U=u) dF_U(u) = \sum_{u'} H(X_{J^c}|U'=u') P_{U'}(u') = H(X_{J^c}|U') \quad \forall J \in \mathfrak{J} \quad (77)$$

Note that $P_X(x)$ also determines X_J and X_{J^c} , then $H(X_J)$ and $H(X_{J^c})$ are also preserved. Therefore, we have

$$I(X_J; U) = H(X_J) - H(X_J|U) = H(X_J) - H(X_J|U') = I(X_J; U') \quad \forall J \in \mathfrak{J} \quad (78)$$

$$I(X_{J^c}; U) = H(X_{J^c}) - H(X_{J^c}|U) = H(X_{J^c}) - H(X_{J^c}|U') = I(X_{J^c}; U') \quad \forall J \in \mathfrak{J} \quad (79)$$

Hence we can prove the arguments by substituting U by U' in the optimization problem using the equalities (75), (78) and (79).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Hou and G. Kramer, "Effective secrecy: Reliability, confusion and stealth," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2014, pp. 601–605.
- [2] S. Kadhe, S. Jaggi, M. Bakshi, and A. Sprintson, "Reliable, deniable, and hidable communication over multipath networks," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2014, pp. 611–615.
- [3] B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel, and D. Towsley, "Limits of reliable communication with low probability of detection on AWGN channels," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 1921–1930, 2013.
- [4] M. R. Bloch, "Covert communication over noisy channels: A resolvability perspective," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 5, pp. 2334–2354, May 2016.
- [5] L. Wang, G. W. Wornell, and L. Zheng, "Fundamental limits of communication with low probability of detection," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3493–3503, 2016.
- [6] P. H. Che, M. Bakshi, and S. Jaggi, "Reliable deniable communication: Hiding messages in noise," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2013, pp. 2945–2949.
- [7] Q. Zhang, M. Bakshi, and S. Jaggi, "Covert communication over adversarially jammed channels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.02426*, 2018.
- [8] L. H. Ozarow and A. D. Wyner, "Wire-tap channel II," *Bell Labs Technical Journal*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 2135–2157, 1984.
- [9] A. D. Sarwate, "Coding against myopic adversaries," in *Proceedings of IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [10] B. K. Dey, S. Jaggi, and M. Langberg, "Sufficiently myopic adversaries are blind," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 1164–1168.
- [11] Y. Zhang, S. Vatedka, S. Jaggi, and A. Sarwate, "Quadratically constrained myopic adversarial channels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.05951*, 2018.
- [12] M. Médard, "Capacity of correlated jamming channels," 2013.
- [13] Q. Zhang, S. Kadhe, M. Bakshi, S. Jaggi, and A. Sprintson, "Talking reliably, secretly, and efficiently: A "complete" characterization," in *IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2015, pp. 1–5.
- [14] T. V. Sobers, B. A. Bash, S. Guha, D. Towsley, and D. Goeckel, "Covert communication in the presence of an uninformed jammer," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 6193–6206, 2017.
- [15] R. Bassily, E. Ekrem, X. He, E. Tekin, J. Xie, M. R. Bloch, S. Ulukus, and A. Yener, "Cooperative security at the physical layer: A summary of recent advances," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 16–28, 2013.
- [16] S. Jaggi, M. Langberg, T. Ho, and M. Effros, "Correction of adversarial errors in networks," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, 2005, pp. 1455–1459.
- [17] E. L. Lehmann and J. P. Romano, *Testing statistical hypotheses*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [18] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge university press, 2011.
- [19] C. McDiarmid, "On the method of bounded differences," *Surveys in combinatorics*, vol. 141, no. 1, pp. 148–188, 1989.