

Strategic Successive Refinement Coding for Bayesian Persuasion with Two Decoders

Rony Bou Roupael and Maël Le Treust

ETIS UMR 8051, CY Cergy-Paris Université, ENSEA, CNRS,
6, avenue du Ponceau, 95014 Cergy-Pontoise CEDEX, FRANCE

Email: {rony.bou-roupael ; mael.le-treust}@ensea.fr

Abstract

We study the multi-user Bayesian persuasion game between one encoder and two decoders, where the first decoder is better informed than the second decoder. We consider two perfect links, one to the first decoder only, and the other to both decoders. We consider that the encoder and both decoders are endowed with distinct and arbitrary distortion functions. We investigate the strategic source coding problem in which the encoder commits to an encoding while the decoders select the sequences of symbols that minimize their long-run respective distortion functions. We characterize the optimal encoder distortion value by considering successive refinement coding with respect to a specific probability distribution which involves two auxiliary random variables, and captures the incentive constraints of both decoders.

I. INTRODUCTION

The optimization of distinct and arbitrary distortion functions resulting from the communication between several autonomous devices with non-aligned objectives is under study. This problem was originally formulated in the game theory literature and referred to as the sender-receiver game, where the amount of information transmitted is generally unrestricted. In the seminal paper [1], Crawford and Sobel investigate the Nash equilibrium solution of the cheap talk game in which the encoder and the decoder have distinct objectives and choose their coding strategies simultaneously. In [2], Kamenica and Gentzkow formulate the Bayesian persuasion game in which the encoder is the Stackelberg leader and the decoder is the Stackelberg follower. More recently, Koessler et al. in [3] investigate games of information design where multiple encoders influence the behavior of several decoders. As a motivating example, one could think of a company trying to convince investors into putting money on a certain number of projects, or a job seeker trying to persuade recruiters to be hired.

This problem is an attractive multi-disciplinary subject of study. The Nash equilibrium solution is investigated for multi-dimensional sources and quadratic distortion functions in [4], [5], whereas the Stackelberg solution is studied in [6]. The computational aspects of the persuasion game are considered in [7]. The strategic communication problem

Maël Le Treust gratefully acknowledges financial support from INS2I CNRS, DIM-RFSI, SRV ENSEA, UFR-ST UCP, INEX Paris Seine Initiative and IEA Cergy-Pontoise. This research has been conducted as part of the project Labex MME-DII (ANR11-LBX-0023-01).




Fig. 1: Strategic successive refinement source coding.

with a noisy channel is investigated in [8], [9], [10], [11], and four different scenarios of strategic communication are studied in [12]. The case where the decoder privately observes a signal correlated to the state, also referred to as the Wyner-Ziv setting [13], is studied in [14], [15] and [16]. Vora and Kulkarni investigate the achievable rates for the strategic communication problem in [17], [18] where the decoder is the Stackelberg leader.

In this paper, we investigate a Bayesian persuasion game with two decoders and restricted communication. We consider an i.i.d. source of information and we suppose that the observation of the first decoder contains the observation of the second decoder, as in Fig. 1. More specifically, we assume that the encoder \mathcal{E} selects and announces beforehand the compression scheme to be implemented. Upon receipt of the indices, the decoders \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 update their Bayesian beliefs over the source sequence and select the action sequences that minimize their respective distortion functions. We characterize the optimal encoder distortion value obtained via the successive refinement coding with respect to the distribution that involves two auxiliary random variables, and that satisfies both decoders incentive constraints.

A. Notations

Let \mathcal{E} denote the encoder and \mathcal{D}_i denote the decoder $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Notations U^n and V_i^n denote the n -sequences of random variables of source information $u^n = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathcal{U}^n$, and decoder \mathcal{D}_i actions $v_i^n \in \mathcal{V}_i^n$ respectively for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Calligraphic fonts \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V}_i denote the alphabets and lowercase letters u and v_i denote the realizations. For a discrete random variable X , we denote by $\Delta(\mathcal{X})$ the probability simplex, i.e. the set of probability distributions over \mathcal{X} , and by $\mathcal{P}_X(x)$ the probability mass function $\mathbb{P}\{X = x\}$. Notation $X \dashv\vdash Y \dashv\vdash Z$ stands for the Markov chain property $\mathcal{P}_{Z|XY} = \mathcal{P}_{Z|Y}$.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

In this section, we aim at formulating the coding problem. We assume that the information source U follows the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) probability distribution $\mathcal{P}_U \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$.

Definition 1. Let $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 = [0, +\infty[^2$, where $[0, +\infty[$ denotes the set of non-negative real numbers, and $n \in \mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. The encoding σ and decoding τ_i strategies of the encoder \mathcal{E} and decoders \mathcal{D}_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$ are

defined by

$$\sigma : U^n \longrightarrow \Delta(\{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\}), \quad (1)$$

$$\tau_1 : \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\} \longrightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{V}_1^n), \quad (2)$$

$$\tau_2 : \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\} \longrightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{V}_2^n), \quad (3)$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \leq x\}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote by $\mathcal{S}(n, R_1, R_2)$ the set of coding triplets (σ, τ_1, τ_2) .

The stochastic coding strategies $(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{S}(n, R_1, R_2)$ induce a joint probability distribution $\mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2} \in \Delta(U^n \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\} \times V_1^n \times V_2^n)$ defined by

$$\forall (u^n, m_1, m_2, v_1^n, v_2^n), \quad \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, m_1, m_2, v_1^n, v_2^n) = \left(\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_U(u_t) \right) \sigma(m_1, m_2 | u^n) \tau_1(v_1^n | m_1, m_2) \tau_2(v_2^n | m_2). \quad (4)$$

Definition 2. We consider arbitrary single-letter distortion functions $d_e : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}_1 \times \mathcal{V}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the encoder \mathcal{E} , $d_1 : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the decoder \mathcal{D}_1 and $d_2 : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the decoder \mathcal{D}_2 . The long-run distortion functions are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) &= \mathbb{E}_{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n d_e(U_t, V_{1,t}, V_{2,t}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{u^n, v_1^n, v_2^n} \mathcal{P}_{U^n V_1^n V_2^n}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, v_1^n, v_2^n) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n d_e(u_t, v_{1,t}, v_{2,t}) \right], \\ d_1^n(\sigma, \tau_1) &= \sum_{u^n, v_1^n} \mathcal{P}_{U^n V_1^n}^{\sigma, \tau_1}(u^n, v_1^n) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n d_1(u_t, v_{1,t}) \right], \\ d_2^n(\sigma, \tau_2) &= \sum_{u^n, v_2^n} \mathcal{P}_{U^n V_2^n}^{\sigma, \tau_2}(u^n, v_2^n) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n d_2(u_t, v_{2,t}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the above equations, $\mathcal{P}_{U^n V_1^n V_2^n}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}$, $\mathcal{P}_{U^n V_1^n}^{\sigma, \tau_1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{U^n V_2^n}^{\sigma, \tau_2}$ denote the marginal distributions of $\mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}$ defined in (4) over (U^n, V_1^n, V_2^n) , (U^n, V_1^n) , and (U^n, V_2^n) respectively.

Definition 3. For any encoding strategy σ , the set of best-response strategies of decoder $i \in \{1, 2\}$ is defined by

$$BR_i(\sigma) = \left\{ \tau_i, d_i^n(\sigma, \tau_i) \leq d_i^n(\sigma, \tilde{\tau}_i), \forall \tilde{\tau}_i \right\}. \quad (5)$$

If several pairs of best-response strategies $(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in BR_1(\sigma) \times BR_2(\sigma)$ are available, we assume that the worst pair (τ_1, τ_2) , from the encoder perspective, is selected. Therefore, the solution is robust to the exact specification of the decoding strategies. For $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the coding problem under study is

$$D_e^n(R_1, R_2) = \inf_{\sigma} \max_{\substack{\tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma), \\ \tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma)}} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2). \quad (6)$$

Remark 1. Suppose that the decoders choose, among their best-response strategies, the pair that also minimizes the encoder distortion. This ‘‘optimistic’’ coding problem writes

$$D_o^n(R_1, R_2) = \min_{\sigma} \min_{\substack{\tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma), \\ \tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma)}} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2). \quad (7)$$

For generic problems $D_o^n(R_1, R_2) = D_e^n(R_1, R_2)$ [11, pp. 8].

The operational significance of (6) corresponds to the persuasion game that is played in the following steps:

- Encoder \mathcal{E} chooses, announces the encoding σ .
- Sequence U^n is drawn i.i.d with distribution \mathcal{P}_U .
- Messages (M_1, M_2) are encoded according to $\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma$.
- Knowing σ , decoder \mathcal{D}_1 observes (M_1, M_2) and draws V_1^n according to $\tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma)$, and decoder \mathcal{D}_2 observes M_2 and draws V_2^n according to $\tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma)$.
- Distortion values are $d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2)$, $d_1^n(\sigma, \tau_1)$, $d_2^n(\sigma, \tau_2)$.

Lemma 1. *The sequence $(nD_e^n(R_1, R_2))_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is sub-additive.*

The proof is stated in Appendix A.

III. MAIN RESULT

In this section, we characterize the asymptotic behaviour of $D_e^n(R_1, R_2)$. Our solution combines the decoders incentive constraints with the information constraints of the successive refinement source coding.

Definition 4. *We consider two auxiliary random variables $W_1 \in \mathcal{W}_1$ and $W_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$ with $|\mathcal{W}_i| = |\mathcal{V}_i|$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. For $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we define*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2) = \{ & \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, \quad R_2 \geq I(U; W_2), \\ & R_1 + R_2 \geq I(U; W_1, W_2) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For every distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$, we define

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) = \arg \min_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}} [d_1(U, V_1)], \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U}) = \arg \min_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2} \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2}}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U}} [d_2(U, V_2)]. \quad (10)$$

Note that $\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) \in \Delta(\mathcal{V}_1)^{|\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2|}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U}) \in \Delta(\mathcal{V}_2)^{|\mathcal{W}_2|}$. The encoder's optimal distortion is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D_e^*(R_1, R_2) &= \inf_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \\ \in \mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)}} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U})}} \mathbb{E} [d_e(U, V_1, V_2)], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the expectation in (11) is evaluated with respect to $\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2}$.

Remark 2. *The random variables U, W_1, W_2, V_1, V_2 satisfy*

$$(U, V_2) \text{ --- } (W_1, W_2) \text{ --- } V_1, \quad (U, W_1, V_1) \text{ --- } W_2 \text{ --- } V_2.$$

Given $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}$, we denote by $\mathcal{Q}_{U | W_1 W_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})^{|\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2|}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{U | W_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})^{|\mathcal{W}_2|}$ the posterior beliefs of decoders \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 . Moreover, for $(w_1, w_2) \in \mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2$, we introduce the notations $\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2} = \mathcal{Q}_{U | W_1 W_2}(\cdot | w_1, w_2) \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2} = \mathcal{Q}_{U | W_2}(\cdot | w_2) \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$.

Theorem 1. *Let $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \hat{n} \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \geq \hat{n}, D_e^n(R_1, R_2) &\leq D_e^*(R_1, R_2) + \varepsilon, \\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, D_e^n(R_1, R_2) &\geq D_e^*(R_1, R_2). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is stated in Sec. IV and V. Together with Fekete's Lemma for the sub-additive sequence $(nD_e^n(R_1, R_2))_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ (see Lemma 1), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_e^n(R_1, R_2) = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} D_e^n(R_1, R_2) = D_e^*(R_1, R_2). \quad (12)$$

IV. CONVERSE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We consider $(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{S}(n, R_1, R_2)$ and a random variable T uniformly distributed over $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and independent of $(U^n, M_1, M_2, V_1^n, V_2^n)$. We introduce the auxiliary random variables $W_1 = (M_1, T)$, $W_2 = (M_2, T)$, $(U, V_1, V_2) = (U_T, V_{1,T}, V_{2,T})$, distributed according to $\mathcal{P}_{UW_1W_2V_1V_2}^{\sigma\tau_1\tau_2}$ defined for all $(u, w_1, w_2, v_1, v_2) = (u_t, m_1, m_2, t, v_{1,t}, v_{2,t})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{P}_{UW_1W_2V_1V_2}^{\sigma\tau_1\tau_2}(u, w_1, w_2, v_1, v_2) \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{U_T M_1 M_2 T V_{1,T} V_{2,T}}^{\sigma\tau_1\tau_2}(u_t, m_1, m_2, t, v_{1,t}, v_{2,t}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{u^{t-1} \\ u_{t+1}^n}} \sum_{\substack{v_1^{t-1}, v_{1,t+1}^n \\ v_2^{t-1}, v_{2,t+1}^n}} \left(\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_U(u_t) \right) \sigma(m_1, m_2 | u^n) \times \tau_1(v_1^n | m_1, m_2) \tau_2(v_2^n | m_2). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Lemma 2. *The distribution $\mathcal{P}_{UW_1W_2V_1V_2}^{\sigma\tau_1\tau_2}$ has marginal on $\Delta(\mathcal{U})$ given by \mathcal{P}_U and satisfies the Markov chain properties*

$$(U, V_2) \text{---} (W_1, W_2) \text{---} V_1, \quad (U, W_1, V_1) \text{---} W_2 \text{---} V_2.$$

Proof. [Lemma 2] The i.i.d. property of the source ensures that the marginal distribution is \mathcal{P}_U . By the definition of the decoding functions τ_1 and τ_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} (U_T, V_{2,T}) &\text{---} (M_1, M_2, T) \text{---} V_{1,T}, \\ (U_T, M_1, V_{1,T}) &\text{---} (M_2, T) \text{---} V_{2,T}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{P}_{UW_1W_2V_1V_2}^{\sigma\tau_1\tau_2} = \mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2 | U}^\sigma \mathcal{P}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2}^{\tau_1} \mathcal{P}_{V_2 | W_2}^{\tau_2}$. \square

Lemma 3. *For all σ , the distribution $\mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2 | U}^\sigma \in \mathbb{Q}_0$.*

Proof. [Lemma 3] We consider an encoding strategy σ , then

$$nR_2 \geq H(M_2) \geq I(M_2; U^n) \quad (14)$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^n I(U_t; M_2 | U^{t-1}) \quad (15)$$

$$= nI(U_T; M_2 | U^{T-1}, T) \quad (16)$$

$$= nI(U_T; M_2, U^{T-1}, T) \quad (17)$$

$$\geq nI(U_T; M_2, T) \quad (18)$$

$$= nI(U; W_2). \quad (19)$$

In fact, (16) follows from the introduction of the uniform random variable $T \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, (17) comes from the i.i.d. property of the source, and (19) follows from the identification of the auxiliary random variables (U, W_2) and the independence between T and U_T . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} n(R_1 + R_2) &\geq H(M_1, M_2) \geq I(U^n; M_1, M_2) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n I(U_t; M_1, M_2 | U^{t-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= nI(U_T; M_1, M_2 | U^{T-1}, T) \\ &\geq nI(U_T; M_1, M_2, T) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$= nI(U; W_1, W_2). \quad (22)$$

□

Lemma 4. For all (σ, τ_1, τ_2) and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathbb{E}[d_e(U, V_1, V_2)]$ and $d_i^n(\sigma, \tau_i) = \mathbb{E}[d_i(U, V_i)]$ evaluated with respect to $\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2 | U}^\sigma \mathcal{P}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2}^{\tau_1} \mathcal{P}_{V_2 | W_2}^{\tau_2}$. Moreover, for all σ , we have

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2 | U}^\sigma) = \left\{ \mathbb{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2}, \quad \exists \tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma), \mathbb{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} = \mathcal{P}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2}^{\tau_1} \right\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{P}_{W_2 | U}^\sigma) = \left\{ \mathbb{Q}_{V_2 | W_2}, \quad \exists \tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma), \mathbb{Q}_{V_2 | W_2} = \mathcal{P}_{V_2 | W_2}^{\tau_2} \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Proof. [Lemma 4] By Definition 2 and (4), (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) &= \sum_{\substack{u^n, m_1, m_2, \\ v_1^n, v_2^n}} \left(\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_U(u_t) \right) \sigma(m_1, m_2 | u^n) \times \tau_1(v_1^n | m_1, m_2) \tau_2(v_2^n | m_2) \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n d_e(u_t, v_{1,t}, v_{2,t}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{\substack{u_t, m_1, m_2, \\ v_{1,t}, v_{2,t}}} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u_t, m_1, m_2, t, v_{1,t}, v_{2,t}) \times d_e(u_t, v_{1,t}, v_{2,t}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[d_e(U_T, V_{1,T}, V_{2,T})] = \mathbb{E}[d_e(U, V_1, V_2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Now we prove the second part of lemma 4. For any σ and any $\mathbb{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2 | U}^\sigma)$, we define $\tilde{\tau}_1$ by

$$\tilde{\tau}_1(v_1^n | m_1, m_2) = \prod_{s=1}^n \mathbb{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2}(v_{1,s} | m_1, m_2, s), \quad (26)$$

$\forall(m_1, m_2, v_1^n)$. Then $\forall(w_1, w_2, v_1) = (m_1, m_2, t, v_{1,t})$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{P}_{V_1|W_1W_2}^{\tilde{\tau}_1}(v_1|w_1, w_2) = \mathcal{P}_{V_1|W_1W_2}^{\tilde{\tau}_1}(v_{1,t}|m_1, m_2, t) \\
&= \sum_{v_1^{t-1}, v_{1,t+1}^n} \tilde{\tau}_1(v_1^n|m_1, m_2) \\
&= \sum_{v_1^{t-1}, v_{1,t+1}^n} \prod_{s=1}^n \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}(v_{1,s}|m_1, m_2, s) \\
&= \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}(v_{1,t}|m_1, m_2, t) \times \sum_{v_1^{t-1}, v_{1,t+1}^n} \prod_{s \neq t} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}(v_{1,s}|m_1, m_2, s) \\
&= \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}(v_{1,t}|m_1, m_2, t) = \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}(v_1|w_1, w_2). \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover assume that $\tilde{\tau}_1 \notin BR_1(\sigma)$, then there exists $\bar{\tau}_1 \neq \tilde{\tau}_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma \\ \mathcal{P}_{V_1|W_1W_2}^{\tilde{\tau}_1}}} [d_1(U, V_1)] = d_1^n(\sigma, \bar{\tau}_1) < d_1^n(\sigma, \tilde{\tau}_1) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma \\ \mathcal{P}_{V_1|W_1W_2}^{\tilde{\tau}_1}}} [d_1(U, V_1)] = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}}} [d_1(U, V_1)], \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma)$. Therefore, $\tilde{\tau}_1 \in BR_1(\sigma)$ and thus $\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}$ belongs to the right-hand side of (23). For the other inclusion, we assume that $\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2}$ belongs to the right-hand side of (23) and does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma)$, then we show that it leads to a contradiction. Similar arguments imply (24). \square

For any strategy σ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\substack{\tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma), \\ \tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma)}} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) \\
&= \max_{\substack{\tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma), \\ \tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma)}} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma \\ \mathcal{P}_{V_1|W_1W_2}^{\tau_1} \mathcal{P}_{V_2|W_2}^{\tau_2}}} [d_e(U, V_1, V_2)] \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{P}_{W_2|U}^\sigma)}} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathcal{P}_{W_1W_2|U}^\sigma \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2}}} [d_e(U, V_1, V_2)] \tag{30}$$

$$\geq \inf_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1W_2|U} \\ \in \mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)}} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1W_2|U}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U})}} \mathbb{E} [d_e(U, V_1, V_2)] \tag{31}$$

$$= D_e^*(R_1, R_2). \tag{32}$$

Equations (29) and (30) come from Lemma 4, whereas (31) comes from Lemma 3 and (32) follows from (11).

Therefore, $D_e^*(R_1, R_2) \leq \inf_{\sigma} \max_{\substack{\tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma), \\ \tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma)}} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) = D_e^n(R_1, R_2), \forall n$.

V. SKETCH OF ACHIEVABILITY PROOF OF THEOREM 1

A. Alternative Formulation

Definition 5. For any distributions $q_1 \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ and $q_2 \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$, we denote by $V_1^*(q_1)$ and $V_2^*(q_2)$, the sets of optimal actions of decoders \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 .

$$V_1^*(q_1) = \arg \min_{v_1 \in V_1} \sum_u q_1(u) d_1(u, v_1), \tag{33}$$

$$V_2^*(q_2) = \arg \min_{v_2 \in V_2} \sum_u q_2(u) d_2(u, v_2). \quad (34)$$

Definition 6. Given a strategy $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}$ and symbols (w_1, w_2) , we denote by $\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ the Bayesian posterior beliefs defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}(u) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_U(u) \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}(w_1, w_2 | u)}{\sum_{u'} \mathcal{P}_U(u') \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}(w_1, w_2 | u')}. \quad (35)$$

Among the set of optimal actions of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , we denote the worst pairs for the encoder distortion by

$$\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2) = \arg \max_{\substack{(v_1, v_2) \in V_1^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}) \times \\ V_2^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})}} \left\{ \sum_u \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1, w_2}(u) d_e(u, v_1, v_2) \right\}. \quad (36)$$

Definition 7. Given $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2) = & \left\{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \text{ s.t. } R_2 > I(U; W_2), \right. \\ & \left. R_1 + R_2 > I(U; W_1, W_2), \max_{w_1, w_2} |\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2)| = 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 8. Consider the following problem

$$\tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) = \inf_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \\ \in \tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2)}} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U})}} \mathbb{E} \left[d_e(U, V_1, V_2) \right],$$

where the expectation is evaluated with respect to $\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2}$.

Lemma 5. For $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, $D_e^*(R_1, R_2) = \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2)$.

Similarly to the proof of [11, Lemma A.5], this proof relies on showing that $\tilde{\mathbb{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2)$ is dense in $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$. It is provided in the full version of the paper [19, Lemma 6].

B. Achievability Scheme




Fig. 2: Achievability of successive refinement source coding.

1) $R_1 > 0, R_2 > 0$: Fix a conditional probability distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1, W_2 | U}$. There exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$R_2 = I(U; W_2) + \eta, \quad R_1 = I(U; W_1 | W_2) + \eta. \quad (37)$$

Codebook generation: Randomly and independently generate $2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}$ sequences $w_2^n(m_2)$ for $m_2 \in [1 : 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}]$, according to the i.i.d distribution $\mathcal{P}_{W_2^n} = \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{W_2}(w_{2t})$. For each $(m_1, m_2) \in [1 : 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}] \times [1 : 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}]$ generate a sequence $w_1^n(m_1, m_2)$ randomly and conditionally independently according to the i.i.d conditional distribution $\mathcal{P}_{W_1^n | M_1 W_2^n} = \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{W_1 | M_1 W_2}(w_{1t} | m_1, w_{2t}(m_2))$.

Encoding strategy σ : Encoder \mathcal{E} observes u^n and looks in the codebook for a pair (m_1, m_2) such that $(u^n, w_1^n(m_1, m_2), w_2^n(m_2)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2 | U})$, i.e. the sequences are jointly typical with tolerance parameter

$\delta > 0$. If such a jointly typical tuple doesn't exist, the source encoder sets (m_1, m_2) to $(1, 1)$. Then, it sends m_2 to decoder \mathcal{D}_2 , and (m_1, m_2) to decoder \mathcal{D}_1 .

Here comes the main difference with the successive refinement coding, which is due to the strategic nature of the problem. Instead of declaring $w_1^n(m_1, m_2)$ and $w_2^n(m_2)$ and selecting V_1^n and V_2^n i.i.d. with respect to $\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1W_2|U})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U})$, at each stage $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the decoders \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 compute their Bayesian posterior beliefs $\mathcal{P}_{U_t|M_1M_2}^\sigma(\cdot|m_1, m_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{U_t|M_2}^\sigma(\cdot|m_2)$ and select the actions $v_{1,t} \in V_1^*(\mathcal{P}_{U_t|M_1M_2}^\sigma)$ and $v_{2,t} \in V_2^*(\mathcal{P}_{U_t|M_2}^\sigma)$ that minimize their own distortion function. If several pairs are available, they select the worst one for the encoder distortion.

Error Event: Given a tolerance $\delta > 0$, the error event is given by $\mathcal{F} = \{(U^n, W_2^n(m_2), W_1^n(m_2, m_1)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}$. We have by the union of events bound $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1) + \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_2(M_2) \cap \mathcal{F}_1^c)$, where $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{(U^n, W_2^n(m_2)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n \forall m_2\}$, $\mathcal{F}_2(m_2) = \{(U^n, W_2^n(m_2), W_1^n(m_2, m_1)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n \forall m_1\}$. By [20, Lemma 3.3, pp. 62], $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1)$ tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if $R_2 > I(U; W_2) + \eta$. By [20, Lemma 3.3, pp. 62], $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1^c \cap \mathcal{F}_2(M_2))$ goes to zero if $R_1 + R_2 > I(U; W_1, W_2) + \eta$.

Since the expected error probability evaluated with respect to the random codebook is small, we have that for all $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, for all $\eta > 0$, there exists $\bar{\delta} > 0$, for all $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}$, there exists $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq \bar{n}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_1)] \leq \varepsilon_2, \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_2(m_2))] \leq \varepsilon_2. \quad (38)$$

2) *Control of beliefs:* We introduce the indicator of error events $E_\delta^1 \in \{0, 1\}$ for decoder \mathcal{D}_1 defined as follows

$$E_\delta^1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1W_2|U}). \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

We denote the Bayesian posterior beliefs $\mathcal{P}_{U_t|M_1M_2}^\sigma(\cdot|m_1, m_2) \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{P}_{U_t|M_2}^\sigma(\cdot|m_2) \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ by $\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}$ and $\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2}$. We show that on average, the Bayesian beliefs are close in KL distance to the target beliefs $\mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1W_2}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{U|W_2}$ induced by the single-letter distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1W_2|U}$. Assuming the distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1W_2}$ is fully supported, the beliefs of decoder \mathcal{D}_1 are controlled as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1W_2}(\cdot|W_{1t}, W_{2t})) \mid E_\delta^1 = 0\right] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2, \\ w_1^n, w_2^n}} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \mid E_\delta^1 = 0) \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u)}{\mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1W_2}(u|w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2, \\ w_1^n, w_2^n}} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \mid E_\delta^1 = 0) \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1W_2}(u|w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \\ & \quad - \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2, \\ w_1^n, w_2^n}} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \mid E_\delta^1 = 0) \times \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u)} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} I(U^n; M_1, M_2 | E_\delta^1 = 0) - I(U; W_1, W_2) + \delta \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} + \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(E_\delta^1 = 1) \\
& \leq \eta + \delta + \frac{1}{n} + \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(E_\delta^1 = 1). \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

3) *Conclusion:* By combining the equations (124), (137) with [11, Lemma A.21, equations (40)-(46), Lemma A.8], we obtain $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \hat{n}, \forall n \geq \hat{n}, D_e^n(R_1, R_2) \leq D_e^*(R_1, R_2) + \varepsilon$. More details are provided in Appendix B.

C. Special Cases

1) $R_1 = R_2 = 0$: The auxiliary random variables (W_1, W_2) are independent of U . The message sets are singletons, and the only possible encoding strategy σ_0 is given by $\sigma_0 : \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow \{1\} \times \{1\}$. The codebook consists of two sequences $W_2^n(1)$ and $W_1^n(1, 1)$ only. Therefore, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*, D_e^*(0, 0) = D_e^n(0, 0)$.

2) $R_1 > 0$ & $R_2 = 0$: Random variables W_2 and U are independent for $R_1 > 0$ and $R_2 = 0$, i.e. $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} = \mathcal{Q}_{W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 | W_2 U}$. This means that decoder \mathcal{D}_2 will repeatedly chose the action $v_{2,0} \in V^*(\mathcal{P}_U)$ that corresponds to its prior belief \mathcal{P}_U and maximizes the encoder's distortion. The persuasion game is thus reduced to the point-to-point problem with one decoder \mathcal{D}_1 , as in [11].

3) $R_1 = 0$ & $R_2 > 0$: The auxiliary random variable W_1 is independent of U . Hence, the encoder transmits the same index to both decoders. Therefore, both decoders will have the same posterior belief $\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$, $\forall w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$.

In that case, the optimal distortion can be reformulated in terms of a convexification of its expected distortion as in [11], $D_e^*(0, R_2) = \inf_{(\lambda_{w_2}, \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})_{w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2}} \sum_{w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2} \lambda_{w_2} \Psi_e(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})$ where $\Psi_e(q) = \max_{\substack{(v_1, v_2) \in \\ V_1^*(q) \times V_2^*(q)}} \mathbb{E}_q[d_e(U, v_1, v_2)]$.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Proof. [Lemma 1] Let $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. We denote by σ_c^{n+m} , the concatenation of the strategies σ^n, σ^m where σ^n is implemented over the first n stages and σ^m is implemented over the last m stages. For decoder $i \in \{1, 2\}$, consider the best responses $\tau_i^n \in BR_i(\sigma^n)$ and $\tau_i^m \in BR_i(\sigma^m)$. Then, the concatenation $\tau_{i,c}^{n+m}$ of τ_i^n and τ_i^m is also a best response $\tau_{i,c}^{n+m} \in BR_i(\sigma_c^{n+m})$. Therefore, we have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& nD_e^n(R_1, R_2) + mD_e^m(R_1, R_2) \\
& = \inf_{\sigma^n} \max_{\substack{\tau_1^n \in BR_1(\sigma^n), \\ \tau_2^n \in BR_2(\sigma^n)}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^n d_e(U_t, V_{1,t}, V_{2,t}) \right] \\
& \quad + \inf_{\sigma^m} \max_{\substack{\tau_1^m \in BR_1(\sigma^m), \\ \tau_2^m \in BR_2(\sigma^m)}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^m d_e(U_t, V_{1,t}, V_{2,t}) \right] \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \inf_{\sigma_c^{n+m}} \max_{\substack{\tau_1^{n+m} \in BR_1(\sigma_c^{n+m}), \\ \tau_2^{n+m} \in BR_2(\sigma_c^{n+m})}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n+m} d_e(U_t, V_{1,t}, V_{2,t}) \right] \tag{42}$$

$$\geq \inf_{\sigma^{n+m}} \max_{\substack{\tau_1^{n+m} \in BR_1(\sigma^{n+m}), \\ \tau_2^{n+m} \in BR_2(\sigma^{n+m})}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n+m} d_e(U_t, V_{1,t}, V_{2,t}) \right] \quad (43)$$

$$= (n+m) D_e^{n+m}(R_1, R_2), \quad (44)$$

where the notation σ_c^{n+m} stands for the encoding strategies obtained by concatenation \square

Definition 9 (KL Divergence). *The Kullback-Leiber (KL) Divergence for distributions P and Q on $\Delta(U)$ with respective supports $\text{supp}P$ and $\text{supp}Q$ is given by*

$$D(P||Q) = \begin{cases} \sum_{u \in \text{supp}P} P(u) \log_2 \frac{P(u)}{Q(u)} & , \text{ if } \text{supp}Q \subset \text{supp}P. \\ +\infty & , \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

Definition 10 (Typical Sequences). *Let \mathcal{X} be a finite alphabet and x^n a sequence in \mathcal{X}^n , and let π_{x^n} the empirical probability mass function over \mathcal{X} corresponding to the relative frequency of symbols in x^n , i.e. $\pi_{x^n}(x) = \frac{|t: x_t=x|}{n}$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$.*

The sequence x^n is said to be δ -typical with respect to a probability distribution P_X on \mathcal{X} if

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\pi_{x^n}(x) - P_X(x)| \leq \delta. \quad (46)$$

We denote by $\mathcal{T}_\delta^n(P_X)$ the set of all δ -typical sequences corresponding to P_X . This definition can be extended to K -tuples of sequences $(x_1^n, x_2^n, \dots, x_k^n) \in \mathcal{X}_1^n \times \mathcal{X}_2^n \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_k^n$, that are jointly δ -typical with respect to the joint probability $P_{X_1 \dots X_k}$. The set of all such k -tuples is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_\delta^n(P_{X_1 \dots X_k})$.

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF ACHIEVABILITY OF THEOREM 1

1) Alternative Formulation:

Definition 11. *We denote by $V_1^*(q_1)$ and $V_2^*(q_2)$, the respective action sets of decoders \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 for belief parameters $q_1 \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ and $q_2 \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$.*

$$V_1^*(q_1) = \arg \min_{v_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1} \sum_u q_1(u) d_1(u, v_1), \quad (47)$$

$$V_2^*(q_2) = \arg \min_{v_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \sum_u q_2(u) d_2(u, v_2). \quad (48)$$

Definition 12. *Fix a strategy $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}$. Let $\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2)$ denote the set of action pairs (v_1, v_2) that are optimal for the decoders and worst for the encoder. This set is given by:*

$$\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2) = \arg \max_{\substack{(v_1, v_2) \in V_1^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}) \times \\ V_2^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})}} \left\{ \sum_u \mathcal{Q}^{w_1, w_2}(u) d_e(u, v_1, v_2) \right\} \subset \mathcal{V}_1 \times \mathcal{V}_2. \quad (49)$$

The set $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2)$ of target probability distributions for $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is given by:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2) = \left\{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \text{ s.t. } R_2 > I(U; W_2), R_1 + R_2 > I(U; W_1, W_2), \max_{w_1, w_2} |\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2)| = 1 \right\}. \quad (50)$$

Definition 13. Consider the following program:

$$\tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) = \inf_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2)} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \in \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2} \in \mathcal{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U})}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}} \left[d_e(U, V_1, V_2) \right]. \quad (51)$$

Lemma 6. For $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have

$$D_e^*(R_1, R_2) = \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \quad (52)$$

Proof. of lemma 6 Consider the following sets:

$$\mathcal{Q}_0(R_1, R_2) = \{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \text{ s.t. } R_2 \geq I(U; W_2), R_1 + R_2 \geq I(U; W_1, W_2) \}, \quad (53)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{01} = \{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \text{ s.t. } \max_{w_1, w_2} |\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2)| = 1 \}, \quad (54)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2) = \{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \text{ s.t. } R_2 > I(U; W_2), R_1 + R_2 > I(U; W_1, W_2) \}. \quad (55)$$

We will show that $\mathcal{Q}_{01} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2) = \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2)$ is dense in $\mathcal{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$. We first show that $\mathcal{Q}_{01} \cap \mathcal{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$ is open and dense in $\mathcal{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$.

Definition 14 (Equivalent actions). Two action v_i and \tilde{v}_i for decoder \mathcal{D}_i , $i \in \{1, 2\}$ are said to be equivalent if: $d_i(u, v_i) = d_i(u, \tilde{v}_i)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We denote this equivalence relation by \sim_i . We use \approx_i for non equivalent actions v_i and \tilde{v}_i , i.e. there exists $u \in \mathcal{U}$, such that $d_i(u, v_i) \neq d_i(u, \tilde{v}_i)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Two action pairs (v_1, v_2) and $(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ are equivalent for the encoder \mathcal{E} if: $d_e(u, v_1, v_2) = d_e(u, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$. We denote this equivalence relation by \sim_e . We use \approx_e for non equivalent action pairs (v_1, v_2) and $(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ i.e. there exists $u \in \mathcal{U}$, such that $d_e(u, v_1, v_2) \neq d_e(u, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$. We say that two pairs of actions (v_1, v_2) and $(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ are completely equivalent if:

- 1) $(v_1, v_2) \sim_e (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$,
- 2) $v_1 \sim_1 \tilde{v}_1$,
- 3) $v_2 \sim_2 \tilde{v}_2$.

Without loss of generality we can assume that no pairs of actions are completely equivalent, otherwise we can merge them into one action and reduce the set of actions.

Definition 15. For a fixed i.i.d distribution $\mathcal{P}_U \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$, we denote by \mathcal{Q}_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the set of distributions $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$ for which decoder \mathcal{D}_i is indifferent between two actions v_i and \tilde{v}_i that are not equivalent,

$$\mathcal{Q}_1 = \left\{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, \exists v_1 \approx_1 \tilde{v}_1, \exists w_1, w_2, \right. \\ \left. \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [d_1(U, v_1)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [(d_1(U, \tilde{v}_1))] \right\}, \quad (56)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_2 = \left\{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, \exists v_2 \approx_2 \tilde{v}_2, \exists w_2, \right. \\ \left. \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2}} [d_2(U, v_2)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2}} [(d_2(U, \tilde{v}_2))] \right\}, \quad (57)$$

and by \mathbb{Q}_e , the set of distributions $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$ for which the encoder \mathcal{E} is indifferent between two action pairs (v_1, v_2) and $(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ that are not equivalent:

$$\mathbb{Q}_e = \left\{ \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, \exists (v_1, v_2) \approx_e (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2), \exists w_1, w_2 \right. \\ \left. \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [d_e(U, v_1, v_2)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [d_e(U, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)] \right\}. \quad (58)$$

Let $\mathbb{Q}^c = \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|} \setminus (\mathbb{Q}_e \cup \mathbb{Q}_1 \cup \mathbb{Q}_2)$ the set of distributions $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}$ where for all w_1, w_2 , at least one of the following statements hold: i) The encoder is not indifferent between any two pairs of actions, ii) At least one of the decoders is not indifferent between any two actions.

Lemma 7. For each distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}$ in \mathbb{Q}^c , the set $\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t})$ is a singleton.

Proof. of lemma 7 We proceed by contradiction. Let $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \mathbb{Q}^c$ and suppose there exists $(w_1, w_2) \in \mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2$ such that $|\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2)| = 2$. This means there exists two distinct action pairs $(v_1, v_2) \neq (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ with $v_1, \tilde{v}_1 \in V^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2})$ and $v_2, \tilde{v}_2 \in V^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})$ such that:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [d_e(U, v_1, v_2)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [d_e(U, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)], \quad (59)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [d_1(U, v_1)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}} [d_1(U, \tilde{v}_1)], \quad (60)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2}} [d_2(U, v_2)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2}} [d_2(U, \tilde{v}_2)]. \quad (61)$$

By hypothesis, (v_1, v_2) and $(\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ are not completely equivalent. Therefore, we must have either $(v_1, v_2) \approx_e (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$, or $v_1 \approx_1 \tilde{v}_1$, or $v_2 \approx_2 \tilde{v}_2$, which imply that $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \mathbb{Q}_e \cup \mathbb{Q}_1 \cup \mathbb{Q}_2$. This contradicts the hypothesis $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \mathbb{Q}^c$. Thus, $\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t})$ is a singleton.

□

Lemma 8. The set \mathbb{Q}^c is open and dense in $\Delta(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. of lemma 8 For each $v_i \approx_i \tilde{v}_i$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and pairs $(v_1, v_2) \approx_e (\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2)$ each set

$$\mathbb{Q}(v_i, \tilde{v}_i) = \left\{ \mathcal{Q}_U \in \Delta(\mathcal{U}), \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U} [d_i(U, v_i)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U} [d_i(U, \tilde{v}_i)] \right\}, \quad i \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (62)$$

$$\mathbb{Q}(v_1, v_2, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2) = \left\{ \mathcal{Q}_U \in \Delta(\mathcal{U}), \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U} [(d_e(U, v_1, v_2))] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Q}_U} [(d_e(U, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2))] \right\}, \quad (63)$$

is a closed hyperplane of dimension $\dim(\mathbb{Q}(v_i, \tilde{v}_i)) = \dim \mathbb{Q}(v_1, v_2, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2) = |\mathcal{U}| - 2$. Consider the set $B = \left(\bigcup_{v_1, \tilde{v}_1} \mathbb{Q}(v_1, \tilde{v}_1) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{v_2, \tilde{v}_2} \mathbb{Q}(v_2, \tilde{v}_2) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{v_1, v_2, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2} \mathbb{Q}(v_1, v_2, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2) \right)$. The set B is a finite union of hyperplanes of dimension at most $|\mathcal{U}| - 2$. Hence, $\Delta(\mathcal{U}) \setminus B$ is dense in $\Delta(\mathcal{U})$. If we consider the set $A_0 := ([0, 1] \times \Delta(\mathcal{U}))^{|\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2|}$, it follows that the set $A := ([0, 1] \times (\Delta(\mathcal{U}) \setminus B))^{|\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2|}$ is a dense subset of A_0 .

Let $\Psi : A_0 \mapsto \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$ a continuous and onto function such that $\Psi((\lambda_{w_1 w_2}, \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2})_{w_1, w_2}) = \frac{\lambda_{w_1 w_2} \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}}{\mathcal{P}_U}$.

Let $\Psi(A)$ denote the image of A under Ψ . We show that $\Psi(A)$ is dense in $\Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$. Take a distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$. Since A is dense in A_0 , for each distribution $\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$, there exists a sequence $(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2})_{(w_1, w_2)} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U} \setminus B)$ that converges to it under the KL-divergence. By the continuity of Ψ , the image

$\Psi((\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2})_{(w_1, w_2)}) \in \Psi(A)$ of $(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2})_{(w_1, w_2)}$, is a sequence that converges to $\Psi(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}) \in \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$. Therefore, $\Psi(A)$ is dense in $\Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|}$.

It follows that $\mathbb{Q}^c \cap \mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2) = \mathbb{Q}_0 \cap \mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$ is open and dense in $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2) \cap \Delta(\mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2)^{|\mathcal{U}|} = \mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$ as desired. \square

Lemma 9. If $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, the set $\mathbb{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2)$ is nonempty, open and dense in $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$.

Proof. of lemma 9 For $(R_1, R_2) \in]0, +\infty[$, the sets $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$ and $\mathbb{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2)$ are non-empty. Moreover, the set $\mathbb{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2)$ is open being defined with strict inequalities on the continuous mutual information function, which means its complement $\mathbb{Q}_{02}^c(R_1, R_2) = \{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U} \text{ s.t. } R_2 \leq I(U; W_2), R_1 + R_2 \leq I(U; W_1, W_2)\}$ is closed. Take a feasible distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U} \in \mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$ such that $R_2 \geq I(U; W_2)$ and $R_1 + R_2 \geq I(U; W_1, W_2)$. Consider the distributions $\mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2}(w_1, w_2) = \sum_u \mathcal{P}(u) \mathcal{Q}(w_1, w_2|u) \forall (w_1, w_2) \in \mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2$ and $\mathcal{P}_{W_2}(w_2) = \sum_u \mathcal{P}(u) \mathcal{Q}(w_2|u) \forall w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the perturbed distributions $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}^\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon) \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U} + \varepsilon \mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}^\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon) \mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U} + \varepsilon \mathcal{P}_{W_2}$. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}^\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}$. Therefore,

$$I_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}^\varepsilon}(U; W_1 W_2) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot I_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}}(U; W_1 W_2) + \varepsilon \cdot I_{\mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2}}(U; W_1 W_2) \quad (64)$$

$$< I_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}}(U; W_1 W_2) \quad (65)$$

$$\leq R_1 + R_2. \quad (66)$$

Similarly,

$$I_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}^\varepsilon}(U; W_2) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot I_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}}(U; W_2) + \varepsilon \cdot I_{\mathcal{P}_{W_2}}(U; W_2) \quad (67)$$

$$< I_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}}(U; W_2) \quad (68)$$

$$\leq R_2. \quad (69)$$

Equations (64) and (67) follow from the convexity of the mutual information with respect to $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}$ respectively for fixed \mathcal{P}_U . The strict inequalities in (65) and (68) follow since $I_{\mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2}}(U; W_1 W_2) = 0$ and $I_{\mathcal{P}_{W_2}}(U; W_2) = 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, and last inequalities in equations (66) and (69) come from the definition of the set $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$. This means that both distributions $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}^\varepsilon$ belong to the set $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$. Hence, the set $\mathbb{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2)$ is dense in $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$ which concludes the proof of lemma 9. \square

Since \mathbb{Q}_{01} and $\mathbb{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2)$ are open and dense, $\mathbb{Q}_{01} \cap \mathbb{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2)$ is also open and dense in $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$. We now show that $D_e^*(R_1, R_2) = \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2)$. In fact, the function

$$\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U} \mapsto \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1 W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U})}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1 W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2}} \left[d_e(U, V_1, V_2) \right]$$

is upper semi-continuous (u.s.c) and the infimum of an u.s.c function over a dense set is the infimum over the full set.

In this part of the proof, the assumption that each decoder chooses the optimal action that is worst for the encoder

plays an important role. In fact, if decoders were to choose the pair of actions that is best for the encoder's distortion, our function becomes

$$\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \mapsto \min_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \in \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2} \in \mathcal{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U})}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_{U | \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}}} \left[d_e(U, V_1, V_2) \right]$$

which is lower semi continuous. The infimum of a lower semi continuous (l.s.c) function over a dense subset $\mathcal{Q}_{01} \cap \mathcal{Q}_{02}(R_1, R_2)$ might be greater than the infimum over the whole set $\mathcal{Q}_0(R_1, R_2)$. However, this is only the case whenever the information is constrained, and the information constraint is binding at optimum and all posterior beliefs of each decoder induce actions between which decoder is indifferent. This case is nongeneric in our class of persuasion games: if we slightly perturb the distortion functions of our decoders, we perturb the points of indifference for each decoder, and thus the points of discontinuity in our l.s.c. or u.s.c. This ends the proof of lemma 6. \square

2) Controlling Distortions :

Definition 16. Fix $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a triplet $(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{S}(n, R_1, R_2)$, $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a message pair $(m_1, m_2) \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$, and $\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ the beliefs on u_t conditional to m_1, m_2 and m_2 respectively defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}(u) = \mathcal{P}(U_t = u | M_1 = m_1, M_2 = m_2) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (70)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2}(u) = \mathcal{P}(U_t = u | M_2 = m_2) \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}. \quad (71)$$

Definition 17. Let $\tilde{A}_t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2)$ the set of action pairs (v_1, v_2) that are optimal for the decoders but worst for the encoder for respective beliefs $\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}(\cdot | m_1 m_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2}(\cdot | m_2)$:

$$\tilde{A}_t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) = \arg \max_{\substack{v_1 \in V_1^*(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}(\cdot | m_1 m_2)) \\ v_2 \in V_2^*(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2}(\cdot | m_2))}} \left\{ \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}(u) d_e(u, v_1, v_2) \right\} \quad (72)$$

Definition 18. Fix $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a triplet $(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathcal{S}(n, R_1, R_2)$, $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a message pair $(m_1, m_2) \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\}$. For a sequence (m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n) , and $\alpha > 0$, we define the set of indices for which posterior belief $\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}$ given in Definition 16, and theoretical belief $\mathcal{Q}_{U | W_1 W_2}$ given in Definition ??, are close as follows:

$$T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n) = \left\{ t \in \{1, \dots, n\} : \max(D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \| \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1, t, w_2, t}), D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2} \| \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2, t})) \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2 \ln 2} \right\}. \quad (73)$$

Definition 19. For a sequence (w_1^n, w_2^n) and a pair $(w_1, w_2) \in \mathcal{W}_1 \times \mathcal{W}_2$, the empirical frequency of (w_1, w_2) in (w_1^n, w_2^n) is given by:

$$\text{freq}_{w_1, w_2}(w_1^n, w_2^n) = \frac{1}{n} \left| t = \{1, \dots, n\} : (w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) = (w_1, w_2) \right|. \quad (74)$$

For $\alpha, \gamma, \delta > 0$, let

$$B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta} = \left\{ (m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n) : \frac{|T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)|}{n} \geq 1 - \gamma, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{(w_1, w_2)} |\mathcal{P}(w_1, w_2) - \text{freq}_{w_1, w_2}(w_1^n, w_2^n)| \leq \delta \right\}. \quad (75)$$

where $\forall w_1, w_2 \mathcal{P}(w_1, w_2) = \sum_u \mathcal{P}(u) \mathcal{Q}(w_1, w_2 | u)$.

Definition 20. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. Given a strategy σ of the encoder, the induced expected distortion is given as follows:

$$D_e^\sigma(R_1, R_2) = \max_{\substack{\tau_1 \in BR_1(\sigma) \\ \tau_2 \in BR_2(\sigma)}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}^\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2} [d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2)]. \quad (76)$$

Definition 21. Given an encoding strategy σ and a pair of messages (m_1, m_2) , the encoder's expected distortion is given as follows:

$$D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) = \max_{\substack{v_1 \in V_1^*(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}) \\ v_2 \in V_2^*(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2})}} \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) d_e(u, v_1, v_2). \quad (77)$$

Definition 22. We denote by $D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2)$ the encoder's distortion defined as a function of the beliefs of the decoders as follows:

$$D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_1, w_2) = \max_{\substack{(v_1, v_2) \in V_1^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1, w_2}) \times \\ V_2^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})}} \sum_u \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1, w_2}(u) d_e(u, v_1, v_2). \quad (78)$$

Lemma 10. Given (n, R_1, R_2) , for all $\sigma_{M_1 M_2 W_1^n W_2^n | U^n}$ we have,

$$|D_e^\sigma(R_1, R_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2)| \leq (\alpha + 2\gamma + \delta) \|D\| + (1 - \mathcal{P}^\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta})) \|D\|. \quad (79)$$

where $\|D\| = \max_{u, v_1, v_2} |d_e(u, v_1, v_2)|$ is the greatest absolute value of the encoder's distortion.

Proof. (of lemma 10) The strategy σ induces a joint probability distribution \mathcal{P}^σ over $\mathcal{U}^n \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\} \times \mathcal{W}_1^n \times \mathcal{W}_2^n$ such that for all $u^n, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n$,

$$\mathcal{P}^\sigma(u^n, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}(u^n) \mathcal{P}^\sigma(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | u^n). \quad (80)$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_{W_1^n W_2^n}^\sigma$ the marginal distribution of \mathcal{P}^σ over $\mathcal{W}_1^n \times \mathcal{W}_2^n$. For each t , and for each pair $(w_{1,t}, w_{2,t})$, decoder \mathcal{D}_1 chooses an optimal action $v_{1,t} \in V_1^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}})$, and decoder \mathcal{D}_2 chooses an optimal action $v_{2,t} \in V_2^*(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{2,t}})$. If the action pair $(v_{1,t}, v_{2,t})$ belongs to $\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t})$, then it's the worst pair for the encoder. It follows that

$$D_e^\sigma(R_1, R_2) = \sum_{m_1, m_2} \mathcal{P}^\sigma(m_1, m_2) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2). \quad (81)$$

Since the set of belief pairs such that $|\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t})| = 1$ is open, there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$, such that for all m_1, m_2 and for all t , we have:

$$\max \left\{ D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} | \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}}), D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2} | \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{2,t}}) \right\} \leq \alpha_0 \implies \tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) = \tilde{A}_t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2). \quad (82)$$

Whenever $\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t})$ is a singleton, denote $(v_1(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}}), v_2(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{2,t}}))$ the unique (worst) optimal action pair for the encoder's distortion. From now on, we assume that $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0)$. Equation (82) implies that for each $t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)$, the action pair chosen by the decoders for problem t is $(v_1(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}}), v_2(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_{2,t}}))$.

This means that the set $T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)$ is the set of indices t for which the information transmission is successful.

Lemma 11. Let $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. For each $(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n) \in B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| \leq (\alpha + 2\gamma + \delta) \|D\| \quad (83)$$

where $\|D\| = \max_{u, v_1, v_2} |d_e(u, v_1, v_2)|$ is the greatest absolute value of the encoder's distortion.

Proof. (of lemma 11) We have :

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \notin T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| + \gamma \|D\|. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

$$\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| + \gamma \|D\|. \quad (85)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} [D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t})] \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} [D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2)] \right| \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

$$\quad (87)$$

Since $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$, for each $t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)$, $\tilde{A}(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) = \tilde{A}_t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U}, m_1, m_2)$, therefore,

$$\left| D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) \right| \leq \sum_u \left| \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}(u) \right| \cdot \|D\| \quad (88)$$

$$\leq \|\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} - \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1 w_2}\| \cdot \|D\| \leq \alpha \|D\|, \quad (89)$$

where the second inequality comes from Pinsker's inequality: $\|p - q\| \leq \sqrt{2 \ln 2 D(p \| q)}$ and the definition of $T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)$. It follows:

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^t(\mathcal{P}_{M_1 M_2 | U^n}^\sigma, m_1, m_2) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| \quad (90)$$

$$\leq \alpha \|D\| + \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right|. \quad (91)$$

Now from $\frac{|T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)|}{n} \geq 1 - \gamma$, we have:

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T_\alpha(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n)} D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| + \gamma \|D\|. \quad (92)$$

We have $\forall w_1, w_2, \mathcal{P}(w_1, w_2) = \sum_u \mathcal{P}(u) \mathcal{Q}(w_1, w_2|u)$, then

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D_e^w(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U}, w_{1,t}, w_{2,t}) - \tilde{D}_e(R_1, R_2) \right| \leq \sum_{w_1, w_2} \left| (\text{freq}_{w_1, w_2}(w_1^n, w_2^n) - \mathcal{P}(w_1 w_2)) \right| \cdot \|D\| \quad (93)$$

$$\leq \delta \|D\|. \quad (94)$$

□

3) *Special Cases:* We begin by investigating some particular cases where at least one of the rates equals zero. Then we will prove our result for the general case and we control the beliefs of our decoders.

Remark 3. If both decoders have the same distroction functions, then they can be considered as one, and the persuasion game will be reduced to the point-to-point case as in [11].

Let $Q_{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}^n$ denote a distribution over $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}_1 \times \mathcal{V}_2$ that averages the probability of occurrence of (u, v_1, v_2) in a triplet of sequences (U^n, V_1^n, V_2^n) with respect to coding pair σ, τ_1, τ_2 defined as follows:

$$Q_{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}^n(u, v_1, v_2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}\{(U_t, V_{1,t}, V_{2,t}) = (u, v_1, v_2)\}, \quad \forall (u, v_1, v_2). \quad (95)$$

Since the source is memory-less we have $Q_{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}^n = \mathcal{P}_U$.




Fig. 3: Achievability of Successive Refinement Source Coding Setup.

4) $R_1 = R_2 = 0$: Assume the prior belief \mathcal{P}_U is fixed and shared by both decoders at the beginning of the game. Since $R_1 = R_2 = 0$, message sets are singletons, and the only possible encoding strategy σ_0 is given by $\sigma_0 : \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow \{1\} \times \{1\}$. The codebook consists of two sequences $W_2^n(1)$ and $W_1^n(1, 1)$ only. Let $(v_{1,0}, v_{2,0})$ denote the action pair that corresponds to the decoders' prior \mathcal{P}_U and maximizes the encoder's long run distortion. This action pair will be played at each repetition of the game, i.e $v_{1,0}^n = (v_{1,0}, v_{1,0}, \dots, v_{1,0})$ and $v_{2,0}^n = (v_{2,0}, v_{2,0}, \dots, v_{2,0})$. The corresponding pair of decoding strategies is denoted by $(\tau_{1,0}, \tau_{2,0}) \in BR_1(\sigma_0) \times BR_2(\sigma_0)$. The set of target distributions is given by $\mathbb{Q}_0(0, 0) = \{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U} \text{ s.t. } I(U; W_2) = I(U; W_1, W_2) = 0\}$. This means that random variables W_1 and W_2 are independent from U , i.e $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2|U} = \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2}$ and no information can be communicated to the decoders. Therefore, the following result holds:

Lemma 12. $D_e^*(0, 0) = D_e^n(0, 0) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof.

$$D_e^n(0, 0) = \inf_{\sigma_0} \max_{\substack{\tau_{1,0} \in BR_{d_1}(\sigma_0), \\ \tau_{2,0} \in BR_{d_2}(\sigma_0)}} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2) \quad (96)$$

$$= d_e^n(\sigma_0, \tau_{1,0}, \tau_{2,0}) \quad (97)$$

$$= \sum_{u^n, v_{1,0}^n, v_{2,0}^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, v_{1,0}^n, v_{2,0}^n) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n d_e(u_t, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}) \quad (98)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{u_t, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma_0, \tau_{1,0}, \tau_{2,0}}(u_t, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}) d_e(u_t, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}) \quad (99)$$

$$= \sum_{u, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma_0, \tau_{1,0}, \tau_{2,0}}(U_t = u, V_{1,t} = v_{1,0}, V_{2,t} = v_{2,0}) d_e(u, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}) \quad (100)$$

$$= \sum_{u, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}} \mathcal{Q}_{\sigma_0, \tau_{1,0}, \tau_{2,0} | U V_1 V_2}^n(u, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}) d_e(u, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0}) \quad (101)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_U} [d_e(U, v_{1,0}, v_{2,0})] \quad (102)$$

$$= \inf_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_0(0,0)} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2} \in \mathbb{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2})}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1 W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{V_2 | W_2}} [d_e(U, V_1, V_2)] \quad (103)$$

$$= D_e^*(0, 0). \quad (104)$$

□

5) $R_1 > 0$ & $R_2 = 0$: Random variables W_2 and U are independent for $R_1 > 0$ and $R_2 = 0$, i.e. $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} = \mathcal{Q}_{W_2} \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 | W_2 U}$. This means that decoder \mathcal{D}_2 will repeatedly chose the action $v_{2,0} \in V^*(\mathcal{P}_U)$ that corresponds to its prior belief \mathcal{P}_U and maximizes the encoder's distortion. The persuasion game is thus reduced to the point-to-point problem with one decoder \mathcal{D}_1 . In that case, the coding problem to be solved by the encoder is as follows:

$$D_e^n = \inf_{\sigma} \max_{\tau_1 \in BR_{d_1}(\sigma)} d_e^n(\sigma, \tau_1) \quad (105)$$

where $BR_{d_1}(\sigma) = \arg \min_{\tau_1} d_1^n(\sigma, \tau_1)$. This problem has been investigated in point to point and JET. The set of target distributions is given as follows $\mathbb{Q}_0(R_1, 0) = \{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 | U} \text{ s.t. } R_1 \geq I(U; W_1)\}$. Given $\mathcal{Q}_{U W_1}$, the set of single-letter best responses of decoder \mathcal{D}_1 is given by

$$\mathbb{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 | U}) = \arg \min_{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1 | W_1}} \mathbb{E}[d_1(U, V_1)].$$

Definition 23. We denote by $\Psi_e(q)$ the encoder's expected distortion for belief $q \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$ i.e.,

$$\Psi_e(q) = \max_{\substack{(v_1, v_2) \in V_1^*(q) \times \\ V_2^*(q)}} \mathbb{E}_q [d_e(U, v_1, v_2)],$$

Definition 24. A family of pairs $(\lambda_{w_1}, \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1})_{w_1} \in ([0, 1] \times \Delta(\mathcal{U}))^{|\mathcal{W}_1|}$ is a splitting for decoder \mathcal{D}_1 if

$$\sum_{w_1} \lambda_{w_1} = 1, \quad (106)$$

$$\sum_{w_1} \lambda_{w_1} \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1} = \mathcal{P}_U. \quad (107)$$

For every $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}_1$, the weight λ_{w_1} is given by $\lambda_{w_1} = \mathcal{P}(w_1) = \sum_u \mathcal{P}(u) \mathcal{Q}(w_1|u)$. The encoder's optimal distortion can be reformulated as a convexification of its expected distortion as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D_e^*(R_1, 0) &= \inf_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_1|U} \in \mathcal{Q}_0(R_1, 0)} \max_{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_1} \in \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_1|U})} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1|U}} \left[d_e(U, V_1) \right]. \\ &= \inf_{(\lambda_{w_1}, \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1})_{w_1}} \sum_{w_1} \lambda_{w_1} \Psi_e(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_1}). \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

Remark 4. The auxiliary random variable $W_1 \in \mathcal{W}_1$ satisfies $|\mathcal{W}_1| = \min\{|\mathcal{U}| + 1, |\mathcal{V}_1|\}$.

Theorem 2. Encoder Commitment, theorem 3.1 in [11]

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \hat{n} \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \geq \hat{n}, D_e^n(R_1, 0) \leq D_e^*(R_1, 0) + \varepsilon. \quad (\text{achievability}) \quad (109)$$

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, D_e^n(R_1, 0) \geq D_e^*(R_1, 0). \quad (\text{converse}) \quad (110)$$

6) $R_1 = 0$ & $R_2 > 0$: If $R_1 = 0$ and $R_2 > 0$, random variables W_1 and U are independent. Hence, the encoder can transmit information to decoder \mathcal{D}_2 , to which decoder \mathcal{D}_1 has access. Therefore, both decoders will have the same posterior belief $\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2} \in \Delta(\mathcal{U}) \forall w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$. Actions V_1^n and V_2^n are drawn according to $\mathcal{Q}_{V_1^n|W_2^n}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{V_2^n|W_2^n}$ respectively. If the objectives of both decoders are aligned, then the persuasion game can be reduced to one decoder as in [11]. Otherwise, the persuasion game is an extension to the problem investigated in [11] with two decoders that observe the same information from the encoder and hence have the same belief $q \in \Delta(\mathcal{U})$.

In that case, the set of target distributions is defined as follows: $\mathcal{Q}_0(0, R_2) = \{\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U} \text{ s.t. } R_2 \geq I(U; W_2)\}$.

We consider an auxiliary random variable $W_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$ with $|\mathcal{W}_2| = \min\{|\mathcal{U}| + 1, |\mathcal{V}_1|, |\mathcal{V}_2|\}$. The set of target distributions is given as follows $\mathcal{Q}_0(R_1, 0) = \{\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U} \text{ s.t. } R_2 \geq I(U; W_2)\}$. Given \mathcal{Q}_{UW_2} , the set of single-letter best responses of decoders \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are given by

$$\mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}) = \arg \min_{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_2}} \mathbb{E}[d_1(U, V_1)].$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}) = \arg \min_{\mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2}} \mathbb{E}[d_2(U, V_2)].$$

Definition 25. A family of pairs $(\lambda_{w_2}, \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})_{w_2} \in ([0, 1] \times \Delta(\mathcal{U}))^{|\mathcal{W}_2|}$ is a splitting if

$$\sum_{w_2} \lambda_{w_2} = 1, \quad (111)$$

$$\sum_{w_2} \lambda_{w_2} \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2} = \mathcal{P}_U. \quad (112)$$

For $w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_2$, the weights λ_{w_2} are given by $\mathcal{P}(w_2) = \sum_u \mathcal{P}(u) \mathcal{Q}(w_2|u)$. The encoder's optimal distortion can be reformulated as a convexification of its expected distortion as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D_e^*(0, R_2) &= \inf_{\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U} \in \mathcal{Q}_0(0, R_2)} \max_{\substack{\mathcal{Q}_{V_1|W_2} \in \mathcal{Q}_1(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}) \\ \mathcal{Q}_{V_2|W_2} \in \mathcal{Q}_2(\mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U})}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_2|U}} \left[d_e(U, V_1, V_2) \right] \\ &= \inf_{(\lambda_{w_2}, \mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2})_{w_2}} \sum_{w_2} \lambda_{w_2} \Psi_e(\mathcal{Q}_U^{w_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

where $\Psi_e(q)$ is given by Definition 23.

Theorem 3. *theorem 3.1 in [11]*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \hat{n} \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \geq \hat{n}, \quad D_e^n(0, R_2) \leq D_e^*(0, R_2) + \varepsilon. \quad (\text{achievability}) \quad (114)$$

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad D_e^n(0, R_2) \geq D_e^*(0, R_2). \quad (\text{converse}) \quad (115)$$

7) $(R_1, R_2) \in]0, +\infty[^2$: Fix a conditional probability distribution $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1, W_2|U}$. There exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$R_2 = I(U; W_2) + \eta, \quad (116)$$

$$R_1 = I(U; W_1|W_2) + \eta. \quad (117)$$

Codebook generation: Randomly and independently generate $2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}$ sequences $w_2^n(m_2)$ for $m_2 \in [1 : 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}]$, according to the i.i.d distribution $\mathcal{P}_{W_2^n} = \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{W_2}(w_{2t})$. For each $(m_1, m_2) \in [1 : 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}] \times [1 : 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}]$ generate a sequence $w_1^n(m_1, m_2)$ randomly and conditionally independently according to the i.i.d conditional distribution $\mathcal{P}_{W_1^n|M_1 W_2^n} = \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{W_1|M_1 W_2}(w_{1t}|m_1, w_{2t}(m_2))$.

Coding algorithm: Encoder \mathcal{E} observes u^n and looks in the codebook for a pair (m_1, m_2) such that $(u^n, w_1^n(m_1, m_2), w_2^n(m_2)) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{P}_{W_1 W_2|U})$. If such a jointly typical tuple doesn't exist, the source encoder sets (m_1, m_2) to $(1, 1)$. Then, it sends m_2 to decoder \mathcal{D}_2 , and (m_1, m_2) to decoder \mathcal{D}_1 . Decoder \mathcal{D}_2 declares $w_2^n(m_2)$ and decoder \mathcal{D}_1 declares $w_1^n(m_1, m_2)$.

Consider two auxiliary decoding functions g_1 and g_2 given as follows:

$$g_1 : \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}_1^n \quad (118)$$

$$g_2 : \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{W}_2^n \quad (119)$$

We assume that decoder \mathcal{D}_1 applies both decoding functions g_1 and g_2 in order to declare (W_1^n, W_2^n) i.e for $M_1, M_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_1 \rfloor}\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\}$, $\tau_1(M_1, M_2) = (g_1(M_1, M_2), g_2(M_2))$. However, for $M_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\lfloor nR_2 \rfloor}\}$, decoder \mathcal{D}_2 's strategy $\tau_2(M_2) = g_2(M_2) \in \mathcal{W}_2^n$.

Error Event: The error event is given by $\mathcal{E} = \{(U^n, W_2^n(m_2), W_1^n(m_2, m_1)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}$. We have by the union of events bound $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_1) + \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_2(M_2) \cap \mathcal{E}_1^c)$, where

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \{(U^n, W_2^n(m_2)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n \forall m_2\} \quad (120)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2(m_2) = \{(U^n, W_2^n(m_2), W_1^n(m_2, m_1)) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n \forall m_1\} \quad (121)$$

By the covering lemma, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_1)$ tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if

$$R_2 > I(U; W_2) + \eta. \quad (122)$$

$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2(M_2))$ goes to zero by the covering lemma if

$$R_1 + R_2 > I(U; W_1, W_2) + \eta. \quad (123)$$

The expected probability of error over the codebook being small means that for all $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, for all $\eta > 0$, there exists $\bar{\delta} > 0$, for all $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}$, there exists $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq \bar{n}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_1)] \leq \varepsilon_2, \quad (124)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_2(m_2))] \leq \varepsilon_2. \quad (125)$$

8) *Control of Beliefs:* We introduce the indicator of error events $E_\delta^1 \in \{0, 1\}$ for decoder \mathcal{D}_1 , and $E_\delta^2 \in \{0, 1\}$ for decoder \mathcal{D}_2 defined as follows

$$E_\delta^1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}). \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (126)$$

$$E_\delta^2 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (u^n, w_2^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U}). \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (127)$$

Remark 5. Note that $E_\delta^1 = 0 \iff (u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) \implies (u^n, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U}) \iff E_\delta^2 = 0$. Conversely, $E_\delta^2 = 1 \iff (u^n, w_2^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_2 | U}) \implies (u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_\delta^n(\mathcal{P}_U \mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U}) \iff E_\delta^1 = 1$. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}(E_\delta^1 = 0) \leq \mathcal{P}(E_\delta^2 = 0)$ and $\mathcal{P}(E_\delta^1 = 1) \geq \mathcal{P}(E_\delta^2 = 1)$. Assuming the distribution $\mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}$ is fully supported, the beliefs of decoder \mathcal{D}_1 are controlled as follows

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \| \mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t})) \Big| E_\delta^1 = 0\right] \quad (128)$$

$$= \sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \Big| E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \| \mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t})) \quad (129)$$

$$= \sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \Big| E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u)}{\mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \quad (130)$$

$$= \sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \Big| E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \\ - \sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \Big| E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u)} \quad (131)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n \Big| E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \\ - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t | M_1, M_2, E_\delta^1 = 0) \quad (132)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u_t | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t | M_1, M_2, E_\delta^1 = 0) \quad (133)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u_t | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t | M_1, M_2, E_\delta^1 = 0) \quad (134)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot n \cdot (H(U|W_1, W_2) + \delta) - \frac{1}{n} H(U^n | M_1, M_2, E_\delta^1 = 0) \quad (135)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} I(U^n; M_1, M_2 | E_\delta^1 = 0) - I(U; W_1, W_2) + \delta + \frac{1}{n} + \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(E_\delta^1 = 1) \quad (136)$$

$$\leq \eta + \delta + \frac{1}{n} + \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(E_\delta^1 = 1). \quad (137)$$

- Equation (129) comes from the definition of expected K-L divergence.
- Equation (130) comes from the definition of K-L divergence.
- Equation (131) comes from splitting the logarithm.
- Equation (132) follows since:

$$\sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{f, g_1, g_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u)} \quad (138)$$

$$= \sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{f, g_1, g_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t | M_1 = m_1, M_2 = m_2) \quad (139)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{f, g_1, g_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot H(U_t | M_1 = m_1, M_2 = m_2) \quad (140)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{m_1, m_2} \mathcal{P}^{f, g_1, g_2}(m_1, m_2 | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot H(U_t | M_1 = m_1, M_2 = m_2) \quad (141)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t | M_1, M_2, E_\delta^1 = 0). \quad (142)$$

- Equation (133) follows since:

$$\sum_{m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_u \mathcal{P}_t^{m_1 m_2}(u) \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \quad (143)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{u_t, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u_t, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u_t | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \quad (144)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{u^n, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u_t | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \quad (145)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u^n, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, m_1, m_2, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u_t | w_{1t}, w_{2t})} \quad (146)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U|W_1 W_2}(u_t | w_{1t}, w_{2t})}. \quad (147)$$

- Equation (134) follows since the support of $\mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n | E_\delta^1 = 0) = \mathbb{P}\{(u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n\}$ is included in \mathcal{T}_δ^n .

- Equation (135) follows from the typical average lemma property (Property 1 pp.26 in [20]) given in lemma 15, and the chain rule of entropy: $H(U^n|M_1, M_2, W_1^n, W_2^n) \leq \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t|M_1, M_2, W_1, W_2)$.
- Equation (136) comes from the conditional entropy property and the fact that $H(U^n) = nH(U)$ for an i.i.d random variable U and lemma 16.
- Equation (137) follows since $I(U^n; M_1, M_2) \leq H(M_1, M_2) \leq \log_2 |J| = n \cdot (R_1 + R_2) = n \cdot (I(U; W_1, W_2) + \eta)$ and lemma 16.

Similarly for decoder \mathcal{D}_2 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2} || \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U_t|W_{2t}}) \middle| E_\delta^2 = 0 \right] \quad (148)$$

$$= \sum_{m_2, w_2^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_2}(m_2, w_2^n | E_\delta^2 = 0) \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_2} || \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U_t|W_{2t}}) \quad (149)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(u^n, m_2, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_2}(m_2, w_2^n | E_\delta^2 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U_t|W_{2t}}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t|M_2, E_\delta^2 = 0) \quad (150)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(u^n, m_2, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_2}(u^n, m_2, w_2^n | E_\delta^2 = 0) \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{U_t|W_{2t}}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n H(U_t|M_2, E_\delta^2 = 0) \quad (151)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(u^n, m_2, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n} \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_2}(u^n, m_2, w_2^n | E_\delta^2 = 0) \cdot n \cdot (H(U|W_2) + \delta) - \frac{1}{n} H(U^n|M_2, E_\delta^2 = 0) \quad (152)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} I(U^n; M_2, E_\delta^2 = 0) - I(U; W_2) + \delta + \frac{1}{n} + \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_2}(E_\delta^2 = 1) \quad (153)$$

$$\leq \eta + \delta + \frac{1}{n} + \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_2}(E_\delta^2 = 1) \quad (154)$$

$$\leq \eta + \delta + \frac{1}{n} + \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\sigma, \tau_1, \tau_2}(E_\delta^1 = 1). \quad (155)$$

If the expected probability of error is small over the codebooks, then it has to be small over at least one codebook.

Therefore, equations (124) and (125) imply that:

$$\forall \epsilon_2 > 0, \forall \eta > 0, \exists \bar{\delta} > 0, \forall \delta \leq \bar{\delta}, \exists \bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \geq \bar{n}, \exists b^*, \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{P}_{b^*}(E_\delta^2 = 1) \leq \epsilon_2. \quad (156)$$

The strategy σ of the encoder consists of using b^* in order to transmit the pair (m_1, m_2) such that $(U^n, W_2^n(m_2), W_1^n(m_2, m_1))$ is a jointly typical sequence. By construction, this satisfies equation (156).

Lemma 13. Let $\mathcal{Q}_{W_1 W_2 | U} \in \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_0(R_1, R_2)$, then $\forall \epsilon > 0, \forall \alpha > 0, \gamma > 0$, there exists $\bar{\delta}, \forall \delta \leq \bar{\delta}, \exists \bar{n}, \forall n \geq \bar{n}, \exists \sigma$, such that $1 - \mathcal{P}^\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}) \leq \epsilon$.

Proof. of lemma 13 We have:

$$1 - \mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}) := \mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}^c) \quad (157)$$

$$= \mathcal{P}_\sigma(E_\delta^2 = 1) \mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}^c | E_\delta^2 = 1) + \mathcal{P}_\sigma(E_\delta^1 = 0) \mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}^c | E_\delta^1 = 0) \quad (158)$$

$$\leq \mathcal{P}_\sigma(E_\delta^2 = 1) + \mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}^c | E_\delta^1 = 0) \quad (159)$$

$$\leq \epsilon_2 + \mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}^c | E_\delta^2 = 1). \quad (160)$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^c | E_\delta^1 = 0) = \sum_{w_1^n, w_2^n, m_1, m_2} \mathcal{P}_\sigma \left((w_1^n, w_2^n, m_1, m_2) \in B_{\alpha,\gamma,\delta}^c \mid E_\delta^1 = 0 \right) \quad (161)$$

$$= \sum_{w_1^n, w_2^n, m_1, m_2} \mathcal{P}_\sigma \left((w_1^n, w_2^n, m_1, m_2) \text{ s.t. } \frac{|T_\alpha(w_1^n, w_2^n, m_1, m_2)|}{n} \leq 1 - \gamma \mid E_\delta^1 = 0 \right) \quad (162)$$

$$= \mathcal{P}_\sigma \left(\frac{\#}{n} \left\{ t, D \left(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t}) \right) \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2 \ln 2} < 1 - \gamma \mid E_\delta^1 = 0 \right\} \right) \quad (163)$$

$$= \mathcal{P}_\sigma \left(\frac{\#}{n} \left\{ t, D \left(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t}) \right) > \frac{\alpha^2}{2 \ln 2} \geq \gamma \mid E_\delta^1 = 0 \right\} \right) \quad (164)$$

$$\leq \frac{2 \ln 2}{\alpha^2 \gamma} \cdot \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D \left(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t}) \right) \right] \quad (165)$$

$$\leq \frac{2 \ln 2}{\alpha^2 \gamma} \cdot \left(\eta + \delta + \frac{2}{n} + 2 \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}_\sigma(E_\delta^2 = 1) \right) \quad (166)$$

- Equations (161) to (164) are simple reformulations.
- Equation (165) comes from using Markov's inequality given in lemma 14.
- Equation (166) comes from equations (137) and (154).

Lemma 14. (Markov's Inequality). For all $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D \left(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t}) \right) \right] \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad (167)$$

$$\implies \mathcal{P}_{w_1^n, w_2^n, m_1, m_2} \left(\frac{\#}{n} \left\{ t, D \left(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t}) \right) > \varepsilon_1 \right\} > \varepsilon_2 \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}. \quad (168)$$

Proof. of lemma 14 We denote by $D_t = D(\mathcal{P}_t^{m_1, m_2} \parallel \mathcal{Q}_{U|W_1 W_2}(\cdot | W_{1t}, W_{2t}))$ and $D^n = \{D_t\}_t$ the K-L divergence.

We have that:

$$\mathcal{P} \left(\frac{\#}{n} \left\{ t, \text{s.t. } D_t > \varepsilon_1 \right\} > \varepsilon_2 \right) = \mathcal{P} \left(\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{1} \left\{ D_t > \varepsilon_1 \right\} > \varepsilon_2 \right) \quad (169)$$

$$\leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{1} \left\{ D_t > \varepsilon_1 \right\} \right]}{\varepsilon_2} \quad (170)$$

$$= \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left\{ D_t > \varepsilon_1 \right\} \right]}{\varepsilon_2} \quad (171)$$

$$= \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P} \left(D_t > \varepsilon_1 \right)}{\varepsilon_2} \quad (172)$$

$$\leq \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[D_t \right]}{\varepsilon_1}}{\varepsilon_2} \quad (173)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n D_t \right] \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}. \quad (174)$$

- Equations (169), (171), (172) and (174) are reformulations of probabilities and expectations.

- Equations (170) and (173), come from Markov's inequality $\mathcal{P}(X \geq \alpha) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{\alpha}$, $\forall \alpha > 0$.

Combining equations (156), (160), and (174) we get the following statement:

$$\forall \varepsilon_3 > 0, \forall \alpha > 0, \forall \gamma > 0, \exists \bar{\eta}, \forall \eta \leq \bar{\eta}, \exists \bar{\delta} > 0, \forall \delta \leq \bar{\delta}, \exists \bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \geq \bar{n}, \exists \sigma \quad (175)$$

such that

$$\mathcal{P}_\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}^c) \leq 2 \cdot \mathcal{P}_\sigma(E_\delta^2 = 1) + \frac{2 \ln 2}{\alpha^2 \gamma} \cdot \left(\eta + \delta + \frac{2}{n} + 2 \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \cdot \mathcal{P}_\sigma(E_\delta^2 = 1) \right) \leq \varepsilon_3. \quad (176)$$

By choosing appropriately the rates (R_1, R_2) in (116) and (117) such as to make $\eta > 0$ small, we obtain the desired result:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \forall \alpha > 0, \gamma > 0, \exists \bar{\delta}, \forall \delta \leq \bar{\delta}, \exists \bar{n}, \forall n \geq \bar{n}, \exists \sigma, \text{ s.t. } 1 - \mathcal{P}^\sigma(B_{\alpha, \gamma, \delta}) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (177)$$

This completes the proof of achievability. \square

APPENDIX C

MORE LEMMAS

Lemma 15. (Typical Sequences Property 1, pp.26 in [20]). The typical sequences $(u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n$ satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \bar{\delta} > 0, \forall \delta \leq \bar{\delta}, \forall n, \forall (u^n, w_1^n, w_2^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\delta^n, \\ & \left| \frac{1}{n} \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}(u|w_{1t}, w_{2t})} - H(U|W_1, W_2) \right| \leq \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

where $\bar{\delta} = \varepsilon \cdot H(U|W_1, W_2)$.

Lemma 16. Let U^n an i.i.d random variable and M a random variable. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $n \geq \bar{n}$, we have

$$H(U^n | E_\delta = 0) \geq n \cdot (H(U) - \varepsilon). \quad (179)$$

Proof.

$$H(U^n | E_\delta = 0) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}(E_\delta = 0)} \cdot \left(H(U^n | E_\delta = 1) - \mathcal{P}(E_\delta = 1) \cdot H(U^n | E_\delta = 1) \right) \quad (180)$$

$$\geq H(U^n | E_\delta) - \mathcal{P}(E_\delta = 1) \cdot H(U^n | E_\delta = 1) \quad (181)$$

$$\geq H(U^n) - H(E_\delta) - \mathcal{P}(E_\delta = 1) \cdot H(U^n | E_\delta = 1) \quad (182)$$

$$\geq H(U^n) - n \cdot \varepsilon. \quad (183)$$

\square

- Equation (180) follows from the conditional entropy definition.
- Equation (181) follows since $\mathcal{P}(E_\delta = 0) \leq 1$.
- Equation (182) comes from the property $H(U^n | M, E_\delta) = H(U^n, M, E_\delta) - H(M) - H(E_\delta) \geq H(U^n) - H(M) - H(E_\delta)$.
- Equation (183) follows since U is i.i.d and the definition of $E_\delta = 1$. Hence, for all ε , there exists an $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq \bar{n}$ we have $H(\mathcal{P}(E_\delta = 1)) + H(M) + \mathcal{P}(E_\delta = 1) \cdot \log_2 |\mathcal{U}| \leq \varepsilon$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Tristan Tomala for fruitful discussions regarding the equation (26) in the converse proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Crawford and J. Sobel, “Strategic information transmission,” *Econometrica*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1431–51, 1982.
- [2] E. Kamenica and M. Gentzkow, “Bayesian persuasion,” *American Economic Review*, vol. 101, pp. 2590 – 2615, 2011.
- [3] F. Koessler, M. Laclau, and T. Tomala, “Interactive information design,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, June 2021.
- [4] S. Sarutaş, S. Yüksel, and S. Gezici, “Quadratic multi-dimensional signaling games and affine equilibria,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 2, p. 605–619, Feb 2017.
- [5] S. Sarutaş, P. Furrer, S. Gezici, T. Linder, and S. Yüksel, “On the number of bins in equilibria for signaling games,” in 2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), 2019, pp. 972–976.
- [6] S. Sarutaş, S. Yüksel, and S. Gezici, “Dynamic signaling games with quadratic criteria under Nash and Stackelberg equilibria,” *Automatica*, vol. 115, no. C, May 2020.
- [7] S. Dughmi, D. Kempe, and R. Qiang, “Persuasion with limited communication,” in Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, ser. EC ’16. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, p. 663–680.
- [8] E. Akyol, C. Langbort, and T. Başar, “Strategic compression and transmission of information,” in IEEE Information Theory Workshop - Fall (ITW), Oct 2015, pp. 219–223.
- [9] E. Akyol, C. Langbort, and T. Başar, “Information-theoretic approach to strategic communication as a hierarchical game,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 105, no. 2, pp. 205–218, 2017.
- [10] M. Le Treust and T. Tomala, “Information design for strategic coordination of autonomous devices with non-aligned utilities,” *IEEE Proc. of the 54th Allerton conference*, Monticello, Illinois, pp. 233–242, 2016.
- [11] —, “Persuasion with limited communication capacity,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, vol. 184, p. 104940, 2019.
- [12] —, “Point-to-point strategic communication,” *IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, 2020.
- [13] A. D. Wyner and J. Ziv, “The rate-distortion function for source coding with side information at the decoder,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 1976.
- [14] E. Akyol, C. Langbort, and T. Başar, “On the role of side information in strategic communication,” in IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), July 2016, pp. 1626–1630.
- [15] R. Bou Rouphael and M. Le Treust, “Impact of private observation in bayesian persuasion,” *International Conference on NETWORK Games COntrol and OPTimization NetGCoop*, Mar. 2020.
- [16] M. Le Treust and T. Tomala, “Strategic communication with decoder side information,” *Information Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021.
- [17] A. S. Vora and A. A. Kulkarni, “Achievable rates for strategic communication,” in 2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), 2020, pp. 1379–1384.
- [18] —, “Information extraction from a strategic sender: The zero error case,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.10641>
- [19] R. Bou Rouphael and M. Le Treust, “Strategic successive refinement coding for Bayesian persuasion with two decoders,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06201>
- [20] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge university press, 2011.