

Multiple Access Channel in Massive Multi-User MIMO Using Group Testing

George Vershinin, Asaf Cohen, Omer Gurewitz

The School of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Abstract—The number of wireless devices (e.g., cellular phones, IoT, laptops) connected to Wireless Local Area Networks (WLAN) grows exponentially each year. The orchestration of the connected devices becomes infeasible, especially when the number of resources available at the single access point (e.g., Base Station, Wireless Access Points) is limited. On the other hand, the number of antennas in each device grows too. We leverage the large number of antennas to suggest a massive multiple-user multiple-input-multiple-output (MU-MIMO) scheme using sparse coding based on Group Testing (GT) principles, which reduces overhead and complexity. We show that it is possible to jointly identify and decode K messages simultaneously out of NC messages (where N is the number of users and C is the number of messages per user) without any scheduling overhead or prior knowledge of the identity of the transmitting devices.

Our scheme is order-optimal in the number of users and messages, utilizing minimal knowledge of channel state and an efficient (in both run-time and space) decoding algorithm requiring $O(K \log NC)$ antennas. We derive sufficient conditions for vanishing error probability, bound the minimal number of antennas necessary for our scheme (Converse), and show that our scheme's number of antennas is asymptotically tight with the converse result.

I. INTRODUCTION

MIMO systems have become ubiquitous for their increased reception and transmission quality in single and MU communications due to their significant number of antennas. Many MU-MIMO works focus on user selection (e.g., [1]) as a possible solution to the Multiple Access Channel (MAC) problem. Collecting and processing Channel State Information (CSI) to schedule users can be computationally hard when the number of users is large, so optimal user scheduling is infeasible. Reducing this complexity encompasses many challenges; Eliminating the need for CSI collection (at the receiver) and user scheduling while maintaining high rates and reliability requires sophisticated mechanisms.

We address these challenges by combining two ideas; Threshold-based Index Modulation, where users selectively activate antennas at the receiver to provide additional information [2, Chapter 1.2], and the GT problem, capable of finding K items of interest out of a large population of N items [3]. In GT, items are tested together rather than individually, minimizing the number of tests required to identify the K items. The set of items participating in each test can be determined *a-priori* in the form of a test matrix. After conducting all tests, the test conductor observes the Result Vector and uses decoding algorithms such as Noisy Column Matching (Noisy CoMa) from [4] (Noisy Combinatorial Orthogonal Matching Pursuit in [5]) to identify the defective items.

Modern literature suggests GT-originated codes to devise communication protocols capable of joint decoding many messages using a simple decoding algorithm. For example, [6] proposed an energy-efficient sensor discovery in power-constrained clustered networks. [7], based on ideas from [8, Supplementary Materials], showed that GT can be used for communication protocols. Our work can be considered an extension of [9], which considered a Single-Input-Single-Output (SISO) Rayleigh Fading Channel device discovery scheme. The main idea is to reduce the continuous signal and noise models into discrete binary models using energy detection, followed by Noisy CoMa for decoding.

In our scheme, users have a codebook generated using methods from GT. The users leverage their massive number of antennas to null their transmitted signals' energy in the antennas corresponding to zeros in their transmitted codeword. Any other antenna may read some energy. The receiver uses energy detection, converting channel output to a binary vector, to estimate which antenna is targeted by at least one user or not. The binary vector is treated as the Result Vector of GT and

is the input to Noisy CoMa which returns the sent messages (consequently, the identities of the transmitting users).

Our scheme requires no scheduling overhead (headers, control messages, CSI collection at the receiver, etc.) and has extraordinarily low complexity; The detectors in each antenna are simple energy detectors, and the decoding algorithm is efficient in both run-time and space. Only the (complete) codebook is vital for its operation. We analyze the error probability of our scheme, find a lower bound and scaling laws of the number of antennas, and show it is order-optimal in codebook size (either in the number of users or the number of messages per user).

II. RELATED WORK

A. Group Testing

The GT problem revolves around finding K items of interest, also known as the defective items, out of a large population of N items using as few as possible tests.

The order of tests, or equivalently when each item is tested in which group-test, forms a matrix (dubbed as the "test matrix" or "test design") whose columns represent the items and rows represent tests. A component in the matrix is either zero (the corresponding item does not participate in the group test) or one. The Result Vector is, essentially, the Boolean sum (Logic OR operation) of the columns corresponding to the defective items. It is the input to an algorithm capable of *separating* the columns and obtaining their indices in the test design.

Most GT-related works have extensively researched the relationship between K , N , and the number of tests, T . Notably, Atia et al. showed that $T = \Theta(K \log N)$ is sufficient to find the K items (with arbitrarily small error probability) using Maximum Likelihood in [10], [11]. Atia has reduced the GT problem into a communication system in [12]. In Atia's communication model, the set of items is analogous to transmitting users. The defective items are the set of transmitting users. The codebook is the test matrix (each column is a codeword), and the channel sums transmissions using Boolean sum. Since GT deals with Boolean vectors, all discrete (memoryless) binary channels have been addressed in the literature. In their later work, [10], Atia et al. solved the GT problem for Reversed-Z Channel (RZ-Channel) and Z-Channel. Chan et al. addressed the Binary Symmetric Channel (BSC) in [4], [5] and solved the GT problem using Noisy CoMa. The Binary Asymmetric Channel (BAC) was addressed by Scarlett et al. in [13] and

Sejdinovic et al. in [14]. Modern literature on GT engages in devising communication protocols using the same reduction, modified for well-known communication models.

B. MIMO

Most of the models for wireless channels are time-shifted Affine Transformations. The transmitted signal suffers from multiplicative noise (attenuation or fading) and additive noise. The MIMO model extends these models by adding more antennas at the receiver and transmitter. These additions enable transmitting multi-dimensional symbols, but at the cost of possible interferences at the receiver. In this case, the attenuation parameter is replaced with a matrix (dubbed the channel matrix), and the noise becomes a noise vector.

When multiple users transmit simultaneously, the transmitted signals of the users are mixed, resulting in a sum of affine transformations. In MU-SISO, if the system is designed for this purpose, the receiver can decode the transmissions jointly (e.g., using GT codes like in [6]) or successively (like NOMA). These solutions are possible as each transmitted signal only interferes with the transmissions of other users. The decoder can be further optimized when the distributions of attenuation and noise are known, [15, Chapter 4].

Recent work by Bicais et al. in [16] suggested using energy detection in MIMO systems for sub-Terra Hertz bands, using On-Off Keying (OOK). Their work covered communication from one antenna to its parallel in the receiver and can be extended easily for any pair of antennas. Bicais' idea has used Paquelet's original idea in [17] but for multiple antennas. Paquelet showed that the energy detection scheme is optimal when using OOK, in addition to its low complexity. However, both works do not address the multi-user problem with their solutions. The optimal thresholds derived were optimal per pair of antennas (one at the transmitter and one at the receiver) utilizing the receiver's CSI. Each user may have a different optimal threshold, so careful user-to-antenna assignment (alternatively, scheduling) is essential. Hence, their solutions are unscalable without the use of proper coding.

III. SYSTEM MODEL

A. Notation

Matrices will appear in bold (e.g., \mathbf{H}) and vectors are underlined (e.g., \underline{x}). We shall use subscript for user indices (e.g., \mathbf{H}_i), components of a vector or matrix are specified as a subscript after squared parentheses (e.g., $[\underline{y}]_m$ is \underline{y} 's m^{th}

component, $[\mathbf{H}_k]_{i,j}$ is \mathbf{H}_k 's component in the i^{th} row and j^{th} column). All logarithms in this article are in base two. When they aren't, we will specify the log base explicitly or write $\ln(\cdot)$ in the case of the natural logarithm. We write $[n]$ as a shorthand notation for the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We write $2^{\mathcal{S}}$ as the power set of a set \mathcal{S} (e.g., $2^{[n]}$). We use a single subscript after squared parentheses of a matrix to specify a column of a matrix. E.g., $[\mathbf{H}_k]_j$ is \mathbf{H}_k 's j^{th} column. We use $(\cdot)^T$ for the transpose operation and $(\cdot)^*$ for the Conjugate Transpose.

B. Model

We assume a time-slotted network of N users where $K \ll N$ of them simultaneously transmit to a single receiver. In each time slot, a different set of K users may transmit, and their identity is unknown a-priori. Every user wishes to send one out of C possible messages using a *single* time slot, and there is no a-priori knowledge about the distribution of which a message is sent. The k^{th} user's messages are $\mathcal{W}_k = \{w_{k,1}, w_{k,2}, \dots, w_{k,C}\}$. WLOG, the transmitting users are $[K]$, and each user wishes to transmit its first message, $w_{k,1}$.

Each transmitter has M_t antennas, whereas the receiver has M_r antennas. Each transmitter has complete knowledge of its channel state at any given time but has no channel state of other transmitters (CSIT model, as named in [18, Chapter 10]). The receiver, on the other hand, has no CSI. The channel matrix of the k^{th} user is $\mathbf{H}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times M_t}$. Each entry in \mathbf{H}_k is a zero-mean Complex Gaussian Random Variable (CGRV). We also assume a zero-mean White Complex Gaussian Additive Noise, $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times 1}$, where $[n]_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, N_0)$ for all i .

Since \mathbf{H}_k is known to the k^{th} transmitter, its encoder is a function that maps some $w_k \in \mathcal{W}_k$ to a complex vector $\underline{x}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{M_t \times 1}$. The choice of \underline{x}_k also depends on the CSI by utilizing beamforming. Formally:

$$\mathcal{E}_k : \mathcal{W}_k \times \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times M_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{M_t \times 1} \quad (1)$$

The transmission cannot exceed some power level, P . I.e., $\|\underline{x}_k\|^2 \leq P$. For convenience, we shall assume each component of \mathbf{H}_k has a unit variance¹, that is, $[\mathbf{H}_k]_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ for all i, j, k . Finally, the receiver obtains:

$$\underline{y} = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbf{H}_k \underline{x}_k + \underline{n} \quad (2)$$

¹The assumption of unit variance at the channel matrix can be interpreted as the normalization of the power constraint with the fading power. I.e., P is not the transmitted power per se, but the average SNR per antenna.

The decoder uses \underline{y} to obtain the messages sent and infer the identity of the K users. Formally:

$$\mathcal{D} : \mathbb{C}^{M_r \times 1} \rightarrow \prod_{k=1}^N 2^{\mathcal{W}_k} \times 2^{[N]} \quad (3)$$

Where the product is the Cartesian Product.

For simplicity, $M_r = M_t$. We assume Massive MIMO settings, so $1 \ll M_t, M_r$. When a system has a minuscule number of antennas, one can use additional time slots/frequency bands to compensate for the difference. E.g., if our solution requires $L = l \cdot M_r$ antennas, use l time slots. In each time slot save the channel output to obtain $\{\underline{y}_i\}_{i=1}^l$. Finally, \underline{y} can be obtained by concatenation: $\underline{y} = (\underline{y}_1^T, \underline{y}_2^T, \dots, \underline{y}_l^T)^T$.

We are interested in the finite-block length regime, deriving different results as functions of N , K , and C . K is allowed to scale with N (increasing the number of simultaneously transmitting users) or C . We say that the system is *message-user reliable* if:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}(\underline{y}) \neq (\underbrace{w_{1,1}, w_{2,1}, \dots, w_{K,1}}_{\text{The sent messages}}, \underbrace{[K]}_{\text{Identities}})) \xrightarrow[N, C \rightarrow \infty]{} 0. \quad (4)$$

That is, the decoder obtains *exactly* K messages and the correct ones. Additionally, it must correctly identify the corresponding users.

C. Rates

Each user has C codewords, meaning each user sends $\log C$ bits per transmission. To identify the K users, the receiver needs additional $\log \binom{N}{K}$ bits. Replacing $\log \binom{N}{K}$ with its asymptotic value $K \log N$, we obtain the sum-rate of $K \log C + K \log N = K \log NC$ bits per time slot.

We want to compare our rate with *Ergodic* sum-rates. The capacity is achieved using codes in increasing block length (e.g., more time slots), whereas we use only a single time slot and a finite number of antennas. It is, however, convenient to compare the rate with famous quantities - especially when their approximations are functions of M_r . Rhee and Cioffi established the highest Ergodic sum-rate possible in [19]. Adapting their result to our system model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}(MAC) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\log \det \left(\mathbf{I}_{M_r} + \rho \cdot \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{H}_i \mathbf{H}_i^* \right) \right] \\ &\approx \log \det (\mathbf{I}_{M_r} + K \cdot \rho \cdot M_t \cdot \mathbf{I}_{M_r}) \\ &= M_r \cdot \log(K \cdot \rho \cdot M_r + 1) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Where the approximation used the law of large numbers. Notably, the sum-rate Ergodic Capacity in CSIT-only is [19, Equation (40)]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}(MAC_{CSIT}) &\approx M_r \cdot \mathbb{E}[\log(1 + \rho \cdot |[\mathbf{H}_1]_{1,1}|^2)] \\ &\quad + O(\log(1 + K \cdot M_t - M_r)) \\ &\leq M_r \cdot \log(1 + \rho) + O(\log(K \cdot M_r)) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The last transition follows from the fact that $|\mathbf{H}_k]_{i,j}|^2 \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ and Jensen's Inequality.

For comparison, we are also interested in the settings where all users are already scheduled. Namely, users are scheduled using Round Robin (RR). In RR, in each time slot, *exactly one* user (whose identity is well-known) transmits but may transmit at the highest rate possible (from [20]). Hence, the average Ergodic Rate (calculated similar to (5)) is:

$$\text{cap}(RR) \approx \frac{K}{N} \cdot M_r \cdot \log(\rho \cdot M_r + 1) \quad (7)$$

IV. A MIMO-GT-BASED TRANSMISSION SCHEME

In this section, we describe in depth our suggested scheme. The scheme is comprised of three parts; codebook generation, transmission scheme, and the receiver algorithm. First, we generate NC binary codewords and distribute C codewords to each user. Each codeword is of length $\beta K \log NC$, where $\beta \geq 1$ is a constant to be determined later. Each bit in these codewords is generated using i.i.d. Bernoulli distribution with parameter $p = \frac{\alpha}{K}$. α is a constant to be defined later.

To transmit the j^{th} codeword, \underline{c}_j , the i^{th} user takes the following procedure: Let $\mathcal{Z}_j \triangleq \{l : [c_j]_l = 0\}$. Construct $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Z}_j} \triangleq \{[\mathbf{H}_i^T]_l^T\}_{l \in \mathcal{Z}_j} \in \mathbb{C}^{|\mathcal{Z}_j| \times M_i}$. That is, collect all rows of \mathbf{H}_i whose index corresponds to a zero in \underline{c}_j . Now, calculate the orthonormal basis of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{Z}_j}$'s nullspace, and take an arbitrary *normalized* linear combination of them as a weight vector, \underline{w}_i . We dub this technique as Zero-Forcing Beamforming (ZFBF). Finally, amplify \underline{w}_i to hold the power constraint and obtain \underline{x}_i .

In other words, each user beamforms their signals such that the receiver, in the absence of the additive noise, will read no energy in antennas corresponding to zeros in their respective codewords but may read some energy in antennas corresponding to ones. Hence, the sum-rate of our scheme is:

$$R \approx K \cdot \log(N \cdot C) = M_r \cdot \frac{1}{\beta} \quad (8)$$

Similarly, the Spectral Efficiency of our scheme is:

$$\eta = \frac{K \log NC}{\beta K \log NC} = \beta^{-1} \quad (9)$$

The receiver obtains \underline{y} according to (2), and compares $|\underline{y}]_i|^2$ to an energy threshold $N_0\gamma$ for all i . γ will be selected later. The result of the comparison, \underline{Y} , is the Result Vector in the GT context. Clearly, a hard decision using energy detection may introduce erroneous bits in \underline{Y} . The errors are characterized by crossover probabilities from '1' to '0' and vice-versa, denoted by q_{10} and q_{01} , respectively. We will calculate them later.

We then use \underline{Y} as an input to the Noisy CoMa algorithm to obtain the messages. Noisy CoMa outputs *all* codewords with at least $1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1)$ common '1's with \underline{Y} . Since it has the complete codebook, the decoder also infers the users' identities *without a dedicated header*.

Noisy CoMa may output any number of codewords between 0 and NC (consequently, any users ranging from 0 to N). Hence, we have to consider two types of errors; the first is miss-detection, where Noisy CoMa fails to find at least one transmitted codeword. The other error is a false alarm where Noisy CoMa declares at least one excess codeword (that was not transmitted). The probabilities of these events are denoted by p_{MD} and p_{FA} , respectively. p_{FA} also covers the event of identical codewords by its definition. If p_e is the error probability of our scheme, then $p_e \leq p_{MD} + p_{FA}$. Our main result is:

Theorem IV.1. *Fix N, K, C . Let $\delta > 0$. Set $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}(1-p)^K \cdot \frac{1-q_{01}-q_{10}}{q_{10}}$ and $M_r = \beta^* \cdot K \log NC$, where β^* is the solution to the following optimization problem:*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{p, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}} & \frac{(1+\delta) \ln 2}{K \cdot p \cdot (1 - \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{10}-q_{01})^2\})} \\ \text{s.t.} & \begin{cases} 0 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 \leq \gamma \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then, MIMO-GT achieves $\max\{p_{FA}, p_{MD}\} \leq (NC)^{-\delta}$. Consequently, MIMO-GT is message-user reliable.

We compare our system rate in (8) with (5), (6) and (7) by dividing them. The ratios are:

$$\frac{\text{cap}(MAC)}{R} \approx \beta \cdot \log(\rho \cdot \beta K^2 \log NC + 1) \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\text{cap}(MAC_{CSIT})}{R} \lesssim \beta \cdot \log(1 + \rho) + O\left(\frac{\log(K^2 \log NC)}{K \log NC}\right) \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\text{cap}(RR)}{R} \approx \frac{K}{N} \cdot \beta \cdot \log(\rho \cdot \beta K \log NC + 1) \quad (12)$$

We observe two kinds of losses; The first is SNR loss, where we analyze how the rate ratios scale with ρ . The other loss is the User-Codebook Loss, where we observe how the rate ratios scale with N, C , and $K \leq N \cdot C$.

When $\rho \rightarrow 0$, all ratios tend to infinity by corollary V.7 below - a direct result of Shannon's Power Efficiency Limit (SPEL); it is a lower bound on the energy per bit, equivalently on ρ , from which onward a communication system can achieve vanishing error rates. In the optimal solutions, in the Full CSI (both for RR and MIMO MAC) or complete CSIT settings, users cooperate to create dedicated virtual channels resulting in non-zero sum-rates. Cooperation is not possible in our

scheme due to the lack of irrelevant CSI. Additionally, SPEL restricts the performance of energy detection in low SNRs. When $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, the SNR loss scales like $O(\log \rho)$. In both cases, our scheme is sub-optimal.

The User-Codebook Loss, however, scales differently. In (10), the User-Codebook Loss is $O(\log(K^2 \log NC))$ (see how β scales with K in lemma V.6 below), which tends to infinity when $NC \rightarrow \infty$ and $K = O(NC)$. In (11) the loss tends to zero, so our scheme is order-optimal when either the number of users or the number of messages grow. The User-Codebook Loss in (12) tends to infinity when $NC \rightarrow \infty$, but vanish when $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $K = o(N)$. I.e., if K is small enough, scheduling is ineffective as it forces all users but one to idle.

V. ANALYSIS - DIRECT RESULT

This section analyzes our scheme's error probability and scaling laws. In Subsection V-A we define and calculate q_{10} and q_{01} . We elaborate on Noisy CoMa's performance analysis in Subsection V-B. We study β 's scaling laws in Subsection V-C. In Section VI, we give a matching converse result and discuss its tightness.

A. Calculating the Crossover Probabilities

If no additive noise exists, the Result Vector, \underline{Y} , is a Boolean Sum of the K transmitted messages (when selecting $\gamma = 0$). When the additive noise is present, we have to use some mechanism to differentiate between the noise and send signals. Since we are sampling \underline{y} once, we use an energy threshold to convert \underline{y} to \underline{Y} . Therefore, we are interested in the following random variable:

$$[\underline{Y}]_i = \begin{cases} 1 & |[y]_i|^2 > N_0 \cdot \gamma \\ 0 & |[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

$[\underline{Y}]_i$ estimates whether *at least one* user targets the i^{th} antenna or not. $[\underline{Y}]_i$ are i.i.d. due to symmetry. Naturally, the estimation may err - either due to weak transmissions (caused by either deep fade or intense noise), denoted by q_{10} , or the additive noise overcomes the threshold when no user targets the antenna (denoted by q_{01}). Our detection differs from Bicaïs' work in [16] because our receiver has no CSI.

To calculate q_{01} and q_{10} by their definition, we have to calculate the distribution of $|[y]_i|^2$ conditioned on the number of users targeting the i^{th} antenna. The calculations can be found in Appendix A-A. Due to brevity, we present the results of the calculations in the following theorems:

Theorem V.1. For any γ , the crossover probability from '0' to '1' is $q_{01} = e^{-\gamma}$.

Theorem V.2. Denote $\rho \triangleq \frac{P}{N_0}$. For any γ , the crossover probability from '1' to '0' is:

$$q_{10} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \left(1 - \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1} \right\} \right)$$

ρ can be interpreted as the SNR of the faded signal against the additive noise, and γ is the normalization of threshold into units of N_0 , rather than energy.

B. Decoding Error Probability

We shall follow the footsteps of [4, Section V.B], which analyzes the Noisy CoMa algorithm for a BSC with parameter q . The steps are very similar, except for the different discrete channels in which a test tube ($[\underline{Y}]_i$ in our case) is corrupt. Our relaxation criterion will be the same as in [9, Chapter IV]. For simplicity, we shall use N for the total number of codewords rather than the number of users. I.e., $N = N' \cdot C$.

Following Chan's footsteps in [4, Proof of Theorem 6], we consider the probability that some antenna reads '1', p_1 . This probability is equivalent to some component of the transmitted codeword being "hidden" by other codewords or noise. We can calculate this probability by calculating its complement, $p_0 \triangleq \mathbb{P}([\underline{Y}]_i = 0) = (1 - (1-p)^K)q_{10} + (1-p)^K(1 - q_{01})$.

Theorem V.3. Set $M_r = \beta_1 \cdot K \log N$. If β_1 satisfies:

$$\beta_1 \geq \frac{(1 + \delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp \{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2\})}$$

then $p_{MD} \leq N^{-\delta}$ for any $\delta \geq 0$ we like.

Likewise, we have a sufficient condition on p_{FA} :

Theorem V.4. Set $M_r = \beta_2 \cdot K \log N$ and $\Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$. If β_2 satisfies:

$$\beta_2 \geq \frac{(1 + \delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp \{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))^2\})}$$

then $p_{FA} \leq N^{-\delta}$ for any desired $\delta \geq 0$.

Proof Sketch: We bound p_{MD} (p_{FA}) three times (union and Hoeffding bounds followed by Taylor approximation), similar to Chan. Afterward, we substitute β_1 (β_2) with their respective values from the above theorems. The proofs can be found in Appendices A-B and A-C respectively and are omitted due to brevity.

We are interested in a vanishing error probability for our scheme, so we would like to take β such that both p_{MD} and p_{FA} tend to zero. In other words, an appropriate choice of β

is the solution to the optimization problem of minimizing the number of antennas in our scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\Delta, \alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \max\{\beta_1, \beta_2\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \begin{cases} 0 < \Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 \\ 0 < \alpha \leq \frac{K}{2} \\ 0 < \gamma \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The following theorem simplifies the optimization problem:

Theorem V.5. *The optimization problem in (14) is equivalent to the optimization problem in Theorem IV.1 and has at least one solution.*

The proof is technical and appears in Appendix A-D. *Proof Sketch:* The proof has five steps; (1) simplify Δ 's upper bound, $\frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$, to $(1-p)K \frac{1-q_{01}-q_{10}}{q_{10}}$. (2) eliminate the dependency on Δ and convert the minimax problem into a minimization problem (by noticing that β_1 and β_2 have opposing trends in Δ , so Δ^* is their equalizer). (3) annihilate the boundaries of the convex hull, which is a rectangle in \mathbb{R}^2 ; It is possible to show that each corner point is not a solution² (either $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ or a better solution exists in the interior), and so are any convex combination of them. (4) show that β is convex in γ , so at least one solution exists. (5) invoke the KKT Conditions. Since the corner points are not solutions, their corresponding Lagrange Multipliers are canceled out, so it is possible to obtain the solution by comparing the gradient to zero.

C. Scaling

This subsection shows different scaling laws on β as a function of K and ρ . First, we shall show that β converges to some constant term when $K \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma V.6. *Let β be the solution to the optimization problem in Theorem V.5. Then, $\beta \rightarrow \text{const.}$ when $K \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof Sketch: Recalling that $\alpha = K \cdot p$, we can invoke the Poisson Limit Theorem on q_{10} . Any other term dependant on K tends to some exponent powered by α , so β tends to some constant. Complete proof can be found in A-E.

For β 's scaling with ρ , we observe that the expression in Theorem V.5 is not a function of ρ , except for q_{10} (Theorem V.2). From this observation, we have the following (immediate) result:

Corollary V.7. *If $\rho \rightarrow 0$ then $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. If $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ then $\beta \rightarrow \text{const.}$*

²converting the form of the objective function from $\frac{1}{f(\gamma, p)}$ to $-f(\gamma, p)$ might result in some feasible points on the boundary

VI. CONVERSE

In this section, we shall derive a lower bound on the number of antennas using Fano's Inequality and Data Processing Inequality, similar to [5, Section IV].

Theorem VI.1. *Assume N users, each with a C -sized codebook. Assume K of them wish to transmit a single codeword. Then, a lower bound on the number of antennas, M_r , is required to obtain the K messages reliably when using a hard-decision criterion at the receiver is:*

$$M_r \geq \frac{K \log \frac{N \cdot C}{K}}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))}$$

Where $\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))$ is the BAC capacity ([21]):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10})) &= \frac{q_{01}}{1 - q_{01} - q_{10}} \cdot H(q_{10}) \\ &- \frac{1 - q_{10}}{1 - q_{01} - q_{10}} \cdot H(q_{01}) + \log \left(1 + 2^{\frac{H(q_{01}) - H(q_{10})}{1 - q_{01} - q_{10}}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$H(\cdot)$ is the binary entropy function

The detailed proof can be found in A-G and is very similar to Chan's proof in [5, Chapter IV]. Dividing our the converse bound with our scheme's number of antennas yields:

$$\frac{K \log \frac{N \cdot C}{K}}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))} \cdot \frac{1}{\beta K \log NC} = \frac{1 - \frac{\log K}{\log NC}}{\beta \cdot \text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))} \quad (16)$$

Which tends to a constant when $NC \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, our scheme's number of antennas is asymptotically tight when N and C grow as long as $K < NC$. According to corollary V.7, the same claims hold when $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ and N , C and K are constant.

VII. SIMULATION & NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present simulation and numerical evaluation results. The simulation had a network of $N = 100$ sensors with $C = 1000$ codewords each. ρ is taken to be 24_{dB} ³, $N_0 = 2$ and $\delta = 0.33$. We assumed $K = \log_{10}(N \cdot C) = 5$ users wish to transmit simultaneously and solved the optimization problem in Theorem V.5 to obtain $\gamma^* = 5.6583$, $p^* = 0.0986$ (equivalently, $\alpha^* = 0.4932$) and $\beta^* = 9.048$. The initial number of antennas at the receiver is the bound in Corollary VI.1.

Figure 1 shows that the calculations in theorems V.1 and V.2 coincide with the simulation results. Figure 2 shows that theorems V.3 and V.4 hold when taking $M_r \geq \beta^* \cdot K \ln N$ ⁴. We note that our results are asymptotically tight.

³SNR required for MCS3 in 802.11ac, [22]

⁴Taking \ln instead of \log removes the $\ln 2$ in the numerator of the optimization problem




Fig. 1. Simulation results when $N = 100$, $C = 1000$, $K = 5$, $\rho = 24_{\text{dB}}$, $\delta = 0.33$, $\gamma = 11.318$ and $\alpha = 0.4932$.




Fig. 2. Simulation results when $N = 100$, $C = 1000$, $K = 5$, $\rho = 24_{\text{dB}}$, $\delta = 0.33$, $\gamma = 11.318$ and $\alpha = 0.4932$.

Figure 3 compares the rates in Subsection III-C with our scheme's rate in (8). Additionally, we also compare our rate with MU systems used in practice - satellite networks (using data provided by AYECKA) and four-carriers 802.11ax (MCS2 maximal rate with short guard interval, multiplied by $4K$). The rates of the satellite network and 802.11ax are normalized by their bandwidth. The blue line is the ratio between the optimal solution (with Full CSI) and our scheme, given in (5). The orange line is (6), whereas the yellow line is (7). The purple line compares oracle-aided 802.11ax (where the identity of the users is known to the receiver) rate per carrier to our scheme. The green line is the sum-




Fig. 3. Rate ratio as a function of N when $\rho = 20_{\text{dB}}$, $K = 5$, $C = 1000$, $\delta = 0.33$ and $N_0 = 2$. The 802.11ax is oracle-aided; it assumes knowledge of the identity of the K users without scheduling overhead.




Fig. 4. Spectral Efficiency as a function of ρ (in dB) when $\delta = 0.33$ and $N_0 = 2$. The mentioned probabilities, $q_e \triangleq (1-p)^K q_{01} + (1-(1-p)^K) q_{10}$, are the BER of the blue line at the corresponding SNR.

rate of errorless, raw-transmissions at the highest symbol rate of a K -to-1 satellite communication. Our scheme achieves higher sum-rates than 802.11ax or satellite networks, but has no significant overheads.

Figure 4 compares our scheme's Spectral Efficiency from (9) with SPEL, evaluated for different settings of K , N and C . The SPEL is calculated as in [23, Chapter 3.5]. For our system, we have used $\frac{E_b}{N_0} = \frac{K \cdot P}{N_0 \cdot M_r}$. The bold dark line is SPEL, and its dashed counterpart is the *absolute* SPEL, $\ln 2$. The orange line is the limit of β^{-1} when $K \rightarrow \infty$ (calculated regardless of N or C).




Fig. 5. α^* 's value as a function of ρ when $N = 100$, $K = 5$, $C = 1000$, $\delta = 0.33$ and $N_0 = 2$.




Fig. 7. BER as a function of ρ when $N = 100$, $K = 5$, $C = 1000$, $\delta = 0.33$ and $N_0 = 2$.




Fig. 6. γ^* 's value as a function of ρ when $N = 100$, $K = 5$, $C = 1000$, $\delta = 0.33$ and $N_0 = 2$.

Figures 5, 6 and 7 show how α^* , γ^* , and the BER (respectively) scale as a function of $\rho \in [-30, 60]_{\text{dB}}$. When the SNR is low, the BER tends to 0.5, equivalent to the error when the receiver guesses whether the antenna is activated or not. γ^* tends to 1 when the SNR is low, unlike its proportion to $\ln \rho$ in the high SNR region. Since γ can be independent of the code we use, choosing $\gamma = \ln(1 + \rho)$ is an excellent *heuristic*. Additionally, we can adjust α^* 's range to the interval $[0, 1]$, justifying the heuristic used in [10], [9].

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied a non-cooperative distributed MU-MIMO scheme using GT codes on the antennas at the

receiver. The receiver used energy detection in each antenna and a simple decoding algorithm to obtain numerous messages simultaneously. Our approach is not only simple to implement (compared to LTE, for example) but also order-optimal in the number of users or messages. We also presented a universal upper bound on the error probability of the decoding algorithm, which requires only characterizing the transition probabilities of the channel when using energy detection at each resource. We have expressed and determined the scaling laws of the antennas when the SNR and number of sent messages grow large. Our work also showed a converse bound, simulations to support our analysis, and simplifying heuristics.

Our scheme relies heavily on the reliability of the channel estimation at *each* transmitter; If a user errs in their estimation, the communication will undoubtedly fail, and the receiver will read a vector of ones from the energy detectors. Future research may address this issue by either using a special deterministic codebook (with a constant number of intersections between every K codewords) or by devising a scheme non-reliant on CSIT (e.g., utilizing multi-user/antenna diversity). The codebooks of the first approach are hard to find, and the second approach might suffer from a reduced sum-rate (with possibly different scaling laws in the number of users).

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Yoo and A. Goldsmith, "On the optimality of multiantenna broadcast scheduling using zero-forcing beamforming," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 528–541, 2006.
- [2] M. Wen, X. Cheng, and L. Yang, *Index Modulation for 5G Wireless Communications*, 1st ed. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2017.
- [3] M. Aldridge, O. Johnson, and J. Scarlett, "Group testing: an information theory perspective," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06002*, 2019.
- [4] C. L. Chan, S. Jaggi, V. Saligrama, and S. Agnihotri, "Non-adaptive group testing: Explicit bounds and novel algorithms," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, 2012, pp. 1837–1841.
- [5] C. Chan, P. H. Che, S. Jaggi, and V. Saligrama, "Non-adaptive probabilistic group testing with noisy measurements: Near-optimal bounds with efficient algorithms," *49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 07 2011.
- [6] J. Robin and E. Erkip, "Sparse activity discovery in energy constrained multi-cluster iot networks using group testing," in *IEEE International Conference on Communications*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [7] A. Cohen, A. Cohen, and O. Gurewitz, "Efficient data collection over multiple access wireless sensors network," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. PP, pp. 1–14, 02 2020.
- [8] —, "Secure group testing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security*, pp. 1–1, 2020.
- [9] J. Robin and E. Erkip, "Capacity bounds and user identification costs in rayleigh-fading many-access channel," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021, pp. 2477–2482.
- [10] G. K. Atia and V. Saligrama, "Boolean compressed sensing and noisy group testing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1880–1901, 2012.
- [11] G. K. Atia, V. Saligrama, and C. Aksoylar, "Correction to "boolean compressed sensing and noisy group testing" [mar 12 1880-1901]," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 1507–1507, 2015.
- [12] G. Atia and V. Saligrama, "Noisy group testing: An information theoretic perspective," in *2009 47th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2009, pp. 355–362.
- [13] J. Scarlett and O. Johnson, "Noisy non-adaptive group testing: A (near-)definite defectives approach," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 3775–3797, 2020.
- [14] D. Sejdinovic and O. Johnson, "Note on noisy group testing: Asymptotic bounds and belief propagation reconstruction," in *2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 998–1003.
- [15] Proakis, *Digital Communications 5th Edition*. McGraw Hill, 2007.
- [16] S. Bicaïs, J.-B. Dore, and V. Savin, "Design of mimo systems using energy detectors for sub-terahertz applications," in *31st Annual International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [17] S. Paquelet, L.-M. Aubert, and B. Uguen, "An impulse radio asynchronous transceiver for high data rates," in *2004 International Workshop on Ultra Wideband Systems Joint with Conference on Ultra Wideband Systems and Technologies. Joint UWBST IWUWBS 2004 (IEEE Cat. No.04EX812)*, 2004, pp. 1–5.
- [18] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [19] W. Rhee and J. Cioffi, "On the capacity of multiuser wireless channels with multiple antennas," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2580–2595, 2003.
- [20] I. E. Telatar, "Capacity of multi-antenna gaussian channels," *European Transactions on Telecommunications*, vol. 10, pp. 585–595, 1999.
- [21] S. M. Moser, P.-N. Chen, and H.-Y. Lin, "Error probability analysis of binary asymmetric channels," *Dept. El. & Comp. Eng., Nat. Chiao Tung Univ*, 2009.
- [22] D. M. Heath, "Wi-fi setup guide: What is a good signal level or signal-to-noise ratio (snr) for wi-fi?" Increase Broadband Speed — Tips to improve and speed up your broadband, July 18, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.increasebroadbandspeed.co.uk/what-is-a-good-signal-level-or-signal-to-noise-ratio-snr-for-wi-fi>
- [23] V. Srinivasan and M. Viswanathan, *Wireless Communication Systems in Matlab: Second Edition (Black & White Print)*. Independently Published, 2020.

APPENDIX A
PROOFS

A. Proof of Theorems V.1 and V.2

Denote the number of users targeting the i^{th} antenna J_i . When each transmitter has a random codebook generated by i.i.d. coin tosses with probability p for '1', $J_i \sim \text{Bin}(K, p)$. By their definition,

$$q_{01} \triangleq \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \geq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i = 0) \quad (17)$$

$$q_{10} \triangleq \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i \geq 1) \quad (18)$$

Before calculating the error probabilities, we would like to introduce a helpful lemma about the distribution of $|[y]_i|^2 | J_i$:

Lemma A.1. *Assume each transmitter uses ZFBF with no optimizations to the power allocation. Then:*

$$|[y]_i|^2 | J_i \sim \text{Exp}\left(\frac{1}{J_i \cdot P + N_0}\right)$$

Proof. Each transmitter uses ZFBF by taking an arbitrary normalized vector from the nullspace of their channel matrix, corresponding to the zeros in their codeword. Afterward, the vector is amplified by \sqrt{P} . Hence, from the rotational invariance of the CGRVs, each user contributes a zero-mean P -variance CGRV. Since all users are independent and J_i users target the i^{th} antenna, these RVs are i.i.d. and summed with the additive noise. As a result, $[y]_i$ is a CGRV as a linear combination of CGRVs. I.e., $[y]_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, J_i \cdot P + N_0)$. By the Random Variable Transformation Theorem, we obtain the desired result.

For completeness, we attach the full calculation; Denote $\sigma^2 = \frac{J_i \cdot P + N_0}{2}$. $[y]_i \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 2\sigma^2)$, so $\Re([y]_i) \stackrel{d}{=} \Im([y]_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. We are interested in the distribution of $W \triangleq |[y]_i|^2 = \Re([y]_i)^2 + \Im([y]_i)^2$. The proof has two steps - first, we calculate $Z \triangleq \sqrt{W}$'s CDF. Then, we show that $W \sim \text{Exp}(\frac{1}{2\sigma^2})$ by the Random Variable Transformation Theorem:

$$F_Z(z) = \mathbb{P}(Z \leq z) \quad (19)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{\Re([y]_i)^2 + \Im([y]_i)^2} \leq z) \quad (20)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \iint_{\sqrt{x^2+y^2} \leq z} \frac{1}{2\pi\sigma^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2+y^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dx dy \quad (21)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \int_0^z \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{r}{2\pi\sigma^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} d\theta dr \quad (22)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \int_0^z \frac{r}{\sigma^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} dr \quad (23)$$

In (a), we recalled that $\Re([y]_i)$ and $\Im([y]_i)$ are independent from the definition of CGRV, so they are jointly Gaussian. In (b), we changed the integration variables from x and y to $r \cos \theta$ and $r \sin \theta$, respectively. The Jacobian, in this case, is

r . Step (c) is justified by noticing that the integrand is not a function of θ .

By deriving the CDF, we obtain that Z 's PDF is:

$$f_Z(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{z}{\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\sigma^2}} & z \geq 0 \\ 0 & z < 0 \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

When $w < 0$, there is no solution to $w = z^2$ (as a function of z). Hence, $f_W(w) = 0$ for any $w < 0$. In any other case, $z = \pm\sqrt{w}$. Now we are ready to calculate W 's PDF:

$$f_W(w) \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{f_Z(-\sqrt{w})}{|\frac{\partial w}{\partial z}|} + \frac{f_Z(\sqrt{w})}{|\frac{\partial w}{\partial z}|} \quad (25)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{w}} (f_Z(-\sqrt{w}) + f_Z(\sqrt{w})) \quad (26)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{w}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{w}}{\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{w}{2\sigma^2}} + 0 \right) \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{w}{2\sigma^2}} \quad (28)$$

Step (a) is the Random Variable Transformation Theorem. In step (b), we calculate $|\frac{\partial w}{\partial z}| = 2|z| = 2\sqrt{w}$. We substituted (24) in step (c). Finally, W 's PDF is given by:

$$f_W(w) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \cdot e^{-\frac{w}{2\sigma^2}} & w \geq 0 \\ 0 & w < 0 \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

Which is the PDF of an exponentially distributed random variable with parameter $\frac{1}{2\sigma^2}$. I.e., $|[y]_i|^2 \sim \text{Exp}(\frac{1}{J_i \cdot P + N_0})$. \square

Now, we can straightforwardly calculate the crossover probabilities, starting with q_{01} :

$$q_{01} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \geq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i = 0) \quad (30)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \int_{N_0 \cdot \gamma}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N_0} e^{-\frac{t}{N_0}} dt \quad (31)$$

$$= e^{-\gamma} \quad (32)$$

Transition (a) used (17), whereas (b) used lemma A.1. Calculating q_{10} :

$$q_{10} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i \geq 1) \quad (33)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{J_i \geq 1} [\mathbb{P}(|[y]_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i) \mid J_i] \quad (34)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \mathbb{P}(|y_i|^2 \leq N_0 \cdot \gamma \mid J_i = j) \quad (35)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \left(1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{N_0 \cdot \gamma}{j \cdot P + N_0}\right\} \right) \quad (36)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \left(1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\} \right) \quad (37)$$

In (a), we used (18) and (b) used the Smoothing Theorem. In (c), we write the conditional expectation explicitly. Note that the term $\frac{1}{1 - (1-p)^K}$ is used to convert the event $J_i \geq 1$ into a proper probability measure. Step (d) used lemma A.1. The last

step normalized the term inside the exponent by N_0 defining $\rho \triangleq \frac{P}{N_0}$.

B. Proof of Theorem V.3

We define how Noisy CoMa obtains messages from \underline{Y} :

Definition 1 (Noisy CoMa Decision Criterion). Fix $\Delta > 0$. Denote $\text{supp}(\underline{x})$ as the set of indices where \underline{x} has non-zero components. Let $\mathcal{T}_j \triangleq |\text{supp}(\underline{c}_j)|$ and $\mathcal{S}_j \triangleq |\text{supp}(\underline{c}_j) \cap \text{supp}(\underline{Y})|$. Noisy CoMa's declares that \underline{c}_j has been transmitted is if and only if $\mathcal{S}_j \geq \mathcal{T}_j(1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))$.

Much like Chan, we bound p_{MD} :

Theorem A.2. The probability of missing at least one true codeword is bounded from above by:

$$p_{MD} \leq K \cdot \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\}$$

Proof.

$$p_{MD} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_1 = i) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 < \mathcal{T}_1(1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))) \quad (38)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_1 < i(1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))) \quad (39)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \cdot \sum_{l=i-i(1-q_{10}(\Delta+1))}^i \binom{i}{l} q_{10}^l (1-q_{10})^{i-l} \quad (40)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} K \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \cdot e^{-2i(q_{10}\Delta)^2} \quad (41)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{=} K \cdot (1-p + pe^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2})^{M_r} \quad (42)$$

$$\stackrel{(f)}{\leq} K \cdot \exp \left\{ -p(1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\}^{M_r} \quad (43)$$

$$= K \cdot \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\} \quad (44)$$

In (a), we used the union bound. (b) is derived from the random codebook construction where $\mathcal{S}_1 \sim \text{Bin}(M_r, p)$. In (c), we used the fact that the local decision rule is identical among the antennas, so the probability for bit flips is symmetric (the number of flipped bits is binomially distributed with parameters M_r, q_{10}). Additionally, we used the binomial distribution's symmetry⁵. We used Hoeffding bound⁶, $F(k; n, p) \leq \exp\{-2n(p - \frac{k}{n})^2\}$ and $p - \frac{k}{n} > 0$, in (d). (e) used the binomial theorem to combine the sum of products

⁵ $F(k; n, p) = F(n - k; n, 1 - p)$

⁶ often called Chernoff bound

into a power of a sum. In (f) we used the Taylor Expansion of $\exp\{-x(1-a)\}$ at $x_0 = 0$. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem V.3:

$$p_{MD} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} K \cdot \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\} \quad (45)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} K \cdot \exp \left\{ -\beta_1 \cdot K \log N \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \right\} \quad (46)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} K \exp \left\{ -\frac{(1+\delta)K \log N \cdot p(1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2})}{\alpha(1 - e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2}) \log e} \right\} \quad (47)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} K \exp \left\{ -\frac{(1+\delta) \cdot K \log N \cdot \frac{\alpha}{K}}{\alpha \log e} \right\} \quad (48)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{=} K \exp \left\{ -(1+\delta) \ln N \right\} \quad (49)$$

$$\stackrel{(f)}{=} K \cdot N^{-(1+\delta)} \leq N \cdot N^{-(1+\delta)} = N^{-\delta} \quad (50)$$

(a) used Theorem A.2. In (b), we utilized Theorem V.3's conditions. (c) replaced β_1 with its lower bound (from the theorem's conditions), and in (d), we reduced the fraction and replaced $p = \frac{\alpha}{K}$. (e) used algebraic manipulation using logarithmic identities, and (f) used the logarithm's definition.

C. Proof of Theorem V.4

Similar to the previous theorem, we bound p_{FA} :

Theorem A.3. Assume $\Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$. The probability of declaring at least one false codeword is bounded from above by:

$$p_{FA} \leq (N - K) \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot (1 - e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}) \right\}$$

Proof.

$$p_{FA} \leq (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_1 = i) \quad (51)$$

$$\cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 \geq \mathcal{T}_1(1 - q_{10}(\Delta + 1))) \quad (52)$$

$$= (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \cdot \sum_{l=i-i(1-q_{10}(\Delta+1))}^i \binom{i}{l} p_1^l (1-p_1)^{i-l} \quad (53)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} \cdot e^{-2i(1-p_1 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2} \quad (54)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} (N - K) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{M_r} \binom{M_r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{M_r-i} e^{-2i(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2} \quad (55)$$

$$= (N - K) \cdot (1-p + pe^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2})^{M_r} \quad (56)$$

In (a) we used Hoeffding bound like in the proof of Theorem A.2, which is applicable due to $\Delta < \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$. We replace

$1 - p_1 = p_0$ in (b). Any other transition is identical to the proof of Theorem A.2. \square

Now we prove Theorem V.4:

$$p_{FA} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} (N - K) \exp \left\{ -M_r \cdot p \cdot \left(1 - e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}\right) \right\} \quad (57)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} (N - K) \exp \left\{ -\beta_2 K \log N \cdot p \cdot \left(1 - e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}\right) \right\} \quad (58)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} N \cdot \exp \left\{ -\frac{(1 + \delta)K \log N \cdot p}{\alpha(1 - e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}) \log e} \cdot \left(1 - e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2}\right) \right\} \quad (59)$$

$$= N \cdot \exp \left\{ -(1 + \delta) \ln N \right\} \leq N^{-\delta} \quad (60)$$

In (a) we used theorem A.3. In both (b) and (c) we used theorem V.4's conditions. The rest is similar to the proof of theorem V.3.

D. Proof of Theorem V.5

First, we simplify $\frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 &= \frac{(1-p)^K(1-q_{01}) + (1-(1-p)^K)q_{10}}{q_{10}} - 1 \\ &= (1-p)^K \cdot \frac{1 - q_{01} - q_{10}}{q_{10}} \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Now, we convert the problem in (14) to a minimization problem by removing the dependence on Δ :

Lemma A.4. *The objective function in (14) can be re-written as follows:*

$$\frac{(1 + \delta) \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1 - q_{10} - q_{01})^2\})}$$

Proof. Derive β_i by Δ :

$$\frac{\partial \beta_1}{\partial \Delta} = -\frac{4q_{10}^2 e^{-2(q_{10}\Delta)^2} \Delta}{(\cdot)^2} \leq 0 \quad \forall \Delta \geq 0 \quad (62)$$

$$\frac{\partial \beta_2}{\partial \Delta} = \frac{4q_{10} e^{-2(p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))^2} (p_0 - q_{10}(\Delta+1))}{(\cdot)^2} \quad (63)$$

The last term is non-negative as long as $\Delta \leq \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$. Hence, β_1 decrease with Δ whereas β_2 increase in Δ . In other words, the minimax problem would pick the equalizer:

$$\Delta^* = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 \right) \quad (64)$$

Putting Δ^* and (61) back into $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ results in the following term inside the exponent:

$$q_{10} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{2} (1-p)^K (1 - q_{01} - q_{10}) \quad (65)$$

\square

We shall henceforth name the objective function $\beta = (1 + \delta) \cdot \beta(\gamma, \alpha)$. Now, we shall prove that the solution must be an interior point of the rectangle $[0, \frac{K}{2}] \times [0, \infty)$:

Lemma A.5. *All strong inequalities in (14) can be written with weak inequalities.*

Proof. We'll show that each time some variable meets its strong inequality then either $\beta_1 \rightarrow \infty$ or $\beta_2 \rightarrow \infty$. When $\gamma = 0$, $q_{10} = 0$ and $\beta_1 \rightarrow \infty$. The same occurs when $\Delta = 0$. When $\Delta = \frac{p_0}{q_{10}} - 1$ then $\beta_2 \rightarrow \infty$. When $\alpha = 0$ both $\beta_i \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, we can replace the strong inequalities with weak inequalities as we do not introduce new solutions to the optimization problem. \square

We are left with proving that $\alpha = \frac{K}{2}$ is not a solution to the optimization problem. To do this, we show that there always is an interior point with a lower objective value. Hence, we define the following two quantities:

Definition 2. *For any fixed p , we define γ_1 to be the solution to:*

$$e^{-\gamma} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\{\frac{-\gamma}{j\rho+1}\}}{j\rho+1}$$

Definition 3. *Let γ_2 be the solution to:*

$$e^{-\gamma} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\{\frac{-\gamma}{j\rho+1}\}}{j\rho+1}$$

We want to show that γ_1 , as an interior point, has a lower objective function than γ_2 , a point on the boundary.

Lemma A.6. *$\beta(\gamma_1)$ is increasing in γ_1 , where γ_1 is as defined in definition 2.*

Proof. Putting γ_1 in $g(\gamma, p) \triangleq (1 - q_{01} - q_{10})$ yields:

$$g(\gamma_1, p) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \left(\right) \quad (66)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\exp\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\}}{j\rho+1} + 1 - \exp\left\{-\frac{\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{j\rho \cdot \exp\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\}}{j\rho+1} \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

$g(\gamma_1(p), p)$ is a sum of non-negative numbers, so $g(\gamma_1, p) \geq 0$. Furthermore, $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \gamma_1} \leq 0$. Observe β 's derivative with respect to γ_1 :

$$\frac{\partial \beta(\gamma_1)}{\partial \gamma_1} = -\frac{(1-p)^{2K} e^{(\cdot)} g(\gamma_1) \cdot \frac{\partial g}{\partial \gamma_1}}{\alpha \cdot (\cdot)^2} \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha > 0 \quad (68)$$

\square

Lemma A.7.

$$e^{-\gamma_1} \geq \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (69)$$

With equality if and only if $p = 0.5$.

Proof. Observing $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(p)$, we have $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1(0.5)$.

$$e^{-\gamma_1} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (70)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (71)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \sum_{j=\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (72)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (73)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{K-1}{2} \rfloor - 1} \binom{K}{j} \left(\frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} - \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \right) \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1} \quad (74)$$

$$\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{1}{2^K - 1} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{j\rho+1}$$

In (a) we used definition 2. We separated the sum in (b), and used p 's limited range ($p \in [0, 1]$) in (c). We have added and subtracted the same term in (d), whereas in (e), we discarded non-negative terms due to p 's range. If $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$, then we have equality from definition 3. \square

Corollary A.8. $\beta(\gamma_2) \geq \beta(\gamma_1)$

Proof. γ_2 is the maximizer of the lower bound in lemma A.7. In other words:

$$e^{-\gamma_1} \geq e^{-\gamma_2} \quad (75)$$

By taking $\ln(\cdot)$ from both sides we have $\gamma_2 \geq \gamma_1$. Using lemma A.6 gives us the desired result. \square

Now, after showing that the solution must be an interior point, we are ready to show that a solution exists:

Lemma A.9. *The objective function in lemma A.4 is convex in γ .*

Proof. $\beta(\gamma)$ is convex in γ if and only if:

$$2\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \gamma}\right)^2 - f(\gamma) \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \gamma^2} \geq 0 \quad (76)$$

By dividing by non-zero positive quantities, the above condition is simplified to:

$$\left(e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} + 1 \right) \cdot (1-p)^{2K} \cdot (1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2 \quad (77)$$

$$\cdot \left(\frac{\partial q_{01}}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial q_{10}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^2 + \left(e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} - 1 \right)$$

$$\cdot \left[(1-q_{01}-q_{10}) \left(\frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} + \frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} \right) - \left(\frac{\partial q_{01}}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial q_{10}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^2 \right] \geq 0$$

Rearranging both sides results in the following:

$$\left(\frac{\partial q_{01}}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{\partial q_{10}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^2 \cdot \left[\frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} + 1}{e^{\frac{1}{2}(1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2} - 1} \right. \quad (78)$$

$$\cdot (1-p)^{2K}(1-q_{01}-q_{10})^2 - 1 \left. \right] \geq$$

$$(1-q_{01}-q_{10}) \left(-\frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} - \frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} \right)$$

The LHS of (78) is non-negative (as $\frac{e^{0.5x}+1}{e^{0.5x}-1} \cdot x \geq 4$). The RHS is a multiplication of a non-negative term with a non-positive one:

$$-\frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{(j\rho+1)^2} \quad (79)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} = e^{-\gamma} = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \cdot e^{-\gamma} \quad (80)$$

Hence:

$$\left(-\frac{\partial^2 q_{10}}{\partial \gamma^2} - \frac{\partial^2 q_{01}}{\partial \gamma^2} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j(1-p)^{K-j}}{1-(1-p)^K} \quad (81)$$

$$\cdot \left(\frac{\exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma_1}{j\rho+1}\right\}}{(j\rho+1)^2} - e^{-\gamma} \right)$$

This is a weighted sum of elements of the forms:

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{a}{x+1}}}{(x+1)^2} - e^{-a} \quad (82)$$

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{x}{a+1}}}{(a+1)^2} - e^{-x} \quad (83)$$

Where (82) describes the difference as a function of ρ and (83) describes it as a function of γ . In both cases, if $a \geq 0$, the terms are non-positive. In other words, (78) is always true so the objective function is convex in γ . \square

Proof of Theorem V.5. We shall invoke the KKT conditions. Lemma A.5 proves that all Lagrange Multipliers are nulled except for the multiplier of the constraint $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$, or equivalently

$\alpha \leq \frac{K}{2}$ (Complementary Slackness). Hence, the Lagrangian's gradient is:

$$\nabla L(\gamma, p, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial \gamma} \\ \frac{\partial \beta}{\partial p} + \lambda \end{bmatrix} = \underline{0} \quad (84)$$

If $\lambda \neq 0$, then $p = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\gamma^* = \gamma_2$. If $\lambda = 0$, then $p \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. According to corollary A.8 $\lambda = 0$, so (γ^*, p^*) must be an interior point. Lemma A.9 shows that γ^* is unique, so the optimization problem becomes one-dimensional in p . The interval $[0, 0.5]$ is closed and β is continuous, so a global minimum p^* exists. \square

E. Proof of Lemma V.6

We note that by the famous limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \frac{x}{n})^n = e^{-x}$ we have:

$$\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{K}\right)^{2K} \rightarrow e^{-2\alpha} \quad (85)$$

We remind that $K \cdot p = \alpha$. Therefore, whether β tends to a constant depends on the limit:

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} q_{10} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \quad (86)$$

$$\cdot \left(1 - \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\}\right) \\ \stackrel{(b)}{=} 1 - \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} \frac{p^j (1-p)^{K-j}}{1 - (1-p)^K} \quad (87)$$

$$\cdot \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\} \\ \stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1 - (1-p)^K} \quad (88)$$

$$\cdot \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^K \binom{K}{j} p^j (1-p)^{K-j} \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\} \\ \stackrel{(d)}{=} 1 - \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\alpha}} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^j}{j!} \exp\left\{\frac{-\gamma}{j \cdot \rho + 1}\right\} \quad (89)$$

Where step (a) replaced q_{10} with its exact expression from Theorem V.2. Steps (b) and (c) used the Limit Sum and Product Laws, respectively. The final step, (d), used Poisson Limit Theorem and the famous limit.

Combining (85) and (89) with Theorem V.5 when $K \rightarrow \infty$ results in an optimization problem independent of K (or N), completing the proof.

F. Proof of Corollary V.7

When $\rho \rightarrow 0$, the exponents in Theorem V.2 tend to $e^{-\gamma}$. Hence, $q_{10} \rightarrow 1 - q_{01}$ when $\rho \rightarrow 0$, resulting in $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. When $\rho \rightarrow \infty$, the exponents in Theorem V.2 tend to 1, so $q_{10} \rightarrow 0$. Since the rest of the parameters are unaffected by ρ , β 's limit is a constant (with respect to ρ).

G. Proof of Theorem VI.1

Denote $\tilde{\underline{Y}}$ as the noiseless \underline{Y} . It is the column-wise Boolean sum of the K transmitted codewords. Let $\mathcal{W} \in \{1, 2, \dots, \binom{N}{K} C^K\}$ be the index of the set corresponding to the K messages transmitted. The codewords corresponding to \mathcal{W} are $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{W})$. Observe that we can treat \underline{Y} as an output of some discrete channel (characterized by q_{10} and q_{01}) whose input is $\tilde{\underline{Y}}$. Notice the following Markov Chain:

$$\mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{W}) \rightarrow \tilde{\underline{Y}} \rightarrow \underline{Y} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{C}}(\hat{\mathcal{W}}) \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{W}} \quad (90)$$

I.e., the K messages, their corresponding codewords, the "clean" Boolean sum, the noisy output vector, the estimated codewords, and estimated messages form a Markov Chain. Using the definition of mutual information, we have:

$$H(\mathcal{W}) = H(\mathcal{W}|\hat{\mathcal{W}}) + I(\mathcal{W}; \hat{\mathcal{W}}) \quad (91)$$

We assume we have no prior information on the messages or users, so \mathcal{W} is uniform on $\{1, 2, \dots, \binom{N}{K} C^K\}$. This is equivalent to $H(\mathcal{W}) = \log \binom{N}{K} C^K$. Using Fano's Inequality, we have:

$$H(\mathcal{W}|\hat{\mathcal{W}}) \leq 1 + p_e \cdot \log \binom{N}{K} C^K \quad (92)$$

We have the following chain of inequalities:

$$I(\mathcal{W}; \hat{\mathcal{W}}) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(\tilde{\underline{Y}}; \underline{Y}) \quad (93)$$

$$= H(\underline{Y}) - H(\underline{Y}|\tilde{\underline{Y}}) \quad (94)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} H(\underline{Y}) - \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} H([\underline{Y}]_m | [\underline{Y}]_1, \dots, [\underline{Y}]_{m-1}, \tilde{\underline{Y}}) \quad (95)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} H([\underline{Y}]_m) - \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} H([\underline{Y}]_m | [\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_m) \quad (96)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} [H([\underline{Y}]_m) - H([\underline{Y}]_m | [\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_m)] \quad (97)$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{M_r} I([\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_m; [\underline{Y}]_m) \quad (98)$$

$$\leq M_r \cdot \text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10})) \quad (99)$$

(a) is valid due to the Data Processing Inequality. In (b), we have used the Entropy Chain Rule, whereas in (c), we used the fact that $[\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_m$ ($[\underline{Y}]_m$) is independent of $[\tilde{\underline{Y}}]_k$ ($[\underline{Y}]_k$) for all $m \neq k$. Now, we can put (99) and (92) into (91):

$$\log \binom{N}{K} C^K \leq 1 + p_e \cdot \log \binom{N}{K} C^K \\ + M_r \cdot \text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10})) \quad (100)$$

Rearranging both sides results in the following:

$$M_r \geq \frac{(1 - p_e) \cdot \log \binom{N}{K} C^K - 1}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))} \quad (101)$$

Using Stirling's Approximation:

$$\log \binom{N}{K} C^K = \log \binom{N}{K} + \log C^K \quad (102)$$

$$\approx K \log \frac{N}{K} + K \log C \quad (103)$$

$$= K \log \frac{N}{K} \cdot C \quad (104)$$

Which results in the following:

$$M_r \geq \frac{(1 - p_e) \cdot K \log \frac{N \cdot C}{K}}{\text{cap}(BAC(q_{01}, q_{10}))} \quad (105)$$