

ON THE RELIABILITY FUNCTION OF DISCRETE MEMORYLESS MULTIPLE-ACCESS CHANNEL WITH FEEDBACK

BY MOHSEN HEIDARI^{1,a}, ACHILLEAS ANASTASOPOULOS^{2,b}
AND S. SANDEEP PRADHAN^{2,c}

¹*CS Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, mheidar@iu.edu*

²*Department of EECS, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, anastas@umich.edu, pradhanv@umich.edu*

The reliability function of a channel is the maximum achievable exponential rate of decay of the error probability as a function of the transmission rate. In this work, we derive bounds on the reliability function of discrete memoryless multiple-access channels (MAC) with noiseless feedback. We show that our bounds are tight for a variety of MACs, such as m -ary additive and two independent point-to-point channels. The bounds are expressed in terms of a new information measure called “variable-length directed information”. The upper bound is proved by analyzing stochastic processes defined based on the entropy of the message, given the past channel’s outputs. Our method relies on tools from the theory of martingales, variable-length information measures, and a new technique called time pruning. We further propose a variable-length achievable scheme consisting of three phases: (i) data transmission, (ii) hybrid data-confirmation, and (iii) full confirmation. We show that two-phase-type schemes are strictly suboptimal in achieving the MAC’s reliability function. Moreover, we study the shape of the lower-bound and show that it increases linearly with respect to a specific Euclidean distance measure defined between the transmission rate pair and the capacity boundary. As side results, we derive an upper bound on the capacity of MAC with noiseless feedback and study a new problem involving a hybrid of hypothesis testing and data transmission.

1. Introduction. Channel capacity determines the maximum transmission rate for communications with vanishing error probability. The reliability function determines the maximum exponential decay rate of error probability as a function of the transmission rate. It measures the trade-off between reliability and delay in communication. The reliability function has been studied extensively since the dawn of information theory [9, 1, 20, 3, 6]. However, its single-letter characterization for elementary setups such as discrete memoryless channels (DMCs) is still an open problem. At this point, several bounds exist, such as the random-coding lower and sphere-packing upper bound. The results are promising for other settings where the channel output is available as feedback to the encoder. In a seminal work, Burnashev [3] completely characterized the error exponent of DMCs with noiseless and causal feedback. This characterization has a simple yet intuitive form:

$$(1) \quad E(R) = C_1 \left(1 - \frac{R}{C}\right),$$

where R is the (average) transmission rate, C is the channel’s capacity, and C_1 is the maximal relative entropy between conditional output distributions. Intuitively, C_1 is the maximum exponent for binary hypothesis testing over the channel. The Burnashev’s exponent can significantly exceed the sphere-packing exponent for no-feedback communications as it

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary Information Theory, Reliability Function, Multiple Access Channel; secondary Martingales, Drift Analysis.

approaches capacity with a nonzero slope. These improvements are obtained using variable length codes (VLCs), where the communication length depends on the channel's realizations.

Yamamoto and Itoh [26] introduced a VLC scheme achieving the error exponent in (1). Their scheme consists of two distinct transmission phases, the data and the confirmation phase. In the data phase, the message is encoded using a capacity-achieving fixed block length code. During the confirmation phase, the transmitter (who knows if the codeword was correctly decoded at the receiver through noiseless feedback) sends one bit of information to the receiver indicating if the decoded message is correct. The decoder performs a binary hypothesis test to decide if 0 or 1 was transmitted.

The reliability function has been studied for various communication setups such as channels with states and/or memory [4, 23, 24, 22, 12], multi-user channels with or without feedback [9, 16, 17, 11, 7], and other setups [21]. For a comprehensive survey of the reliability function, see [10] and references therein.

Among such setups, this paper studies the reliability function of multiple access channels (MACs) with noiseless feedback. There are several bounds on the reliability function of MAC without feedback [17, 5]. Given the promising derivation of Burnashev for DMC, the reliability function of MAC with feedback is an important problem [11].

In the context of communications over MAC, the benefits of feedback are more prominent than DMC. For instance, Gaarder and Wolf [8] showed that feedback expands the capacity region even using fixed-length codes. Willems [25] derived the feedback-capacity region for a class of MACs, and Kramer [13] derived a multi-letter characterization of the feedback-capacity region of two-user MAC with feedback using fixed-length codes. The expressions are given in terms of *directed information*, introduced by Massy [15] and Marko [14]. Single-letter characterizations of the capacity region and the error exponent for general MACs are still open problems.

1.1. Summary of the Contributions. While the focus in the literature has been on fixed-length coding schemes for communications over MAC, in this paper, we study capacity and reliability function with VLCs for communications over MAC. We derive lower and upper bounds on the reliability function of MAC with feedback and provide an upper bound on its feedback capacity when VLCs are permitted. Below we highlight some of the main contributions of this work.

MAC Feedback Capacity. We introduce an outer bound on the feedback capacity of VLCs for communications over MAC. We formulate a new information measure for variable-length sequences of random variables called "variable-length directed information." Using this information measure, we derive our outer bound on the capacity region and show that it subsumes existing bounds of Kramer [13], Tatikonda and Mitter [22], and Permuter *et al.* [18] where fixed-length codes are studied.

Upper bound on the reliability function. We derive an upper bound on the reliability function of two-user MAC with noiseless feedback. The bound is expressed in terms of our "variable-length" mutual information and relative entropy. As a corollary, we show that this bound reduces to Burnashev's expression when the channel consists of two parallel DMCs. Our approach relies on analyzing the entropy of the stochastic process defined based on the entropy of the message given the past channel's output. This method has been studied in our earlier works [11, 12]. In this work, we take a more comprehensive approach by considering five different entropies, involving individual, conditional, and joint entropy of the messages for the two-user MAC problem.

The entropies at time zero are equal to the logarithm of the message sizes. As time goes on with more channel outputs, the entropies decrease linearly (in expectation) to a sufficiently

small threshold $\epsilon > 0$. After a transient phase, the entropies drift logarithmically. We derive the upper bound by analyzing the rate of the drift of these entropies. We bound the slope of the linear and logarithmic drifts in terms of variable-length mutual information and relative entropy, respectively. For that, we use tools from the theory of martingales and variable-length information measures.

One of the major technical challenges in our proofs is the transient period from linear to logarithmic drifts. We address the transient period by proposing a new technique called “time pruning”. In the conventional stochastic process $\{X_t\}_{t>0}$, time t increases linearly by one unit at each step. With the time-pruning technique, we allow the time to increase randomly as a stopping time with respect to the process itself. As a result, we obtain a random process where multiple samples X_t can appear at each step. This novel technique is critical in our analysis as it allows for jumping to the future.

A three-phase achievable scheme. Lastly, we propose an achievable scheme, thus establishing a lower bound on the error exponent. Our scheme is a variable-length achievable scheme consisting of three phases: (i) data transmission, where both encoders send the messages; (ii) hybrid data confirmation, where one encoder starts the confirmation while the other is still in the data transmission stage; and (iii) full confirmation, where both encoders send one bit of confirmation message to the receiver. As a side result, we study a new problem involving a hybrid of hypothesis testing and data transmission.

We show that while the two-phase scheme of Yamamoto and Itoh [26] is optimal for DMC, its natural extension to MAC is sub-optimal in achieving the MAC’s reliability function. By studying a concrete example, we show the necessity of a three-phase scheme allowing the encoders to stop transmission at different times.

Geometric study of the lower bound. Finally, we study the geometry of the lower bound. We show that it increases linearly with respect to a specific Euclidean distance measure defined between the transmission rate pair and the capacity boundary. For a more intuitive visualization of the reliability function, we derive a simplified version of our lower bound that takes the form

$$E(R_1, R_2) \geq D_{lb} \left(1 - \frac{\|R\|}{\mathcal{C}(\theta_R)} \right),$$

where $(\|R\|, \theta_R)$ represents the polar coordinates of the rate pair (R_1, R_2) in \mathbb{R}^2 plane and $\mathcal{C}(\theta_R)$ is the point at the intersection of the capacity boundary and the line crossing the origin with angle θ_R .

1.2. Organization of the paper. The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides basic definitions and the problem formulation. In Section 3 we present the main results on the feedback capacity of MAC using VLCs and our bounds on the reliability function. In Section 4, we study the tightness of the bounds and present a geometric study of the lower bound. Section 5 presents the proofs and analysis of the upper bound. Section 6 presents our coding scheme and its analysis for the lower bound. Lastly, Section 7 concludes the paper.

2. Definitions and Problem Formulation.

2.1. Casual conditioning. Consider a sequence of random variables $(X_t, Y_t, Z_t), t \in [n]$. The casually conditional entropy of X^n given Y^n is defined as [13]

$$H(X^n || Y^n) \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^n H(X_t | X^{t-1}, Y^t),$$

where H denotes Shannon entropy. We use *directed information* and *conditional directed information* as defined in [13]. The directed information from a sequence X^n to a sequence Y^n when causally conditioned on Z^n is defined as

$$(2) \quad I(X^n \rightarrow Y^n \| Z^n) \triangleq H(X^n \| Z^n) - H(X^n \| Y^n, Z^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n I(X^i; Y_i | Y^{i-1}, Z^i).$$

2.2. Variable-length information measures. In this paper, we consider a set of information measures suitable for variable-length sequences of random variables. Consider the stochastic process $\{Y_t\}_{t>0}$ and let T be a stopping time with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t, t > 0$ generated by Y^t . We study the random-variable Y^T that takes values from the set $\bigcup_{t>0} \mathcal{Y}^t$. To picture Y^T , let us extend \mathcal{Y} by adding a dummy symbol as $\mathcal{Y} \cup \{\zeta\}$. Then, Y^T is equivalent to a sequence that equals to Y_t for all $t \leq T$ and ζ for $t > T$. The entropy of the (variable-length) random vector Y^T equals

$$(3) \quad H(Y^T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T H(Y_t | \mathcal{F}_{Y, t-1}) \right],$$

where the expectation is taken over the filtration $\mathcal{F}_{Y, t}, t \in \mathbb{N}$, the σ -algebra generated from Y^t . Moreover, $H(Y^T) = H(Y^T, T) = H(T) + H(Y^T | T)$. See an illustrative example in Appendix A.

Consider a sequence of random variables $\{(X_t, Y_t, Z_t)\}_{t>0}$ and let T be a stopping time with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t, t > 0$ generated by Y^t with $\mathbb{E}[T]$ being finite. Suppose (X_t, Y_t, Z_t) takes values from the finite set $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$ for all $t > 0$. The entropy of X^T conditioned on Y^T is given by

$$(4) \quad H(X^T | Y^T) = \sum_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{P}(T = t) H(X^t | Y^t, T = t).$$

Using the entropy, mutual information is defined as $I(X^T; Y^T) = H(X^T) - H(X^T | Y^T)$.

We next define the casual conditioning and the variable-length directed information between sequences of random variables with random lengths.

DEFINITION 1. *Given the pair (X^T, Y^T) , the variable-length entropy of X^T casually conditioned on Y^T is defined as*

$$H(X^T \| Y^T) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T H(X_t | X^{t-1}, \mathcal{F}_{Y, t}) \right].$$

Also, the variable-length directed information from X^T to Y^T is defined as

$$(5) \quad I(X^T \rightarrow Y^T \| Z^T) \triangleq H(X^T) - H(X^T \| Y^T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T I(X^t; Y_t | \mathcal{F}_{Y, t-1}) \right].$$

See an illustrative example in Appendix A.

2.3. Problem formulation. Consider a discrete memoryless MAC with input alphabets $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2$, and output alphabet \mathcal{Y} . The channel conditional probability distribution is denoted by $Q(y|x_1, x_2)$ for all $(y, x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$. Such setup is denoted by $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{Y}, Q)$. Let y^t and $x_i^t, i = 1, 2$, be the channel output and the input sequences after t uses of the channel, respectively. Then, the following condition is satisfied:

$$(6) \quad P(y_t | y^{t-1}, x_1^{t-1}, x_2^{t-1}) = Q(y_t | x_{1t}, x_{2t}).$$

We assume the channel output is available at the encoders with one delay unit through noiseless feedback.

DEFINITION 2. An (M_1, M_2, N) -variable-length code (VLC) for a MAC $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{Y}, Q)$ with feedback is defined by

- A pair of messages W_1, W_2 selected randomly, independently and with uniform distribution from $\{1, 2, \dots, M_i\}, i = 1, 2$.
- Two sequences of encoding functions $e_{i,t} : \{1, 2, \dots, M_i\} \times \mathcal{Y}^{t-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i, t \in \mathbb{N}, i = 1, 2$, one for each transmitter.
- A sequence of decoding functions $d_t : \mathcal{Y}^t \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, M_1\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, M_2\}, t \in \mathbb{N}$.
- A stopping time T with respect to (w.r.t.) the filtration \mathcal{F}_t , where \mathcal{F}_t is the sigma-algebra generated by the channel output sequence at time Y^t for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, it is assumed that T is almost surely bounded as $T \leq N$.

For each $i = 1, 2$, given a message W_i , the t th output of Transmitter i is denoted by $X_{i,t} = e_{i,t}(W_i, Y^{t-1})$. Let $(\hat{W}_{1,t}, \hat{W}_{2,t}) = d_t(Y^t)$ represent the ‘‘provisional’’ decoded messages at time t . Then, the decoded messages at the decoder are denoted by $\hat{W}_1 = \hat{W}_{1,T}$, and $\hat{W}_2 = \hat{W}_{2,T}$. In what follows, for any (M_1, M_2, N) VLC, we define the average rate-pair, error probability, and error exponent. Average rates for an (M_1, M_2, N) VLC are defined as

$$R_i \triangleq \frac{\log_2 M_i}{\mathbb{E}[T]}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The probability of error is defined as $P_e \triangleq P\left((\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2) \neq (W_1, W_2)\right)$. The error exponent of a VLC with the probability of error P_e and stopping time T is defined as

$$E \triangleq -\frac{\log_2 P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]}.$$

In this paper, we study a class of (M_1, M_2, N) -VLCs for which the parameter N grows polynomially with $\log M_1 M_2$, that is $N \leq (\log M_1 M_2)^m$, where m is a fixed integer. For example, a sequence of $(M_1^{(n)}, M_2^{(n)}, N^{(n)})$ -VLCs, $n \geq 1$, where

$$M_1^{(n)} = 2^{nr_1}, \quad M_2^{(n)} = 2^{nr_2}, \quad N^{(n)} \leq n^m,$$

and with fixed parameters $r_1, r_2, m > 0$, satisfies this condition.

DEFINITION 3. A triplet of reliability and rates (E, R_1, R_2) is said to be achievable for a given MAC if for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $(M_1^{(n)}, M_2^{(n)}, N^{(n)})$ -VLC for sufficiently large n , such that

$$-\frac{\log P_e^{(n)}}{\mathbb{E}[T^{(n)}]} \geq E - \varepsilon, \quad \frac{\log M_i^{(n)}}{\mathbb{E}[T^{(n)}]} \geq R_i - \varepsilon, \quad M_i^{(n)} \geq M, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and $N^{(n)} \leq n^m$, where m is fixed. The reliability function $E(R_1, R_2)$ of a MAC with feedback is defined as the supremum of all reliability E such that (E, R_1, R_2) is achievable.

Given a MAC, and any integer N , let \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N be the set of all N -letter distributions on $\mathcal{X}_1^N \times \mathcal{X}_2^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$ that factor as

$$(7) \quad P_{X_1^N, X_2^N, Y^N} = \prod_{\ell=1}^N P_{1,\ell}(x_{1,\ell}|x_1^{\ell-1}y^{\ell-1})P_{2,\ell}(x_{2,\ell}|x_2^{\ell-1}y^{\ell-1})Q(y_\ell|x_{1,\ell}x_{2,\ell}),$$

where Q is the transition matrix of the channel. For a more compact representation, define \mathcal{P}_{MAC} , without the superscript, as the union $\bigcup_N \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N$. For any $P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}$, denote by N_P as the letter size of P .

3. Main Results.

3.1. *Outer bound on the capacity region of MAC.* In this section, we study the feedback capacity for communications over a MAC using VLCs, and provide an upper bound on the capacity region. We start with the definition of achievable rates.

DEFINITION 4. *A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is said to be achievable for a given MAC if for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists an $(M_1^{(n)}, M_2^{(n)}, N^{(n)})$ -VLC for sufficiently large n such that*

$$P_e^{(n)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \frac{\log M_i^{(n)}}{\mathbb{E}[T^{(n)}]} \geq R_i - \varepsilon, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and $N^{(n)} \leq n^m$, where m is fixed. The feedback capacity of VLCs, denoted by \mathcal{C}_{FB} , is the convex closure of all achievable rates.

Next, we define a set of rate-pairs denoted by \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} , and show that it contains the capacity region, thus forming an outer bound. For any $P^N \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N$, let T be a stopping time with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}_t with $T \leq N$ almost surely. Using this notation, we define \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} := cl \left[\bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}} \bigcup_{T: T \leq N_P} \left\{ (R_1, R_2) \in [0, \infty)^2 : \begin{array}{l} R_1 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T) \\ R_2 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_1^T) \\ R_1 + R_2 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T, X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T) \end{array} \right\} \right],$$

where cl denotes the *convex closure* operation.

THEOREM 1. \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} is an outer bound on the capacity region of VLCs for communications over the discrete memoryless MAC with noiseless feedback, i.e., $\mathcal{C}_{FB} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC}$.

A proof is provided in Appendix B. This theorem generalizes the results on the feedback capacity of MAC with fixed-length codes [13] to that with VLCs. In what follows, we present another characterization of the outer bound on the capacity region. This characterization is via supporting hyperplanes, as in [19], and is useful to characterize our outer bound on the error exponent.

THEOREM 2. \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} equals to the set of rate pairs (R_1, R_2) such that for all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in [0, 1]$ with $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1$, the following inequality holds

$$\lambda_1 R_1 + \lambda_2 R_2 + \lambda_3 (R_1 + R_2) \leq \mathcal{C}_\lambda,$$

where \mathcal{C}_λ is the supremum of

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \left(\lambda_1 I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T | Q) + \lambda_2 I(X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_1^T | Q) + \lambda_3 I(X_1^T, X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T | Q) \right),$$

over all distributions $P_{QX_1^N X_2^N Y^N}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $P_{X_1^N X_2^N Y^N | Q=q} \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N, \forall q \in \mathcal{Q}$, where $|\mathcal{Q}| = 3$, and T is a stopping time with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}_t with $T \leq N$ almost surely.

A proof of the theorem and detailed discussion are provided in Appendix C.

3.2. *Upper bounds on the error exponents.* Before proceeding with the results we establish some additional notation. For any $P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}$, let $\bar{Q}_r^1 \triangleq P_{Y_r|X_{1,r}, Y^{r-1}}$ be the effective channel from the first user's perspective at time $t = r$. Then, for any $y^{r-1} \in \mathcal{Y}^{r-1}$, define

$$D_r^1(y^{r-1}) \triangleq \max_{x_1, x'_1} \sup_{P_{X'_2|Y^{r-1}}} D_{KL}\left(\bar{Q}_r^1(\cdot|x_1, y^{r-1}) \parallel \bar{Q}'_r^1(\cdot|x'_1, y^{r-1})\right),$$

where \bar{Q}'_r^1 is an effective channel of the first user with the distribution of the second user chosen as $P_{X'_2|Y^{r-1}}$. Similarly, let $\bar{Q}_r^2 \triangleq P_{Y_r|X_{2,r}, Y^{r-1}}$ be the effective channel from the second user's perspective at time $t = r$, and define

$$D_r^2(y^{r-1}) \triangleq \max_{x_2, x'_2} \sup_{P_{X'_1|Y^{r-1}}} D_{KL}\left(\bar{Q}_r^2(\cdot|x_2, y^{r-1}) \parallel \bar{Q}'_r^2(\cdot|x'_2, y^{r-1})\right).$$

Moreover, define

$$D^3 \triangleq \max_{x_1, x'_1} \max_{x_2, x'_2} D_{KL}\left(Q(\cdot|x_1, x_2) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right).$$

With this notation, we are ready to present the main result of this section with the detailed proofs given in Section 5.

THEOREM 3. *The reliability function of a MAC channel is bounded from above as*

$$E(R_1, R_2) \leq E^{ub}(R_1, R_2) := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}} \sup_{\substack{T: \\ T \leq N_P}} \sup_{\substack{T_1, T_2, T_3: \\ T_i \leq T}} \min_{i \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \left\{ D^i(P) \left(1 - \frac{R_i}{I^i(P)}\right) \right\},$$

where $R_3 = R_1 + R_2$, and $I^i(P)$ and $D^i(P)$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} I^1(P) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T_1]} I(X_1^{T_1} \rightarrow Y^{T_1} \| X_2^{T_1}), & D^1(P) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T - T_1]} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=T_1}^T D_r^1(Y^{r-1})\right] \\ I^2(P) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T_2]} I(X_2^{T_2} \rightarrow Y^{T_2} \| X_1^{T_2}), & D^2(P) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T - T_2]} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=T_2}^T D_r^2(Y^{r-1})\right] \\ I^3(P) &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T_3]} I(X_1^{T_3} X_2^{T_3} \rightarrow Y^{T_3}), & D^3(P) &= D^3. \end{aligned}$$

This upper bound is proved by analyzing an arbitrary coding scheme in three stages. Roughly speaking, these stages correspond with the rate of decrease of appropriately defined entropy functions. Specifically, in the first stage, entropies decrease linearly, while in the second, exponentially. The boundary between these two behaviors can be different for the two users and is quantified by the stopping times T_i for user i . Next, we present a simplified version of the upper bound as a corollary.

COROLLARY 1 (Two-Phase Upper Bound). *The reliability function of a MAC channel is bounded from above as*

$$(8) \quad E(R_1, R_2) \leq E^{ub}_{two-phase}(R_1, R_2) := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}} \sup_{\substack{T: \\ T \leq N_P}} \sup_{\substack{T_1, T_2, T_3: \\ T_i \leq T}} D_{ub} \min_{i \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{R_i}{I^i(P)} \right\},$$

where $D_{ub} = \max_{\substack{x_1, x'_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1, \\ x_2, x'_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2}} D_{KL}\left(Q(\cdot|x_1, x_2) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right)$.

The proof follows from Theorem 3 and the fact that $D_{ub} \geq D^i(P)$ for any $i = 1, 2, 3$, and $P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}$.

3.3. *Lower bounds on the error exponent.* In this section, we present our lower bounds on the reliability function. For any $L \in \mathbb{N}$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}$, and rates (R_1, R_2) , define

$$(9) \quad E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2) := 1 - \max \left\{ \frac{R_1}{I_L^1(P)}, \frac{R_1}{I_L^2(P)}, \frac{R_1 + R_2}{I_L^3(P)} \right\}.$$

For a PMF $P_{X_2} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}_2)$, define $\bar{Q}^1(y|x_1) := \sum_{x_2} P_{X_2}(x_2)Q(y|x_1, x_2)$ as the single-letter effective channel from the first user's perspective. Similarly, define \bar{Q}^2 . Define for any $x_j \in \mathcal{X}_j$,

$$D_{\bar{Q}^j}(x_j, P_{X_j}) := \sup_{z \in \mathcal{X}_j} D_{KL}(\bar{Q}^j(x_j) \| \bar{Q}^j(z)),$$

where $j = 1, 2$ and $\bar{j} = 3 - j$. For $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$, define $C_2(x_1) = I(X_2; Y | X_1 = x_1)$. Similarly, define $C_1(x_2)$. Let $Z = (Z_1(0), Z_2(0), Z_1(1), Z_2(1))$ be a vector of random variables on $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ with joint distribution P_Z . Define for all $a, b \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$(10) \quad \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| ab) := \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim P_Z} \left[D_{KL} \left(Q(\cdot | Z_1(0), Z_2(0)) \| Q(\cdot | Z_1(a), Z_2(b)) \right) \right].$$

THEOREM 4. *The following is a lower-bound for the reliability function of any discrete memoryless MAC:*

$$(11) \quad E^{lb}(R_1, R_2) = \max \{ E_{l,3-phase}^1(R_1, R_2), E_{l,3-phase}^2(R_1, R_2) \},$$

where,

$$(12) \quad E_{l,3-phase}^1(R_1, R_2) = \sup_{\substack{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1 \\ 0 \leq \gamma_2 < 1}} \sup_{P_Z} \sup_{\substack{P_{X_2} \\ P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}}} \min \left\{ (E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2(x_1)) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| 01), \right. \\ \left. (E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2(x_1)) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| 10) + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^1}(x_1, P_{X_2}), \right. \\ \left. (E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2(x_1)) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| 11) + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^1}(x_1, P_{X_2}) \right\},$$

and

$$(13) \quad E_{l,3-phase}^2(R_1, R_2) = \sup_{\substack{x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2 \\ 0 \leq \gamma_2 < 1}} \sup_{P_Z} \sup_{\substack{P_{X_1} \\ P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}}} \min \left\{ (E_{o,P}(R_1 - \gamma_2 C_1(x_2), R_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| 01) \right. \\ \left. + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^2}(x_2, P_{X_1}), (E_{o,P}(R_1 - \gamma_2 C_1(x_2), R_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| 10), \right. \\ \left. (E_{o,P}(R_1 - \gamma_2 C_1(x_2), R_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| 11) + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^2}(x_2, P_{X_1}) \right\}.$$

A proof is given in Appendix H. Note that we derive this theorem by proposing a coding scheme consisting of three phases: (1) data transmission, in which a capacity-achieving code is used, (2) hybrid data-confirmation stage, in which one user stops transmission and sends one bit of confirmation message while the other user continues the transmission, and (3) final confirmation, where both users send a one-bit confirmation message. As a special case, we present a simplified inner bound with a two-phase coding scheme.

COROLLARY 2 (Two-Phase Lower Bound). *The following is a lower-bound for the reliability function of any discrete memoryless MAC:*

$$(14) \quad E_{two-phase}^{lb}(R_1, R_2) = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}} D_{lb} E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2),$$

where,

$$(15) \quad D_{lb} \triangleq \sup_{P_Z} \min_{ab \neq 00} \bar{D}_{P_Z}(00 \| ab).$$

The result is obtained by setting $\gamma_2 = 0$ in Theorem 4.

4. On The Shape and Tightness of The Bounds.

4.1. *Geometric characterization.* In this Section, we study the tightness of the upper bound in Theorem 3 and the lower bound in Theorem 4. Furthermore, we provide an alternative representation for the lower bound. We start with the two-phase lower bound in Corollary 2. For that, suppose (R_1, R_2) is a point inside the capacity region \mathcal{C} . Denote by $(\|R\|, \theta_R)$ the polar coordinates of (R_1, R_2) in \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $\mathcal{C}(\theta_R)$ be the point at the intersection of the capacity boundary and the line crossing the origin with angle θ_R , as shown in Fig. 1. The following lemma provides a geometric characterization of the lower bound with the




FIG 1. (a) Given a rate pair (R_1, R_2) that is inside the capacity region, consider the line passing (R_1, R_2) and the origin. Then, (R'_1, R'_2) is the point of intersection of this line with the boundary of the capacity region. (b) The conceptual shape of the lower bound on the error exponent of a given MAC with respect to the transmission rate pair (R_1, R_2) .

proof provided in Appendix I.

LEMMA 1. *The reliability function of a MAC channel is bounded from below as*

$$E(R_1, R_2) \geq D_{lb} \left(1 - \frac{\|R\|}{\mathcal{C}(\theta_R)} \right).$$

This lemma provides a lower bound that decreases linearly by $\frac{\|R\|}{\mathcal{C}(\theta_R)}$ as (R_1, R_2) gets closer to the capacity boundary (see Fig. 1(a)). Based on this observation, we present Fig. 1(b) that shows the shape of a typical lower bound as a function of the transmission rate pairs.

The above bound is a result of a two-phase scheme. Next, we study a geometric representation of a lower bound using the three-phase scheme. Recall that there are three stages in this scheme: (1) data communication for both users; (2) confirmation stage only for one of the users; and (3) confirmation stage for both users. As a result, one user continues data transmission during the second phase. Because of this approach, the user allocates part of its message to the second phase, lowering its rate during the first phase. For a more intuitive argument, we consider a simplified version of the three-phase lower bound given in Theorem 4. For that, we consider the following looser bound

$$E(R_1, R_2) \geq D_{lb} \max_{0 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 1} \max \{ E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2) - \gamma_2, E_{o,P}(R_1 - \gamma_2 C_1, R_2) - \gamma_2 \},$$




FIG 2. The three-phase scheme provides more flexibility to adjust the rates during the second phase. Recall that the two-phase lower bound in Lemma 1 depends on the ratio of the first stage transmission rates $\|R\|$ and $\mathcal{C}(\theta)$, the capacity boundary as in Fig. 1. The three-phase lower bound is similar but with the flexibility that the first-stage transmission rate can be adjusted by allocating a fraction of the rate to the second stage. For example, suppose the second user transmits with rate βC_2 during the second phase with $\beta \in [0, 1]$ and C_2 being the capacity during this stage. Then the first stage rates become $(R_1, R_2 - \beta C_2)$. In that case, the three-phase lower bound scales with the ratio of the new effective rate and $\mathcal{C}(\theta^2_{R,\beta})$, the capacity boundary at the new angle. With such flexibility, the three-phase scheme gives a higher error exponent than the two-phase scheme.

where, $C_1 = \max_{x_1} C_1(x_1)$ and $C_2 = \max_{x_2} C_2(x_2)$ are the capacity of the Point-to-Point (PtP) channel during the second phase. We obtain this bound by noting that $\bar{D}_{P_2}(00\|ab)$ in the theorem is greater than D_{lb} as in (15). Moreover, we ignored the non-negative terms $\gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^1}$ and $\gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^2}$ in (12) and (13).

Using a similar argument as in Lemma 1, we obtain a geometric interpretation of the above bound as

$$E(R_1, R_2) \geq D_{lb} \max_{0 \leq \beta \leq 1} \max \left\{ \left(1 - \beta - \frac{\|(R_1 - \beta C_1, R_2)\|}{\mathcal{C}(\theta^1_{R,\beta})} \right), \left(1 - \beta - \frac{\|(R_1, R_2 - \beta C_2)\|}{\mathcal{C}(\theta^2_{R,\beta})} \right) \right\},$$

where $\theta^1_{R,\beta}$ and $\theta^2_{R,\beta}$ are the angle of the point $(R_1 - \beta C_1, R_2)$ and $(R_1, R_2 - \beta C_2)$ in polar coordinates, respectively. Note that the second maximization determines whether the first or the second user must continue data transmission during the second stage. Moreover, the parameter β determines the amount of the rate allocated to the second phase. Therefore, by tuning β and choosing which user to transmit information to during the second stage, we get the effective rate during the first stage ranging from $(R_1 - C_1, R_2)$, when the first user sends data with rate C_1 during the second stage ($\beta = 1$), to (R_1, R_2) where there is no second stage ($\beta = 0$), and to $(R_1, R_2 - C_2)$ where the second user sends data with rate C_2 during the second stage ($\beta = 1$). These rates are demonstrated as the vertical and horizontal lines in Fig. 2. Observe that by setting β , the corresponding angle ranges from θ_{\min} to θ_{\max} as in Fig. 2. These angles are calculated as

$$\theta = \arctan\left(\frac{R_2}{R_1}\right) \quad \theta_{\min} = \arctan\left(\frac{[R_2 - C_2]^+}{R_1}\right) \quad \theta_{\max} = \arctan\left(\frac{R_2}{[R_1 - C_1]^+}\right).$$

As a result, $\mathcal{C}(\theta_R)$ is the capacity boundary as in Fig. 1 ranges between $\mathcal{C}(\theta_{\min})$ to $\mathcal{C}(\theta_{\max})$ as in Fig. 2. Therefore, by appropriately tuning β , we can get a better achievable exponent than the two-phase scheme. In other words, the three-phase scheme allows more flexibility in changing the angle θ_R by allocating parts of the rates to the second phase. We should note that the three-phase bound in Theorem 4 is larger due to the additional terms such as $\gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^1}$ and $\gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^2}$. We ignored those terms here for the sake of a more intuitive argument.

4.2. *On the tightness of the error exponent bounds.* In what follows, we provide examples of classes of channels for which the lower and upper bound coincide. The following is an example of a MAC for which the two-phase bounds match.

EXAMPLE 1. Consider a MAC with input alphabets $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2 = \{0, 1, 2\}$, and output alphabet $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, 2\}$. The following relation describes the transition probability of the channel: $Y = X_1 \oplus_3 X_2 \oplus_3 N_p$, where the additions are modulo-3, and N_p is a random variable with $P(N_p = 1) = P(N_p = 2) = p$, and $P(N_p = 0) = 1 - 2p$, where $0 \leq p \leq 1/2$. It can be shown that for this channel $D_l = D_u = (1 - 3p) \log \frac{1-2p}{p}$. Hence, the upper-bound in Corollary 1 matches the lower-bound in Corollary 2.

The argument in the above example can be extended to m -ary additive MACs for $m > 2$, where all the random variables take values from \mathbb{Z}_m , and N_p is a random variable with $P(N_p = i) = p$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, $i \neq 0$ and $P(N_p = 0) = 1 - (m - 1)p$. It can be shown that for this channel

$$D_l = D_u = (1 - mp) \log \frac{1 - (m - 1)p}{p}.$$

Next, MAC consists of two independent channels. Interestingly, the two-phase bounds do not match but the three-phase bounds match.

EXAMPLE 2. Consider a MAC in which the output is $(y_1, y_2) \in \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$ with the transition probability matrix described by the product $Q_{Y_1, Y_2 | X_1, X_2} = Q_{Y_1 | X_1} Q_{Y_2 | X_2}$. This MAC consists of two parallel (independent) PtP channels. Suppose C_1 and C_2 are the first and second parallel channel capacities. Next, we define the corresponding relative entropies of these channels. For $i = 1, 2$, let

$$D_i = \max_{x_i, z_i} D_{KL} \left(Q_{Y_i | X_i}(\cdot | x_i) \| Q_{Y_i | X_i}(\cdot | z_i) \right).$$

We start with calculating the two-phase bounds in Corollaries 1 and 2. They simplify to the following

$$E_{\text{two-phase}}^{\text{ub}}(R_1, R_2) = \max(D_1, D_2) \min \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1}\right), \left(1 - \frac{R_2}{C_2}\right) \right\}$$

$$E_{\text{two-phase}}^{\text{lb}}(R_1, R_2) = \min(D_1, D_2) \min \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1}\right), \left(1 - \frac{R_2}{C_2}\right) \right\}.$$

These bounds do not match when $D_1 \neq D_2$.

Next, we study the upper bound in Theorem 3. Note that the relative entropy terms in the theorem are equal to $D^1(P) = D_1$, $D^2(P) = D_2$, and $D^3 = D_1 + D_2$. Moreover, maximizing over P gives $I^1(P) = C_1$, $I^2(P) = C_2$, and $I^3(P) = C_1 + C_2$. Hence, it is not difficult to see that the upper bound simplifies to the following

$$E(R_1, R_2) \leq E^{\text{ub}}(R_1, R_2) = \min \left\{ D_1 \left(1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1}\right), D_2 \left(1 - \frac{R_2}{C_2}\right) \right\},$$

where we used the inequality $\max\{\frac{a}{b}, \frac{a'}{b'}\} \geq \frac{a+a'}{b+b'}$ for any $a, a', b, b' > 0$. Next, we show that this upper bound matches the lower bound in Theorem 4. The calculations that are more involved are given below. Without loss of generality, assume $\frac{R_1}{C_1} \leq \frac{R_2}{C_2}$.

We start with simplifying $E_{i,3\text{-phase}}^1(R_1, R_2)$ in (12). Since the channels are independent, then $C_2(x_1) = C_2$ and $C_1(x_2) = C_1$ for any $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$. Hence, we can independently optimize over x_1 in (12). Note that $\bar{D}_{P_z^*}(00 \| 10) = D_{\bar{Q}_1}(x_1^*, P_{X_2}) = D_1$, where the

superscript * implies that we optimized over the corresponding variable. Similarly, note that $\bar{D}_{P_z^*}(00||01) = D_{\bar{Q}^2}(x_2^*, P_{X_1}) = D_2$ and $\bar{D}_{P_z^*}(00||11) = D_1 + D_2$. As a result, $E_{l,3-phase}^1(R_1, R_2)$ simplifies to the following

$$E_{l,3-phase}^1(R_1, R_2) = \sup_{0 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 1} \min \left\{ \begin{aligned} &(E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2) - \gamma_2) D_2, \\ &(E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2) - \gamma_2) D_1 + \gamma_2 D_1, \\ &(E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2) - \gamma_2) (D_1 + D_2) + \gamma_2 D_1 \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

Note that the third term can be ignored as it is always larger than the second term. We set $\gamma_2 = \frac{R_2}{C_2} - \frac{R_1}{C_1}$. This is a valid assignment as $0 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 1$. With this assignment, $E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2 - \gamma_2) = (1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1})$. Therefore, due to the supremum over γ_2 , with the above assignment, we get a lower bound for $E_{l,3-phase}^1(R_1, R_2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{l,3-phase}^1(R_1, R_2) &\geq \min \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1} - \left(\frac{R_2}{C_2} - \frac{R_1}{C_1}\right)\right) D_2, \left(1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1}\right) D_1 \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ D_1 \left(1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1}\right), D_2 \left(1 - \frac{R_2}{C_2}\right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound in Theorem 4 is greater or equal to the above expression. Hence, we get that

$$E(R_1, R_2) \geq \min \left\{ D_1 \left(1 - \frac{R_1}{C_1}\right), D_2 \left(1 - \frac{R_2}{C_2}\right) \right\}.$$

This is a lower bound that matches the upper bound we derived above.

5. Analysis and Proof Techniques. The typical behavior of the entropy is shown in Fig. 3 (generated for a PtP channel). The figure shows $H(W|y^t), t > 0$, where W is the message taking values from $[1 : 2^{10}]$, and y^t is the channel output realization. For MAC, we study the drift of five different entropies involving the messages' individual, conditional, and joint entropy. We derive the upper bound by analyzing the rate of the drift of these entropies. Particularly, we derive bounds on the slope of the linear and logarithmic drifts in terms of variable-length mutual information and relative entropy, respectively. For that, we use tools from the theory of martingales and variable-length information measures.




FIG 3. Realization of the entropy process decrease. The plot uses linear scale for values above a threshold (e.g., 0.1) and log scale for values below this threshold.

5.1. *Prune-timing technique.* One of the major technical challenges in our proofs is the transient period from linear to logarithmic drifts. We address the transient period by proposing a new technique called “time pruning”. Particularly, we allow the time to increase randomly as a stopping time with respect to the underlying random process.

Let $\{H_t\}_{t>0}$ be a non-negative random process. Based on this process we define the pruned time random process $\{t_n\}_{n>0}$. First, for any $\epsilon \geq 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ define the following random variables

$$(16) \quad \tau_\epsilon \triangleq \inf \{t > 0 : H_t \leq \epsilon\} \wedge N,$$

$$(17) \quad \tau^\epsilon \triangleq \sup \{t > 0 : H_{t-1} \geq \epsilon\} \wedge N = \left[\sup \{t > 0 : H_t \geq \epsilon\} + 1 \right] \wedge N.$$

Then the pruned time process is defined as

$$(18) \quad t_n \triangleq \begin{cases} n & \text{if } n < \tau_\epsilon, \\ n \vee \tau^\epsilon & \text{if } \tau_\epsilon \leq n \leq N, \\ N & \text{if } n > N. \end{cases}$$

The diagram of t_n as a function of n is demonstrated in Fig. 4. Now we consider the random




FIG 4. The evolution of t_n with n .

sampling of the random process $\{Y_t\}_{t>0}$ based on the pruned time process $\{t_n\}_{n>0}$. Particularly, we are interested in the resulted random process $\{Y^{t_n}\}_{n>0}$ which represents the receiver’s observation in pruned time t_n .

EXAMPLE 3. Fig. 5 shows an example of the process $\{Y^{t_n}\}_{n>0}$. Let $N = 4$, and Y_t take values from $\{0, 1\}$. Then, each path in the tree in Fig. 5 represents a particular realization of Y^N . For example, the left most path corresponds to $y^4 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. In this case $\tau_\epsilon = 2$ and $\tau^\epsilon = 4$. Hence, $t_1 = 1, t_2 = 4, t_3 = 4, t_4 = 4$. Therefore, the pruned process evolves as

$$y^{t_1} = 0, \quad y^{t_2} = (0, 0, 0, 0), \quad y^{t_3} = (0, 0, 0, 0), \quad y^{t_4} = (0, 0, 0, 0).$$

It implies that in the second sample a jump in the future occurs and all samples of y_t from $t = \tau_\epsilon = 2$ to $\tau^\epsilon = 4$ become available. Hence, in this example, the observed samples in pruned time are $0, (0, 0, 0), -, -,$ implying that second sample contains (y_2, y_3, y_4) and the third and fourth samples contain no new information.

Let $\{\tilde{Y}_n\}_{n>0}$ be the sampled version of $\{Y_t\}_{t>0}$ with $\tilde{Y}_n = Y^{t_n}$. For instance, in Fig. 5,

$$\tilde{y}_1 = 0, \quad \tilde{y}_2 = (0, 0, 0, 0), \quad \tilde{y}_3 = (0, 0, 0, 0), \quad \tilde{y}_4 = (0, 0, 0, 0).$$

Let $\mathcal{G}_n, n > 0$ represent the σ -algebra generated by \tilde{Y}_n . Then, as t_n is monotonically increasing with n , \mathcal{G}_n is a filtration, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{G}_N$.




FIG 5. An example of a random sampled random process $\{Y_t\}_{t>0}$ based on the pruned time $\{t_n\}_{n>0}$. Here, $N = 4$, and Y_t takes values from $\{0, 1\}$. The upper labels ($\geq \epsilon$, $< \epsilon$) indicate whether H_t is greater or smaller than ϵ . Each path in the tree represents a particular realization of Y^N . For example, the left most path corresponds to $y^4 = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. In this case $\tau_\epsilon = 2$ and $\tau^\epsilon = 4$. Hence, $t_1 = 1, t_2 = 4, t_3 = 4, t_4 = 4$. Therefore, $y^{t_1} = 0, y^{t_2} = (0, 0, 0, 0), y^{t_3} = (0, 0, 0, 0), y^{t_4} = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. Hence, the observed samples in pruned time are $0, (0, 0, 0), -, -,$ implying that second sample contains (y_2, y_3, y_4) and the third and fourth samples contain no new information.

Note that τ_ϵ is a stopping time with respect to $\{H_t\}_{t>0}$, but this is not the case for τ^ϵ . This raises the question as to whether one can determine the occurrence of τ_ϵ and τ^ϵ based on the past observation of the sampled process $\{\tilde{Y}_n\}_{n>0}$. We show that the answer is affirmative. More precisely, whether $\tau_\epsilon \geq t_n$ and/or $\tau^\epsilon \geq t_n$ are determined having \tilde{Y}^n . For that, we prove the following statements.

LEMMA 2. *The processes $t_n, t_n \wedge \tau_\epsilon$, and $t_n \wedge \tau^\epsilon$ are measurable with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{G}_n, n > 0$.*

PROOF. We show that the random processes in the statement are functions of $\tilde{Y}^n, n > 0$. Note that t_n is measurable as it is a function of the length of the vector \tilde{Y}^n . For any $n \leq N$, the other random processes can be written as

$$t_n \wedge \tau_\epsilon = n \mathbb{1}\{\tau_\epsilon > n\} + \tau_\epsilon \mathbb{1}\{\tau_\epsilon \leq n\}, \quad t_n \wedge \tau^\epsilon = n \mathbb{1}\{\tau^\epsilon > n\} + \tau^\epsilon \mathbb{1}\{\tau^\epsilon \leq n\}.$$

This statement follows from the definition of t_n in (18) implying when $t_n < \tau_\epsilon$ then $t_n = n$, and that when $t_n \geq \tau_\epsilon$ then $t_n \geq \tau^\epsilon$. Since, τ_ϵ is a stopping time w.r.t $\{Y_t\}_{t>0}$, then $\mathbb{1}\{\tau_\epsilon > n\}$ is measurable w.r.t \mathcal{F}_t and, hence, w.r.t \mathcal{G}_n . Moreover, $\tau_\epsilon \mathbb{1}\{t_n \geq \tau_\epsilon\}$ is also measurable w.r.t \mathcal{G}_n . This is because τ_ϵ is completely determined when $n \geq \tau_\epsilon$, as we have more than τ_ϵ samples. Consequently, $t_n \wedge \tau_\epsilon$ is measurable. Similarly, $\tau^\epsilon \mathbb{1}\{\tau_\epsilon \leq n\}$ is measurable w.r.t \mathcal{G}_n ; because when $\tau_\epsilon \leq n$, then $t_n \geq \tau^\epsilon$. In that case, t_n already jumped up and τ^ϵ is determined by counting the number of samples in the jump. Consequently, $t_n \wedge \tau^\epsilon$ is also measurable. \square

5.2. *Analysis of the entropy drift of the messages.* Next, we analyze the drift of messages' entropy. For that, we consider the marginal and conditional entropy of the messages. More precisely, define the following random processes:

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{H}_t^1 &= H(W_1|W_2, \mathcal{F}_t), & \bar{H}_t^2 &= H(W_2|W_1, \mathcal{F}_t), & \bar{H}_t^3 &= H(W_1, W_2|\mathcal{F}_t), \\ \tilde{H}_t^1 &= H(W_1|\mathcal{F}_t), & \tilde{H}_t^2 &= H(W_2|\mathcal{F}_t), & \tilde{H}_t^3 &= H(W_1, W_2|\mathcal{F}_t). \end{aligned}$$

We analyze the drift of each pair $\{(\bar{H}_t^i, \tilde{H}_t^i)\}_{t>0}$, where $i = 1, 2, 3$. First, the following result is provided with the proof in Appendix D.

LEMMA 3. *Let $\{\bar{H}_r\}_{r>0}$ and $\{\tilde{H}_r\}_{r>0}$ be a pair of random processes with the following properties with respect to a filtration $\mathcal{F}_r, r > 0$,*

$$(20a) \quad \bar{H}_r \leq \tilde{H}_r \quad \text{if } r > 0,$$

$$(20b) \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_{r+1} - \bar{H}_r | \mathcal{F}_r] \geq -k_{1,r+1},$$

$$(20c) \quad \mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{H}_{r+1} - \log \tilde{H}_r | \mathcal{F}_r] \geq -k_{2,r+1} \quad \text{if } \tilde{H}_r < \epsilon$$

$$(20d) \quad \left| \log \tilde{H}_{r+1} - \log \tilde{H}_r \right| \leq k_3$$

$$(20e) \quad \left| \tilde{H}_{r+1} - \tilde{H}_r \right| \leq k_4$$

where $k_{1,r}, k_{2,r}$ are non-negative random variables measurable w.r.t \mathcal{F}_r , and $k_{1,r} \leq k_{2,r}$ for all $r > 0$. Moreover, k_3, k_4 are non-negative constants. Let $\{\tilde{t}_n\}_{n>0}$ be the pruned time process defined in (18) with respect to $\{\tilde{H}_r\}_{r>0}$. Further, let $\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon$ and $\tilde{\tau}^\epsilon$ be the random variables as in (16) and (17) but with $H_t = \tilde{H}_t$, respectively. Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $I \geq D > 0$ define the random process $\{Z_t\}_{t>0}$ as

$$Z_t \triangleq \left(\frac{\bar{H}_t - \epsilon}{I} \right) \mathbb{1}\{\bar{H}_t \geq \epsilon\} + \left(\frac{\log \tilde{H}_t - \log \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{\tilde{H}_t}{\epsilon}\right) \right) \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_t < \epsilon\},$$

where $f(y) = \frac{1-e^{\lambda y}}{\lambda D}$ with $\lambda > 0$. Further define the random process $\{S_t\}_{t>0}$ as

$$S_t \triangleq \sum_{r=1}^{t \wedge \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} \frac{k_{1,r}}{I} + \sum_{r=t \wedge \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon + 1}^{t \wedge \tilde{\tau}^\epsilon} \frac{k_4}{I} \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} + \sum_{r=t \wedge \tilde{\tau}^\epsilon + 1}^t \frac{k_{2,r}}{D} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I} \mathbb{1}\{t \geq \tilde{\tau}^\epsilon\},$$

Lastly define the random process $\{L_n\}_{n>0}$ as $L_n \triangleq Z_{t_n} + S_{t_n}$. Then, for small enough $\lambda > 0$ the process $\{L_n\}_{n>0}$ is a sub-martingale with respect to the time pruned filtration $\mathcal{G}_n, n > 0$.

We want to show that for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, the pair of random processes $\{(\bar{H}_t^i, \tilde{H}_r^i)\}_{r>0}$ satisfy the conditions in (20) and hence Lemma 3 can be applied. Clearly, (20a) holds as conditioning reduces the entropy. Condition (20b) holds because of the following lemma.

LEMMA 4. *Given an (M_1, M_2, N) -VLC, the following inequalities hold almost surely for $1 \leq r \leq N$*

$$(21a) \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_r^1 - \bar{H}_{r-1}^1 | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \geq -J_r^1, \quad \text{where } J_r^1 \triangleq I(X_{1,r}; Y_r | X_2^r, \mathcal{F}_{r-1}),$$

$$(21b) \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_r^2 - \bar{H}_{r-1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \geq -J_r^2, \quad \text{where } J_r^2 \triangleq I(X_{2,r}; Y_r | X_1^r, \mathcal{F}_{r-1}),$$

$$(21c) \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_r^3 - \bar{H}_{r-1}^3 | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \geq -J_r^3, \quad \text{where } J_r^3 \triangleq I(X_{1,r}, X_{2,r}; Y_r | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}),$$

where the mutual information quantities are calculated with the induced probability distribution $P_{X_1^N X_2^N Y^N} \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N$.

PROOF. We start with proving the inequality in (21a).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_r^1 - \bar{H}_{r-1}^1 | y^{r-1}] &= H(W_1 | Y_r, W_2, y^{r-1}) - H(W_1 | W_2, y^{r-1}) = -I(W_1; Y_r | W_2, y^{r-1}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} -I(W_1, X_{1,r}; Y_r | W_2, X_2^r, y^{r-1}) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} -H(Y_r | W_2, X_2^r, y^{r-1}) + H(Y_r | X_{2,r}, X_{1,r}, X_2^{r-1}, y^{r-1}) \\ &\geq -H(Y_r | X_2^r, y^{r-1}) + H(Y_r | X_2^r, X_{1,r}, y^{r-1}) = -J_r^1, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds as $X_{1,r} = e_{1,r}(W_1, y^{r-1})$ and $X_{2,\ell} = e_{1,\ell}(W_1, y^{\ell-1}), 1 \leq \ell \leq r$. Equality (b) is due to (6) implying that conditioned on $(X_{1,r}, X_{2,r})$ the channel's output Y_r is independent of W_1, W_2 , and X_2^{r-1} .

Similarly for the inequality in (21b), the following lower-bound holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_r^2 - \tilde{H}_{r-1}^2 | y^{r-1}] &= -I(W_2; Y_r | W_1, y^{r-1}) = -I(W_2, X_{2,r}; Y_r | W_1, X_1^r, y^{r-1}) \\ &\geq -H(Y_r | X_1^r, y^{r-1}) + H(Y_r | X_1^r, X_{2,r}, y^{r-1}) = -J_r^2.\end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument for (21c), we can show that the following inequality holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_r^3 - \tilde{H}_{r-1}^3 | y^{r-1}] &= -I(W_1, W_2; Y_r | y^{r-1}) \\ &= -I(W_1, X_{1,r}, W_2, X_{2,r}; Y_r | y^{r-1}) = -J_r^3.\end{aligned}$$

□

For condition (20d), we need the following result.

LEMMA 5. *For any $r \geq 1$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$, the following inequality holds if the channel's transition probabilities $Q(\cdot | \cdot, \cdot)$ are positive.*

$$\left| \log \tilde{H}_r^i - \log \tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \right| \leq \eta \triangleq \max_{x_1, z_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \max_{x_2, z_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \log \frac{Q(y | x_1, x_2)}{Q(y | z_1, z_2)}.$$

PROOF. The proof follows from the argument given in that of Lemma 4 in [3]. □

Condition (20c) holds as a result of the following lemma which is proved in Appendix E.

LEMMA 6. *Given an (M_1, M_2, N) -VLC and $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, if $\tilde{H}_r^i < \epsilon$, then the following inequality holds almost surely*

$$(22) \quad \mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{H}_r^i - \log \tilde{H}_{r-1}^i | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \geq -D_r^i - O(\sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)}),$$

where and D_r^i is a function of y^{r-1} and is defined as

$$(23) \quad D_r^i \triangleq \max_{x_i, x'_i} \sup_{P_{X'_i | Y^{r-1}}} D_{KL}(\bar{Q}_r^i(\cdot | x_i, y^{r-1}) \| \bar{Q}_r^i(\cdot | x'_i, y^{r-1})),$$

where $\bar{Q}_r^i = P_{Y_r | X_{i,r}, Y^{r-1}}$ is the effective channel from the user i 's perspective.

Lastly, condition (20e) follows as $\tilde{H}_r^i \leq \log M_i$, that is

$$\left| \tilde{H}_r^i - \tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \right| \leq \max\{\tilde{H}_r^i, \tilde{H}_{r-1}^i\} \leq \log M_i,$$

where $M_3 = M_1 M_2$. As a result, we apply Lemma 3 on each pair $\{(\tilde{H}_t^i, \tilde{H}_r^i)\}_{r>0}$, where $i = 1, 2, 3$ and with the following parameters

$$k_{1,r} = J_r^i, \quad k_{2,r} = D_r^i, \quad k_3 = \eta, \quad k_4 = \log M_i, \quad I = I^i, \quad D = D^i.$$

That said, let Z_t^i, S_t^i, t_n^i , and L_n^i be the corresponding random processes as in Lemma 3 but for $(\tilde{H}_t, \tilde{H}_t) = (\tilde{H}_t^i, \tilde{H}_t^i), \forall t \geq 0$ and $D = D^i, I = I^i$, where $i = 1, 2, 3$. Therefore, from the lemma, $\{L_n^i\}_{n>0}$ is a sub-martingale w.r.t $\mathcal{F}_{t_n^i}, n > 0$.

5.3. *Connection to the error exponent.* Now we are ready to study the connection between the entropy drift and the error exponent. For that we have the following lemma with the proof given in Appendix F.

LEMMA 7. *For any (M_1, M_2, N) -VLC with rates (R_1, R_2) , probability of error P_e and stopping time T the following holds*

$$(24) \quad \frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \leq \frac{1}{1-\Delta} D^i \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i}^i]}{\mathbb{E}[T]} - \frac{R_i}{I^i} \right) + \frac{1}{1-\Delta} U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

where $\{S_t\}_{t>0}$ is the slope process as in Lemma 3, and

$$U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon) \triangleq R_i \left(D^i \frac{h_b(P_e) + P_e \log(M_1 M_2) + \epsilon}{I^i \log M_i} + \frac{-\log \epsilon}{\log M_i} + \frac{1}{\lambda \log M_i} \right),$$

$$\Delta \triangleq \frac{\log(-\log P_e + 2 + \log M_1 M_2)}{-\log P_e}.$$

Next, we find appropriate I^i and D^i so that $\mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i}^i] \approx \mathbb{E}[T]$. Further, we argue that Δ and $U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon)$ converge to zero for any sequence of VLCs satisfying the conditions in Definition 3. We have the following lemma toward this.

LEMMA 8. *Under the condition that $\epsilon > \alpha(P_e)$, for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, if*

$$I^i = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} J_r^i \right], \quad D^i = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T - \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i+1}^T D_r^i \right],$$

then $\mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i}^i] \leq \mathbb{E}[T](1 + V(\epsilon, N))$, where $V(\epsilon, N) = \frac{R_i}{I^i}(\sqrt{\epsilon}N) + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{\mathbb{E}[T]I^i}$.

Before presenting the proof of the lemma, let us discuss its consequences. From this lemma and (24), we get the desired upper bound by appropriately setting I^i and D^i as in the lemma. Hence, we get for $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$(25) \quad \frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \leq \frac{1}{1-\Delta} D^i \left(1 - \frac{R_i}{I^i} \right) + \frac{1}{1-\Delta} D^i V(\epsilon, N) + \frac{1}{1-\Delta} U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon).$$

Note that all D^i , $t = 1, 2, 3$ is bounded by a constant d^{max} depending only on the channel's characteristics. Then, having $R_i \leq I^i$, the bound in (25) is simplified to the following

$$(26) \quad \frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \leq D^i \left(1 - \frac{R_i}{I^i} \right) + \frac{d^{max}}{1-\Delta} (\Delta + V(\epsilon, N)) + \frac{1}{1-\Delta} U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon),$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Let the residual terms above denoted by

$$\tilde{V}(P_e, M_1, M_2, \epsilon, N) \triangleq d^{max} \frac{\Delta}{1-\Delta} + \frac{1}{1-\Delta} d^{max} V(\epsilon, N) + \frac{1}{1-\Delta} \max_i \{U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon)\}.$$

We show that for any sequence of $(M_1^{(n)}, M_2^{(n)}, N^{(n)})$ -VLCs as in Definition 3 with vanishing $P_e^{(n)}$, the above term converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It is easy to see that Δ as in (60) converges to zero as $P_e^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$. Further, by setting $\epsilon^{(n)} = (\frac{1}{N^{(n)}})^2$, we can check that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V(\epsilon^{(n)}, N^{(n)}) = 0$. It remains to show the convergence of $U_i(\cdot)$ as in (59). The convergence of the third term in (59) follows as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M_i^{(n)}} = 0$. For the second term, as $\epsilon^{(n)} = (\frac{1}{N^{(n)}})^2$ then we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log \epsilon^{(n)}}{\log M_i^{(n)}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log N^{(n)}}{\log M_i^{(n)}} = 0,$$

where the last equality holds as $N^{(n)}$ grows sub-exponentially with n . The convergence of the first term also follows from the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(P_e^{(n)}) = 0$, as $P_e^{(n)}$ converges exponentially fast¹. To sum-up, with the above argument we showed that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{V}(P_e^{(n)}, M_1^{(n)}, M_2^{(n)}, \epsilon^{(n)}, N^{(n)}) = 0.$$

Hence, by maximizing over all distributions and from Definition 3, we get the following upper bound on the error exponent

$$(27) \quad E(R_1, R_2) \leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{P^N \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N} \sup_{T: T \leq N} \min_{i \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \left\{ D^i(P^N) \left(1 - \frac{R_i}{I^i(P^N)} \right) \right\},$$

where the maximizations are taken over all distributions $P^N \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N$. Further, $I^i(P^N)$ and $D^i(P^N)$ are defined as in Lemma 8 with the distribution P^N . Lastly, we complete our argument by presenting a proof of Lemma 8 in the following.

PROOF OF LEMMA 8. From the definition of $\{S_t^i\}_{t>0}$, we have that

$$S_t^i = \sum_{r=1}^{t \wedge \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} \frac{J_r^i}{I^i} + \sum_{r=t \wedge \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i + 1}^{t \wedge \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}} \frac{\log M_i}{I^i} \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} + \sum_{r=t \wedge \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i} + 1}^t \frac{D_r^i}{D^i} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I^i} \mathbb{1}\{t \geq \tilde{\tau}^\epsilon\}.$$

Therefore, as $(T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}) \geq \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i} \geq \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} \frac{J_r^i}{I^i} + \sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i + 1}^{\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}} \frac{\log M_i}{I^i} \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} + \sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i} + 1}^{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}} \frac{D_r^i}{D^i} \right] + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I^i}.$$

As for the first summation, after multiplying and dividing by $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} \frac{J_r^i}{I^i} \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]}{I^i} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} J_r^i \right] \right) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i],$$

where the last equality follows by setting I^i as in the statement of the lemma. Similarly, the third summation is bounded as in the following

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i} + 1}^{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}} \frac{D_r^i}{D^i} \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[T - \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]}{D^i} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T - \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i + 1}^{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}} D_r^i \right] \right) = \mathbb{E}[T - \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i],$$

where the first equality holds after multiplying and dividing by $\mathbb{E}[T - \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i]$, and the second equality follows by setting D^i as in the statement of the lemma. As a result,

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i] &\leq \mathbb{E}[T] + \frac{\log M_i}{I^i} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i + 1}^{\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}} \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right] + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I^i} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[T] + \frac{\log M_i}{I^i} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i + 1}^N \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right] + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I^i} \end{aligned}$$

¹The exponential convergence of $P_e^{(n)}$ holds because otherwise the error exponent is zero.

where the inequality follows as $\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i} \leq N$. Next, we bound the remaining summation. By iterative expectation we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i+1}^N \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} \left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i+1}^N \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \mid \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i] \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} \left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i+1}^N \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \leq t \leq N-1} \tilde{H}_t^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \mid \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \right) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \leq t \leq N-1} \tilde{H}_t^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \mid \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \right) \sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i+1}^N \mathbb{1} \right] \\
(29) \quad &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i} \left[N \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \leq t \leq N-1} \tilde{H}_t^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \mid \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \right) \right] \stackrel{(c)}{=} N \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \leq t \leq N-1} \tilde{H}_t^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from taking the supremum over all \tilde{H}_{r-1}^i appearing in the summation. Inequality (b) follows as the summation is less than $N - \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i$ which is smaller than N . Lastly, (c) holds by taking the expectation of the conditional probability. We proceed with the following lemma which is a variant of Doob's maximal inequality for super-martingales, where a proof is provided in Appendix G.

LEMMA 9 (Maximal Inequality for Supermartingales). *Let $\{M_t\}_{t>0}$ be a non-negative supermartingale w.r.t a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t>0}$. If τ is a bounded stopping time w.r.t this filtration, then the following inequality holds for any constant $c > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \geq \tau} M_t > c \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[M_\tau]}{c}.$$

Note that $\{\tilde{H}_t^i\}_{t>0}$ is a super martingale. Therefore, from Lemma 9, we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \leq t \leq N-1} \tilde{H}_t^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i}^i]}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$$

If $\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i < N$, then by definition of this stopping time $\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i}^i \leq \epsilon$; otherwise $\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i = N$ which implies that $\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i}^i = \tilde{H}_N^i$. However, as $T \leq N$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_N^i] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_T^i] \leq h_b(P_e) + P_e \log M_1 M_2 \leq \epsilon,$$

where the second inequality follows from Fano's and the last inequality holds as $P_e \ll \epsilon$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i \leq t \leq N-1} \tilde{H}_t^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon} \right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} = \sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Therefore, using this inequality in (29) we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon^i+1}^N \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^i \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right] \leq N\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Thus, from (28), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}^i] \leq \mathbb{E}[T] + \frac{\log M_i}{I^i} (\sqrt{\epsilon}N) + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I^i}.$$

Hence, factoring $\mathbb{E}[T]$ gives the following inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{T\sqrt{\zeta}\epsilon, i}^i] \leq \mathbb{E}[T](1 + V(\epsilon, N)),$$

where $V(\epsilon, N) = \frac{R_i}{T_i}(\sqrt{\epsilon}N) + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{\mathbb{E}[T]T_i}$. Further, one can see that by setting $\epsilon = \epsilon_N = \frac{1}{N^{2+\zeta}}$ for some $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ it holds that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} V(\epsilon_N, N) = 0$. Hence, the proof is complete. \square

6. Achievability Schemes.

6.1. *Two-phase scheme.* We build upon Yamamoto-Itoh transmission scheme for PtP channel coding with feedback [26]. The scheme sends the messages W_1, W_2 through blocks of length n . The transmission process is performed in two stages: 1) The ‘‘data transmission’’ stage taking up to $n(1 - \gamma)$ channel uses, 2) The ‘‘confirmation’’ stage taking up to $n\gamma$ channel uses, where γ is a design parameter taking values from $[0, 1]$.

Stage 1. For the first stage, we use any coding scheme that achieves the feedback capacity of the MAC. The length of this coding scheme is at most $n(1 - \gamma)$. Let \hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2 denote the decoder’s estimation of the messages at the end of the first stage. Define the following random variables: $\Theta_i = 1\{\hat{W}_i \neq W_i\}$, $i = 1, 2$. Because of the feedback, \hat{W}_1 and \hat{W}_2 are known at each transmitter. Therefore, at the end of the first stage, transmitter i has access to $W_i, \hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2$, and Θ_i , where $i = 1, 2$.

Stage 2. The objective of the second stage is to inform the receiver whether the hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0 : (\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2) = (W_1, W_2)$ or $\mathcal{H}_1 : (\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2) \neq (W_1, W_2)$ is correct. Each transmitter employs a code of size two and length γn . The codebook of user i consists of two codewords $\{x_i(0), x_i(1)\}$. User i transmits codeword $\underline{x}_i(\Theta_i)$. These two codebooks are not generated independently. Instead, the four codewords $(\underline{x}_1(0), \underline{x}_2(0), \underline{x}_1(1), \underline{x}_2(1))$ are selected randomly among all the sequences with joint-type $P_{\gamma n}$ defined over the set $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ and for sequences of length γn .

Decoding. Upon receiving the channel output, the receiver estimates Θ_1, Θ_2 . Denote this estimation by $\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2$. If $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2) = (0, 0)$, then the decoder declares that the hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 has occurred. Otherwise, \mathcal{H}_1 is declared. Because of the feedback, this decision is also known at each encoder. Therefore, under \mathcal{H}_0 , and if $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2) = (0, 0)$ transmission stops and a new data packet is transmitted at the next block. Otherwise, the message is transmitted again at the next block. The process continues until $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2) = (0, 0)$ occurs.

We use the log-likelihood decoder in this stage. Let $m = \gamma n$. The decision region for \mathcal{H}_0 in the log-likelihood decoder is define as

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ y^m \in \mathcal{Y}^m : \log \frac{Q^m(y^m | \underline{x}_1(0), \underline{x}_2(0))}{Q^m(y^m | \underline{x}_1(a_1), \underline{x}_2(a_2))} \geq \lambda, (a_1, a_2) = (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1) \right\},$$

where λ is the decision threshold to be adjusted and $Q^m(y^m | x_1^m, x_2^m) = \prod_i Q(y_i | x_{1,i}, x_{2,i})$ for any $y^m \in \mathcal{Y}^m, x_1^m \in \mathcal{X}_1^m, x_2^m \in \mathcal{X}_2^m$.

The confirmation stage in the proposed scheme can be viewed as a decentralized binary hypothesis problem in which a binary hypothesis $\{\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1\}$ is observed partially by two distributed agents and the objective is to convey the true hypothesis to a central receiver. This problem is qualitatively different from the sequential binary hypothesis testing problem as identified in [2] for PtP channel. Note also that in the confirmation stage we use a different coding strategy than the one used in Yamamoto-Itoh scheme [26]. Here, all four codewords have a joint-type $P_{\gamma n}$. It can be shown that repetition codes, and more generally, constant composition codes are strictly suboptimal in this problem. Based on this scheme, we can derive the lower bound in Corollary 2 in Section 3.3.

Example 2 shows the potential problem with the “Two-Phase” scheme. Indeed, to achieve the reliability function of the channel, each transmitter transitions from the data transmission to the data confirmation stage at a different time, while the proposed “Two-Phase” scheme enforces the same time for this transition. Motivated by this observation, we now propose a “Three-Phase” scheme.

6.2. Three-phase scheme. This section explains a more sophisticated scheme than the two-phase scheme described in Section 6.1. We propose a three-phase scheme that allows the encoders to finish the data transmission phase at different times. Let n be the total number of channel uses and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 > 0$ be the protocol’s parameters corresponding to the length of each phase and satisfying $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 = 1$. Moreover, suppose user i ’s message, W_i , takes values from $\{1, 2, \dots, M_i\}$, where $M_i = 2^{nR_i}$ with $R_i \geq 0, i = 1, 2$. For simplicity of the presentation, we assume that $n\gamma_i$ and 2^{nR_i} are integers for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

The transmission is performed in three stages: (i) full data transmission taking up to $\gamma_1 n$ channel uses; (ii) data-confirmation hybrid phase, where one encoder starts the confirmation while the other is still in the data transmission stage. This stage takes up to $\gamma_2 n$ channel uses; (iii) full confirmation stage, where both users are in the confirmation taking $\gamma_3 n$ channel uses.

Before the communication starts, the coding strategy determines γ_i and selects which user should stop data transmission at the end of the first stage. Without loss of generality, the first encoder starts the confirmation at the second stage while the second user continues data transmission until the end of the second stage. In this case, the second user splits its message into two parts, each to be communicated over stages one and two.

Stage 1. The first encoder sends its entire message during this stage; while the second user splits its message into two parts with sizes $2^{nR_{2,1}}$ and $2^{nR_{2,2}}$. Given that the length of this stage is $n\gamma_1$, the effective transmission rate during the first stage is $(\frac{R_1}{\gamma_1}, \frac{R_{2,1}}{\gamma_1})$. The effective rates must be inside the feedback capacity region for reliable communication during this stage. We use a fixed-length capacity achieving code to send messages over $n\gamma_1$ uses of the MAC. At the end of this stage, the first user finishes data transmission. Let \hat{W}_1^1 be the decoder’s estimate of W_1 at the end of this stage. Let $\Theta_1 = \mathbb{1}\{\hat{W}_1^1 \neq W_1\}$ be the indicator on whether W_1 is decoded correctly or not.

Stage 2. During the second phase, the second user transmits the second part of its message while the first user sends one bit of confirmation. Therefore, the effective transmission rate in this stage is $(0, \frac{R_{2,2}}{\gamma_2})$. As the rate of the first user is zero, the second user can potentially send information at a higher rate than during the first stage. The first user employs a repetition code to inform the decoder whether its message is decoded correctly. It sends the decoder one bit of information described by Θ_1 . For that, this user sends the symbol $x_1^1(\Theta_1)$ repeatedly for $n\gamma_2$ times. As a result, the second user faces a PtP channel with a state that depends on $x_1^1(\Theta_1)$. This user assumes that $\Theta_1 = 0$ and employs a Shannon PtP capacity-achieving code for this channel. The case $\Theta_1 = 1$ is ignored by the second user because when $\Theta_1 = 1$, the first user’s message is decoded erroneously, and the communication must be restarted. In this case, it does not matter whether the second user’s message is decoded correctly or not. Therefore, the channel’s capacity from the second user’s perspective is

$$C_2(x_1^1(0)) := \max_{P_{x_2}} I(X_2; Y | X_1 = x_1^1(0)).$$

Note that the feedback does not increase the capacity of this PtP channel. The second user operates near the capacity by setting $R_{2,2} = C_2(x_1^1(0)) - \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Let \hat{W}_2^2 be the overall decoded message of the second user at the end of this stage. Further, let $\Theta_2 = \mathbb{1}\{\hat{W}_2^2 \neq W_2\}$ as the indicator on whether W_2 is decoded correctly or not.

Stage 3. Both encoders are in the confirmation phase during the third stage. They inform the receiver whether the messages are decoded correctly. We use the same strategy in this stage as in the two-phase scheme. The codebook of user i consists of two codewords $\{\underline{x}_i^2(0), \underline{x}_i^2(1)\}$. User i transmits codeword $\underline{x}_i^2(\Theta_i)$. The four codewords $(\underline{x}_1^2(0), \underline{x}_2^2(0), \underline{x}_1^2(1), \underline{x}_2^2(1))$ are selected randomly among all the sequences with joint-type $\overline{P}_{\gamma_3 n}$ defined over the set $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ and for sequences of length $\gamma_3 n$.

Decoding. Upon receiving the channel output, the receiver estimates Θ_1, Θ_2 . Denote this estimation by $\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2$. If $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2) = (0, 0)$, then the decoder declares that the hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 is occurred. Otherwise, \mathcal{H}_1 is declared. Because of the feedback, this decision is also known at each encoders. Therefore, under \mathcal{H}_0 , and if $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2) = (0, 0)$ transmission stops and a new data packet is transmitted at the next block. Otherwise, the message is transmitted again at the next block. The process continues until $(\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2) = (0, 0)$ occurs.

We use the log-likelihood decoder for confirmation during the second and third stages. Let $m_2 = \gamma_2 n$ and $m_3 = \gamma_3 n$ be the length of the corresponding stages. Let $\bar{Q}^1(y|x_1) \triangleq \sum_{x_2} P_{X_2}(x_2)Q(y|x_1, x_2)$ denote the effective channel from the first user's perspective during the second stage, where P_{X_2} is the single-letter probability distribution based on which the codewords of the second user are generated. With this definition, the decision region for \mathcal{H}_0 in the log-likelihood decoder is given by

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ y^m \in \mathcal{Y}^m : \log \frac{\bar{Q}^{1, m_2}(y^{m_2}|x_1^1(0))}{\bar{Q}^{1, m_2}(y^{m_2}|x_1^1(1))} + \log \frac{Q^{m_3}(y_{m_2+1}^m|x_1(0), x_2(0))}{Q^{m_3}(y_{m_2+1}^m|x_1(a_1), x_2(a_2))} \geq \lambda, \right. \\ \left. (a_1, a_2) = (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1) \right\},$$

where $m = m_2 + m_3$, and λ is the decision threshold to be adjusted.

The case where the second user is selected to stop transmission at the end of stage (i) is the same as the role of the users interchanged. In that case, we have $x_2^1(0)$ and $x_2^1(1)$ as the symbols for the second user's repetition code with $C_1(x_2^1(0))$ being the capacity of the first user's channel in stage (ii). To maximize the error exponent, we optimize over the parameters $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)$, the type \overline{P}_n , and the repeating symbols $x_1^1(0), x_1^1(1), x_2^1(0), x_2^1(1)$. Based on this optimization, we decide which user must stop transmission at the end of stage (i).

6.3. Exponent-rate region. The analysis of the three-phase scheme is different from the two phase scheme. This is because of the second phase of the communication, where one user sends data and the other is in the confirmation stage (see Fig. 6). In what follows, we consider this problem.




FIG 6. Diagram of the second phase of the transmission. The first user performs a binary hypothesis for Θ testing while the second user transmits a message M

Note that the hypothesis in this problem is highly asymmetric, as the probability of error in the decoded message converges to zero. Given this assumption, suppose the prior on the hypotheses are: $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_1) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_0) \leq \zeta_n$, where ζ_n is the probability of error for decoding the first message during the first stage of the transmission. By standard arguments,

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_n = 0$ as long as the transmission rates are inside the capacity. Therefore, we are interested only on bounding the exponent for the type-II error in decoding Θ and the transmission rate for the second user.

LEMMA 10. *With n uses of the channel Q as in Fig. 6, let $R = \frac{\log M}{n}$, and $\beta = \mathbb{P}(\hat{\Theta} = 1 \mid \Theta = 0)$, then there exist $x_1(0), x_1(1) \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and a distribution P_{X_2} on \mathcal{X}_2 such that*

$$R \leq \min \{I(X_2; Y|x_1(0)), I(X_2; Y|x_1(1))\}, \quad \beta \leq 2^{-nD(\bar{Q}(x_1(0))\|\bar{Q}(x_1(1)))}.$$

where, $\bar{Q}^1(y|x_1) = \sum_{x_2} P_{X_2}(x_2)Q(y|x_1, x_2)$ for all $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

PROOF. The first encoder is based on a repetition code: $e_1(\theta) = x_1(\theta)^n$. For the second encoder, we use standard random codes generated independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) based on P_{X_2} . Independent decoders are used for M and Θ . The loglikelihood decoder is used for Θ with the decision region as

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n : \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{\bar{Q}^n(y^n|x_1(0))}{\bar{Q}^n(y^n|x_1(1))} \geq \lambda \right\},$$

where $\bar{Q}(y|x_1) := \sum_{x_2} P_{X_2}(x_2)Q(y|x_1, x_2)$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2$. If $y \notin \mathcal{A}$, then $\hat{\Theta} = 1$ is declared and the decoding is aborted (alternatively, we set $\hat{m} = 1$). If $y \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\hat{\Theta} = 0$ and we continue to decoding M . For decoding M we find \hat{m} such that $(x_2^n(\hat{m}), y^n)$ are jointly typical with respect to $P_{X_2}Q(\cdot|x_1(0), \cdot)$. Next, we analyze β :

$$\beta = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}|x_1^n(1)) = \sum_m \frac{1}{m} \sum_{x_2^n} P_{X_2}^n(x_2^n) \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{A}} Q^n(y^n|x_1^n(1), x_2^n) = \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{Q}^n(y^n|x_1^n(1)).$$

Let \hat{P}_{y^n} be the empirical type (distribution) of y^n . Then, the condition in \mathcal{A} is equivalent to

$$[D(\hat{P}_{y^n} \|\bar{Q}(x_1(1))) - D(\hat{P}_{y^n} \|\bar{Q}(x_1(0)))] \geq \lambda.$$

Therefore, from the Chernoff-Stein lemma, it is not difficult to see that $\beta \approx 2^{-nD(\bar{Q}(x_1(0))\|\bar{Q}(x_1(1)))}$.

Since the first user employs a repetition code, the second user faces a memoryless PtP channel with unknown state Θ . Therefore, from standard arguments, M is correctly decoded with probability converging to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$, if R is inside the capacity of the channel seen from the second user. That capacity is expressed as $\min \{I(X_2; Y|x_1(0)), I(X_2; Y|x_1(1))\}$. \square

REMARK 1. *Note that for the analysis of the three-phase scheme, we are only interested in the error for decoding M when $\Theta = 0$. The reason is that $\Theta = 1$ implies that the message during the first stage of transmission is decoded incorrectly. Hence, decoding the message in the second phase is not of interest as a re-transmission must occur. As a result, the data transmission rate in the Lemma 10 can be made slightly larger to $R \leq I(X_2; Y|x_1(0))$.*

With this scheme, we establish Theorem 4 in Section 3.3, with the full proof given in Appendix H.

7. Conclusion. This paper studies the bounds on the achievable rate and error exponent of variable length codes for communications over multiple access channels. The bounds are tight for a variety of channels. The upper bound on the reliability function is derived via analysis of the drift of the message entropy conditioned on the channel output. For the lower bound, a three-phase achievable scheme is proposed.




FIG 7. The tree of realizations of Y^T , in Example 5, with left branches denoting $y_t = 0$ and the right branches denoting $y_t = 1$.

APPENDIX A: ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 4. Let us consider an example for illustration. Let $Y_t, t = 1, 2, 3$, be a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with uniform distribution. Let T be the first time $Y_t = 1$, that is $T = \min \{1 \leq t \leq 3 : Y_t = 1\}$. Then, Y^T is characterized by the following table:

Y^T	1	01	000	001
$P(Y^T)$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{8}$	$\frac{1}{8}$

Fig. 7 shows the tree of the realizations of Y^T and its entropy quantities. The total entropy of Y^T is calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}
 H(Y^T) &= \mathbb{P}(Y^T = 1)H(Y_1) + \mathbb{P}(Y^T = 01)(H(Y_1) + H(Y_2|Y_1 = 0)) \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{P}(Y^T = 000)(H(Y_1) + H(Y_2|Y_1 = 0) + H(Y_3|Y_1 = 0, Y_2 = 0)) \\
 &\quad + \mathbb{P}(Y^T = 001)(H(Y_1) + H(Y_2|Y_1 = 0) + H(Y_3|Y_1 = 0, Y_2 = 0))
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have that $H(Y^T) = \frac{7}{4}$. Note that $H(T) = H([\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]) = \frac{3}{2}$, and

$$H(Y^T|T) = \frac{1}{2}H(Y_1|T=1) + \frac{1}{4}H(Y_1, Y_2|T=2) + \frac{1}{4}H(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3|T=3) = 0 + 0 + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Hence, $H(Y^T) = \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{7}{4}$.

EXAMPLE 5. Let us consider an example for illustration. Consider the sequence of Boolean random variables $(X_t, Y_t, Z_t), t = 1, 2, \dots$. Define the stopping time $T = \min \{t \in \{1, 2, 3\} : y_t = 1\}$. Figure 8 shows the tree of realizations of Y^T , with left branches denoting $y_t = 0$ and the right branches denoting $y_t = 1$. Corresponding to each non-leaf node is a mutual information $I(X^t; Y_t | Z^t, y^{t-1})$. The weights represent the probability of each realization as

$$a = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 = 0), \quad b = \mathbb{P}(Y^2 = 00), \quad c = \mathbb{P}(Y^3 = 000).$$

Therefore,

$$I(X^T \rightarrow Y^T || Z^T) = I(X_1; Y_1 | Z_1) + aI(X_1 X_2; Y_2 | Z^2, Y_1 = 0) + bI(X^3; Y_3 | Z^3, Y^2 = 00).$$




FIG 8. The tree of realizations of Y^T , in Example 5, with left branches denoting $y_t = 0$ and the right branches denoting $y_t = 1$.

APPENDIX B: PROOF OF THEOREM 1

From Definition 4, consider an achievable rate pair (R_1, R_2) . Based on the definition of achievability, consider any (M_1, M_2, N) -VLC with the probability of error P_e and a stopping time T that is less than N almost surely such that $R_i \leq \frac{\log M_i}{\mathbb{E}[T]}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then, Fano's inequality implies that $H(W_1, W_2 | Y^T) \leq \alpha(P_e)$, where $\alpha(P_e) = h_b(P_e) + P_e \log M_1 M_2$. As conditioning reduces the entropy, we get a similar bound for the other entropy terms:

$$H(W_1 | W_2, Y^T) \leq \alpha(P_e), \quad H(W_2 | W_1, Y^T) \leq \alpha(P_e).$$

Next, we start with bounding the rate R_1 . Since at time $t = 0$, the messages (W_1, W_2) are independent with uniform distribution, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \log M_1 &= H(W_1) = H(W_1 | W_2) = I(W_1; Y^T | W_2) + H(W_1 | W_2, Y^T) \\ (30) \quad &\leq I(W_1; Y^T | W_2) + \alpha(P_e). \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by showing that $I(W_1; Y^T | W_2) \leq I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T | X_2^T)$. We first pad Y^T to make it a sequence of length N . Let ξ be an auxiliary symbol and define

$$Y^N = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_T, \xi, \xi, \dots, \xi).$$

Similarly, we extend the encoding functions and the channel's transition probability to include ξ . Specifically, after the stopping time T , the encoders send the constant symbol ξ and the channel outputs ξ to the receiver. More precisely,

$$e_i(W_i, Y^n) = \xi, \quad \forall n \geq T, i = 1, 2, \quad Q(y | \xi, x_1) = Q(y | x_2, \xi) = \mathbb{1}\{y = \xi\}, \quad \forall x_1, x_2, y.$$

This auxiliary adjustment is only for tractability of the analysis as it does not affect the performance of the code. Specifically, the mutual information stays the same by replacing Y^T with Y^N :

$$\begin{aligned} I(W_1; Y^N | W_2) &= I(W_1; Y^T | W_2) + I(W_1; Y^N | W_2, Y^T) \\ (31) \quad &= I(W_1; Y^T | W_2) + I(W_1; \xi_{T+1}^N | W_2, Y^T) = I(W_1; Y^T | W_2). \end{aligned}$$

From the chain rule, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} I(W_1; Y^N | W_2) &= \sum_{r=1}^N I(W_1; Y_r | W_2, Y^{r-1}) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^N H(Y_r | W_2, X_2^r, Y^{r-1}) - H(Y_r | W_1, X_{1,r}, W_2, X_2^r, Y^{r-1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{r=1}^N H(Y_r|X_2^r, Y^{r-1}) - H(Y_r|W_1, X_{1,r}, W_2, X_2^r, Y^{r-1}) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{r=1}^N H(Y_r|X_2^r, Y^{r-1}) - H(Y_r|X_{1,r}, X_2^r, Y^{r-1}) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} I(X_1^N \rightarrow Y^N \| X_2^N)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds as conditioning reduces the entropy, and (b) holds because conditioned on $X_{1,r}, X_{2,r}$ the channel's output Y_r is independent of the messages (W_1, W_2) . Lastly, (c) is due to the definition of directed mutual information as in (2). Next, we show that the directed mutual information above equals to the following:

$$I(X_1^N \rightarrow Y^N \| X_2^N) = I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^T I(X_{1,r}; Y_r | X_2^r, \mathcal{F}_{r-1}) \right],$$

where the second equality is due to the definition given in (5). Note that $I(X_{1,r}; Y_r | X_2^r, \mathcal{F}_{r-1}) = 0$ almost surely for any $r > T$ as $Y_r = \xi$. Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(32) \quad I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^T I(X_{1,r}; Y_r | X_2^r, \mathcal{F}_{r-1}) \right] \\
&= \sum_{r=1}^T \mathbb{E} [I(X_{1,r}; Y_r | X_2^r, \mathcal{F}_{r-1})] = I(X_1^N \rightarrow Y^N \| X_2^N).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining (30)-(32) gives an upper bound on $\log M_1$. Dividing both sides by $\mathbb{E}[T]$ gives the following upper bound on R_1

$$(33) \quad R_1 \leq \frac{\log M_1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T) + \frac{\alpha(P_e)}{\mathbb{E}[T]}.$$

The first term above is the desired expression. The second term is vanishing as $P_e \rightarrow 0$. Based on a similar argument, we can bound R_2 and $R_1 + R_2$ as in the following

$$\begin{aligned}
(34) \quad R_2 &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_1^T) + \frac{\alpha(P_e)}{\mathbb{E}[T]}, \\
R_1 + R_3 &\leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T, X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T) + \frac{\alpha(P_e)}{\mathbb{E}[T]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the upper bounds in (33) and (34) hold for any VLC as long as $R_i \leq \frac{\log M_i}{\mathbb{E}[T]}$. In view of Definition 4, we consider a sequence of $(M_1^{(n)}, M_2^{(n)}, N^{(n)})$ -VLCs with $P_e^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the normalized mutual information quantities in (33) and (34) belong to \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} . Hence, the proof is completed as the above argument implies that $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC}$.

APPENDIX C: CHARACTERIZATION OF THE FEEDBACK CAPACITY REGION VIA SUPPORTING HYPERPLANES

From Theorem 1, \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} is the outer bound on the feedback-capacity region. In what follows, we provide an alternative characterization for our achievability scheme. Let \mathcal{Q} be a finite set. It suffices to assume $|\mathcal{Q}| = 3$. For any positive integer L , define $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Q}L}$ as the set of all joint distributions $P_{QX_1^L X_2^L Y^L}$ such that the conditioned distribution $P_{X_1^L X_2^L Y^L | Q=q} \in \mathcal{P}_L$ for any $q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{C}'_{FB} = \text{cl} \left[\bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{PQ}_N} \bigcup_{T \leq N} \left\{ (R_1, R_2) \in [0, \infty)^2 : R_1 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T | Q), \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. R_2 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_1^T | Q), \quad R_1 + R_2 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T | Q) \right\} \right],$$

where cl means closure, and T is a stopping time with respect to the filtration of y^t , $t > 0$.

LEMMA 11. $\mathcal{C}'_{FB} = \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC}$.

PROOF. Clearly, $\mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'_{FB}$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{C}'_{FB} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC}$. Let (R_1, R_2) be a rate-pair inside \mathcal{C}'_{FB} . Then, there exists $N > 0$, $P \in \mathcal{PQ}_N$ and stopping time $T \leq N$ such that the inequalities in (35) are satisfied. Note that,

$$I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T | Q) = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} P_Q(q) I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T | Q = q) \\ = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} P_Q(q) I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T)_{P_{X_1^N X_2^N Y^N | Q=q}}.$$

Similarly, other mutual information quantities are decomposed. By assumption, $P_{X_1^N X_2^N Y^N | Q=q} \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^N$. Then, we can write

$$(R_1, R_2) = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} P_Q(q) (R_{1,q}, R_{2,q}),$$

where $(R_{1,q}, R_{2,q})$ are rate-pair satisfying

$$R_{1,q} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T | Q = q), \\ R_{2,q} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_1^T | Q = q), \\ R_{1,q} + R_{2,q} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T | Q = q).$$

This implies that $(R_{1,q}, R_{2,q}) \in \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC}$. Hence, their convex combination is also in \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} implying that $\mathcal{C}'_{FB} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC}$. \square

We are ready to prove Theorem 2. For any $P \in \mathcal{PQ}_N$ and the corresponding stopping time $T \leq N$, define

$$E(P, T) \triangleq \left\{ (R_1, R_2, R_3) \in [0, \infty)^3 : R_1 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_2^T | Q), \right. \\ \left. R_2 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T \| X_1^T | Q), \quad R_3 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} I(X_1^T X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T | Q) \right\}.$$

and let

$$E \triangleq \text{cl} \left[\bigcup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{PQ}_N} \bigcup_{T \leq N} E(P, T) \right].$$

Note that E is a convex set in \mathbb{R}^3 . This follows from the convexifying random variable Q in the mutual information quantities and from Caratheodory's theorem (implying that it

is sufficient to have $|\mathcal{Q}| = 3$). Let $\underline{\lambda} \in \Delta^3$, where Δ^3 is the simplex of vectors $v \in [0, 1]^3$ satisfying $\sum_i v_i = 1$. Define,

$$C_{\underline{\lambda}} \triangleq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Q}_N}} \sup_{T \leq N} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \left(\lambda_1 I(X_1^T \rightarrow Y^T | X_2^T | \mathcal{Q}) + \lambda_2 I(X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T | X_1^T | \mathcal{Q}) + \lambda_3 I(X_1^T X_2^T \rightarrow Y^T | \mathcal{Q}) \right)$$

With that, let

$$E' \triangleq \left\{ (R_1, R_2, R_3) \in [0, \infty)^3 : \forall \underline{\lambda} \in \Delta^3, \sum_i \lambda_i R_i \leq C_{\underline{\lambda}} \right\}.$$

Using the same techniques as in [19], one can show that $E' = E$. Next, define

$$\mathcal{D} \triangleq \left\{ (R_1, R_2) \in [0, \infty)^2 : (R_1, R_2, R_1 + R_2) \in E \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC}$ as follows from Lemma 11, indicating that $\mathcal{C}_{FB}^{VLC} = \mathcal{C}'_{FB} = \mathcal{D}$. Consequently, we obtain another characterization of the outer bound region via supporting hyperplanes. That is the set of rate pairs (R_1, R_2) such that for all $\underline{\lambda} \in \Delta^3$ the inequality holds: $\lambda_1 R_1 + \lambda_2 R_2 + \lambda_3 (R_1 + R_2) \leq C_{\underline{\lambda}}$. With that the proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

APPENDIX D: PROOF OF LEMMA 3

We first proceed with a simpler version of the lemma stated below.

LEMMA 12. *Suppose a non-negative random process $\{H_r\}_{r>0}$ has the following properties with respect to a filtration $\mathcal{F}_r, r > 0$,*

$$(36a) \quad \mathbb{E}[H_{r+1} - H_r | \mathcal{F}_r] \geq -k_{1,r+1}, \quad \text{if } H_r \geq \epsilon,$$

$$(36b) \quad \mathbb{E}[\log H_{r+1} - \log H_r | \mathcal{F}_r] \geq -k_{2,r+1} \quad \text{if } H_r < \epsilon$$

$$(36c) \quad |\log H_{r+1} - \log H_r| \leq k_3$$

$$(36d) \quad |H_{r+1} - H_r| \leq k_4$$

where $k_{1,r}, k_{2,r}$ are non-negative random variables measurable w.r.t \mathcal{F}_r , and $k_{1,r} \leq k_{2,r}$ for all $r > 0$. Moreover, k_3, k_4 are non-negative constants. Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1), N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $I \geq D > 0$ define the random process $\{Z_t\}_{t>0}$ as

$$Z_t \triangleq \left(\frac{H_t - \epsilon}{I} \right) \mathbb{1}\{H_t \geq \epsilon\} + \left(\frac{\log H_t - \log \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{H_t}{\epsilon}\right) \right) \mathbb{1}\{H_t < \epsilon\},$$

where $f(y) = \frac{1 - e^{\lambda y}}{\lambda D}$ with $\lambda > 0$. Further define the random process $\{S_t\}_{t>0}$ as

$$S_t \triangleq \sum_{r=1}^{t \wedge \tau_\epsilon} \frac{k_{1,r}}{I} + \sum_{r=t \wedge \tau_\epsilon + 1}^{t \wedge \tau^\epsilon} \frac{k_4}{I} \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} + \sum_{r=t \wedge \tau^\epsilon + 1}^t \frac{k_{2,r}}{D} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I} \mathbb{1}\{t \geq \tau^\epsilon\}$$

Let $\{t_n\}_{n>0}$ be the prune time process defined in (18) with respect to $\{H_r\}_{r>0}$. Lastly define the random process $\{L_n\}_{n>0}$ as $L_n \triangleq Z_{t_n} + S_{t_n}$. Then, for small enough $\lambda > 0$ the process $\{L_n\}_{n>0}$ is a sub-martingale with respect to the time pruned filtration $\mathcal{G}_n, n > 0$.

PROOF. First, we point out that L_n is measurable w.r.t $\mathcal{G}_n, n > 0$. This follows from Proposition 2 and that H_t is measurable w.r.t \mathcal{F}_t . Next, the objective is to prove $\mathbb{E}[L_{n+1} -$

$L_n|y^{t_n}] \geq 0$ almost surely for all $n \geq 1$ and y^{t_n} . We prove the lemma by considering three cases depending on n .

Case (a). $\{y^{t_n} : n < \tau_\epsilon\}$: This corresponds to the case where the channel output yields $H_n \geq \epsilon$. From the definition of t_n in (18), in this case $t_n = n$ and t_{n+1} is either $n+1$ if $n < \tau_\epsilon - 1$ or τ_ϵ if $n = \tau_\epsilon - 1$. We use indicator functions to separate these two possibilities. We first consider $(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\}$. The random process of interest equals to

$$L_n\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\} = (Z_n + S_n)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\} = \left(\frac{H_n - \epsilon}{I} + \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{k_{1,r}}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\}.$$

Similarly,

$$L_{n+1}\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\} = \left(\frac{H_{n+1} - \epsilon}{I} + \sum_{r=1}^{n+1} \frac{k_{1,r}}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\}.$$

As a result, the difference between L_n and L_{n+1} satisfies the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\}|y^{t_n}] &= \mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\}|y^n] \\ (37) \quad &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{H_{n+1} - H_n}{I} + \frac{k_{1,n+1}}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tau_\epsilon - 1\}|y^n\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider the $(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\}$. In this case, we have $t_{n+1} = \tau_\epsilon$. Consequently, the random processes equal to

$$L_n\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} = \left(\frac{H_n - \epsilon}{I} + \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{k_{1,r}}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\},$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n+1}\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} &= (Z_{\tau_\epsilon} + S_{\tau_\epsilon})\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \\ &= \left(\frac{H_{\tau_\epsilon} - \epsilon}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{H_{\tau_\epsilon} \geq \epsilon\} + \left(\frac{\log H_{\tau_\epsilon} - \log \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{H_{\tau_\epsilon}}{\epsilon}\right)\right)\mathbb{1}\{H_{\tau_\epsilon} < \epsilon\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{r=1}^{\tau_\epsilon} \frac{k_{1,r}}{I} + \sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau_\epsilon} \frac{k_4}{I}\mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I}\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that one cannot be sure as to whether H_{τ_ϵ} is less than ϵ or not. The reason is that τ_ϵ is pruned by N as in (17). Thus, H_{τ_ϵ} can be greater than ϵ when $\tau_\epsilon = N$. Therefore, We proceed by bounding Z_{τ_ϵ} . Note that, for small enough λ the following inequality holds

$$(38) \quad \frac{\epsilon}{I}(e^y - 1) - \frac{y}{D} < f(y), \quad \forall y < 0.$$

The reason is that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} f(y) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda y}}{\lambda D} = \frac{-y}{D}$. This is greater than the left-hand side of (38) as $y < 0$.

Now, using inequality (38) with $y = \log \frac{H_{\tau_\epsilon}}{\epsilon}$, we obtain the following bound:

$$(39) \quad \left(\frac{\log H_{\tau_\epsilon} - \log \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{H_{\tau_\epsilon}}{\epsilon}\right)\right)\mathbb{1}\{H_{\tau_\epsilon} < \epsilon\} \geq \left(\frac{H_{\tau_\epsilon} - \epsilon}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{H_{\tau_\epsilon} < \epsilon\}.$$

Consequently, the difference $L_{n+1} - L_n$ satisfies the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\}|y^n] &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{H_{\tau_\epsilon} - H_n}{I} + \frac{k_{1,\tau_\epsilon}}{I} + \sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau_\epsilon} \frac{k_4}{I}\mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\}\right.\right. \\ (40) \quad &\quad \left.\left. + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\}|y^n\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound the first term above as

$$H_{\tau^\epsilon} - H_n = H_{n+1} - H_n + \sum_{r=n+2}^{\tau^\epsilon} (H_r - H_{r-1}),$$

where in the first equality, we add and subtract the intermediate terms $H_r, n+1 \leq r \leq \tau^\epsilon - 1$. Next, we substitute the above terms in the right-hand side of (40). As $n+2 = \tau_\epsilon + 1$, then the RHS of (40) equals the following:

$$(41) \quad \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(H_{n+1} - H_n + k_{1, \tau_\epsilon} \right) \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right] \\ + \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau^\epsilon} \left(H_r - H_{r-1} + k_4 \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right) + \sqrt{\epsilon} N \right) \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right].$$

Now we combine the two sub-cases (i.e., (37) and (41)) to obtain:

$$(42) \quad \mathbb{E}[L_{n+1} - L_n | y^n] \geq \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[H_{n+1} - H_n + k_{1, n+1} \middle| y^n \right] \\ + \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau^\epsilon} \left(H_r - H_{r-1} + k_4 \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right) + \sqrt{\epsilon} N \right) \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right].$$

Note that using condition (36a), we infer that the first term is non-negative. We work on the second term using the following chain of inequalities:

$$\frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left[\sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau^\epsilon} \left((H_r - H_{r-1}) + k_4 \right) \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \left((H_r - H_{r-1}) \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} < \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right) + \sqrt{\epsilon} N \right] \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right] \\ \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left[\sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau^\epsilon} \left((H_r - H_{r-1}) \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} < \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right) + \sqrt{\epsilon} N \right] \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right] \\ \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left[\left(\sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau^\epsilon} -H_{r-1} \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} < \sqrt{\epsilon}\} \right) + \sqrt{\epsilon} N \right] \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right] \\ \stackrel{(c)}{>} \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left[\left(\sum_{r=\tau_\epsilon+1}^{\tau^\epsilon} -\sqrt{\epsilon} \right) + \sqrt{\epsilon} N \right] \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right] \\ \stackrel{(d)}{\geq} \frac{1}{I} \mathbb{E} \left[\left[\left(\sum_{r=1}^N -\sqrt{\epsilon} \right) + \sqrt{\epsilon} N \right] \mathbb{1}\{n = \tau_\epsilon - 1\} \middle| y^n \right] = 0,$$

where (a) is due to (36d), inequality (b) holds as $H_r \geq 0$, inequality (c) holds as $H_{r-1} \mathbb{1}\{H_{r-1} < \sqrt{\epsilon}\} < \sqrt{\epsilon}$, and lastly (d) holds as $\tau^\epsilon \leq N$. To sum up, we proved that

$$\mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n) | y^n] \geq 0.$$

Case (b). $\{y^{t_n} : n \geq \tau_\epsilon\}$: Note that if $n < \tau^\epsilon$, then $t_n = t_{n+1} = \tau^\epsilon$. Thus, immediately, $L_{n+1} - L_n = 0$ almost surely. Otherwise, if $n \geq \tau^\epsilon$ and $\{\tau^\epsilon = N\} \cup \{n \geq N\}$, then $t_n = t_{n+1} = N$ and hence $L_{n+1} - L_n = 0$. Therefore, it remains to consider the case that $\tau^\epsilon < N$ and $\tau^\epsilon \leq n < N$. Therefore, $t_n = n$ and $t_{n+1} = n+1$. Furthermore, as $n+1 > n \geq \tau^\epsilon$

and $\tau^\epsilon < N$, then $H_n < \epsilon$ and $H_{n+1} < \epsilon$, implying that we are in the logarithmic drift. Therefore, we have

$$L_n = Z_n + S_n = \frac{\log H_n - \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}\right) + S_n,$$

$$L_{n+1} = Z_{n+1} + S_{n+1} = \frac{\log H_{n+1} - \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{\epsilon}\right) + S_{n+1}.$$

Hence, to sum up, in all of the above sub-cases in (b), the following holds:

$$L_{n+1} - L_n = \frac{\log H_{t_{n+1}} - \log H_{t_n}}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{H_{t_{n+1}}}{\epsilon}\right) - f\left(\log \frac{H_{t_n}}{\epsilon}\right) + S_{t_{n+1}} - S_{t_n}.$$

Note that from (36b), one can check that the following inequality holds in all sub-cases:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\log H_{t_{n+1}} - \log H_{t_n}}{D} + S_{t_{n+1}} - S_{t_n} \middle| y^{t_n} \right] \geq 0.$$

Therefore, the difference $L_{n+1} - L_n$ satisfies the following

$$\mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n) | y^{t_n}] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[f\left(\log \frac{H_{t_{n+1}}}{\epsilon}\right) - f\left(\log \frac{H_{t_n}}{\epsilon}\right) \middle| y^{t_n} \right].$$

Next, we use the Taylor's theorem for f . We only need to consider the case that $\tau^\epsilon < N$ and $\tau^\epsilon \leq n < N$ implying that $t_n = n$ and $t_{n+1} = n + 1$. Using the Taylor's theorem we can write

$$f\left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{\epsilon}\right) = f\left(\log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}\right) + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=\log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right) + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} \bigg|_{y=\zeta} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right)^2,$$

where ζ is between $\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{\epsilon}$ and $\log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}$ and

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=\log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}} = -\frac{e^{\lambda \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}}}{D}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} \bigg|_{y=\zeta} = -\frac{\lambda}{D} e^{\lambda \zeta}.$$

As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[f\left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{\epsilon}\right) - f\left(\log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}\right) \middle| y^n \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{e^{\lambda \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}}}{D} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right) - \frac{\lambda}{D} e^{\lambda \zeta} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right)^2 \middle| y^n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{e^{\lambda \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}}}{D} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right) - \frac{\lambda}{D} e^{\lambda(\zeta \pm \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon})} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right)^2 \middle| y^n \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{e^{\lambda \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}}}{D} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right) - \frac{\lambda}{D} e^{\lambda(k_3 + \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon})} \left(\log \frac{H_{n+1}}{H_n}\right)^2 \middle| y^n \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{e^{\lambda \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}}}{D} k_3 - \frac{\lambda k_3^2}{D} e^{\lambda(k_3 + \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon})} \middle| y^n \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{k_3}{D} - \frac{\lambda k_3^2 e^{\lambda k_3}}{D} \right) e^{\lambda \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) holds as $|\zeta - \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon}| \leq \left| \log \frac{H_{n+1}}{\epsilon} - \log \frac{H_n}{\epsilon} \right| \leq k_3$ using (36c). Again, (b) follows from (36c). The last inequality holds for sufficiently small $\lambda > 0$. Consequently, for case (b), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n) | y^{t_n}] \geq 0.$$

Lastly, combining cases (a) and (b), we get the desired result. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Now we are ready to prove Lemma 3. We follow the same argument with the same cases as in the proof of Lemma 12 but with $\tau_\epsilon = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon$ and $\tau^\epsilon = \tilde{\tau}^\epsilon$. Measurability of L_n w.r.t $\mathcal{G}_n, n > 0$ follows from the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 12. Below, we consider the corresponding cases.

Case (a). $\{y^{t_n} : n < \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon\}$: This case consists of two sub-cases depending on whether $n < \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1$ or not.

For the first event, $n < \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1$, the argument in this case is the same as the first sub-case of (a) as in the proof of Lemma 12 but with $H_n = \bar{H}_n, n > 0$. Particularly, we can show that

$$(43) \quad \mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\}|y^{t_n}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\bar{H}_{n+1} - \bar{H}_n}{I} + \frac{k_{1,n+1}}{I}\right)\mathbb{1}\{n < \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\}|y^n\right].$$

Next, we consider the other sub-case with $(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\}$. Following the same argument as Case (b) in the proof of Lemma 12, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} L_n \mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\} &= \left(\frac{\bar{H}_n - \epsilon}{I} + \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{k_{1,r}}{I}\right) \mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\}, \\ L_{n+1} \mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\} &= (Z_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} + S_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon}) \mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\} \\ &= \left(\left(\frac{\bar{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} - \epsilon}{I}\right) \mathbb{1}\{H_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} \geq \epsilon\} + \left(\frac{\log \tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} - \log \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{H_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon}}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} < \epsilon\}\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{r=1}^{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} \frac{k_{1,r}}{I} + \sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon+1}^{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} \frac{k_4}{I} \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\} + \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I} \mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, using the inequality (38) with $y = \log \frac{\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon}}{\epsilon}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\log \tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} - \log \epsilon}{D} + f\left(\log \frac{\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon}}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} < \epsilon\} &\geq \left(\frac{\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} - \epsilon}{I}\right) \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} < \epsilon\} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{\bar{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} - \epsilon}{I}\right) \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} < \epsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (20a) implying that $\tilde{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} \geq \bar{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon}$. With the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(L_{n+1} - L_n)\mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\}|y^n] &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\bar{H}_{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} - \bar{H}_n}{I} + \frac{k_{1,\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon}}{I} + \sum_{r=\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon+1}^{\tilde{\tau}_\epsilon} \frac{k_4}{I} \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{H}_{r-1} \geq \sqrt{\epsilon}\}\right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left.+ \sqrt{\epsilon} \frac{N}{I}\right) \mathbb{1}\{n = \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon - 1\}|y^n\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two sub-cases and the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 12, we can show that $\mathbb{E}[L_{n+1} - L_n|y^{t_n}] \geq 0$.

Case (b). $\{y^{t_n} : n \geq \tilde{\tau}_\epsilon\}$: The argument is the same as in Case (b) in the proof of Lemma 12 but with $H_n = \bar{H}_n$. Hence, in this case, $\mathbb{E}[L_{n+1} - L_n|y^{t_n}] \geq 0$.

Lastly, combining these cases we get the desired result.

APPENDIX E: PROOF OF LEMMA 6

PROOF. We start with the case $i = 1$. The proof for the other two cases follows from the same argument. Define the following quantities

$$\mu_1(w) = \mathbb{P}(W_1 = w | Y^{r-1} = y^{r-1})$$

$$\mu_1(w, y_r) = \mathbb{P}(W_1 = w | Y^{r-1} = y^{r-1}, Y_r = y_r)$$

$$Q_w^1(y_r) = \mathbb{P}(Y_r = y_r | W_1 = w, Y^{r-1} = y^{r-1}),$$

where $w \in [1 : M_1], y_{t+1} \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Let $w_{1,r}^* \in [1 : M_1]$ be the most likely message condition on y^{r-1} . That is $w_{1,r}^* = \arg \max_{w \in [1 : M_1]} \mu_1(w)$. First, we show that having $\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 < \epsilon, \epsilon \in [0, 1)$ implies that $\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) = 1 - \eta_1(\epsilon)$ with η_1 being a function satisfying $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \eta_1(\epsilon) = 0$. The argument is as follows:

Using the grouping axiom we have

$$(44) \quad \tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 = H(W_1 | y^{r-1}) = h_b(\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)) + (1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*))H(\hat{W}_1),$$

where \hat{W}_1 is a random variable with probability distribution $P(\hat{W}_1 = w) = \frac{\mu_1(w)}{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)}$, $w \in [1 : M_1], w \neq w_{1,r}^*$. Hence, having $\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 \leq \epsilon$ implies that $h_b(\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)) \leq \epsilon$. Taking the inverse image of h_b implies that either $\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \geq 1 - h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)$ or $\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \leq h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)$, where $h_b^{-1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ is the lower-half inverse function of h_b . We show that the second case is not feasible. For this purpose, we show that the inequality $\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \leq h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)$ implies that $\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 \geq 1$ which is a contradiction with the original assumption $\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 \leq \epsilon < 1$. This statement is proved in the following proposition. With this argument, we conclude that $\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 \leq \epsilon$ implies that $\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \geq 1 - \eta_1(\epsilon)$, where $\eta_1(\cdot) = h_b^{-1}(\cdot)$.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let W be a random variable taking values from a finite set \mathcal{W} . Suppose that $P_W(w) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Then $H(W) \geq 1$.*

PROOF. The proof follows from an induction on $|\mathcal{W}|$. For $|\mathcal{W}| = 2$ the condition in the statement implies that W has uniform distribution and hence $H(W) = 1$ trivially. Suppose the statement holds for $|\mathcal{W}| = n - 1$. Then, for $|\mathcal{W}| = n$. Sort elements of \mathcal{W} in an descending order according to $P_W(w)$, from the most likely (denoted by w_1) to the least likely (w_n). If $P_W(w_n) = 0$, then the statement holds trivially from the induction's hypothesis. Suppose $P_W(w_n) > 0$. In this case, by the grouping axiom, we can reduce $H(W)$ by increasing $P_W(w_1)$ and decreasing $P_W(w_n)$ so that $P_W(w_1) + P_W(w_n)$ remains constant. In that case, either $P_W(w_n)$ becomes zero or $P_W(w_1)$ reaches the limit $\frac{1}{2}$. The first case happens if $P_W(w_1) + P_W(w_n) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. For that, the statement $H(W) \geq 1$ follows from the induction's hypothesis, as there are only $(n - 1)$ elements with non-zero probability. It remains to consider the second case in which $P_W(w_1) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $P_W(w_n) > 0$. Again, we can further reduce the entropy by increasing $P_W(w_2)$ and decreasing $P_W(w_n)$ while $P_W(w_2) + P_W(w_n)$ remains constant. Observe that $P_W(w_2) + P_W(w_n) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ as $\sum_{i=2}^n P_W(w_i) = 1 - P_W(w_1) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $p_W(w_i) > 0$. Hence, after this redistribution process $P_W(w_n)$ becomes zero. Then, the statement $H(W) \geq 1$ follows from the induction's hypothesis, as there are only $(n - 1)$ elements with non-zero probability. \square

Next, we analyze the log-drift. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, and let $\mathcal{Y}_\delta := \{y_r \in \mathcal{Y} : P(y_r | y^{r-1}) > \delta\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 - \log \tilde{H}_r^1 | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] &\leq \sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \frac{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1}{\tilde{H}_r^1(y_r)} + \delta \sum_{y_r \notin \mathcal{Y}_\delta} \left| \log \frac{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1}{\tilde{H}_r^1(y_r)} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \frac{\tilde{H}_{r-1}^1}{\tilde{H}_r^1(y_r)} + \delta \eta |\mathcal{Y}|, \end{aligned}$$

where η is given in Lemma 5. We proceed by applying Lemma 7 in [3] stated below. For any non-negative sequence of numbers p_ℓ, μ_i and $\beta_{i,\ell}, \ell \in [1 : L], i \in [1 : N]$ the following inequality holds

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L p_\ell \log \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \beta_{i,\ell}} \right) \leq \max_i \sum_{\ell=1}^L p_\ell \log \frac{\mu_i}{\beta_{i,\ell}}.$$

By the definitions of \tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 and \tilde{H}_r^1 , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 - \log \tilde{H}_r^1 | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] &\leq \sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \left(\frac{-\sum_w \mu_1(w) \log \mu_1(w)}{-\sum_w \mu_1(w, y_r) \log \mu_1(w, y_r)} \right) + \delta \eta |\mathcal{Y}| \\ (45) \quad &\leq \max_w \Gamma(w) + \delta \eta |\mathcal{Y}|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Gamma(w) = \sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \frac{-\mu_1(w) \log \mu_1(w)}{-\mu_1(w, y_r) \log \mu_1(w, y_r)}.$$

Note that

$$(46) \quad \mu_1(w, y_r) = \frac{\mu_1(w) Q_w(y_r)}{P(y_r | y^{r-1})}.$$

Therefore, for a fixed $w \neq w_{1,r}^*$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Gamma(w) &= \sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \left[\frac{Q_w(y_r)}{P(y_r | y^{r-1})} \left(1 + \frac{\log \frac{P(y_r | y^{r-1})}{Q_w(y_r)}}{-\log \mu_1(w)} \right) \right] \\ (47) \quad &= \sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \left(\log \frac{Q_w(y_r)}{P(y_r | y^{r-1})} + \log \left(1 + \frac{\log \frac{P(y_r | y^{r-1})}{Q_w(y_r)}}{-\log \mu_1(w)} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

We bound the first term above:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \frac{Q_w(y_r)}{P(y_r | y^{r-1})} - \sum_{y_r \notin \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \frac{Q_w(y_r)}{P(y_r | y^{r-1})} \\ &= D_{KL} \left(P(\cdot | y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_w \right) + \sum_{y_r \notin \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log \frac{P(y_r | y^{r-1})}{Q_w(y_r)} \\ &\geq D_{KL} \left(P(\cdot | y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_w \right) + \sum_{y_r \notin \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \log P(y_r | y^{r-1}) \\ &\geq D_{KL} \left(P(\cdot | y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_w \right) - |\mathcal{Y}| h_b(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality we used the facts that $p \log p \geq -h_b(p)$, and $h_b(p) \leq h_b(\delta)$ for $p \leq \delta$, and $|\mathcal{Y}_\delta| \leq |\mathcal{Y}|$.

Next, we bound the second term in (47). The term in the logarithm is bounded as

$$\frac{\log \frac{P(y_r | y^{r-1})}{Q_w(y_r)}}{-\log \mu_1(w)} \geq \frac{\log P(y_r | y^{r-1})}{-\log \mu_1(w)} > \frac{\log \delta}{-\log \mu_1(w)},$$

where we used the fact that $P(y_r|y^{r-1}) > \delta$ as $y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta$. Therefore, the second term in (47) is bounded as

$$\sum_{y_r \in \mathcal{Y}_\delta} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \left(1 + \frac{\log \delta}{-\log \mu_1(w)} \right) \geq \delta |\mathcal{Y}_\delta| \log \left(1 + \frac{\log \delta}{-\log \mu_1(w)} \right).$$

We select $\delta = \sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)}$. Since, $\mu_1(w) \leq h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)$ for all $w \neq w_{1,r}^*$, then the RHS is bounded from below as $-|\mathcal{Y}_\delta| \sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)} \geq -|\mathcal{Y}| \sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)}$.

Combining the bounds for each term in (47) gives, for all $w \neq w_{1,r}^*$,

$$(48) \quad \Gamma(w) \leq D_{KL} \left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_w \right) + |\mathcal{Y}| \left(h_b \left(\sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)} \right) + \sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)} \right).$$

Clearly the residual terms converge to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Next, we consider the case $w = w_{1,r}^*$. We use the Taylor's theorem for the function $f(x) = -x \log x$ around $x = 1$. Hence, $f(x) = (\log e) \left((1-x) - \zeta(1-x)^2 \right)$ for some ζ between x and 1. Hence, with $x = \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)$, we have that

$$-\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \leq (\log e)(1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)).$$

Next, from the inequality $\log x \leq (\log e)(x-1), \forall x > 0$, we have that

$$-\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r) \log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r) \geq (\log e) \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r) (1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r)).$$

As a result of these inequalities, we have that

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma(w_{1,r}^*) &= \sum_{y_r} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \frac{-\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)}{-\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r) \log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r)} \\ &\leq \sum_{y_r} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \frac{(1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*))}{\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r) (1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r))} \\ &= \sum_{y_r} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \frac{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)}{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r)} - \sum_{y_r} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r). \end{aligned}$$

We proceed with simplifying the first summation above. Using (46), we have that

$$(50) \quad (1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r)) = (1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)) \frac{\sum_{w \neq w_{1,r}^*} \frac{\mu_1(w)}{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)} Q_w^1(y_r)}{P(y_r|y^{r-1})}.$$

Thus, the first summation on the right-hand side of (49) is simplified as

$$\sum_{y_r} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \frac{P(y_r|y^{r-1})}{\sum_{w \neq w_{1,r}^*} \frac{\mu_1(w)}{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)} Q_w^1(y_r)} = D_{KL} \left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1 \right),$$

where $Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1(y_r) \triangleq \sum_{w \neq w_{1,r}^*} \frac{\mu_1(w)}{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)} Q_w^1(y_r)$ for all $y_r \in \mathcal{Y}$. Next, we bound the second summation in (49). Using (46), we have that

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} - \sum_{y_r} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*, y_r) &= -\log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) - \sum_{y_r} P(y_r|y^{r-1}) \log \frac{Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1(y_r)}{P(y_r|y^{r-1})} \\ &= -\log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) + D_{KL} \left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1 \right) \\ &\leq 2(\log e) \eta_1(\epsilon) + D_{KL} \left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds from the fact that $\log x \geq (\log e)(1 - \frac{1}{x})$ and that $\mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \geq 1 - \eta_1(\epsilon)$, implying

$$-\log \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \leq -\log(1 - \eta_1(\epsilon)) \leq (\log e) \frac{\eta_1(\epsilon)}{1 - \eta_1(\epsilon)} \leq 2(\log e)\eta_1(\epsilon),$$

which holds as $\eta_1(\epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Note that $P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) = \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1 + (1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*))Q_{\sim w_{1,r}^*}^1$. Therefore, from the convexity of the relative entropy, the right-hand side of (51) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} & 2(\log e)\eta_1(\epsilon) + \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)D_{KL}\left(Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1 \parallel Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1\right) + (1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*))D_{KL}\left(Q_{\sim w_{1,r}^*}^1 \parallel Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1\right) \\ & \leq 2(\log e)\eta_1(\epsilon) + \eta_1(\epsilon)D_{KL}\left(Q_{\sim w_{1,r}^*}^1 \parallel Q_{w_{1,r}^*}^1\right) \\ & \leq (2\log e + d^{\max})\eta_1(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where d^{\max} is the maximum of the above relative entropy for all $r \geq 1$. As a result of the above argument, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(w_{1,r}^*) & \leq D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_{\sim w_{1,r}^*}^1\right) + (2\log e + d^{\max})\eta_1(\epsilon) \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{w \neq w_{1,r}^*} \frac{\mu_1(w)}{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)} D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_w^1\right) + (2\log e + d^{\max})\eta_1(\epsilon) \\ (52) \quad & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \max_{w \neq w_{1,r}^*} D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_w^1\right) + (2\log e + d^{\max})\eta_1(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to the convexity of the relative entropy on the second argument and the definition of $Q_{\sim w_{1,r}^*}^1$. Inequality (b) follows as $\frac{\mu_1(w)}{1 - \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*)}$ form a probability distribution on $w \neq w_{1,r}^*$.

Combining (48) and (52) and (45) gives the following bound

$$(53) \quad \mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 - \log \tilde{H}_r^1 | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \leq \max_{w_1'} D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_{w_1'}^1\right) + \kappa(\epsilon),$$

where

$$(54) \quad \kappa(\epsilon) \triangleq (2 + d^{\max})h_b^{-1}(\epsilon) + |\mathcal{Y}|\left(h_b(\sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)}) + (1 + \eta)\sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)}\right).$$

Observe that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \kappa(\epsilon) = 0$. Since $h_b(p) \leq 2\sqrt{p(1-p)} \leq 2\sqrt{p}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(\epsilon) & \leq (2\log e + d^{\max})h_b^{-1}(\epsilon) + |\mathcal{Y}|\sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)} \\ & \leq \left(2\log e + d^{\max} + |\mathcal{Y}|\sqrt{3 + \eta}\right)\sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)} = O(\sqrt{h_b^{-1}(\epsilon)}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the right-hand side of (53) depends on the coding scheme. In what follows, we remove this dependency.

In what follows, we bound each relative entropy from above. Note that for each w_1'

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{w_1'}^1(y_r) & = \mathbb{P}(Y_r = y_r | Y^{r-1} = y^{r-1}, W_1 = w_1') \\ & = \sum_{x_1' \in \mathcal{X}_1} \sum_{x_2' \in \mathcal{X}_2} \mathbb{P}(X_{1,r} = x_1', X_{2,r} = x_2', Y_r = y_r | y^{r-1}, w_1') \\ & = \sum_{x_2' \in \mathcal{X}_2} \mathbb{P}(X_{2,r} = x_2' | Y^{r-1} = y^{r-1}, w_1) Q(y_r | x_1', x_2'). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the convexity of relative entropy implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q_{w'_1}^1\right) &\leq \sum_{x'_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2} \mathbb{P}(X_{2,r} = x'_2 | Y^{r-1} = y^{r-1}, w_1) \\
&\quad \times D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right) \\
(55) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq \max_{x'_1, x'_2} D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\bar{Q}_r^1 = P_{Y_r|X_{1,r}, Y^{r-1}}$, which is the effective channel from the first user's perspective at time r . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
P(y_r|y^{r-1}) &= \sum_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{P}(X_{1,r} = x_1, Y_r = y_r | y^{r-1}) \\
&= \sum_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \mathbb{P}(X_{1,r} = x_1 | y^{r-1}) \bar{Q}_r^1(y_r|x_1, y^{r-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\nu_1(x_1) \triangleq \mathbb{P}(X_{1,r} = x_1 | y^{r-1})$. Hence the convexity of relative entropy gives

$$D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right) \leq \sum_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \nu_1(x_1) D_{KL}\left(\bar{Q}_r^1(\cdot|x_1, y^{r-1}) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right).$$

Let $x_{1,r}^* = e_1(w_{1,r}^*, y^{r-1})$. Note that $\nu_1(x_{1,r}^*) \geq \mu_1(w_{1,r}^*) \geq 1 - \eta_1(\epsilon)$. Hence, the above term is bounded from above as

$$(56) \quad D_{KL}\left(P(\cdot|y^{r-1}) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right) \leq D_{KL}\left(\bar{Q}_r^1(\cdot|x_{1,r}^*, y^{r-1}) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right) + \eta_1(\epsilon) d^{\max}.$$

Lastly, combining (53), (55), and (56) gives the following bound on the log-drift

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{H}_{r-1}^1 - \log \tilde{H}_r^1 | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] &\leq \max_{x'_1, x'_2} D_{KL}\left(\bar{Q}_r^1(\cdot|x_{1,r}^*, y^{r-1}) \parallel Q(\cdot|x'_1, x'_2)\right) + \eta_1(\epsilon) d^{\max} + \kappa(\epsilon) \\
&\leq \max_{x'_1} \sup_{P_{X'_2|Y^{r-1}}} D_{KL}\left(\bar{Q}_r^1(\cdot|x_{1,r}^*, y^{r-1}) \parallel \bar{Q}'_r^1(\cdot|x'_1, y^{r-1})\right) + \eta_1(\epsilon) d^{\max} + \kappa(\epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where \bar{Q}'_r^1 is the same as \bar{Q}_r^1 but with $P_{X'_2|Y^{r-1}}$ at user 2. □

APPENDIX F: PROOF OF LEMMA 7

PROOF. Since $\{L_n^i\}_{n>0}$ is a sub-martingale w.r.t $\mathcal{F}_{t_n^i}$, $n > 0$ then, $L_0^i \leq \mathbb{E}[L_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i]$, where T is the stopping time used in the VLC and $\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}$ is as in (17) but with $H_t = \tilde{H}_t^i$. Note that $L_0^i = \frac{\log M_i}{I}$. Next, we analyze $\mathbb{E}[L_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i]$. By definition $L_n^i = Z_{t_n^i}^i + S_{t_n^i}^i$. Since, $T \leq N$, then from (18) we have that $t_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i = (T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}) \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i} = T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}$. Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[L_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i] &= \mathbb{E}[Z_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i + S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\tilde{H}_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i}{I^i} + \epsilon\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\log \tilde{H}_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i - \log \epsilon}{D^i} + f\left(\log \frac{\tilde{H}_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i}{\epsilon}\right)\right] + \mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i] \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\tilde{H}_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i}{I^i} + \epsilon\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\log \tilde{H}_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i - \log \epsilon}{D^i}\right] + \frac{1}{\lambda D^i} + \mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i] + \epsilon}{I^i} + \frac{\log \mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i] - \log \epsilon}{D^i} + \frac{1}{\lambda D^i} + \mathbb{E}[S_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i] \\
(57) \quad &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_T^i] + \epsilon}{I^i} + \frac{\log \mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_T^i] - \log \epsilon}{D^i} + \frac{1}{\lambda D^i} + \mathbb{E}[S_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i],
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows by changing $-\epsilon$ to $+\epsilon$ for the linear part and from the following inequality for the logarithmic part

$$(\log x - \epsilon)\mathbb{1}\{x < \epsilon\} \leq (\log x - \epsilon)\mathbb{1}\{x < \epsilon\} + (\log x - \epsilon)\mathbb{1}\{x \geq \epsilon\} = \log x - \epsilon,$$

inequality (b) holds as $f_i(y) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda D^i}$, inequality (c) follows from Jensen's inequality and concavity of $\log(x)$. Lastly, inequality (d) holds because of the following argument

$$\bar{H}_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i = H(W_i|Y^{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}) \leq H(W_i|Y^T),$$

where the last inequality holds because conditioning reduces the entropy and that Y^T is a function of $Y^{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}$. Next, we bound $\mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_T^i]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_T^i]$. For that we use Fano's inequality to get the following inequality

$$(58) \quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{H}_T^i] \leq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{H}_T^i] = \mathbb{E}[H(W_i|Y^T)] \leq \mathbb{E}[H(W_1, W_2|Y^T)] \leq h_b(P_e) + P_e \log M_1 M_2,$$

where P_e is the probability of error. Define $\alpha(P_e) = h_b(P_e) + P_e \log(M_1 M_2)$. Therefore, from (57) and (58), we obtain that

$$\frac{\log M_i}{I} \leq \frac{\alpha(P_e) + \epsilon}{I^i} + \frac{\log \alpha(P_e) - \log \epsilon}{D^i} + \frac{1}{\lambda D^i} + \mathbb{E}[S_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i].$$

Rearranging the terms gives the following inequality

$$\frac{-\log \alpha(P_e)}{D^i} \leq \frac{\alpha(P_e) + \epsilon}{I^i} + \frac{-\log \epsilon}{D^i} + \frac{1}{\lambda D^i} + \mathbb{E}[S_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i] - \frac{\log M_i}{I}.$$

Therefore, multiplying by D^i and dividing by $\mathbb{E}[T]$ gives the following

$$\frac{-\log \alpha(P_e)}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \leq D^i \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_{T^{\vee\tilde{\tau}^{\epsilon,i}}}^i]}{\mathbb{E}[T]} - \frac{R_i}{I^i} \right) + U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon)$$

where we used the fact that $\frac{\log M_i}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \geq R_i$, and

$$(59) \quad U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon) = R_i \left(D^i \frac{\alpha(P_e) + \epsilon}{I^i \log M_i} + \frac{-\log \epsilon}{\log M_i} + \frac{1}{\lambda \log M_i} \right).$$

For the left hand side, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\log \alpha(P_e) &= -\log P_e - \log \left(-\log P_e - \frac{(1-P_e)}{P_e} \log(1-P_e) + \log M_1 M_2 \right) \\
&\geq -\log P_e - \log \left(-\log P_e - \frac{1}{P_e} \log(1-P_e) + \log M_1 M_2 \right) \\
&\geq -\log P_e - \log \left(-\log P_e + 2 + \log M_1 M_2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows because $\log(x) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{x}$ for $x > 0$ implying that $\log(1-P_e) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{1-P_e} = \frac{-P_e}{1-P_e}$; and hence, $-\frac{1}{P_e} \log(1-P_e) \leq \frac{1}{1-P_e} \leq 2$ as $P_e \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, by factoring $-\log P_e$ we have that

$$-\log \alpha(P_e) \geq (-\log P_e)(1 - \Delta),$$

where

$$(60) \quad \Delta = \frac{\log(-\log P_e + 2 + \log M_1 M_2)}{-\log P_e}.$$

Using the above inequality, we get the following bound on the error exponent

$$\frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \leq \frac{1}{1-\Delta} D^i \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_{T \vee \bar{\tau}^{\epsilon, i}}^i]}{\mathbb{E}[T]} - \frac{R_i}{I^i} \right) + \frac{1}{1-\Delta} U_i(P_e, M_i, \epsilon), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

□

APPENDIX G: PROOF OF LEMMA 9

PROOF. Define $S \triangleq \inf \{t > 0 : t \geq \tau, M_t > c\}$. Note that S is a stopping time. Since $\{M_t\}_{t>0}$ is non-negative, then for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$M_{n \wedge S} \geq c \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{\tau \leq t \leq n} M_t > c \right\}.$$

Therefore, taking the expectation of both sides and rearranging the terms gives the following inequality

$$(61) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{\tau \leq t \leq n} M_t > c \right\} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[M_{n \wedge S}]}{c}.$$

Since $\{M_t\}_{t>0}$ is a super-martingale and that $\tau \leq S$, then $\mathbb{E}[M_{n \wedge \tau}] \geq \mathbb{E}[M_{n \wedge S}]$. Therefore, we can write

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{\tau \leq t \leq n} M_t > c \right\} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[M_\tau]}{c}.$$

This is because if $n < \tau$ then the left-hand side is zero and the inequality holds trivially. When $n \geq \tau$, using the above argument, the right-hand side of (61) is less than $\frac{\mathbb{E}[M_{n \wedge \tau}]}{c} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[M_\tau]}{c}$.

Next, taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ and from monotone convergence theorem we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{\tau \leq t} M_t > c \right\} &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \bigcup_{n>0} \left\{ \sup_{\tau \leq t \leq n} M_t > c \right\} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{\tau \leq t \leq n} M_t > c \right\} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[M_\tau]}{c}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the continuity of the probability measure. With that the proof is complete. □

APPENDIX H: PROOF OF THEOREM 4

PROOF. We first consider the variant of the coding scheme in which the first user finishes the data transmission sooner than the second user. At each block a re-transmission occurs with probability q , an error occurs with probability P_{eb} and a correct decoding process happens with probability $1 - q - P_{eb}$. Let $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ denote the decoders declared hypothesis. Note that \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_0 are the hypothesis that $\mathcal{H}_0 : (\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2) = (W_1, W_2)$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 : (\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2) \neq (W_1, W_2)$, respectively. The probability of a re-transmission at each block is

$$q = P(\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_1).$$

The probability of error at each block is

$$P_{eb} = P(\mathcal{H}_1)P(\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_0 | \mathcal{H}_1),$$

meaning that the decoder wrongfully declares \mathcal{H}_0 — the no error hypothesis. Therefore, with this setting the total probability of error for the transmission of a message is

$$(62) \quad P_e = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k P_{eb} = \frac{P_{eb}}{1-q}.$$

The number of blocks required to complete the transmission of one message is a geometric random variable with probability of success $1 - q$. Thus, the expected number of blocks for transmission of a message is $\frac{1}{1-q}$.

In what follows, we analyze q and P_{eb} for the proposed three-phase scheme. For shorthand, denote $\Theta_{12} = (\Theta_1, \Theta_2)$, $\hat{\Theta}_{12} = (\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2)$. Then

$$(63) \quad P_{eb} = P(\hat{\Theta}_{12} = 00, \Theta_{12} \neq 00) = \sum_{a \in \{01, 10, 11\}} P(\Theta_{12} = a) P(\hat{\Theta}_{12} = 00 | \Theta_{12} = a).$$

Note that, from a standard argument in channel coding, if the effective transmission rates are inside the capacity region, then $P(\Theta_{12} \neq 00)$ can be made sufficiently small. Observe that the effective rates of the three-phase scheme is $(\frac{R_1}{\gamma_1}, \frac{R_2}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2})$. We need to choose γ_1, γ_2 such that the rates are inside the feedback-capacity region of the channel. Let the rate-splitting of the second user be $R_2 = R_{2,1} + R_{2,2}$, where $R_{2,1}$ and $R_{2,2}$ are the transmission rate during the first and second phases, respectively. During the first stage, we face a MAC channel with feedback. Hence, from Theorem 1 the effective rates during this phase must satisfy the following inequalities for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$, and $P^L \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}^L$

$$(64a) \quad \frac{R_1}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{1}{L} I(X_1^L \rightarrow Y^L \| X_2^L) + \varepsilon$$

$$(64b) \quad \frac{R_{2,1}}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{1}{L} I(X_2^L \rightarrow Y^L \| X_1^L) + \varepsilon$$

$$(64c) \quad \frac{R_1 + R_{2,1}}{\gamma_1} \leq \frac{1}{L} I(X_1^L, X_2^L \rightarrow Y^L) + \varepsilon.$$

For shorthand, let $I_L^1(P)$, $I_L^2(P)$ and $I_L^3(P)$ denote, respectively, the normalized directed mutual information terms above, where P denotes the multi-letter probability distribution for the first phase.

During the second phase, only the second user transmits the remaining of its messages. Hence, it faces a PtP channel during the second phase. Therefore, from Lemma 10 and Remark 1, the transmission rate of the second user during this stage must satisfy

$$\frac{R_{2,2}}{\gamma_2} \leq C_2 := I(X_2; Y | x_{1,2}(0)),$$

where $x_{1,2}(0)$ and $x_{1,2}(1)$ are the symbols that the first user sends for confirmation during the second phase. These symbols together with P_{X_2} are chosen to maximize the rate-exponent region during the second phase. We set $R_{2,2} = \gamma_2 C_2$. Hence, $R_{2,1} = R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2$. Replacing this quantity in (64) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_1}{\gamma_1} &\leq I_L^1(P) + \varepsilon \\ \frac{R_2}{\gamma_1} &\leq I_L^2(P) + \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} C_2 + \varepsilon \\ \frac{R_1 + R_2}{\gamma_1} &\leq I_L^3(P) + \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1} C_2 + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by rearranging the terms, the following condition must hold:

$$(65) \quad \gamma_1 \geq \max \left\{ \frac{R_1}{I_L^1(P)}, \frac{R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2}{I_L^2(P)}, \frac{R_1 + R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2}{I_L^3(P)} \right\}.$$

As a result, with γ_1 and γ_2 satisfying the above inequality, there exists a sequence $\zeta_n, n \geq 1$ with $\zeta_n \rightarrow 0$ such that after the error probability $\mathbb{P}\{\Theta_{12} = a\}$ is bounded by ζ_n . Hence, we obtain the following upper bound

$$(66) \quad P_{eb} \leq \sum_{a \in \{01, 10, 11\}} \zeta_n \mathbb{P}(\hat{\Theta}_{12} = 00 | \Theta_{12} = a).$$

In what follows, we bound each term inside (66). For any $a_1, a_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, let $\beta_{a_1, a_2} := \mathbb{P}(\hat{\Theta}_{12} = 00 | \Theta_{12} = (a_1, a_2))$ which is the corresponding error term in (66). Then, we have that

$$(67) \quad \beta_{a_1 a_2} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A} | \Theta_{12} = a_1 a_2) = \sum_{(y^{m_2}, y^{m_3}) \in \mathcal{A}} \bar{Q}(y^{m_2} | x_{12}^{m_2}(a_1)) Q^{m_3}(y^{m_3} | x_{13}^{m_3}(a_1), x_{23}^{m_3}(a_2)).$$

Decision Region: Recall the definition of \mathcal{A} in the main text. We proceed by simplifying the log-ratio terms in \mathcal{A} . First, consider $a = 01$. Then, the second log-ratio term in \mathcal{A} is equivalent to the following

$$(68) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{m_3} \log \frac{Q^{m_3}(y_{m_2+1}^m | \underline{x}_{1,3}(0), \underline{x}_{2,3}(0))}{Q^{m_3}(y_{m_2+1}^m | \underline{x}_{1,3}(0), \underline{x}_{2,3}(1))} = \frac{1}{m_3} \sum_{j=m_2+1}^m \log \frac{Q(y_j | x_{1,3,j}(0), x_{2,3,j}(0))}{Q(y_j | x_{1,3,j}(0), x_{2,3,j}(1))} \\ & = \sum_{u_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \sum_{u_2, v_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2} P_m(u_1, u_2, *, v_2) \left[\sum_{s \in \mathcal{Y}} \hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}(s | u_1, u_2, v_2) \log \frac{Q(s | u_1, u_2)}{Q(s | u_1, v_2)} \right] \\ & = \sum_{u_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \sum_{u_2, v_2 \in \mathcal{X}_2} P_m(u_1, u_2, *, v_2) \left[D(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}(\cdot | u_1, u_2, v_2) \| Q(\cdot | u_1, v_2)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - D(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}(\cdot | u_1, u_2, v_2) \| Q(\cdot | u_1, u_2)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1(0), Z_2(0), Z_1(1), Z_2(1))$ are random variables with joint distribution P_n . Then, the right-hand side of (68) equals to

$$(69) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{m_3} \log \frac{Q^{m_3}(y_{m_2+1}^m | \underline{x}_{1,3}(0), \underline{x}_{2,3}(0))}{Q^{m_3}(y_{m_2+1}^m | \underline{x}_{1,3}(0), \underline{x}_{2,3}(1))} = D(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}(\cdot | \mathbf{Z}) \| Q(\cdot | Z_1(0), Z_2(1)) | \mathbf{Z}) \\ & \quad - D(\hat{Q}_{\mathbf{y}}(\cdot | \mathbf{Z}) \| Q(\cdot | Z_1(0), Z_2(0)) | \mathbf{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

We can derive similar expressions for other values of $a = 10, 11$. Using a similar argument, the first log-ratio is simplified as

$$\log \frac{\bar{Q}^{m_2}(y^{m_2} | x_{1,2}(0))}{\bar{Q}^{m_2}(y^{m_2} | x_{1,2}(1))} = m_2 \left[D(\hat{P}_{y^{m_2}} \| \bar{Q}(x_{1,2}(1))) - D(\hat{P}_{y^{m_2}} \| \bar{Q}(x_{1,2}(0))) \right],$$

where $\hat{P}_{y^{m_2}}$ is the empirical distribution of y^{m_2} and \bar{Q} is the averaged channel from the first user's perspective. For any $a_1, a_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, define

$$(70) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_\lambda(a_1, a_2) := & \left\{ \hat{Q}(y | \mathbf{z}) : D(\hat{Q}(\cdot | \mathbf{z}) \| Q(\cdot | Z_1(a_1), Z_2(a_2)) | \mathbf{z}) \right. \\ & \left. - D(\hat{Q}(\cdot | \mathbf{z}) \| Q(\cdot | Z_1(0), Z_2(0)) | \mathbf{z}) \geq \frac{\lambda}{m_3} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also define

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda(a_1) := \left\{ \hat{P} : D(\hat{P} \parallel \bar{Q}(x_{1,2}(a_1))) - D(\hat{P} \parallel \bar{Q}(x_{1,2}(0))) \geq \frac{\lambda}{m} \right\}.$$

Therefore, whether $y^m \in \mathcal{A}$ or not depends entirely on its corresponding empirical distributions $(\hat{P}_{y^m}, \hat{Q}_y)$. Such distributions must be such that the sum of the two log-ratio quantities in \mathcal{A} are greater than λ . Then, given that $\frac{m_2}{m_2+m_3} = \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_2+\gamma_3}$, define:

$$\mathcal{D}_\lambda(a_1, a_2) : \left\{ (\hat{P}, \hat{Q}) : \hat{P} \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(a_1), \hat{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\beta(a_1, a_2), \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_2 + \gamma_3} \alpha + \frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_2 + \gamma_3} \beta \geq \lambda \right\}.$$

Then the decision region \mathcal{A} is the set of all \mathbf{y} such that (\hat{P}_y, \hat{Q}_y) belongs to $\bigcap_{\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{0}} \mathcal{D}_\lambda(\mathbf{a})$. For shorthand we drop the subscript λ in \mathcal{D}_λ . Therefore, using a type-analysis argument, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{a_1 a_2} &= \sum_{\substack{(\hat{P}, \hat{Q}) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}), \\ \mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{0}}} \sum_{y^{m_2} \in T_\delta^{m_2}(\hat{P})} \bar{Q}(y^{m_2} | x_{12}^{m_2}(a_1)) \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in T[\mathbf{P}_{m_3}]} \mathbf{P}_{m_3}(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{y^{m_3} \in T_\delta^{m_3}(\hat{Q}(\cdot | \mathbf{x}))} Q^{m_3}(y^{m_3} | x_{13}^{m_3}(a_1), x_{23}^{m_3}(a_2)) \\ &\leq \sup_{(\hat{P}, \hat{Q}) \in \mathcal{D}(a_1, a_2)} \exp \left\{ -m_2 D(\hat{P} \parallel \bar{Q}(x_{12}(a_1))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - m_3 \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{P}_{m_3}} [D(\hat{Q}(\cdot | \mathbf{X}) \parallel Q(\cdot | X_1(a_1), X_2(a_2)))] + \delta' \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from Chernoff-Stein lemma, it is not difficult to see that

$$\beta_{a_1 a_2} \leq 2^{-n \gamma_2 D(\bar{Q}(x_{12}(0)) \parallel \bar{Q}(x_{12}(a_1)))} 2^{-n \gamma_2 \bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_{m_3}}(00 \| a_1, a_2) + \delta''},$$

where we used the definition given in (10):

$$\bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_{m_3}}(00 \| ij) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{P}_{m_3}} \left[D_Q(X_1(0), X_2(0) \parallel X_1(i), X_2(j)) \right], \quad \forall i, j \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Let $D_{\bar{Q}_1} = D(\bar{Q}(x_{12}(0)) \parallel \bar{Q}(x_{12}(1)))$. Then, the bound on β_{a_1, a_2} simplifies to the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{01} &\leq 2^{-n (\gamma_3 \bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_{m_3}}(00 \| 01) + \delta'')}, \\ \beta_{10} &\leq 2^{-n (\gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}_1} + \gamma_3 \bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_{m_3}}(00 \| 10) + \delta'')}, \\ \beta_{11} &\leq 2^{-n (\gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}_1} + \gamma_3 \bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_{m_3}}(00 \| 11) + \delta'')}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combining such bounds and (66), we obtain the following

$$(71) \quad \frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \geq \min \left\{ \gamma_3 \bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_3}(00 \| 01), \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}_1} + \gamma_3 \bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_3}(00 \| 10), \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}_1} + \gamma_3 \bar{D}_{\mathbf{P}_3}(00 \| 11) \right\}.$$

It remains to optimize the bound over the choices of all parameters: $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \mathbf{P}_{m_3}, P_1$ and $x_{1,2}(0), x_{1,2}(1)$. Note that condition (65) must be satisfied. Given that $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 = 1$, the condition (65) is equivalent to the following:

$$\gamma_2 + \gamma_3 + \max \left\{ \frac{R_1}{I_L^1(PL)}, \frac{R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2}{I_L^2(PL)}, \frac{R_1 + R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2}{I_L^3(PL)} \right\} \leq 1.$$

Clearly γ_3^* , the optimal γ_3 , is a function of γ_2 :

$$\gamma_3^* = 1 - \gamma_2 - \max \left\{ \frac{R_1}{I_L^1(PL)}, \frac{R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2}{I_L^2(PL)}, \frac{R_1 + R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2}{I_L^3(PL)} \right\}.$$

Define

$$E_{o,P}(r_1, r_2) := 1 - \min \left\{ \frac{r_1}{I_L^1(P)}, \frac{r_1}{I_L^2(P)}, \frac{r_1 + r_2}{I_L^3(P)} \right\}.$$

Then, we get the following lower bound:

$$\frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \geq E_{l,3\text{-phase}}^1(R_1, R_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_{l,3\text{-phase}}^1(R_1, R_2) = & \sup_{0 \leq \gamma_2 < 1} \sup_{P_3} \sup_{P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}} \min \left\{ (E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|01), \right. \\ & (E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|10) + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^1}, \\ & \left. (E_{o,P}(R_1, R_2 - \gamma_2 C_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|10) + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^1} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the proof was for the variant of the coding scheme where the first user finishes first. Next, we analyze the other variant with the second user finishing data transmission sooner. By symmetry, we obtain the following lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} E_{l,3\text{-phase}}^2(R_1, R_2) = & \sup_{0 \leq \gamma_2 < 1} \sup_{P_3} \sup_{P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{MAC}} \min \left\{ (E_{o,P}(R_1 - \gamma_2 C_1, R_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|01) + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^2}, \right. \\ & (E_{o,P}(R_1 - \gamma_2 C_1, R_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|10), \\ & \left. (E_{o,P}(R_1 - \gamma_2 C_1, R_2) - \gamma_2) \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|10) + \gamma_2 D_{\bar{Q}^2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_1 is the channel capacity seen at the first user, during the second phase of transmission. Combining the two bound we obtain the desired result. \square

APPENDIX I: PROOF OF LEMMA 1

PROOF. The argument is similar to the proof of Theorem 4. Here, the scheme is only two-phase: data transmission and a full confirmation stage; implying that $R_{2,2} = 0, \gamma_2 = 0$. Note that the probability of error is given by (62), where P_{eb} is as in (63):

$$P_{eb} = P(\hat{\Theta}_{12} = 00, \Theta_{12} \neq 00) = \sum_{a \in \{01, 10, 11\}} P(\Theta_{12} = a) P(\hat{\Theta}_{12} = 00 | \Theta_{12} = a).$$

As argued, $P(\Theta_{12} = a)$ can be made sufficiently small as long as the effective rates during the data transmission (R_1, R_2) are inside the feedback-capacity region. To ensure that, instead of the conditions in (64), we use the alternative expression of the capacity region given in Theorem 2. Particularly, we require that

$$(72) \quad \frac{1}{\gamma_1} (\lambda_1 R_1 + \lambda_2 R_2 + \lambda_3 (R_1 + R_2)) \leq C_{\underline{\lambda}},$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \geq 0$. Given that the rest of the argument is the same as in the proof of Theorem 4. Particularly, we get the following bound which is the same as (71) but with $\gamma_2 = 0$ as stated in the beginning of this proof.

$$\frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \geq \gamma_3 \min \left\{ \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|01), \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|10), \bar{D}_{P_3}(00\|11) \right\},$$

If we optimize over the choice of P_3 in the scheme, the right-hand side of the above expression becomes $\gamma_3 D_{lb}$. Given that $\gamma_1 + \gamma_3 = 1$, we optimize over all γ_2 that satisfy (72).

With that, the right-hand side becomes $D_{lb}\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i R_i}{C_{\underline{\lambda}}}\right)$. Since this inequality holds for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \geq 0$, then we get the bound

$$(73) \quad \frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \geq \sup_{\substack{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \geq 0 \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1}} D_{lb}\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i R_i}{C_{\underline{\lambda}}}\right).$$

Next, we present this expression in polar coordination. By $(\|R\|, \theta_R)$ denote the polar coordinates of (R_1, R_2) in \mathbb{R}^2 . First, note that the right-hand side of (73) equals to

$$D_l\left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i^* R_i}{C_{\underline{\lambda}^*}}\right),$$

where $\underline{\lambda}^* = (\lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*, \lambda_3^*)$ is the optimum choice. We show that given an arbitrary $\alpha > 0$ and a rate pair (R_1, R_2) in the capacity region, $\underline{\lambda}^*$ is the same as the one for $(\alpha R_1, \alpha R_2)$. To see this, lets replace (R_1, R_2) with $(\alpha R_1, \alpha R_2)$ for some constant $\alpha > 0$. Then, the right-hand side of (73) for the new rates equals to

$$D_l\left(1 - \alpha \max_{\substack{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \geq 0 \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i R_i}{C_{\underline{\lambda}}}\right) = D_l\left(1 - \alpha \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i^* R_i}{C_{\underline{\lambda}^*}}\right),$$

where the equality follows as α is a constant moving before the maximization over lambda. This means that the objective function for the maximization is the same as the previous one. This implies that there is an identical $\underline{\lambda}^*$ which optimizes the expression for (R_1, R_2) and $(\alpha R_1, \alpha R_2)$. Now, consider the line passing (R_1, R_2) and the origin. Let (R'_1, R'_2) denote the point of intersection of this line with the boundary of the capacity region. Fig. 1 shows how (R'_1, R'_2) is determined. Since, $R'_i = \alpha R_i, i = 1, 2$ for some $\alpha > 0$, then the optimum $\underline{\lambda}$ for (R'_1, R'_2) is the same as the one for (R_1, R_2) . Therefore, from this argument and the fact that $R_i = \frac{R'_i}{\alpha}, i = 1, 2$, we can rewrite (73) as

$$\frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \geq \min_{\substack{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \geq 0 \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 1}} D_{lb}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i R'_i}{C_{\underline{\lambda}}}\right) \stackrel{(a)}{=} D_{lb}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \stackrel{(b)}{=} D_{lb}\left(1 - \frac{\|R\|}{\|R'\|}\right),$$

where (a) follows, since (R'_1, R'_2) is on the capacity boundary, and (b) holds as $\alpha = \frac{\|R'\|}{\|R\|}$. Note that $\|R'\|$ depends on (R_1, R_2) only through θ_R ; in particular, it equals to $C(\theta_R)$ which is a function of θ_R . With this notation, we get our desired lower bound as

$$\frac{-\log P_e}{\mathbb{E}[T]} \geq D_{lb}\left(1 - \frac{\|R\|}{C(\theta_R)}\right).$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] BERLEKAMP, E. R. (1964). Block coding with noiseless feedback, PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [2] BERLIN, P., NAKIBOGLU, B., RIMOLDI, B. and TELATAR, E. (2009). A Simple Converse of Burnashev's Reliability Function. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55** 3074–3080. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2009.2021322>
- [3] BURNASHEV, M. V. (1976). Data Transmission over a Discrete Channel with Feedback. Random Transmission Time. *Probl. Peredachi Inf.* **12** 10–30.
- [4] COMO, G., YUKSEL, S. and TATIKONDA, S. (2009). The Error Exponent of Variable-Length Codes Over Markov Channels With Feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55** 2139–2160. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2009.2015989>

- [5] CSISZAR, I., FARKAS, L. and KOI, T. (2021). Error Exponents for Asynchronous Multiple Access Channels, Controlled Asynchronism May Outperform Synchronism. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **67** 7684–7707. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2021.3115252>
- [6] CSISZAR, I. and KÖRNER, J. (2011). *Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511921889>
- [7] FARKAS, L. and KOI, T. (2014). Universal error exponent for discrete asynchronous multiple access channels. In *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/isit.2014.6875373>
- [8] GAARDER, N. and WOLF, J. (1975). The capacity region of a multiple-access discrete memoryless channel can increase with feedback (Corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **21** 100–102. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.1975.1055312>
- [9] GALLAGER, R. (1985). A perspective on multiaccess channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **31** 124–142. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.1985.1057022>
- [10] HAROUTUNIAN, E. A., HAROUTUNIAN, M. E. and HARUTYUNYAN, A. N. (2007). Reliability Criteria in Information Theory and in Statistical Hypothesis Testing. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory* **4** 97–263. <https://doi.org/10.1561/0100000008>
- [11] HEIDARI, M., ANASTASOPOULOS, A. and PRADHAN, S. S. (2018). On The Reliability Function of Discrete Memoryless Multiple-Access Channel with Feedback. In *2018 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/itw.2018.8613494>
- [12] HEIDARI, M., ANASTASOPOULOS, A. and PRADHAN, S. S. (2022). Upper Bounds on the Feedback Error Exponent of Channels With States and With Memory. In *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/isit50566.2022.9834603>
- [13] KRAMER, G. (1998). Directed information for channels with feedback, PhD thesis. <https://doi.org/10.3929/ETHZ-A-001988524>
- [14] MARKO, H. (1973). The Bidirectional Communication Theory—A Generalization of Information Theory. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* **21** 1345–1351. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tcom.1973.1091610>
- [15] MASSEY, J. L. (1990). Casuality, Feedback and Directed Information. In *Symposium on Information Theory and its Applications*.
- [16] NAZARI, A., ANASTASOPOULOS, A. and PRADHAN, S. S. (2014). Error Exponent for Multiple-Access Channels: Lower Bounds. *Transactions on Information Theory* **60** 5095–5115.
- [17] NAZARI, A., PRADHAN, S. S. and ANASTASOPOULOS, A. (2015). Error Exponent for Multiple Access Channels: Upper Bounds. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **61** 3605–3621. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2015.2424959>
- [18] PERMUTER, H. H., WEISSMAN, T. and GOLDSMITH, A. J. (2009). Finite State Channels With Time-Invariant Deterministic Feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55** 644–662. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2008.2009849>
- [19] SALEHI, M. (1978). Cardinality bounds on auxiliary variables in multiple-user theory via the method of Ahlswede and Körner.
- [20] SHANNON, C. E., GALLAGER, R. G. and BERLEKAMP, E. R. (1967). Lower bounds to error probability for coding on discrete memoryless channels. II. *Information and Control* **10** 522–552. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0019-9958\(67\)91200-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0019-9958(67)91200-4)
- [21] TAMIR, R. and MERHAV, N. (2021). Error Exponents in the Bee Identification Problem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **67** 6564–6582. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2021.3091762>
- [22] TATIKONDA, S. and MITTER, S. (2009). The Capacity of Channels With Feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55** 323–349. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2008.2008147>
- [23] TCHAMKERTEN, A. and TELATAR, I. E. (2005). On the Universality of Burnashev's Error Exponent. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **51** 2940–2944. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2005.850229>
- [24] TCHAMKERTEN, A. and TELATAR, I. E. (2006). Variable length coding over an unknown channel. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **52** 2126–2145. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2006.872974>
- [25] WILLEMS, F. (1982). The feedback capacity region of a class of discrete memoryless multiple access channels (Corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **28** 93–95. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.1982.1056437>
- [26] YAMAMOTO, H. and ITOH, K. (1979). Asymptotic performance of a modified Schalkwijk-Barron scheme for channels with noiseless feedback (Corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **25** 729–733. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.1979.1056119>