

Message-Cognizant Assistance and Feedback for the Gaussian Channel

Amos Lapidoth, Ligong Wang, and Yiming Yan*

Abstract

A formula is derived for the capacity of the Gaussian channel with a benevolent message-cognizant rate-limited helper that provides a noncausal description of the noise to the encoder and decoder. This capacity is strictly larger than when the helper is message oblivious, with the difference being particularly pronounced at low signal-to-noise ratios. It is shown that in this setup, a feedback link from the receiver to the encoder does not increase capacity. However, in the presence of such a link, said capacity can be achieved even if the helper is oblivious to the transmitted message.

1 Introduction

Complementing recent work on the capacity of the Gaussian channel with a rate-limited message-oblivious helper [1], [2], [3], [4], we study here the message-cognizant helper. We focus on the case where the help is to both encoder and decoder. The help is provided noncausally to the communicating parties and comprises an nR_h -long message-dependent binary description of the noise sequence. For recent results on DMCs with causal help see [5]. Also highly relevant to our work is [6] which mainly focuses (but not exclusively) on the transmission of a random parameter rather than a message.

The channel we study is the classical discrete-time Gaussian noise channel [7] whose time- k output Y_k corresponding to the time- k input x_k is

$$Y_k = x_k + Z_k \tag{1}$$

*The authors are with the Department of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering, ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland (e-mail: lapidoth@isi.ee.ethz.ch; ligwang@isi.ee.ethz.ch; yan@isi.ee.ethz.ch). This work was supported by SNSF.

where $\{Z_k\}$ are IID variance- σ^2 centered Gaussians, i.e., $\text{IID} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. We assume that $\sigma > 0$, so noise is present.

A blocklength- n rate- R coding scheme with rate- R_h message-cognizant assistance comprises a message set $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, 2^{nR}\}$; a descriptions set $\mathcal{T} = \{1, \dots, 2^{nR_h}\}$; a helper that produces the assistance $T = h(Z^n, M)$ for some helping function $h: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ (where A^i denotes (A_1, \dots, A_i) and M is the transmitted message); an encoder that produces the n -tuple $X^n = \mathbf{x}(m, T) = (x_1(m, T), \dots, x_n(m, T))$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}_T \left[\sum_{k=1}^n x_k^2(m, T) \right] \leq nP \quad (2)$$

where $m \in \mathcal{M}$ is the message to be transmitted, $\mathbb{E}_T[\cdot]$ denotes expectation with respect to T , and where

$$P > 0 \quad (3)$$

is some prespecified positive constant; and a decoder that produces the message $\hat{M} = \psi(Y^n, T)$ for some decoding rule $\psi: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$.

A rate R is said to be achievable if there exists a sequence of coding schemes as above (indexed by the blocklength) for which

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr[M \neq \hat{M}] = 0 \quad (4)$$

when M is drawn equiprobably from \mathcal{M} . The supremum of achievable rates is the capacity C we seek.

The feedback capacity is defined in an analogous way with the transmitted n -tuple $\mathbf{x}(m, t)$ now having the form

$$\mathbf{x}(m, t, y^n) = (x_1(m, t), x_2(m, t, y_1), \dots, x_n(m, t, y^{n-1})).$$

It captures a scenario where, thanks to feedback link from the channel output to the encoder, the time- i transmitted symbol may depend not only on the message m and on the help t , but also on the previously-received symbols y^{i-1} .

The message-oblivious helper capacity with feedback corresponds to a scenario where there is a feedback link as above, but the helper is message oblivious. The help now has the form $h(Z^n)$ and the time- i channel input has the form $x_i(m, t, y^{i-1})$.

Our main result expresses the different capacities in terms of R_h and the signal-to-noise ratio

$$\mathbf{A} \triangleq \frac{P}{\sigma^2}. \quad (5)$$

Theorem 1 (Message-Cognizant Helper). *On the Gaussian channel with a noncausal message-cognizant helper that assists both the encoder and the decoder*

$$C(R_h) = \frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 + \mathbf{A} + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{A}(1 - 2^{-2R_h})}\right) + R_h. \quad (6)$$

This remains the capacity also when a feedback link from the receiver to the encoder is added.

Proof. The proof the direct part, which does not utilize the feedback link, can be found in Section 2. The converse, which is valid also in the presence of a feedback link, can be found in Section 3. \square

As Theorem 1 shows, feedback does not increase the capacity of the Gaussian message-cognizant helper capacity (when the help is provided to both encoder and decoder). It is, however, useful when the helper is message oblivious. In the absence of feedback, the message-oblivious helper capacity is [2, Remark 5]

$$\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \mathbf{A}) + R_h.$$

But, as the following theorem shows, feedback increases the capacity to that of message-cognizant helper:

Theorem 2 (Message-Oblivious Helper with Feedback). *The capacity of the Gaussian channel with a feedback link from the channel output to the encoder and with a noncausal message-oblivious helper that assists both the encoder and the decoder is also*

$$\frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 + \mathbf{A} + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{A}(1 - 2^{-2R_h})}\right) + R_h$$

i.e., the same as that with a message-cognizant helper.

Proof. In view of Theorem 1, we only need a direct part. This is provided in Section 4, where we describe a feedback coding scheme with help that does not depend on the message. \square

2 Achievability

2.1 In Broad Brushstrokes

We begin with a rough description of the coding scheme that ignores some of the technicalities. Let f_{XYZ} be the centered multivariate Gaussian distribution under which (X, Z) are of covariance matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \sqrt{\mathbf{P}}\sigma\rho \\ \sqrt{\mathbf{P}}\sigma\rho & \sigma^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

and

$$Y = X + Z \quad (8)$$

with probability one, where

$$\rho = \sqrt{1 - 2^{-2R_h}} \quad (9)$$

so

$$I(X; Z) = h(Z) - h(Z|X) \quad (10)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e\sigma^2) - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e\sigma^2(1 - \rho^2)) \quad (11)$$

$$= R_h. \quad (12)$$

Generate $2^{n(R+R_h)}$ codewords $\{\mathbf{x}(m, t)\}_{(m,t) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{T}}$ independently, with the n components of each being drawn IID $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{P})$. If the message to be transmitted is $M = m$, and if it observes the noise sequence Z^n , the helper searches the 2^{nR_h} codewords $\{\mathbf{x}(m, t)\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ for a codeword $\mathbf{x}(m, t^*)$ that is (weakly) jointly typical with Z^n with respect to the XZ -marginal f_{XZ} of the above density f_{XYZ} . The helper is very likely to find such t^* because, by our choice of ρ (9), $R_h \approx I(X; Z)$. Having found t^* , the helper reveals it to the encoder and the decoder, with the former now transmitting $\mathbf{x}(m, t^*)$. The decoder, for its part, searches $\{\mathbf{x}(m', t^*)\}_{m' \in \mathcal{M}}$ for a some \hat{M} for which $\mathbf{x}(\hat{M}, t^*)$ is jointly typical with the received sequence Y^n with respect to the XY -marginal f_{XY} of the above f_{XYZ} . Since the incorrect codewords are drawn independently of Y^n , the decoding will succeed with high probability when R is approximately $I(X; Y)$ (where the latter is computed with respect to f_{XY}). This mutual information is given by

$$I(X; Y) = h(Y) - h(Y|X) \quad (13)$$

$$= h(Y) - h(Z|X) \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e (\mathbf{P} + \sigma^2 + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{P}}\sigma\rho) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e\sigma^2(1 - \rho^2)) \quad (15)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \mathbf{A} + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{A}(1 - 2^{-2R_h})} \right) + R_h. \quad (16)$$

2.2 A Geometric Approach

For a more rigorous achievability proof, we propose a geometric approach.

Let $\partial\mathcal{B}(\sqrt{n\mathbf{P}}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n: \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = n\mathbf{P}\}$ denote the radius- $\sqrt{n\mathbf{P}}$ $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Euclidean sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\angle(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in [0, \pi]$ denote the angle between the two (nonzero) vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in the sense that

$$\cos \angle(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle}{\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\mathbf{y}\|}. \quad (17)$$

Fix $0 < \epsilon < R_h$ (later to tend to zero), and let $\theta_0 \in [0, \pi/2]$ be such that

$$\sin \theta_0 = 2^{-(R_h - \epsilon)}. \quad (18)$$

Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \partial\mathcal{B}(\sqrt{n\mathbb{P}})$ be a codebook of 2^{nR_h} codewords, indexed by \mathcal{T} , with the covering property that the caps of half-angle θ_0 centered around the codewords completely cover $\partial\mathcal{B}(\sqrt{n\mathbb{P}})$. Such a codebook exists whenever n is large enough [8], as we henceforth assume.

Pick $|\mathcal{M}|$ random orthogonal transformations (rotations) independently, each uniform according to the Haar measure, and index them by the messages $m \in \mathcal{M}$. For each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, generate the set $\mathcal{C}(m) = \{\mathbf{x}(m, t)\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ by applying the orthogonal transformation corresponding to m to each of the codewords in \mathcal{C} .

Note that for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, the set $\mathcal{C}(m)$ —being the result of rotating \mathcal{C} —also satisfies the covering property. This will be important to keep in mind when we describe the transmission scheme.

Also note that, for each fixed $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the codewords $\{\mathbf{X}(m, t)\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}}$ —which are the result of applying different random rotations to the same element of \mathcal{C} —are independent and uniformly distributed over the sphere. This observation will be crucial to our analysis of the probability of error.

We next describe the transmission of some $m \in \mathcal{M}$. Upon observing the noise Z^n , the helper seeks some $T \in \mathcal{T}$ such that the angle between $\mathbf{X}(m, T)$ and Z^n does not exceed θ_0 . Such a T exists because $\mathcal{C}(m)$ inherits the covering property from \mathcal{C} . This T (or one of those satisfying the requirement) is revealed to both the encoder and the decoder, with the former now transmitting $\mathbf{x}(m, T)$.

The decoder—based on its observation Y^n and the help T —produces

$$\hat{M} = \arg \min_{m' \in \mathcal{M}} \|Y^n - \mathbf{x}(m', T)\|. \quad (19)$$

We next analyze the probability of error of our scheme. Set

$$\theta = \angle(X^n, Z^n) \quad (20)$$

$$\leq \theta_0 \quad (21)$$

where the inequality follows from our choice of T . In terms of θ ,

$$\|Y^n\|^2 = \|X^n\|^2 + \|Z^n\|^2 + 2\|X^n\|\|Z^n\|\cos\theta. \quad (22)$$

Setting

$$\alpha = \angle(X^n, Y^n) \quad (23)$$

we observe that

$$\sin \alpha = \frac{\|Z^n\|}{\|Y^n\|} \sin \theta \quad (24)$$

$$= \left(\sqrt{\frac{\|X^n\|^2}{\|Z^n\|^2} + 1 + 2 \frac{\|X^n\|}{\|Z^n\|} \cos \theta} \right)^{-1} \sin \theta. \quad (25)$$

Recalling that $\|X^n\| = \sqrt{n\mathbf{P}}$, we obtain that, whenever $\|Z^n\|^2 \leq n(\sigma^2 + \epsilon)$,

$$\sin \alpha \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon} + 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon}} \cos \theta} \right)^{-1} \sin \theta \quad (26)$$

$$\leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon} + 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon}} \cos \theta_0} \right)^{-1} \sin \theta_0 \quad (27)$$

$$\triangleq \sin \alpha_0, \quad (28)$$

where (27) holds because $\theta \leq \theta_0$ and (28) defines $\alpha_0 \in [0, \pi/2]$.

Having verified that the condition $\|Z^n\|^2 \leq n(\sigma^2 + \epsilon)$ implies that $\angle(X^n, Y^n) \leq \alpha_0$ and that the condition $m' \neq m$ implies that $\mathbf{X}(m', T)$ is independent of Y^n and uniformly distributed over the sphere, we can bound the probability of error as follows:

$$P_e(m) \leq \Pr[\|Z^n\|^2 > n(\sigma^2 + \epsilon)] + \Pr[\exists m' \neq m : \angle(\mathbf{X}(m', T), Y^n) \leq \alpha_0] \quad (29)$$

$$\leq \Pr[\|Z^n\|^2 > n(\sigma^2 + \epsilon)] + 2^{nR} \cdot \frac{C_n(\alpha_0)}{C_n(\pi)} \quad (30)$$

$$= \Pr[\|Z^n\|^2 > n(\sigma^2 + \epsilon)] + 2^{nR} \cdot 2^{-n(\log \sin \alpha_0 + o(1))}, \quad (31)$$

where in (30), we use $C_n(\phi)$ to denote the surface area of a spherical cap of half-angle ϕ on a unit n -sphere for $\phi \in [0, \pi]$; and (31) follows from [8]. The upper bound (31) decays to zero whenever

$$R < -\log \sin \alpha_0 \quad (32)$$

$$= -\log \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon} + 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon}} \cos \theta_0} \right)^{-1} \sin \theta_0 \right) \quad (33)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon} + 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon}} \cos \theta_0 \right) - \log \sin \theta_0 \quad (34)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon} + 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\sigma^2 + \epsilon}} \sqrt{1 - 2^{-2R_h}} \right) + R_h - \epsilon. \quad (35)$$

The direct part is now concluded by letting ϵ tend to zero by employing the random-coding argument that guarantees that there exist deterministic unitary transformation resulting in arbitrarily small probability of error.

3 Converse

We now prove a converse in the presence of a feedback link from the channel output to the encoder. Consider a message M that is drawn equiprobably from \mathcal{M} . Fano's inequality implies that, for any sequence of rate- R coding schemes with rate- R_h message-cognizant assistance and vanishing probabilities of error, there exists some sequence $\{\delta_n\}$ tending to zero such that

$$nR - n\delta_n = H(M) - H(M|Y^n, T) \quad (36)$$

$$= I(M; Y^n, T) \quad (37)$$

$$= I(M; Y^n|T) + I(M; T) \quad (38)$$

$$= h(Y^n|T) - h(Y^n|M, T) + I(M; T) \quad (39)$$

$$= h(Y^n|T) - h(Z^n) + I(Z^n; T|M) + I(M; T) \quad (40)$$

$$= h(Y^n|T) - h(Z^n) + I(Z^n, M; T) \quad (41)$$

$$\leq h(Y^n|T) - h(Z^n) + \log |\mathcal{T}| \quad (42)$$

$$\leq h(Y^n) - h(Z^n) + \log |\mathcal{T}| \quad (43)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^n h(Y_k) - h(Z^n) + \log |\mathcal{T}|, \quad (44)$$

where (40) can be justified as follows:

$$h(Y^n|M, T) = \sum_{k=1}^n h(Y_k|M, T, Y^{k-1}) \quad (45)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n h(Y_k - X_k|M, T, Y^{k-1}) \quad (46)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n h(Z_k|M, T, Y^{k-1}) \quad (47)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n h(Z_k) - \sum_{k=1}^n I(Z_k; M, T, Y^{k-1}) \quad (48)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n h(Z_k) - \sum_{k=1}^n I(Z_k; M, T, Z^{k-1}) \quad (49)$$

$$= h(Z^n) - \sum_{k=1}^n I(Z_k; M, T, Z^{k-1}) \quad (50)$$

$$= h(Z^n) - I(Z^n; T|M) \quad (51)$$

where (46) holds because X_k is a function of (M, T, Y^{k-1}) ; (49) holds because there is a bijection between (M, T, Y^{k-1}) and (M, T, Z^{k-1}) ; and (50) holds because

$$\sum_{k=1}^n I(Z_k; M, T, Z^{k-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^n I(Z_k; M, T|Z^{k-1}) \quad (52)$$

$$= I(Z^n; M, T) \quad (53)$$

$$= I(Z^n; T|M). \quad (54)$$

Having justified (44), it remains to upper-bound its RHS. We begin by bounding $I(X_k; Z_k)$ in two different ways. The first upper-bounds it:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n I(X_k; Z_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n I(X_k, M, T, Z^{k-1}; Z_k) \quad (55)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n I(M, T, Z^{k-1}; Z_k) \quad (56)$$

$$= I(Z^n; T|M) \quad (57)$$

$$\leq \log |\mathcal{T}| \quad (58)$$

$$= nR_h, \quad (59)$$

where (56) holds because X_k is a function of (M, T, Z^{k-1}) ; and (57) follows from (54).

The second lower-bounds it:

$$I(X_k; Z_k) = h(Z_k) - h(Z_k|X_k) \quad (60)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e\sigma^2) - h(Z_k|X_k) \quad (61)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e\sigma^2) - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e\sigma^2(1 - \rho_k^2)) \quad (62)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \log(1 - \rho_k^2), \quad (63)$$

where in (62) we define $\rho_k \in [-1, 1]$ to be the correlation coefficient between X_k and Z_k , and the inequality follows from [9, Problem 2.7].

From the two bounds (59) and (63),

$$R_h \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n -\frac{1}{2} \log(1 - \rho_k^2) \quad (64)$$

$$\geq -\frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \rho_k^2 \right) \quad (65)$$

where (65) follows from Jensen's inequality and the concavity of the logarithmic function. Hence,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \rho_k^2 \leq n(1 - 2^{-2R_h}). \quad (66)$$

We now use this inequality to upper-bound the sum on the RHS of (44). For each k

$$\text{Var}[Y_k] = \text{Var}[X_k + Z_k] \quad (67)$$

$$= \text{Var}[X_k] + \text{Var}[Z_k] + 2\sqrt{\text{Var}[X_k] \text{Var}[Z_k]} \rho_k, \quad (68)$$

so

$$\sum_{k=1}^n h(Y_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e \text{Var}[Y_k]) \quad (69)$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Var}[Y_k] \right) \quad (70)$$

$$= n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\text{Var}[X_k] + \text{Var}[Z_k] + 2\sqrt{\text{Var}[X_k] \text{Var}[Z_k] \rho_k} \right) \right) \quad (71)$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E}[X_k^2] + \text{Var}[Z_k] + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X_k^2] \text{Var}[Z_k] |\rho_k|} \right) \right) \quad (72)$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \left(\mathbb{P} + \sigma^2 + \frac{2\sigma}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X_k^2] |\rho_k|} \right) \right) \quad (73)$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \left(\mathbb{P} + \sigma^2 + \frac{2\sigma}{n} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_k^2]} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^n \rho_k^2} \right) \right) \quad (74)$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \left(\mathbb{P} + \sigma^2 + \frac{2\sigma}{n} \sqrt{n\mathbb{P}} \sqrt{n(1 - 2^{-2R_h})} \right) \right) \quad (75)$$

$$= n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \left(\mathbb{P} + \sigma^2 + 2\sigma \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(1 - 2^{-2R_h})} \right) \right) \quad (76)$$

where (70) follows from the concavity of the logarithmic function; (74) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality; and (75) follows from (66).

Continuing from (44),

$$nR - n\delta_n \leq \sum_{k=1}^n h(Y_k) - \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi e \sigma^2) + nR_h \quad (77)$$

$$\leq n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \left(\mathbb{P} + \sigma^2 + 2\sigma \sqrt{\mathbb{P}(1 - 2^{-2R_h})} \right) \right) - \frac{n}{2} \log(2\pi e \sigma^2) + nR_h \quad (78)$$

$$= n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \mathbb{A} + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{A}(1 - 2^{-2R_h})} \right) + nR_h. \quad (79)$$

Diving both sides of the inequality by n and letting n tend to infinity yields the desired inequality

$$R \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + \mathbb{A} + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{A}(1 - 2^{-2R_h})} \right) + R_h. \quad (80)$$

4 A Feedback Scheme for a Message-Oblivious Helper

We next prove Theorem 2 by proposing a feedback scheme with a helper that is incognizant of the message. The scheme is reminiscent of the Schalkwijk-Kailath scheme [10], [11], albeit with only one use of the feedback link. For notational reasons, we consider transmission with blocks of length $n + 1$ and denote the corresponding channel inputs X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n for positive integers n . In broad brushstrokes, the idea is the following: We map the message m to X_0 using an injective mapping,

so that from X_0 one could recover the message. The problem is, of course, that the receiver has no access to X_0 but only to Y_0 , i.e., to the sum of X_0 and the noise sample Z_0 . This noise sample, however, is known to the encoder as of time 1, because it is simply the difference between Y_0 and X_0 , and the former is revealed to the encoder after time zero. Moreover, the noise sample Z_0 is known to the helper ahead of time, and *a fortiori* as of time 1. We can then think about Z_0 as a new message that is to be conveyed to the receiver using X_1, \dots, X_n with this message being known to both helper and encoder. The idea is to then invoke Theorem 1 for the transmission of Z_0 in the time slots 1 through n . The noise sample Z_0 is, of course, continuous, so there are some quantization issues to be addressed.

To address this, we use a construction somewhat similar to the one in [3, Section 5.2]: For notational reasons we now assume that the message set is $\{0, \dots, 2^{nR} - 1\}$ (i.e., starting at zero) and assume that 2^{nR} is an integer (in order to be able to write 2^{nR} instead of $\lfloor 2^{nR} \rfloor$).

To convey some message $m \in \mathcal{M}$, the encoder transmits at time zero the symbol

$$X_0 = X_0(m) = m \cdot \frac{\sqrt{P}}{2^{nR}}. \quad (81)$$

The decoder observes $Y_0 = X_0 + Z_0$, and the encoder—thanks to the feedback link—can calculate $Z_0 (= Y_0 - X_0)$ after time-0. Using the symbols X_1, \dots, X_n , the encoder attempts to convey to the decoder a quantized version of Z_0 or, more precisely, the integer

$$M' = \left\lfloor Z_0 \cdot \frac{2^{nR}}{\sqrt{P}} \right\rfloor \bmod 2^{nR}, \quad (82)$$

which is a function of Z_0 and hence is also known to the helper. It does so while ignoring the feedback link. The feedback link is thus used by our scheme only to convey Y_0 to the encoder before time-1.

Since, as of time-1, the integer $M' \in \mathcal{M}$ is known to both encoder and helper, we can employ a blocklength- n coding scheme with message-cognizant helper as in Theorem 1 to send M' using X_1, \dots, X_n with arbitrarily small probability of error. With the receiver's guess of M' (based on Y_1, \dots, Y_n) denoted \hat{M}' , the receiver then guesses that the transmitted message was

$$\hat{M} = \left\lfloor Y_0 \cdot \frac{2^{nR}}{\sqrt{P}} - \hat{M}' \right\rfloor \bmod 2^{nR}. \quad (83)$$

As we next argue, if the decoder recovers M' correctly, i.e., if $\hat{M}' = M'$, then its guess \hat{M} of m is correct, because in this case

$$\hat{M} = \left\lfloor (X_0 + Z_0) \cdot \frac{2^{nR}}{\sqrt{P}} - M' \right\rfloor \bmod 2^{nR} \quad (84)$$

$$= \left\lfloor m + Z_0 \cdot \frac{2^{nR}}{\sqrt{P}} - M' \right\rfloor \bmod 2^{nR} \quad (85)$$

$$= m + \left\lfloor Z_0 \cdot \frac{2^{nR}}{\sqrt{P}} \right\rfloor - M' \pmod{2^{nR}} \quad (86)$$

$$= m, \quad (87)$$

where (86) holds because m and M' are both integers. The probability of error in reconstructing m is thus upper bounded by the probability of error in reconstructing M' , which, by Theorem 1, can be made arbitrarily small whenever

$$R < \frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + A + 2\sqrt{A(1 - 2^{-2R_h})} \right) + R_h. \quad (88)$$

This proves the achievability part of Theorem 2.

References

- [1] S. I. Bross, A. Lapidoth, and G. Marti, “Decoder-assisted communications over additive noise channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 4150–4161, 2020.
- [2] A. Lapidoth and G. Marti, “Encoder-assisted communications over additive noise channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 6607–6616, 2020.
- [3] A. Lapidoth and Y. Yan, “The listsize capacity of the Gaussian channel with decoder assistance,” *Entropy*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2022.
- [4] N. Merhav, “On error exponents of encoder-assisted communication systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 11, pp. 7019–7029, 2021.
- [5] A. Lapidoth and L. Wang, “State-dependent DMC with a causal helper,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, to appear.
- [6] A. Khina and N. Merhav, “Modulation and estimation with a helper,” 2023, arXiv:2309.04277 [cs.IT].
- [7] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2nd ed., 2006.
- [8] A. D. Wyner, “Random packings and coverings of the unit n -sphere,” *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 46, no. 9, pp. 2111–2118, 1967.
- [9] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- [10] J. Schalkwijk and T. Kailath, “A coding scheme for additive noise channels with feedback—I: No bandwidth constraint,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 172–182, 1966.
- [11] R. G. Gallager and B. Nakiboğlu, “Variations on a theme by Schalkwijk and Kailath,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 6–17, 2010.