

Coded Many-User Multiple Access via Approximate Message Passing

Xiaoqi Liu* Kuan Hsieh[†] Ramji Venkataramanan*

July 2, 2024

Abstract

We consider communication over the Gaussian multiple-access channel in the regime where the number of users grows linearly with the codeword length. In this regime, schemes based on sparse superposition coding can achieve a near-optimal tradeoff between spectral efficiency and signal-to-noise ratio. However, these schemes are feasible only for small values of user payload. This paper investigates efficient schemes for larger user payloads, focusing on coded CDMA schemes where each user's information is encoded via a linear code before being modulated with a signature sequence. We propose an efficient approximate message passing (AMP) decoder that can be tailored to the structure of the linear code, and provide an exact asymptotic characterization of its performance. Based on this result, we consider a decoder that integrates AMP and belief propagation and characterize its tradeoff between spectral efficiency and signal-to-noise ratio, for a given target error rate. Simulation results show that the decoder achieves state-of-the-art performance at finite lengths, with a coded CDMA scheme defined using LDPC codes and a spatially coupled matrix of signature sequences.

1 Introduction

We consider communication over an L -user Gaussian multiple access channel (GMAC), which has output of the form

$$\mathbf{y} = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbf{c}_{\ell} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (1)$$

over n channel uses. Here $\mathbf{c}_{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the codeword of the ℓ -th user and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ is the channel noise. Motivated by modern applications in machine-type communications, a number of recent works have studied the GMAC in the *many-user* or *many-access* setting, where the number of users L grows with the block length n [1–4].

In this paper, we study the many-user regime where $L, n \rightarrow \infty$ with the user density $\mu := L/n$ converging to a constant. Each user transmits a fixed number of bits k (payload) under a constant energy-per-information-bit constraint $\|\mathbf{c}_{\ell}\|_2^2/k \leq E_b$. The spectral efficiency is the total user payload per channel use, denoted by $S = (Lk)/n = \mu k$. In this regime, a key question is to understand the tradeoff between user density (or spectral efficiency), the signal-to-noise ratio E_b/N_0 , and the

*X. Liu and R. Venkataramanan are with the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, UK. Email: {x1394, rv285}@cam.ac.uk.

[†]K. Hsieh is with Luminance Technologies Ltd, UK. Email: kuanhsieh95@gmail.com.

This paper will be presented in part at the 2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory.

probability of decoding error. Here $N_0 = 2\sigma^2$ is the noise spectral density. A popular measure of decoding performance is the per-user probability of error (PUPE), defined as

$$\text{PUPE} := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{c}_\ell \neq \hat{\mathbf{c}}_\ell), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_\ell$ is the decoded codeword for user ℓ .

Polyanskiy [2] and Zadik et al. [3] obtained converse and achievability bounds on the minimum E_b/N_0 required to achieve $\text{PUPE} \leq \epsilon$ for a given $\epsilon > 0$, when the user density μ and user payload k are fixed. These bounds were extended to the multiple-access channels with Rayleigh fading in [5, 6]. The achievability bounds in these works are obtained using Gaussian random codebooks and joint maximum-likelihood decoding, which is computationally infeasible. In contrast, the focus of our work is computationally efficient schemes for which the tradeoff above can be precisely characterized.

Coding schemes based on sparse superposition coding Sparse superposition codes were introduced by Barron and Joseph [7, 8] for the *single-user* Gaussian channel, but also give a useful framework for efficient communication over the many-user GMAC [9]. We briefly review sparse superposition coding in the context of the GMAC. The codeword for user $\ell \in [L]$ is constructed as $\mathbf{c}_\ell = \mathbf{A}_\ell \mathbf{x}_\ell$, where $\mathbf{A}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times B}$ is a random matrix and $\mathbf{x}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^B$ is a message vector with exactly one nonzero entry. (The value of the nonzero entry is pre-specified, and chosen to satisfy the energy constraint.) Since there are B choices for the location of the nonzero, each user transmits $\log_2 B$ bits in n uses of the GMAC, and the spectral efficiency is $S = \mu \log_2 B$. For this construction, the combined channel model can be written as

$$\mathbf{y} = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbf{A}_\ell \mathbf{x}_\ell + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (3)$$

where the design matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times LB}$ is the horizontal concatenation of matrices $\mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_L$, and the message vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{LB}$ is the concatenation of vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_L$.

The decoding problem is to recover the message vector \mathbf{x} from (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{A}) . An efficient Approximate Message Passing (AMP) decoder for this sparse superposition GMAC scheme was analyzed in [9]. AMP is a family of iterative algorithms that has its origins in relaxations of belief propagation [10–12]. An attractive feature of AMP decoding is that it allows an exact asymptotic characterization of its error performance through a deterministic recursion called ‘state evolution’. For both i.i.d. and spatially coupled choices of the design \mathbf{A} , the asymptotic tradeoff achieved by the AMP decoder between the spectral efficiency and E_b/N_0 was precisely characterized in [9] (for a target PUPE). In fact, [9] analyzed a more general scheme where each user’s message vector \mathbf{x}_ℓ in (3) can be drawn from a general discrete prior on \mathbb{R}^B ; sparse superposition coding is an important special case of this scheme.

Fig. 1a shows the tradeoff for the sparse superposition scheme with AMP decoding for user payload $k = 8$ and target $\text{PUPE} = 10^{-4}$. We observe that the performance of the scheme with a spatially coupled design (dotted black plot) is close to the converse bound (red plot), i.e., it is nearly optimal for $S > 1.6$, and is uniformly better than the achievability bound from [3] (solid black plot). However, sparse superposition coding is challenging to scale to large user payloads, e.g., $k = 240$ bits. To see this, we recall that each user has a message vector of size $B = 2^k$, so the size of the design matrix, and hence the AMP decoding complexity, grows exponentially with k . One solution is to divide each user’s payload of k bits into smaller chunks of \tilde{k} bits, which are




Figure 1: Asymptotic performance of spatially coupled sparse superposition scheme from [9] (dotted black) and that of uncoded binary CDMA scheme (dashed black) compared with the asymptotic achievability and converse bounds from [3] (solid black and red), for user payload $k = 8$ or $k = 240$, and target PUPE = 10^{-4} .

transmitted sequentially using k/\tilde{k} blocks of transmission. Fig. 1b illustrates the performance for $k = 240$ and $\tilde{k} = 8$. We observe that there is now a significant gap between the performance of the sparse superposition scheme and the achievability and converse bounds from [3]. This motivates the question studied in this paper: for large payloads, can we construct efficient coding schemes whose asymptotic performance is closer to the bounds?

Coding schemes based on CDMA Our starting point is binary CDMA, where each user $\ell \in [L]$ transmits one bit of information by modulating a signature sequence (or spreading sequence) $\mathbf{a}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., the codeword $\mathbf{c}_\ell = \mathbf{a}_\ell x_\ell$ where $x_\ell \in \{\pm\sqrt{E}\}$. The decoding problem is to recover the vector of information symbols $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_L]^\top$ from the channel output vector

$$\mathbf{y} = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbf{a}_\ell x_\ell + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_L] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times L}$ is the matrix of signature sequences. We have used the same notation as in (3) to highlight that binary CDMA is similar to the model in (3), with $B = 1$.

The optimal spectral efficiency of CDMA in the large system limit (with random signature sequences) has been studied in a number of works, e.g., [13–17]. Assuming the signature sequences are i.i.d. sub-Gaussian, the best known technique for efficiently decoding \mathbf{x} from \mathbf{y} in (4) is AMP [18]. If each user wishes to transmit $k > 1$ bits in n channel uses, the binary CDMA scheme requires k blocks of transmission, with each block (and each signature sequence) having length n/k . For large user payloads k , the binary CDMA with AMP decoding performs poorly, with a tradeoff curve that is significantly worse than the sparse superposition scheme.

Main contributions The binary CDMA scheme described above transmits *uncoded* user information. In this paper, we show how a significantly better performance tradeoff can be obtained

using a concatenated coding scheme in which each user’s information sequence is first encoded using a linear code before being multiplied with the signature sequence. We propose a flexible AMP decoder that can be tailored to the structure of the linear code, and provide an exact asymptotic characterization of its error performance (Theorems 1 and 2). Specifically, we show how a decoder for the underlying code, such as a maximum-likelihood or a belief propagation decoder, can be incorporated within the AMP algorithm with rigorous asymptotic guarantees (Corollary 1). Simulation results validate the theory and demonstrate the benefits of the concatenated scheme at finite lengths.

We will use a *spatially coupled* construction for the design matrix \mathbf{A} . Spatial coupling was originally proposed [19] as a way to improve the decoding threshold of LDPC codes. Spatially coupled LDPC codes with belief propagation have since been shown to be capacity-achieving decoding for a large class of binary-input channels [20]. Spatially coupled sparse superposition codes with AMP decoding have also been shown to be capacity-achieving, for both AWGN [21, 22] and a broader class of channels [23]. Moreover, spatially coupled designs (with estimation via AMP) achieve Bayes-optimal error for both linear [24–26] and generalized linear models [27]. To keep the exposition simple, we first present the AMP decoder and analysis for the i.i.d. Gaussian design in Sections 3 and 4 before generalizing the results to spatially coupled designs in Section 5.

We emphasize that our setting is distinct from unsourced random access over the GMAC [2, 28–30], where all the users share the same codebook and only a subset of them are active. In our case, each user has a distinct signature sequence and all of them are active. While the latter is particularly relevant in designing grant-free communication systems, coding schemes for this setting often rely on dividing a common codebook into sections for different users. Extending the ideas in this paper to unsourced random access is an interesting direction for future work.

Related work AMP algorithms were first proposed for compressed sensing [12, 18] and its variants [31]. These algorithms have since been applied to a range of problems including estimation in generalized linear models and low-rank matrix estimation. We refer the interested reader to [32] for a survey. In the context of communication over AWGN channels, AMP has been used as a decoder for sparse superposition codes (SPARCs) [21, 33, 34] and for compressed coding [35]. For the GMAC, in addition to efficient schemes for smaller user payloads [9], spatially coupled SPARCs have been used to obtain improved achievability bounds [36]. SPARC-based concatenated schemes with AMP decoding have been proposed for both single-user AWGN channels [37–39] and unsourced random access [29, 30].

In most of these concatenated schemes [29, 35, 37, 38] the AMP decoder for SPARCs does not explicitly use the structure of the outer code (which is decoded separately). Two key exceptions are the SPARC-LDPC concatenated schemes in [30, 39], which use an AMP decoding algorithm with an integrated BP denoiser. Drawing inspiration from these works, in Section 4.3 we propose an AMP decoder with a BP denoiser for our concatenated scheme. Our scheme and its decoder differ from those in [30, 39] in a few important ways: i) we do not use the SPARC message structure, and ii) we treat each user’s codeword as a row of a signal matrix and devise an AMP algorithm with matrix iterates, a notable deviation from prior schemes where AMP operates on vectors.

Notation We write $[L]$ for the set $\{1, \dots, L\}$. We use bold uppercase letters for matrices, bold lowercase for vectors, and plain font for scalars. We write \mathbf{a}_ℓ for the ℓ -th row or column of \mathbf{A} depending on the context, and $a_{\ell,i}$ for its i th component. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ returns a column vector when applied to a column vector, and likewise for row vectors.




Figure 2: Concatenated coding scheme for GMAC

2 Concatenated coding scheme

The k -bit message of user ℓ , denoted by $\mathbf{u}_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^k$, is mapped to a GMAC codeword $\mathbf{c}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in two steps. First, a rate k/d linear code with generator matrix $\mathbf{G} \in \{0, 1\}^{d \times k}$ is used to produce a d -bit binary codeword $\mathbf{G}\mathbf{u}_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^d$. Each 0 code bit is then mapped to \sqrt{E} and each 1 bit code bit to $-\sqrt{E}$ to produce $\mathbf{x}_\ell \in \{\pm\sqrt{E}\}^d$. The magnitude \sqrt{E} of each BPSK symbol will be specified later in terms of the energy per bit constraint E_b . In the second step of encoding, for each user ℓ , we take the outer-product of \mathbf{x}_ℓ with a signature sequence $\mathbf{a}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n}}$, where $\tilde{n} := n/d$. This yields a matrix $\mathbf{C}_\ell = \mathbf{a}_\ell \mathbf{x}_\ell^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times d}$. The final length- n codeword transmitted by user ℓ is simply $\mathbf{c}_\ell = \text{vectorize}(\mathbf{C}_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_L]^\top \in \{\pm\sqrt{E}\}^{L \times d}$ be the signal matrix whose ℓ th row \mathbf{x}_ℓ is the bipolar codeword of user ℓ . Let $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_L] \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times L}$ be the design matrix whose columns are the signature sequences. Then the channel output in (1) can be rewritten into matrix form:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbf{a}_\ell \mathbf{x}_\ell^\top + \mathcal{E} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} + \mathcal{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times d}. \quad (5)$$

See Fig. 2 for an illustration.

2.1 Assumptions

We consider random signature sequences with independent entries and expected squared ℓ_2 -norm of one, i.e., $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{a}_\ell\|_2^2 = 1$. For example, with i.i.d. Gaussian signature sequences, the entries of the design matrix are $A_{i\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1/\tilde{n})$ for $i \in [\tilde{n}]$, $\ell \in [L]$. Due to concentration of measure, this implies that $\|\mathbf{a}_\ell\|_2^2 \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, the energy-per-bit constraint can be enforced asymptotically by choosing E so that $\|\mathbf{c}_\ell\|_2^2/k = \|\mathbf{a}_\ell \mathbf{x}_\ell^\top\|_F^2/k \rightarrow Ed/k \leq E_b$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We make the natural assumption that the information bits $\mathbf{u}_\ell \in \{0, 1\}^k$ are uniformly random, for each user $\ell \in [L]$. We also assume that the noise variance σ^2 in (1) is known, a mild assumption since the unit-norm signature sequences allow σ^2 to be consistently estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}^2 &= \frac{\|\mathbf{Y}\|_F^2}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [\tilde{n}]} \sum_{j \in [d]} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{\ell \in [L]} A_{i\ell} X_{\ell j} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{Y}\|_F^2}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [\tilde{n}]} \sum_{j \in [d]} \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \mathbb{E} [A_{i\ell}^2] \cdot E \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{Y}\|_F^2}{n} - d\mu E. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the asymptotic limit where $L/n \rightarrow \mu$ as $n, L \rightarrow \infty$, for a user density $\mu > 0$ of constant order. We emphasize that d is fixed and does not scale as $n, L \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore $\tilde{n}/L = (n/d)/L \rightarrow 1/(d\mu)$ is also of constant order.

3 AMP decoder for i.i.d. design

Consider the i.i.d. Gaussian design matrix \mathbf{A} with entries $\stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1/\tilde{n})$. The decoding task is to recover the signal matrix \mathbf{X} from the channel observation \mathbf{Y} in (5), given the design matrix \mathbf{A} and the channel noise variance σ^2 (or its estimate). A good decoder must take advantage of the prior distribution on \mathbf{X} : recall that each row of \mathbf{X} is an independent codeword taking values in $\{\pm\sqrt{E}\}^d$, defined via the underlying rate k/d linear code. The prior distribution of each row of \mathbf{X} induced by the linear code is denoted by $P_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$. Note that $P_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$ assigns equal probability to 2^k vectors in $\{\pm\sqrt{E}\}^d$.

The AMP decoder recursively produces estimates $\mathbf{X}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ of \mathbf{X} for iteration $t \geq 0$. This is done via a sequence of denoising functions η_t that can be tailored to the prior $P_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$. Starting from an initializer $\mathbf{X}^0 = \mathbf{0}_{L \times d}$, for $t \geq 0$ the AMP decoder computes:

$$\mathbf{Z}^t = \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}^t + \frac{1}{\tilde{n}}\mathbf{Z}^{t-1} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^L \eta'_{t-1}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^{t-1}) \right]^\top, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^{t+1} = \eta_t(\mathbf{S}^t), \quad \mathbf{S}^t = \mathbf{X}^t + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{Z}^t, \quad (7)$$

where $\eta_t : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ applies row-wise to matrix inputs, and $\eta'_t(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{d\eta_t(\mathbf{s})}{d\mathbf{s}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the derivative (Jacobian) of η_t . Quantities with negative indices are set to all-zero matrices. When $d = 1$, (6)–(7) reduces to the classical AMP algorithm [18] for estimating a vector signal in a linear model.

State Evolution (SE) As $n, L \rightarrow \infty$ (with $\frac{L}{n} \rightarrow \mu$), the memory term $\frac{1}{\tilde{n}}\mathbf{Z}^{t-1} \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^L \eta'_{t-1}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^{t-1}) \right]^\top$ term in (6) ensures that the row-wise empirical distribution of $\mathbf{Z}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times d}$ converges to a Gaussian $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t)$ for $t \geq 1$. Furthermore, the row-wise empirical distribution of $(\mathbf{S}^t - \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ also converges to the same Gaussian $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t)$. The covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is iteratively defined via the following state evolution (SE) recursion, for $t \geq 0$:

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{t+1} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_d + d\mu \mathbb{E} \left\{ [\eta_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}][\eta_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}]^\top \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Here $\mathbf{g}^t \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t)$ is independent of $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \sim P_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$, and \mathbf{I}_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. The expectation in (8) is with respect to $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and \mathbf{g}^t , and the iteration is initialized with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^0 = (\sigma^2 + d\mu E)\mathbf{I}_d$. We shall refer to (8) as ‘iid-SE’ later on because it is associated with the i.i.d. Gaussian design.

The convergence of the row-wise empirical distribution of \mathbf{S}^t to the law of $\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t$ follows by applying standard results in AMP theory [32,40]. This distributional characterization of \mathbf{S}^t crucially informs the choice of the denoiser η_t . Specifically, for each row $\ell \in [L]$, the role of the denoiser η_t is to estimate the codeword \mathbf{x}_ℓ from an observation in zero-mean Gaussian noise with covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t$. In the next section, we discuss the Bayes-optimal denoiser and two other sub-optimal but computationally efficient denoisers.

First, we provide a performance characterization of the AMP decoder with a generic Lipschitz-continuous denoiser in Theorem 1. Decoding performance after t iterations of AMP decoding can be measured via either the user-error rate $\text{UER} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{1}\{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1} \neq \mathbf{x}_\ell\}$, or the bit-error rate $\text{BER} = \frac{1}{Ld} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{1}\{\hat{x}_{\ell,j}^{t+1} \neq x_{\ell,j}\}$. Here $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1} = h_t(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)$ is a hard-decision estimate of the

codeword \mathbf{x}_ℓ , produced using a suitable function h_t , and $\hat{x}_{\ell,j}^{t+1}$ is the j th entry of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1}$. For example, h_t may quantize each entry of $\mathbf{x}_\ell^{t+1} = \eta_t(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)$ to a value in $\{\pm\sqrt{E}\}$. We note that the PUPE defined in (2) is the expected value of the UER.

Theorem 1 (Asymptotic UER and BER with i.i.d. design). *Consider the concatenated scheme with an i.i.d. Gaussian design matrix, with the assumptions in Section 2.1, and the AMP decoding algorithm in (6)–(7) with Lipschitz continuous denoisers $\eta_t : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, for $t \geq 1$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1} = h_t(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)$ be the hard-decision estimate of \mathbf{x}_ℓ in iteration t . The asymptotic UER and BER in iteration t satisfy the following almost surely, for $t \geq 0$:*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{UER} := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{1} \{ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1} \neq \mathbf{x}_\ell \} = \mathbb{P} (h_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t) \neq \bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (9)$$

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{BER} := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{Ld} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{1} \{ \hat{x}_{\ell,j}^{t+1} \neq x_{\ell,j} \} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P} \left([h_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t)]_j \neq \bar{x}_j \right). \quad (10)$$

Here $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \sim P_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$ and $\mathbf{g}^t \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t)$ are independent, with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t$ defined by the state evolution recursion in (8). The limit is taken as $n, L \rightarrow \infty$ with $L/n \rightarrow \mu$.

Proof. The proof is given in Section 6.1. □

Theorem 1 states that in each iteration t , the empirical UER and BER of the AMP decoder with a Lipschitz denoiser asymptotically converge to the deterministic quantities on the RHS of (9) and (10), which involve the d -dimensional SE random vectors $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ and \mathbf{g}^t .

4 Choice of AMP denoiser η_t

4.1 Bayes-optimal denoiser

Since the row-wise distribution of \mathbf{S}^t converges to the law of $\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t$, the Bayes-optimal or minimum mean squared error (MMSE) denoiser η_t^{Bayes} estimates each row \mathbf{X} as the following conditional expectation. For $\ell \in [L]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_\ell^{t+1} &= \eta_t^{\text{Bayes}}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t) = \mathbb{E} [\bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t = \mathbf{s}_\ell^t] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x}' \cdot \frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}' - 2\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t)^{-1} \mathbf{x}')}{\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}' \in \mathcal{X}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}' - 2\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^t)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}')} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{X} \subset \{\pm\sqrt{E}\}^d$ is the set of 2^k codewords. Since $|\mathcal{X}| = 2^k$, the cost of applying η_t^{Bayes} is $O(2^k d^3)$ which grows exponentially in k . In each iteration t , the decoder can produce a hard-decision maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^t$ from \mathbf{s}_ℓ^t via:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1} = h_t(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}' \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t = \mathbf{s}_\ell^t). \quad (12)$$

In Section 4.4 (Fig. 4) we present numerical results illustrating the performance of AMP with denoiser η_t^{Bayes} for a Hamming code with $d = 7$ and $k = 4$. In practical scenarios where d is of the order of several hundreds or thousands, applying η_t^{Bayes} is not feasible, motivating the use of sub-optimal denoisers with lower computational cost.

4.2 Marginal-MMSE denoiser

A computationally efficient alternative to the Bayes-optimal denoiser is the marginal-MMSE denoiser [29, 37] which acts entry-wise on \mathbf{s}_ℓ^t and returns the entry-wise conditional expectation:

$$\mathbf{x}_\ell^{t+1} = \eta_t^{\text{marginal}}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_1 | \bar{x}_1 + g_1^t = s_{\ell,1}^t] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_d | \bar{x}_d + g_d^t = s_{\ell,d}^t] \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_j | \bar{x}_j + g_j^t = s_{\ell,j}^t] \stackrel{(i)}{=} \sqrt{E} \tanh\left(\sqrt{E} s_{\ell,j}^t / \Sigma_{j,j}^t\right) \quad \text{for } j \in [d]. \quad (13)$$

The equality (i) follows from $g_j^t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{j,j}^t)$ and $p(\bar{x}_j = \sqrt{E}) = p(\bar{x}_j = -\sqrt{E}) = \frac{1}{2}$ due to the linearity of the outer code. A hard decision estimate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1}$ can be obtained by quantizing each entry of \mathbf{x}_ℓ^{t+1} to $\{\pm\sqrt{E}\}$.

This marginal denoiser has an $O(d)$ computational cost which is linear in d , but it ignores the parity structure of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, which is useful prior knowledge that can help reconstruction. One way to address this is by using the output of the AMP decoder as input to a channel decoder for the outer code, as in [29, 38]. In the next subsection, we show how to improve on this approach. Considering an outer LDPC code, we use an AMP denoiser that fully integrates BP decoding.

4.3 Belief Propagation (BP) denoiser

Assume that the binary linear code used to define the concatenated scheme is an LDPC code. We propose a BP denoiser η_t^{BP} which exploits the parity structure of the LDPC code in each AMP iteration by performing a few rounds of BP on the associated factor graph. Like the other denoisers above, η_t^{BP} acts row-wise on the effective observation $\mathbf{S}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. For $\ell \in [L]$, it produces the updated AMP estimate \mathbf{x}_ℓ^{t+1} from \mathbf{s}_ℓ^t as follows, using \mathcal{R} rounds of BP.

1) For each variable node $j \in [d]$ and check node $i \in [d - k]$, initialize variable-to-check messages (in log-likelihood ratio format) as:

$$L_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)} = \ln \left[\frac{p(s_{\ell,j}^t | x_{\ell,j} = +\sqrt{E})}{p(s_{\ell,j}^t | x_{\ell,j} = -\sqrt{E})} \right] = \frac{2\sqrt{E}s_{\ell,j}^t}{\Sigma_{j,j}^t} =: L(s_{\ell,j}^t). \quad (14)$$

This initialization follows the distributional assumption $s_{\ell,j}^t \stackrel{d}{=} \bar{x}_j + g_j^t$, where $g_j^t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{j,j}^t)$ and $p(\bar{x}_j = \sqrt{E}) = p(\bar{x}_j = -\sqrt{E}) = \frac{1}{2}$. Note that, similar to the marginal-MMSE denoiser in (13), only the diagonal entries of the covariance matrix Σ^t , $\Sigma_{j,j}^t$ for $j \in [d]$, are used in (14).

2) Let $N(i)$ denote the set of neighbouring nodes of node i . For round $1 \leq r \leq \mathcal{R}$, compute the check-to-variable and variable-to-check messages, denoted by $L_{i \rightarrow j}^{(r)}$ and $L_{j \rightarrow i}^{(r)}$, as:

$$L_{i \rightarrow j}^{(r)} = 2 \tanh^{-1} \left[\prod_{j' \in N(i) \setminus j} \tanh \left(\frac{1}{2} L_{j' \rightarrow i}^{(r-1)} \right) \right], \quad (15)$$

$$L_{j \rightarrow i}^{(r)} = L(s_{\ell,j}^t) + \sum_{i' \in N(j) \setminus i} L_{i' \rightarrow j}^{(r)}. \quad (16)$$

3) Terminate BP after \mathcal{R} rounds by computing the final log-likelihood ratio for each variable node $j \in [d]$:

$$L_j^{(\mathcal{R})} = L(s_{\ell,j}^t) + \sum_{i \in N(j)} L_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\mathcal{R})}. \quad (17)$$

Equations (15)–(17) are the standard BP updates for an LDPC code [41].

4) Compute the updated AMP estimate $\mathbf{x}_\ell^{t+1} = \eta_t^{\text{BP}}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)$, where for $j \in [d]$,

$$[\eta_t^{\text{BP}}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)]_j = \sqrt{E} \frac{\exp(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})})}{1 + \exp(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})})} - \sqrt{E} \frac{1}{1 + \exp(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})})} = \sqrt{E} \tanh(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})}/2). \quad (18)$$

The RHS above is obtained by converting the final log-likelihood ratio (17) to a conditional expectation, recalling that $x_{\ell,j}$ takes values in $\{\pm\sqrt{E}\}$. Following the standard interpretation of BP as approximating the bit-wise marginal posterior probabilities [41], the expression in (18) can be viewed as an approximation to

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{x}_j \mid \bar{x}_j + g_j^t = s_{\ell,j}^t, \text{ parities specified by } N(j) \text{ are satisfied}].$$

We highlight the contrast between the conditional expectation above and the one in (13), which does not use the parity check constraints. As with the marginal-MMSE denoiser, a hard-decision estimate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1}$ can be obtained by quantizing each entry of \mathbf{x}_ℓ^{t+1} to $\{\pm\sqrt{E}\}$. The computational cost of η_t^{BP} is $O(d\mathcal{R})$ which is linear in d .

Computing the derivative of η_t While the derivative η_t' for the memory term can be easily calculated for η_t^{Bayes} and η_t^{marginal} via direct differentiation, the derivative for η_t^{BP} is less obvious because it involves \mathcal{R} rounds of BP updates (15)–(17). Nevertheless, using the approach in [30, 39], the derivative can be derived in closed form and computed efficiently, provided the number of BP rounds \mathcal{R} is less than the girth of the LDPC factor graph.

Lemma 1 (Jacobian of η_t^{BP}). *For $t \geq 1$, consider the AMP decoder with denoiser $\eta_t^{\text{BP}}: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, where BP is performed for fewer rounds than the girth of the LDPC factor graph. Let*

$$\mathbf{D} := \frac{d\eta_t^{\text{BP}}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)}{d\mathbf{s}_\ell^t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (19)$$

Then for $j, h \in [d]$ and $j \neq h$,

$$D_{j,j} = \frac{1}{\Sigma_{j,j}^t} \left(E - [\eta_t^{\text{BP}}(s_\ell^t)]_j^2 \right), \quad D_{j,h} = 0. \quad (20)$$

Proof. With \mathcal{R} denoting the number of BP rounds, from (18) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{j,j} &= \frac{d[\eta_t^{\text{BP}}(s_\ell^t)]_j}{ds_{\ell,j}^t} = \frac{d}{dL_j^{(\mathcal{R})}} \left(\sqrt{E} \cdot \frac{\exp(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})}) - 1}{1 + \exp(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})})} \right) \cdot \frac{dL_j^{(\mathcal{R})}}{ds_{\ell,j}^t} \\ &\stackrel{\text{(i)}}{=} \frac{2\sqrt{E} \exp(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})})}{(1 + \exp(L_j^{(\mathcal{R})}))^2} \cdot \frac{2\sqrt{E}}{\Sigma_{j,j}^t} \\ &= \left(E - [\eta_t^{\text{BP}}(s_\ell^t)]_j^2 \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\Sigma_{j,j}^t} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where (i) uses the fact that

$$\frac{dL_j^{(\mathcal{R})}}{ds_{\ell,j}^t} \stackrel{\text{(ii)}}{=} \frac{dL(s_{\ell,j}^t)}{ds_{\ell,j}^t} \stackrel{\text{(iii)}}{=} \frac{2\sqrt{E}}{\Sigma_{j,j}^t}. \quad (22)$$




Figure 3: Message $L_{i \rightarrow j}$ depends on $\{L_{j' \rightarrow i}\}$ which in turn depend on $\{s_{\ell, j'}^t\}$ and other unlabelled messages in blue, excluding $s_{\ell, j}^t$. The unlabelled messages in blue are independent of $s_{\ell, j}^t$ since BP is performed for fewer rounds than girth of the graph.

The equality (iii) follows from (14), and (ii) uses (17), noting that each summand $L_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\mathcal{R})}$ is a function of the extrinsic messages $\{L_{j' \rightarrow i}^{(\mathcal{R}-1)}\}$ for $j' \in N(i) \setminus j$. The key observation is that the messages $\{L_{j' \rightarrow i}^{(\mathcal{R}-1)}\}$ for $j' \in N(i) \setminus j$ do not depend on $s_{\ell, j}^t$, since \mathcal{R} is smaller than the girth of the graph. We illustrate this in Fig. 3. Thus, none of the summands $L_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\mathcal{R})}$ depends on $s_{\ell, j}^t$ resulting in $\frac{d}{ds_{\ell, j}^t} \sum_{i \in N(j)} L_{i \rightarrow j}^{(\mathcal{R})} = 0$. Similarly we can show that $D_{j, h} = 0$ for $j \neq h$. \square

Lemma 1 implies that the characterization of the limiting UER and BER in Theorem 1 holds for AMP decoding with η_t^{BP} as the denoiser. Formally, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *The asymptotic guarantees in Theorem 1 hold for the AMP decoder with any of the three denoisers: η_t^{Bayes} , η_t^{marginal} , and for η_t^{BP} assuming that the number of BP rounds is less than the girth of the LDPC factor graph.*

Proof. It can be verified by direct differentiation that the derivatives of η_t^{Bayes} and η_t^{marginal} are bounded. For η_t^{BP} , we only need to show that $D_{j, j}$ in (20) is bounded for $j \in [d]$. This follows by observing that $\sum_{j, j}^t > \sigma^2$ (from (8)) and $[\eta_t^{\text{BP}}(s_{\ell}^t)]_j^2 < E$ (from (18)). \square

4.4 Numerical results for i.i.d. design

In this section, we numerically evaluate the tradeoffs achieved by the concatenated coding scheme with an i.i.d. design using different denoisers. For a target BER = 10^{-4} , we plot the maximum spectral efficiency $S = Lk/n = (L/\bar{n})(k/d)$ achievable as a function of signal-to-noise ratio $E_b/N_0 = (Ed/k)/(2\sigma^2)$. We use BER rather than UER since the UER of an uncoded scheme degrades approximately linearly with d . For each setting, we also plot the converse bounds from [3], and the achievability bounds from either [3] or [9] depending on which one yields the larger achievable region without causing computational issues. These bounds can be used to obtain upper and lower bounds on the maximum spectral efficiency achievable for given values of E_b/N_0 and PUPE. To adapt these bounds to target BER (rather than target PUPE), we use the random coding assumption that when a codeword is decoded incorrectly, approximately half of its bits are in error, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\text{BER}] = \frac{1}{2} \text{PUPE}$.

In Figs. 4–6, ‘SE’ refers to curves obtained by using the state evolution result of Theorem 1, and ‘AMP’ (indicated by crosses) refers to points obtained via simulation. Fig. 4 compares the uncoded scheme (i.e., $d = 1$) with the concatenated scheme with a (7, 4) Hamming code, decoded using




Figure 4: Comparison of the uncoded scheme and the concatenated scheme with $(7, 4)$ Hamming outer code and denoiser η_t^{Bayes} . $L = 20000$.

AMP with Bayes-optimal denoiser η_t^{Bayes} . Even this simple code provides a savings of over 1dB in the minimum E_b/N_0 required to achieve positive spectral efficiency, compared to the uncoded scheme as well as the converse bound for $k = 1$.

Figs. 5 and 6 employ LDPC codes from the IEEE 802.11n standards as outer codes (with codeword length $d = 720$ bits). Fig. 5 considers a user payload of $k = 360$ bits and compares the decoding performance of AMP with different denoisers: the marginal-MMSE η_t^{marginal} or the BP denoiser η_t^{BP} which executes 5 rounds of BP per AMP denoising step. The latter outperforms the former by around 7.5dB since η_t^{marginal} does not use the parity constraints of the code. The dotted orange curve in Fig. 5 shows that the performance of AMP with η_t^{marginal} is substantially improved by running a BP decoder (200 rounds) after AMP has converged. This additional BP decoding at the end also improves the performance of η_t^{BP} (blue dotted curve). We observe that the achievable spectral efficiency with $\eta_t^{\text{BP}} + \text{BP}$ is consistently about 40% higher than with $\eta_t^{\text{marginal}} + \text{BP}$.

The dotted black curve in Fig. 5 corresponds to the asymptotic performance of the SPARC-based scheme of [9] with a spatially coupled design and $\tilde{k} = 8$, the highest payload the scheme could handle in our simulations. Hence, to transmit a 360-bit payload, the SPARC-based scheme needs to be used 45 times, with 8 bits transmitted each time. We observe that for smaller spectral efficiency, the SPARC-based scheme is outperformed by our concatenated scheme with BP post-processing (dotted blue curve) by about 2.5dB.

Fig. 6 compares the performance of the concatenated scheme with LDPC codes with different rates: 1/2 and 5/6. The AMP denoiser is η_t^{BP} , and the dotted curves show the effect of adding BP decoding (200 rounds) after AMP convergence. The code with the higher rate 5/6 achieves higher spectral efficiency for large values of E_b/N_0 , but the rate 1/2 code achieves a positive spectral efficiency for smaller E_b/N_0 values, down to 2.5dB. We expect that using an outer LDPC code with a rate lower than 1/2 will enable the concatenated scheme to achieve a positive spectral efficiency at E_b/N_0 values even below 2.5dB.

In Figs. 4–6, the asymptotic performance of AMP, predicted by state evolution, closely tracks




Figure 5: Comparison of marginal-MMSE denoiser η_t^{marginal} (orange) and BP denoiser η_t^{BP} (blue) for decoding LDPC outer code (with fixed rate 1/2). The dotted orange and blue plots correspond to AMP decoding coupled with 200 rounds of BP after AMP has converged. The dotted black curve corresponds to the SPARC-based scheme of [9] with $\tilde{k} = 8$. $L = 2000, k = 360, d = 720$.




Figure 6: Comparison of LDPC outer code with rate 1/2 (blue) or 5/6 (green) under AMP decoding with BP denoiser η_t^{BP} . Dotted curves correspond to AMP decoding coupled with 200 rounds of BP after AMP has converged. $L = 2000, d = 720$. The achievability and converse bounds for $k = 600$ are omitted as they nearly match those for $k = 360$.

its actual performance at large, finite L . Moreover, considering a metropolitan area with 10^6 to 10^7 devices and each device active a few times per hour, the user density μ is typically 10^{-4} to




Figure 7: A spatially coupled design matrix \mathbf{A} constructed using a base matrix \mathbf{W} according to (23). The base matrix shown here is an $(\omega = 3, \Lambda = 7)$ base matrix (defined in Definition 5.1). The white parts of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{W} correspond to zeros.

10^{-3} [3, Remark 3]. For user densities in this range and per-user payload k on the order of 10^2 to 10^3 , the spectral efficiency $S = \mu k$ is less than 1. In all figures, the concatenated coding schemes exhibit the most substantial improvements for $S < 1$.

As illustrated in Figs. 4–6, the gap between the spectral efficiency achieved by the concatenated scheme and the converse bounds grows with E_b/N_0 . In the next section, we demonstrate how the spectral efficiency of our scheme can be substantially improved by using a spatially coupled design matrix [9].

5 Spatially coupled design and AMP decoder

In this section, we study the concatenated scheme with a spatially coupled Gaussian design matrix \mathbf{A} . We first define the spatial coupled design, and then describe the corresponding AMP decoder and characterize its asymptotic performance (Theorem 2).

A spatially coupled (SC) design matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times L}$ is divided into $R \times C$ equally sized blocks. The entries of \mathbf{A} within each block are i.i.d. Gaussian with zero-mean and variance prescribed by a *base matrix* $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times C}$. Specifically, the matrix \mathbf{A} is obtained by replacing each entry $W_{r,c}$ of the base matrix by an $\frac{\tilde{n}}{R} \times \frac{L}{C}$ block with entries drawn $\stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{\tilde{n}/R} W_{r,c})$, for $r \in [R]$, $c \in [C]$. That is, we have

$$A_{i\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{\tilde{n}/R} W_{r(i),c(\ell)}\right), \quad \text{for } i \in [\tilde{n}], \ell \in [L]. \quad (23)$$

Here, the operators $r(\cdot) : [\tilde{n}] \rightarrow [R]$ and $c(\cdot) : [L] \rightarrow [C]$ map a particular row or column index of \mathbf{A} to its corresponding *row block* or *column block* index of \mathbf{W} . See Fig. 7 for an example.

As in [25], the entries of the base matrix $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{R \times C}$ are scaled to satisfy: $\sum_{r=1}^R W_{r,c} = 1$ for $c \in [C]$. This is to ensure that the columns of \mathbf{A} (the signature sequences \mathbf{a}_ℓ) have unit squared ℓ_2 -norm in expectation. Each block of \mathbf{A} can be viewed as an (uncoupled) i.i.d. design matrix with L/C users and $d\tilde{n}/R = n/R$ channel uses. Thus, we define the *inner* user density as

$$\mu_{\text{in}} := \frac{L/C}{n/R} = \frac{R}{C} \mu. \quad (24)$$

The standard i.i.d. Gaussian design where $A_{i\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1/\tilde{n})$ is a special case of the SC design, obtained by using a base matrix with a single entry ($R = C = 1$). We shall use a class of base matrix-

ces called (ω, Λ) base matrices that have also been used for spatially coupled sparse superposition codes [9, 22].

Definition 5.1. An (ω, Λ) base matrix \mathbf{W} is described by two parameters: the coupling width $\omega \geq 1$ and the coupling length $\Lambda \geq 2\omega - 1$. The matrix has $R = \Lambda + \omega - 1$ rows and $C = \Lambda$ columns, with each column having ω identical nonzero entries in the band-diagonal and zeros everywhere else. For $r \in [R]$ and $c \in [C]$, the (r, c) th entry of the base matrix is given by

$$W_{r,c} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\omega} & \text{if } c \leq r \leq c + \omega - 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Fig. 7 shows an example of design matrix constructed using an $(\omega = 3, \Lambda = 7)$ base matrix. From the GMAC perspective, the main difference between such a design and an i.i.d. Gaussian one is that only a small fraction of users are active during any given channel use. In Fig. 7, only the first L/C users are active during the first \tilde{n}/R channel uses, and only the last L/C users are active for the last \tilde{n}/R channel uses. This allows these two sets of users to be decoded more easily than the others, thus helping the decoding of the adjacent blocks of users. This creates a decoding wave that propagate from the ends to the center. Examples and figures illustrating the decoding wave in spatially coupled designs can be found in [22, 24].

5.1 Spatially Coupled AMP

The AMP decoder for a spatially coupled Gaussian design matrix (SC-AMP) is a generalization of the AMP decoder for the i.i.d. Gaussian design presented in Section 3, accounting for the fact that the SC design has an $R \times C$ block-wise structure, with potentially different variances across blocks. Starting with initialization $\mathbf{X}^0 = \mathbf{0}_{L \times d}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^0 = \mathbf{0}_{\tilde{n} \times d}$, the decoder computes for $t \geq 0$:

$$\mathbf{Z}^t = \mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}^t + \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^t, \quad (26)$$

$$\mathbf{X}^{t+1} = \eta_t(\mathbf{S}^t), \quad \text{where } \mathbf{S}^t = \mathbf{X}^t + \mathbf{V}^t. \quad (27)$$

Here the denoising function $\eta_t : \mathbb{R}^{L \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ is assumed to be Lipschitz and acts row-wise on matrix inputs. Denoting the rows of \mathbf{S}^t by \mathbf{s}_ℓ^t for $\ell \in [L]$, we have:

$$\eta_t(\mathbf{S}^t) = \left[\begin{array}{c} \eta_{t,1}(\mathbf{s}_1^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,1}(\mathbf{s}_{L/C}^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,c}(\mathbf{s}_{(c-1)L/C+1}^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,C}(\mathbf{s}_L^t) \end{array} \right] \left. \begin{array}{l} \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{c} \eta_{t,1}(\mathbf{s}_1^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,1}(\mathbf{s}_{L/C}^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,c}(\mathbf{s}_{(c-1)L/C+1}^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,C}(\mathbf{s}_L^t) \end{array}} \right\} \frac{L}{C} \text{ rows with } c = 1 \\ \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{c} \eta_{t,1}(\mathbf{s}_1^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,1}(\mathbf{s}_{L/C}^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,c}(\mathbf{s}_{(c-1)L/C+1}^t) \\ \vdots \\ \eta_{t,C}(\mathbf{s}_L^t) \end{array}} \right\} \frac{L}{C} \text{ rows with } c = C, \end{array} \right\} \quad (28)$$

where $\eta_{t,c} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ corresponds to the denoising function applied to the $\frac{L}{C}$ rows in block $c \in [C]$. We have used the convention that the function returns a row vector when applied to a row vector.

For $t \geq 0$, $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^t$ and \mathbf{V}^t in (26)–(27) are defined through a matrix $\mathbf{Q}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{dR \times dC}$, which consists of $R \times C$ submatrices, each of size $d \times d$. For $r \in [R]$, $c \in [C]$, the submatrix $\mathbf{Q}_{r,c}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{Q}_{r,c}^t = [\Phi_r^t]^{-1} \mathbf{T}_c^t, \quad (29)$$

where $\Phi_r^t, \mathbf{T}_c^t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are deterministic matrices defined later in (32)–(34), as part of the corresponding state evolution. The i th row of matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times d}$ then takes the form:

$$\tilde{z}_i^t = d\mu_{\text{in}} z_i^{t-1} \sum_{c=1}^C W_{r(i),c} \mathbf{Q}_{r(i),c}^{t-1} \frac{1}{L/C} \cdot \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_c} [\eta'_{t-1,c(\ell)}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^{t-1})]^\top, \quad \text{for } i \in [\tilde{n}], \quad (30)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_c = \{(c-1)L/C + 1, \dots, cL/C\}$, and $\eta'_{t,c}(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{d\eta_{t,c}(\mathbf{s})}{d\mathbf{s}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the Jacobian of $\eta_{t,c}$. Quantities with negative iteration index are set to all-zero matrices. The ℓ th row of $\mathbf{V}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ takes the form:

$$\mathbf{v}_\ell^t = \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} A_{i\ell} z_i^t \mathbf{Q}_{r(i),c(\ell)}^t, \quad \text{for } \ell \in [L]. \quad (31)$$

In (30) and (31), the vectors \tilde{z}_i^t, z_i^t and \mathbf{v}_ℓ^t are all row vectors.

Spatially Coupled State Evolution (SC-SE) Similar to the i.i.d. case in Section 3, we now state the asymptotic distributional guarantees for the AMP iterates with the SC design. For each iteration $t \geq 1$, in the limit as $L, n \rightarrow \infty$ with $L/n \rightarrow \mu$, the memory term $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^t$ in (26) ensures that the empirical distribution of the rows of \mathbf{Z}^t in the block $r \in [\mathbf{R}]$ converges to a Gaussian $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \Phi_r^t)$. Furthermore, the empirical distribution of the rows of $(\mathbf{S}^t - \mathbf{X})$ in block $c \in [\mathbf{C}]$ converges to another Gaussian $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{T}_c^t)$. The covariance matrices $\Phi_r^t, \mathbf{T}_c^t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are iteratively defined via the spatially coupled state evolution (SC-SE), a deterministic recursion defined as follows. Starting with initialization with $\Psi_c^0 = E\mathbf{I}_d$, for $t \geq 0$ and $r \in [\mathbf{R}], c \in [\mathbf{C}]$ we define:

$$\Phi_r^t = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_d + d\mu_{\text{in}} \sum_{c=1}^C W_{r,c} \Psi_c^t, \quad (32)$$

$$\Psi_c^{t+1} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ [\eta_{t,c}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}] [\eta_{t,c}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}]^\top \right\}, \quad (33)$$

$$\text{where } \mathbf{g}_c^t \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{T}_c^t), \quad \mathbf{T}_c^t = \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\mathbf{R}} W_{r,c} [\Phi_r^t]^{-1} \right]^{-1}. \quad (34)$$

Here \mathbf{g}_c^t is independent of $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \sim p_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$. We can interpret Ψ_c^t as the asymptotic covariance of the error in the estimated codeword \mathbf{x}_ℓ^t relative to the true codeword \mathbf{x}_ℓ , for $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_c$, i.e., for the c -th block of users. The asymptotic error rates of AMP decoding with SC design are characterized by the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic UER and BER with SC design). *Consider the concatenated scheme with a spatially coupled Gaussian design, with the assumptions in Section 2.1, and the AMP decoding algorithm in (26)–(27) with Lipschitz continuous denoisers $\eta_t : \mathbb{R}^{L \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, for $t \geq 1$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1} = h_{t,c(\ell)}(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)$ be the hard-decision estimate of \mathbf{x}_ℓ in iteration t . Then the asymptotic UER and BER in iteration t satisfy the following almost surely, for $t \geq 0$:*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{UER} := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{1} \{ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_\ell^{t+1} \neq \mathbf{x}_\ell \} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \mathbb{P} (h_{t,c}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t) \neq \bar{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (35)$$

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{BER} := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{Ld} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{1} \{ \hat{x}_{\ell,j}^{t+1} \neq x_{\ell,j} \} = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P} ([h_{t,c}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t)]_j \neq \bar{x}_j). \quad (36)$$

Here $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \sim p_{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}$ and $\mathbf{g}_c^t \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{T}_c^t)$ are independent, with \mathbf{T}_c^t defined in (34). The limit is taken as $n, L \rightarrow \infty$ with $L/n \rightarrow \mu$.




Figure 8: Performance of the concatenated scheme with i.i.d. design (cyan) vs. SC design (orange). Dotted cyan and orange curves correspond to AMP with η_t^{BP} coupled with 200 rounds of BP after AMP has converged. Solid cyan and orange curves are obtained using state evolution. Outer LDPC code has rate $1/2$, $k = 120$, and $L = 2000$ for i.i.d. design; $L = 40000$ and $(\omega = 4, \Lambda = 20)$ for SC design.

Proof. See Section 6.2. □

Choice of η_t and h_t in SC-AMP The denoiser η_t in the AMP algorithm can be chosen analogously to the i.i.d. case in Section 4, except that it now acts in a block-dependent manner as shown in (28). Take the Bayes-optimal denoiser η_t^{Bayes} as an example: since the empirical distribution of the rows of \mathbf{S}^t in block c converges to the law of $\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t$, with $\mathbf{g}_c^t \sim \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{T}_c^t)$, we define for $c \in [C]$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\eta_{t,c}^{\text{Bayes}}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}} \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t = \mathbf{s}] = \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x}' \cdot \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}' - 2\mathbf{s})^\top (\mathbf{T}_c^t)^{-1} \mathbf{x}'\right)}{\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}' \in \mathcal{X}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}' - 2\mathbf{s})^\top (\mathbf{T}_c^t)^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}'\right)}. \quad (37)$$

The marginal-MMSE denoiser η_t^{marginal} and the BP denoiser η_t^{BP} can be defined similarly, with the only difference from the i.i.d. versions being that the covariance matrices are block-dependent for the spatially coupled case. The hard-decision estimator h_t is also defined analogously, with block-dependent covariance. For example, the MAP hard-decision estimate takes the form

$$h_{t,c}(\mathbf{s}) = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}' \mid \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t = \mathbf{s}). \quad (38)$$

Observe that (37)–(38) are the counterparts of (11)–(12).

5.2 Numerical results for spatially coupled design

In Fig. 8, we numerically compare the error rates of the concatenated scheme with the i.i.d. Gaussian design and the SC Gaussian design constructed using an $(\omega = 4, \Lambda = 20)$ base matrix. We consider

the user payload $k = 120$, a rate 1/2 outer LDPC code, and the target $\text{BER} = 10^{-4}$. The solid black and red curves in Fig. 8 correspond to the achievability and converse bounds of [3]. The ‘iid-SE’ and ‘SC-SE’ plots are obtained using the asymptotic error characterization of our concatenated scheme (as $n, L \rightarrow \infty$ with $L/n \rightarrow \mu$), provided in Theorems 1 and 2 for i.i.d. and SC Gaussian design matrices (with $\omega = 4, \Lambda = 20$), respectively. The dotted black curve is the asymptotic performance of the SPARC-based scheme of [9] with a spatially coupled design (as $n, L \rightarrow \infty$ with $L/n \rightarrow \mu$, and $\omega, \Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ with $\Lambda/\omega \rightarrow \infty$). As in Fig. 5, the highest payload the AMP decoder for SPARC-based scheme can handle in simulations is $\hat{k} = 8$. Hence, to transmit a 120-bit payload, the scheme needs to be used 15 times, with 8 bits transmitted each time.

We observe that for higher values of E_b/N_0 , the spectral efficiency asymptotically achievable by the concatenated scheme with the spatially coupled design (‘SC-SE’) is significantly higher than with the i.i.d. design (‘iid-SE’). The ‘SC-SE’ plot plateaus at $E_b/N_0 > 12\text{dB}$, unlike the SPARC-based scheme of [9] (dotted black), since our results are derived for fixed, relatively small values of ω, Λ ($\omega = 4, \Lambda = 20$), while the performance characterization in [9] is for $\omega, \Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ with $\Lambda/\omega \rightarrow \infty$.

The ‘iid-AMP’ and ‘SC-AMP’ plots illustrate the simulated performance of the AMP decoder with the BP denoiser η_t^{BP} with i.i.d. or SC design, followed by 200 rounds of BP. The number of users considered is $L = 2000$ for the i.i.d. case and $L = 40000$ for the SC case. The gap between ‘SC-AMP’ and ‘SC-SE’ is due to the finite-length effects, similar to the observations made in [9]. We observe that for lower values of E_b/N_0 , the achievable region of the concatenated scheme with BP post-processing, marked by ‘iid-AMP’ and ‘SC-AMP’, is noticeably larger than that of the near-optimal scheme of [9] (dotted black). The experiments presented in Fig. 8 used a relatively short LDPC code. The performance gains at small E_b/N_0 could be substantially enhanced by using a longer LDPC code in the concatenated scheme (see Fig. 5).

5.3 Implementation details

We discuss a few implementation details for the numerical results in Sections 4.4 and 5.2.

Covariance estimation In our iid-AMP simulations, the state evolution parameter $\mathbf{\Sigma}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ in (8), used by the Bayes-optimal denoiser η_t^{Bayes} in (11) and the MAP hard-decision estimator h_t in (12), is estimated using the modified residual term \mathbf{Z}^t in (6) via:

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^t = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}} \sum_{i \in [\tilde{n}]} \mathbf{z}_i^t (\mathbf{z}_i^t)^\top, \quad \text{for } t \geq 1. \quad (39)$$

State evolution results (not stated here) guarantee that for $t \geq 1$, we have $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^t \rightarrow \mathbf{\Sigma}^t$ almost surely as $L \rightarrow \infty$ with $L/n \rightarrow \mu$. Recall that $d = n/\tilde{n}$ does not grow with n and L . Since the AMP decoder uses η_t^{Bayes} and the MAP estimator h_t only for small d (e.g., $d = 7$ for the Hamming code in Fig. 4), a sufficiently accurate estimate $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^t$ can be obtained with moderately large \tilde{n} and L .

For larger d (e.g., $d = 720$ for the LDPC code used in Figs. 5 and 6), the AMP decoder employs η_t^{marginal} or η_t^{BP} which do not require the full covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}^t$, but only the diagonal entries $\Sigma_{j,j}^t$ for $j \in [d]$. We estimate these entries via:

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{j,j}^t = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}} \sum_{i \in [\tilde{n}]} (\mathbf{z}_i^t)_j^2, \quad \text{for } t \geq 1, j \in [d]. \quad (40)$$

Estimating the diagonal entries alone is much less computationally expensive than the full $d \times d$ covariance matrix, and ensures the computational cost of the AMP decoder with η_t^{marginal} or η_t^{BP} denoiser remain linear in d (and k).

Similarly, in our SC-AMP simulations, the SC-SE parameter $\mathbf{T}_c^t \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ in (34) for $c \in [C]$ is estimated consistently via

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}}_c^t = \frac{1}{\tilde{n}/R} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_r} \mathbf{z}_i^t (\mathbf{z}_i^t)^\top, \quad \text{for } t \geq 1, \quad (41)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_r = \{(r-1)\tilde{n}/R + 1, \dots, r\tilde{n}/R\}$.

Estimation of state evolution MSE In each iteration of the iid-SE recursion (8), the MSE term $\mathbb{E}\{\eta_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\}[\eta_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}]^\top$ is estimated by generating Monte Carlo samples of $\mathbf{g}^t \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma^t)$ one randomly chosen sample of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, and applying η_t to each sample of $\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t$. Due to the linearity of the outer code, this MSE term is independent of the chosen sample of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, so we can fix $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ to be the all-zero codeword across all iterations. For consistently estimating the $d \times d$ MSE matrix, the number of samples of \mathbf{g}^t needs to be much larger than d . Similarly, in the spatially coupled case, for each $c \in [C]$, the MSE term $\mathbb{E}\{\eta_{t,c}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}\}[\eta_{t,c}(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}]^\top$ in (33) is estimated using many Monte Carlo samples of $\mathbf{g}_c^t \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{T}_c^t)$ and one randomly chosen sample of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$. With the η_t^{BP} denoiser, the computational and memory cost of MSE estimation could potentially be reduced using population dynamics [42].

6 Proofs of theorems

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1 in [9]. We begin with a state evolution characterization of the AMP iterates that follows from standard results in the AMP literature [18], [32, Section 6.7]. For any Lipschitz test function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 1$, we almost surely have:

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \varphi(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t)]. \quad (42)$$

The claims in (9) and (10) require a test function φ that is defined via indicator functions, which is not Lipschitz. We handle this by sandwiching it between two Lipschitz functions that both converge to the required function in a suitable limit.

We prove (10), and omit the proof of (9) as it is simpler and follows along the same lines. For $x_{\ell,j} \in \{\pm\sqrt{E}\}$, partition the space \mathbb{R}^d into two decision regions:

$$\mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j}) := \{\mathbf{s}_\ell^t : [h_t(\mathbf{s}_\ell^t)]_j = x_{\ell,j}\}, \quad (43)$$

and note that $\mathbb{1}\{\hat{x}_{\ell,j}^{t+1} = x_{\ell,j}\} = \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})\}$. Let $d(\mathbf{v}, \mathcal{D}) := \inf\{\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}\|_2 : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}\}$ denote the distance between a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a set $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, define functions $\xi_{\epsilon,+}, \xi_{\epsilon,-} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\xi_{\epsilon,+}(x_{\ell,j}, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j}) \\ 0, & \text{if } d[\mathbf{s}_\ell^t, \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})] > \epsilon \\ 1 - d[\mathbf{s}_\ell^t, \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})]/\epsilon, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\xi_{\epsilon,-}(x_{\ell,j}, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } d[\mathbf{s}_\ell^t, \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})^c] > \epsilon \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})^c \\ d[\mathbf{s}_\ell^t, \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})^c]/\epsilon, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Note that $\xi_{\epsilon,+}, \xi_{\epsilon,-}$ are Lipschitz-continuous with Lipschitz constant $1/\epsilon$. Moreover, define $\varphi_{\epsilon,+} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\varphi_{\epsilon,+}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_{\epsilon,+}(x_{\ell,j}, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t), \quad (44)$$

and define $\varphi_{\epsilon,-}$ analogously. Then $\varphi_{\epsilon,+}$ and $\varphi_{\epsilon,-}$, being sums Lipschitz of functions, are also Lipschitz.

For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\ell \in [L]$, we have

$$\varphi_{\epsilon,-}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})\} \leq \varphi_{\epsilon,+}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t). \quad (45)$$

Applying (42) to $\varphi_{\epsilon,+}$ and $\varphi_{\epsilon,-}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \varphi_{\epsilon,-}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) &= \mathbb{E}[\varphi_{\epsilon,-}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t)], \\ \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \varphi_{\epsilon,+}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) &= \mathbb{E}[\varphi_{\epsilon,+}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The functions $\varphi_{\epsilon,-}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t)$ and $\varphi_{\epsilon,+}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t)$ both converge pointwise to $\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})\}$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Thus by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}[\varphi_{\epsilon,-}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t)] = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t \in \mathcal{D}(\bar{x}_j)\}] = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}[\varphi_{\epsilon,+}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t)]. \quad (47)$$

From (45), (46), and (47), we conclude that almost surely:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \varphi_{\epsilon,-}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \varphi_{\epsilon,+}(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) \\ &= \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{Ld} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})\} \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t \in \mathcal{D}(\bar{x}_j)\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

By recalling $\mathbb{1}\{\mathbf{s}_\ell^t \in \mathcal{D}(x_{\ell,j})\} = \mathbb{1}\{\hat{x}_{\ell,j}^{t+1} = x_{\ell,j}\}$ and noticing $\mathbb{1}\{\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t \in \mathcal{D}(\bar{x}_j)\} = \mathbb{1}\{[h_t(\bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}^t)]_j = \bar{x}_j\}$, we see that (48) is equivalent to (10). \square

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2

A state evolution result for the SC-AMP iteration applied to the generic spatially coupled linear model $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} + \mathcal{E}$ was obtained in [43]. In this model, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times L}$ is a spatially coupled Gaussian design matrix, and $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{n} \times d}$ are matrices whose row-wise empirical distributions converge in Wasserstein distance to well-defined limits.

These assumptions are satisfied in our setting since \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{E} are both row-wise i.i.d. Applying the state evolution result in [43], for any Lipschitz test function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \geq 1$ and $c \in [\mathbf{C}]$, we have:

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{L/\mathbf{C}} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_c} \varphi(\mathbf{x}_\ell, \mathbf{s}_\ell^t) = \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{g}_c^t)], \quad (49)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_c = \{(c-1)L/\mathbf{C} + 1, \dots, cL/\mathbf{C}\}$.

Finally, as in the proof of Theorem 1, we apply (49) to Lipschitz approximations of suitable indicator functions and combine with a sandwich argument to obtain (35)–(36). \square

7 Discussion and future directions

This paper investigated communication over the GMAC in the many-user regime, where the number of users L scales linearly with the codeword length n . We proposed a CDMA-type concatenated coding scheme with an efficient AMP decoder that can be tailored to the outer code. The asymptotic performance tradeoff was rigorously characterized, and it was shown that the scheme achieves state-of-the-art error performance with an outer LDPC code and AMP decoding with a belief propagation (BP) denoiser.

Although we considered Gaussian design matrices \mathbf{A} (i.i.d. or spatially coupled), using recent results on AMP universality [44, 45], the decoding algorithm and all the theoretical results remain valid for a much broader class of ‘generalized white noise’ matrices. This class includes i.i.d. sub-Gaussian matrices, so the results apply to the popular setting of random binary-valued signature sequences [14, 17].

The concatenated scheme and its analysis can also be extended to nonbinary CDMA constellations. Based on results for sparse superposition coding [9, 46], we expect that using PSK constellations instead of binary will improve the performance tradeoff for complex-valued channels.

Our theoretical results for the AMP decoder with a BP denoiser are valid only when BP is executed for fewer rounds than the girth of the LDPC factor graph (Lemma 1). However, simulations indicate that the performance of AMP decoding may be improved if BP is run for additional rounds in each denoising step. Precisely characterizing the performance of AMP when the number of BP rounds is larger than the girth of the factor graph is a challenging open question. Another open question is to characterize the performance improvement achieved by executing several rounds of BP after AMP has converged.

Our asymptotic performance curves were obtained by running the state evolution recursion until convergence, with each iteration involving a computationally intensive MSE estimation step (see (8) and (33)). An alternative approach would be to directly characterize the fixed points of state evolution for sufficiently large base matrices using a potential function analysis, similar to [9, 36]. The main challenge is that in our setting, such an analysis would require finding the extremal values of a potential function over (positive-definite) $d \times d$ matrices [47], which is infeasible even for moderately large d . One approach to simplify this optimization would be to assume symmetries in the structure of the optimal matrix.

This paper focused on the conventional GMAC setting where users have distinct codebooks. It would be very interesting to adapt the coding scheme to *unsourced* random access [2, 28–30], where the users share a common codebook and only a subset of users are active.

Acknowledgment X. Liu was supported in part by a Schlumberger Cambridge International Scholarship funded by the Cambridge Trust. We thank Jossy Sayir for sharing his implementation of

the belief propagation LDPC decoder, and Pablo Pascual Cobo for helping with the implementation of the SC-AMP decoder.

References

- [1] X. Chen, T.-Y. Chen, and D. Guo, “Capacity of Gaussian many-access channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 3516–3539, 2017.
- [2] Y. Polyanskiy, “A perspective on massive random-access,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2017, pp. 2523–2527.
- [3] I. Zadik, Y. Polyanskiy, and C. Thrampoulidis, “Improved bounds on Gaussian MAC and sparse regression via Gaussian inequalities,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2019, pp. 430–434.
- [4] J. Ravi and T. Koch, “Scaling laws for Gaussian random many-access channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2429–2459, 2022.
- [5] S. S. Kowshik, K. Andreev, A. Frolov, and Y. Polyanskiy, “Energy efficient random access for the quasi-static fading MAC,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2019, pp. 2768–2772.
- [6] S. S. Kowshik and Y. Polyanskiy, “Fundamental limits of many-user MAC with finite payloads and fading,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 5853–5884, 2021.
- [7] A. Joseph and A. R. Barron, “Least squares superposition codes of moderate dictionary size are reliable at rates up to capacity,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 2541–2557, May 2012.
- [8] A. Joseph and A. R. Barron, “Fast sparse superposition codes have near exponential error probability for $R < C$,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 919–942, Feb. 2014.
- [9] K. Hsieh, C. Rush, and R. Venkataramanan, “Near-optimal coding for many-user multiple access channels,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 21–36, 2022.
- [10] Y. Kabashima, “A CDMA multiuser detection algorithm on the basis of belief propagation,” *J. Phys. A*, vol. 36, pp. 11 111–11 121, 2003.
- [11] J. Boutros and G. Caire, “Iterative multiuser joint decoding: unified framework and asymptotic analysis,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 1772–1793, 2002.
- [12] D. L. Donoho, A. Maleki, and A. Montanari, “Message-passing algorithms for compressed sensing,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, vol. 106, no. 45, pp. 18 914–18 919, 2009.
- [13] S. Verdú and S. Shamai, “Spectral efficiency of CDMA with random spreading,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 622–640, 1999.
- [14] S. Shamai and S. Verdú, “The impact of frequency-flat fading on the spectral efficiency of CDMA,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1302–1327, 2001.
- [15] G. Caire, S. Guemghar, A. Roumy, and S. Verdú, “Maximizing the spectral efficiency of coded CDMA under successive decoding,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 152–164, 2004.
- [16] T. Tanaka, “A statistical-mechanics approach to large-system analysis of CDMA multiuser detectors,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 2888–2910, 2002.
- [17] D. Guo and S. Verdú, “Randomly spread CDMA: asymptotics via statistical physics,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 1983–2010, 2005.
- [18] M. Bayati and A. Montanari, “The dynamics of message passing on dense graphs, with applications to compressed sensing,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 764–785, 2011.
- [19] A. J. Felstrom and K. S. Zigangirov, “Time-varying periodic convolutional codes with low-density parity-check matrix,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 2181–2191, Sept. 1999.

- [20] S. Kudekar, T. Richardson, and R. L. Urbanke, “Spatially coupled ensembles universally achieve capacity under belief propagation,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 7761–7813, Dec 2013.
- [21] J. Barbier and F. Krzakala, “Approximate message-passing decoder and capacity achieving sparse superposition codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 4894–4927, Aug. 2017.
- [22] C. Rush, K. Hsieh, and R. Venkataramanan, “Capacity-achieving spatially coupled sparse superposition codes with AMP decoding,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 4446–4484, 2021.
- [23] J. Barbier, M. Dia, and N. Macris, “Universal sparse superposition codes with spatial coupling and GAMP decoding,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 5618–5642, 2019.
- [24] F. Krzakala, M. Mézard, F. Sausset, Y. F. Sun, and L. Zdeborová, “Statistical-physics-based reconstruction in compressed sensing,” *Phys. Rev. X*, vol. 2, p. 021005, May 2012.
- [25] D. L. Donoho, A. Javanmard, and A. Montanari, “Information-theoretically optimal compressed sensing via spatial coupling and Approximate Message Passing,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7434–7464, 2013.
- [26] K. Takeuchi, T. Tanaka, and T. Kawabata, “Performance improvement of iterative multiuser detection for large sparsely spread CDMA systems by spatial coupling,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1768–1794, 2015.
- [27] P. Pascual Cobo, K. Hsieh, and R. Venkataramanan, “Bayes-optimal estimation in generalized linear models via spatial coupling,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2023, pp. 773–778.
- [28] V. K. Amalladinne, J.-F. Chamberland, and K. R. Narayanan, “A coded compressed sensing scheme for unsourced multiple access,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 10, pp. 6509–6533, 2020.
- [29] A. Fengler, P. Jung, and G. Caire, “SPARCs for unsourced random access,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 10, pp. 6894–6915, 2021.
- [30] V. K. Amalladinne, A. K. Pradhan, C. Rush, J.-F. Chamberland, and K. R. Narayanan, “Unsourced random access with coded compressed sensing: Integrating AMP and belief propagation,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2384–2409, 2022.
- [31] J. Ziniel and P. Schniter, “Efficient high-dimensional inference in the multiple measurement vector problem,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 340–354, 2013.
- [32] O. Y. Feng, R. Venkataramanan, C. Rush, and R. J. Samworth, “A unifying tutorial on approximate message passing,” *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 335–536, 2022.
- [33] C. Rush, A. Greig, and R. Venkataramanan, “Capacity-achieving sparse superposition codes via approximate message passing decoding,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 1476–1500, Mar. 2017.
- [34] R. Venkataramanan, S. Tatikonda, and A. Barron, “Sparse regression codes,” *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 15, no. 1-2, pp. 1–195, 2019.
- [35] S. Liang, C. Liang, J. Ma, and L. Ping, “Compressed coding, AMP-based decoding, and analog spatial coupling,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7362–7375, 2020.
- [36] S. S. Kowshik, “Improved bounds for the many-user MAC,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2022, pp. 2874–2879.
- [37] A. Greig and R. Venkataramanan, “Techniques for improving the finite length performance of sparse superposition codes,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 905–917, 2018.
- [38] H. Cao and P. O. Vontobel, “Using list decoding to improve the finite-length performance of sparse regression codes,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 7, pp. 4282–4293, 2021.
- [39] J. R. Ebert, J.-F. Chamberland, and K. R. Narayanan, “On sparse regression LDPC codes,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2023.

- [40] A. Javanmard and A. Montanari, “State evolution for general approximate message passing algorithms, with applications to spatial coupling,” *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 115–144, 2013.
- [41] T. Richardson and R. Urbanke, *Modern Coding Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [42] M. Mézard and A. Montanari, *Information, Physics, and Computation*. Oxford University Press, 01 2009.
- [43] X. Liu, P. Pascual Cobo, and R. Venkataramanan, “Many-user multiple access with random user activity,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, 2024.
- [44] T. Wang, X. Zhong, and Z. Fan, “Universality of approximate message passing algorithms and tensor networks,” 2022, arXiv:2206.13037.
- [45] N. Tan, J. Scarlett, and R. Venkataramanan, “Approximate message passing with rigorous guarantees for pooled data and quantitative group testing,” 2023, arXiv:2309.15507.
- [46] K. Hsieh and R. Venkataramanan, “Modulated sparse superposition codes for the complex AWGN channel,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 4385–4404, 2021.
- [47] B. Aubin, A. Maillard, F. Krzakala, N. Macris, L. Zdeborová *et al.*, “The committee machine: Computational to statistical gaps in learning a two-layers neural network,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, 2018.