

# One-Shot Coding over General Noisy Networks

Yanxiao Liu, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, and Cheuk Ting Li, *Member, IEEE*

## Abstract

We present a unified one-shot coding framework designed for the communication and compression of messages among multiple nodes across a general acyclic noisy network. Our setting can be seen as a one-shot version of the acyclic discrete memoryless network studied by Lee and Chung, and noisy network coding studied by Lim, Kim, El Gamal and Chung. We design a proof technique, called the exponential process refinement lemma, that is rooted in the Poisson matching lemma by Li and Anantharam, and can significantly simplify the analyses of one-shot coding over multi-hop networks. Our one-shot coding theorem not only recovers a wide range of existing asymptotic results, but also yields novel one-shot achievability results in different multi-hop network information theory problems, such as compress-and-forward and partial-decode-and-forward bounds for a one-shot (primitive) relay channel, and a bound for one-shot cascade multiterminal source coding. In a broader context, our framework provides a unified one-shot bound applicable to any combination of source coding, channel coding and coding for computing problems.

## Index Terms

One-shot achievability, finite-blocklength, unified framework, multi-hop networks, network information theory.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In information theory, to find optimal and reliable information transmission rates in networks, we often employ the asymptotic equipartition property and the law of large numbers to study the asymptotic behavior of channels and networks in the large blocklength limit, as in conventional asymptotic typicality-based proofs such as [1]. However, due to the fact that packet lengths are not infinite in real applications (they can even be very short in ultrareliable low-latency communications [2]), *finite blocklength information theory* has been widely studied in the past decade. The goal is to provide nonasymptotic results of channel capacities in the scenario where the number of channel uses is limited. See [3]–[6] and references therein.

In particular, in a *one-shot coding* setting [6]–[16], we assume the blocklength is 1, i.e., each source and channel can be only used *once*. One-shot settings are general, in the sense that the sources and channels can be arbitrary, and does not have to be memoryless or ergodic. The goal is to derive one-shot achievability results that can imply existing (first-order and second-order) asymptotic results when applied to memoryless sources and channels, or applied to systems with memory that behave ergodically [17]. For example, for point-to-point channel coding, the achievability of the channel capacity is implied by the one-shot bounds by Feinstein [7], Shannon [8], and the bounds in [6], [9].

We briefly review existing one-shot results for multi-user coding settings. In [10], one-shot versions of the covering and packing lemmas have been proposed and applied to various problems in multiuser information theory, for example, multiple access channels and broadcast channels. In [11], a proof technique based on stochastic likelihood encoders and decoders has been used to derive various one-shot achievability results in several multi-user settings, including broadcast channels, multiterminal source coding and multiple description coding. A one-shot mutual covering lemma has been proposed in [12] for broadcast channels, which recovers Marton's inner bound. In [13], the multiterminal source coding inner bound has been examined by a likelihood encoder. A finite-blocklength version of the random binning technique has been used in [15] to derive second order regions for broadcast channels. Recently, in [16], a technique called the *Poisson matching lemma* has been introduced to prove various one-shot achievability results for a range of coding settings, and the achievable one-shot bounds improve upon the best known one-shot bounds in several settings with shorter proofs. This technique has been applied to the information hiding problem [18], unequal message protection [19], hypothesis testing [20] and secret key generation [21]. The Poisson matching lemma is based on the *Poisson functional representation* [22]. Together with other related techniques, the Poisson functional representation [22] has been applied to various fields recently, e.g., neural estimation [23], minimax learning [24] and differential privacy [25].

In this paper, which is the complete version of [26],<sup>1</sup> we study a general class of networks, which we call *acyclic discrete networks*, where there are  $N$  nodes connected by noisy channels in an acyclic manner. Each node can play the role of an encoder or a decoder (or both) in source coding or channel coding settings. This is a one-shot version of the asymptotic acyclic

This work was partially supported by two grants from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China [Project No.s: CUHK 24205621 (ECS), CUHK 14209823 (GRF)].

This paper was presented in part at the 2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT) [DOI:10.1109/ISIT57864.2024.10619467].

Yanxiao Liu and Cheuk Ting Li are with the Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR of China. Email: yanxiaoliu@link.cuhk.edu.hk, ctli@ie.cuhk.edu.hk.

<sup>1</sup>The conference paper [26] includes the description (but not the complete proof) of our one-shot achievable region and the corresponding coding schemes. Compared to [26], this complete version includes the complete analysis and proof of our one-shot achievability results, as well as the proof of the lemma needed. Moreover, this complete version also discusses a novel one-shot cascade multiterminal source coding with computing problem, which has not been discussed in [26]. Additional figures have also been provided for the purpose of illustration.

discrete memoryless network studied by Lee and Chung [27], and includes a wide range of settings as special cases, such as source and channel coding, primitive relay channel [1], [28]–[31], Gelfand-Pinsker [32], [33], relay-with-unlimited-look-ahead [34], [35], Wyner-Ziv [36], [37], coding for computing [38], multiple access channels [39]–[41], broadcast channels [42] and cascade multiterminal source coding [43]. In a broader context, our one-shot achievability results are general enough to be applicable to any combination of source coding, channel coding and coding for computing problems.

In order to alleviate the difficulty of keeping track of a large number of auxiliary random variables in a general  $N$ -node network, we propose a tool called the *exponential process refinement lemma* based on the Poisson matching lemma [16],<sup>2</sup> which simplifies the analyses of the evolution of the posterior distribution of the sources, messages and/or auxiliary random variables at the decoder. We utilize the lemma to prove a one-shot achievability result for general acyclic discrete networks, which recovers existing one-shot results in a range of settings in [10], [11], [14], [16], and also give novel one-shot results for various multi-hop settings, namely primitive relay channels [1], [28]–[31], relay-with-unlimited-look-ahead [34], [35], and cascade multiterminal source coding [43].

One limitation of the acyclic discrete network is that the nodes must be arranged in an acyclic manner, and each node only transmits once. Therefore, it is unable to model cyclic networks such as the two-way communication channel [44] and noisy network coding [45], and settings where the transmission occurs in an iterative manner such as the relay channel [1], [46], [47] (where the relay chooses each output symbol based on its past received symbols). We argue that this is an inherent limitation of one-shot settings, and the acyclic discrete network already provides the “best one-shot approximation” of noisy network coding [45] and relay channels [1], [46], [47]. Note that the primitive relay channel [1], [28]–[31] and the relay-with-unlimited-look-ahead [34], [35] can be modeled as acyclic discrete networks, since the relay in these settings does not need to transmit in an iterative manner.

The paper is organized as follows. We present our proof technique, called the exponential process refinement lemma, in Section II. We describe our general acyclic discrete network in Section III, and prove our main theorem in Section IV. In Section V, we use a one-shot relay channel and related settings to elaborate our coding scheme in detail. We then discuss a novel one-shot cascade multiterminal source coding problem in Section VI. We also show our coding scheme provides one-shot bounds on various network information theory settings in Section VII. The proof of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 can be found in the appendix.

## Notations

We assume all random variables are from finite alphabets and logarithm and entropy are to the base 2 unless otherwise stated. Logarithm to the base  $e$  is denoted as  $\ln(x)$ . Write  $[i..j] := \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$ ,  $[j] := [1..j]$ . For a set  $S \subseteq [k]$  and random sequence  $U_1, \dots, U_k$ , write  $U^k := (U_1, \dots, U_k)$ ,  $U_S := (U_j)_{j \in S}$ . For a statement  $S$ ,  $\mathbf{1}\{S\}$  is its indicator, i.e.,  $\mathbf{1}\{S\}$  is 1 if  $S$  holds and 0 otherwise.  $\iota_{X;Y|Z}(x; y|z) := \log(P_{X,Y|Z}(x, y|z)/(P_{X|Z}(x|z)P_{Y|Z}(y|z)))$  denotes the conditional information density. We use  $\iota(X; Y)$  instead of  $\iota_{X;Y}(X; Y)$  when the random variables are clear from the context.  $\delta_a$  denotes the degenerate distribution  $\mathbf{P}\{X = a\} = 1$ .

## II. EXPONENTIAL PROCESS REFINEMENT LEMMA

In this section, we briefly review the Poisson functional representation [22] and the Poisson matching lemma [16]. We then design a tool for proving one-shot achievability results over noisy multi-hop networks based on the Poisson matching lemma, called the *exponential process refinement lemma*.

Consider a finite set  $\mathcal{U}$ . Let  $\mathbf{U} := (Z_u)_{u \in \mathcal{U}}$  be i.i.d.  $\text{Exp}(1)$  random variables.<sup>3</sup> Given a distribution  $P$  over  $\mathcal{U}$ ,

$$\mathbf{U}_P := \arg\min_u \frac{Z_u}{P(u)} \quad (1)$$

is called the Poisson functional representation [22]. We have  $\mathbf{U}_P \sim P$ . We can generalize this by letting  $\mathbf{U}_P(1), \dots, \mathbf{U}_P(|\mathcal{U}|) \in \mathcal{U}$  be the elements of  $\mathcal{U}$  sorted in ascending order of  $Z_u/P(u)$ :

$$\frac{Z_{\mathbf{U}_P(1)}}{P(\mathbf{U}_P(1))} \leq \dots \leq \frac{Z_{\mathbf{U}_P(|\mathcal{U}|)}}{P(\mathbf{U}_P(|\mathcal{U}|))}.$$

We break ties arbitrarily and treat  $1/0 = \infty$ . This is similar to the mapped Poisson process in the generalized Poisson matching lemma [16], though unlike [16],  $\mathbf{U}_P(1), \dots, \mathbf{U}_P(|\mathcal{U}|)$  is not an i.i.d. sequence following  $P$ . Write  $\mathbf{U}_P^{-1} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [|\mathcal{U}|]$  for the inverse function of  $i \mapsto \mathbf{U}_P(i)$ . The following is a direct corollary of the generalized Poisson matching lemma [16].

*Lemma 1 (Generalized Poisson matching lemma [16]):* For distributions  $P, Q$  over  $\mathcal{U}$ , we have the following almost surely:

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \mathbf{U}_Q^{-1}(\mathbf{U}_P) \mid \mathbf{U}_P \right] \leq \frac{P(\mathbf{U}_P)}{Q(\mathbf{U}_P)} + 1.$$

<sup>2</sup>We only present the discrete case in this paper for the sake of simplicity. Hence, instead of Poisson processes, we may use an i.i.d. exponential processes instead [22]. While we expect the results to be extended to the continuous case, this is left for future studies.

<sup>3</sup>When the space  $\mathcal{U}$  is continuous, a Poisson process is used in [16], [22].

We now define a convenient tool.

*Definition 1 (Refining a distribution by an exponential process):* For a joint distribution  $Q_{V,U}$  over  $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U}$ , the refinement of  $Q_{V,U}$  by  $\mathbf{U}$ , denoted as  $Q_{V,U}^{\mathbf{U}}$ , is a joint distribution

$$Q_{V,U}^{\mathbf{U}}(v, u) := \frac{Q_V(v)}{\mathbf{U}_{Q_{U|V}(\cdot|v)}^{-1}(u) \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} i^{-1}}$$

for all  $(v, u)$  in the support of  $Q_{V,U}$ , where  $Q_V$  is the  $V$ -marginal of  $Q_{V,U}$  and  $Q_{U|V}$  is the conditional distribution of  $U$  given  $V$ . When  $V = \emptyset$ , the above definition becomes

$$Q_U^{\mathbf{U}}(u) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{U}_{Q_U}^{-1}(u) \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} i^{-1}}.$$

While the Poisson functional representation  $\mathbf{U}_{Q_U}$  (which only gives one value of  $U$ ) is used for the unique decoding of  $U$ , the refinement  $Q_U^{\mathbf{U}}(u)$  is for the *soft decoding* of  $U$ , which gives a distribution over  $U$ , with  $\mathbf{U}_{Q_U}$  having the largest probability. This is useful in non-unique decoding. For example, if we want to decode  $U_1$  uniquely, while utilizing  $U_2$  via non-unique decoding, we can first obtain the distribution  $(\mathbf{U}_2)_{Q_{U_2}}$ , and then compute the marginal distribution of  $U_1$  in  $(\mathbf{U}_2)_{Q_{U_2}} P_{U_1|U_2}$  and use this marginal distribution to recover  $U_1$  via the Poisson functional representation.

Loosely speaking, if the distribution  $Q_{V,U}$  represents our “prior distribution” of  $(V, U)$ , then the refinement  $Q_{V,U}^{\mathbf{U}}$  is our updated “posterior distribution” after taking the exponential process  $\mathbf{U}$  into account. In multiterminal coding settings that a node decodes multiple random variables, the prior distribution of those random variables will be refined by multiple exponential processes. To keep track of the evolution of the “posterior probability” of the correct values of those random variables through the refinement process, we use the following lemma, called the *exponential process refinement lemma*. Although its proof still relies on the Poisson matching lemma [16], it significantly simplifies our analyses.

*Lemma 2 (Exponential Process Refinement Lemma):* For a distribution  $P$  over  $\mathcal{U}$  and a joint distribution  $Q_{V,U}$  over a finite  $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U}$ , for every  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , we have, almost surely,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Q_{V,U}^{\mathbf{U}}(v, \mathbf{U}_P)} \middle| \mathbf{U}_P \right] \leq \frac{\ln |\mathcal{U}| + 1}{Q_V(v)} \left( \frac{P(\mathbf{U}_P)}{Q_{U|V}(\mathbf{U}_P|v)} + 1 \right).$$

*Proof:* We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Q_{V,U}^{\mathbf{U}}(v, \mathbf{U}_P)} \middle| \mathbf{U}_P \right] \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{U}_{Q_{U|V}(\cdot|v)}^{-1}(\mathbf{U}_P) \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} i^{-1}}{Q_V(v)} \middle| \mathbf{U}_P \right] \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} i^{-1}}{Q_V(v)} \left( \frac{P(\mathbf{U}_P)}{Q_{U|V}(\mathbf{U}_P|v)} + 1 \right) \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{\ln |\mathcal{U}| + 1}{Q_V(v)} \left( \frac{P(\mathbf{U}_P)}{Q_{U|V}(\mathbf{U}_P|v)} + 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is by Definition 1, (b) is by Lemma 1 and (c) is by  $\sum_{i=1}^n i^{-1} \leq \int_1^n x^{-1} dx + 1 = \ln n + 1$ .  $\blacksquare$

### III. NETWORK MODEL

We describe a general  $N$ -node network model, which is the one-shot version of the *acyclic discrete memoryless network* (ADMN) [27]. There are  $N$  nodes labelled  $1, \dots, N$ . Node  $i$  observes  $Y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i$  and produces  $X_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$  (while we assume  $\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i$  are finite). Unlike conventional asymptotic settings (e.g. [27]), here  $X_i$  is only *one symbol*, instead of a sequence  $(X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n})$ . The transmission is performed sequentially, and each  $Y_i$  is allowed to depend on all previous inputs and outputs (i.e.,  $X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}$ ) in a stochastic manner, as shown in Figure 1. Therefore, we can formally define an  *$N$ -node acyclic discrete network (ADN)* as a collection of channels  $(P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}})_{i \in [N]}$ , where  $P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}}$  is a conditional distribution from  $(\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{X}_j) \times (\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{Y}_j)$  to  $\mathcal{Y}_i$ . In particular,  $Y_1$  follows  $P_{Y_1}$  and does not depend on any other random variable. The asymptotic ADMN [27] can be considered as the  $n$ -fold ADN  $(P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}}^n)_{i \in [N]}$ , where  $P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}}^n$  denotes the  $n$ -fold product conditional distribution (i.e.,  $n$  copies of a memoryless channel), and we take the blocklength  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We remark that, similar to the asymptotic unified random coding bound [27], the  $X_i$ 's and  $Y_i$ 's can represent sources, states, channel inputs, outputs and messages in source coding and channel coding settings. For example, for point-to-point channel coding, we take  $Y_1$  to be the message, which the encoder (node 1) encodes into the channel input  $X_1$ , which in turn is sent




Fig. 1. Acyclic discrete memoryless network.




Fig. 2. (a) Channel coding. (b) Source coding.

through the channel  $P_{Y_2|X_1}$ . The decoder (node 2) observes  $Y_2$  and outputs  $X_2$ , which is the decoded message. For lossless source coding,  $Y_1$  is the source,  $X_1 = Y_2$  is the description by the encoder, and  $X_2$  is the reconstruction.

We give the definition of a coding scheme below.

*Definition 2:* A *deterministic coding scheme* consists of a sequence of encoding functions  $(f_i)_{i \in [N]}$ , where  $f_i : \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , the following operations are performed:

- **Noisy channel.** The output  $\tilde{Y}_i$  is generated conditional on  $\tilde{X}^{i-1}, \tilde{Y}^{i-1}$  according to  $P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}}$ . For  $i = 1$ ,  $\tilde{Y}_1 \sim P_{Y_1}$  can be regarded as a source or a channel state.
- **Node operation.** Node  $i$  observes  $\tilde{Y}_i$  and outputs  $\tilde{X}_i = f_i(\tilde{Y}_i)$ .

We sometimes allow an additional unlimited public randomness available to all nodes.

*Definition 3:* A *public-randomness coding scheme* for the network consists of a pair  $(P_W, (f_i)_{i \in [N]})$ , where  $P_W$  is the distribution of the public randomness  $W \in \mathcal{W}$  available to all nodes and  $f_i : \mathcal{Y}_i \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i$  is the encoding function of node  $i$  mapping its observation  $Y_i$  and the public randomness  $W$  to its output  $X_i$ . The operations are as follows. First, generate  $W \sim P_W$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , generate  $\tilde{Y}_i$  conditional on  $\tilde{X}^{i-1}, \tilde{Y}^{i-1}$  according to  $P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}}$ , and take  $\tilde{X}_i = f_i(\tilde{Y}_i, W)$ .

We do not impose any constraint on the public randomness  $W$ . In reality, to carry out a public-randomness coding scheme, the nodes share a common random seed to initialize their pseudorandom number generators before the scheme commences.

We use  $\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{Y}_i$  to denote the actual random variables from the coding scheme. In contrast,  $X_i, Y_i$  usually denote the random variables following an ideal distribution. For example, in channel coding, the ideal distribution is  $Y_1 = X_2 \sim \text{Unif}[\mathcal{L}]$  (i.e., the message is decoded without error), independent of  $(X_1, Y_2) \sim P_{X_1} P_{Y_2|X_1}$ . If we ensure that the actual  $\tilde{X}^2, \tilde{Y}^2$  is “close to” the ideal  $X^2, Y^2$ , this would imply that  $\tilde{Y}_1 = \tilde{X}_2$  with high probability as well, giving a small error probability.

The goal (the “achievability”) is to make the actual joint distribution  $P_{\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N}$  “approximately as good as” the ideal joint distribution  $P_{X^N, Y^N}$ . If we have an “error set”  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq (\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{X}_i) \times (\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i)$  that we do not want  $(\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N)$  to fall into (e.g., for channel coding,  $\mathcal{E}$  is the set where  $\tilde{Y}_1 \neq \tilde{X}_2$ , i.e., an error occurs; for lossy source coding,  $\mathcal{E}$  is the set where  $d(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{X}_2) > D$ , i.e., the distortion exceeds the limit), we want

$$\mathbf{P}((\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N) \in \mathcal{E}) \lesssim \mathbf{P}((X^N, Y^N) \in \mathcal{E}). \quad (2)$$

If  $P_{\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N}$  is close to  $P_{X^N, Y^N}$  in total variation distance, i.e.,

$$d_{\text{TV}}(P_{X^N, Y^N}, P_{\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N}) \approx 0, \quad (3)$$

then (2) is guaranteed. For public-randomness coding, we show that (3) can be achieved, which can be seen as a channel simulation [48], [49] or a coordination [50] result. For deterministic coding, since the node operations are deterministic, there might not be sufficient randomness to make  $P_{\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N}$  close to  $P_{X^N, Y^N}$ , and hence we use the error bound in (2).

#### IV. MAIN THEOREM FOR ACYCLIC DISCRETE NETWORKS

We show a one-shot achievability result for ADN via public-randomness coding scheme.

*Theorem 3:* Fix any ADN  $(P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}})_{i \in [N]}$ . For any collection of indices  $(a_{i,j})_{i \in [N], j \in [d_i]}$  where  $(a_{i,j})_{j \in [d_i]}$  is a sequence of distinct indices in  $[i-1]$  for each  $i$ , any sequence  $(d'_i)_{i \in [N]}$  with  $0 \leq d'_i \leq d_i$  and any collection of conditional distributions  $(P_{U_i|Y_i, \bar{U}'_i}, P_{X_i|Y_i, U_i, \bar{U}'_i})_{i \in [N]}$  (where  $\bar{U}_{i,S} := (U_{a_{i,j}})_{j \in S}$  for  $S \subseteq [d_i]$  and  $\bar{U}'_i := \bar{U}_{i,[d'_i]}$ ), which induces the joint distribution

of  $X^N, Y^N, U^N$  (the “ideal distribution”), there exists a public-randomness coding scheme  $(P_W, (f_i)_{i \in [N]})$  such that the joint distribution of  $\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N$  induced by the scheme (the “actual distribution”) satisfies

$$\delta_{\text{TV}}(P_{X^N, Y^N}, P_{\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N}) \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{d'_i} B_{i,j}, 1 \right\} \right],$$

where

$$B_{i,j} := \gamma_{i,j} \prod_{k=j}^{d_i} \left( 2^{-\iota(\bar{U}_{i,k}; \bar{U}_{i,[d_i] \setminus [j..k]}, Y_i) + \iota(\bar{U}_{i,k}; \bar{U}'_{a_{i,k}}, Y_{a_{i,k}})} + \mathbf{1}\{k > j\} \right) \quad (4)$$

such that<sup>4</sup>

$$\gamma_{i,j} := \prod_{k=j+1}^{d_i} (\ln |\mathcal{U}_{a_{i,k}}| + 1).$$

The sequences  $(a_{i,j})_j$  control which auxiliaries  $U_j$  node  $i$  decodes and in which order. Node  $i$  uniquely decodes  $\bar{U}'_i = (U_{a_{i,j}})_{j \in [d'_i]}$  while utilizing  $(U_{a_{i,j}})_{j \in [d'_i+1..d_i]}$  by non-unique decoding via the exponential process refinement (Definition 1). For brevity, we say “the *decoding order* of node  $i$  is  $\bar{U}_{i,1}, \dots, \bar{U}_{i,d'_i}, \bar{U}_{i,d'_i+1}?, \dots, \bar{U}_{i,d_i}?$ ” where “?” means the random variable is only used in non-unique decoding. Node  $i$  decodes  $\bar{U}'_i$ , creates its own  $U_i$  by using the Poisson functional representation on  $P_{U_i|Y_i, \bar{U}'_i}$ , and generates  $X_i$  from  $P_{X_i|Y_i, U_i, \bar{U}'_i}$ .

We also have the following result for deterministic coding schemes.

**Theorem 4:** Fix any ADN  $(P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}})_{i \in [N]}$ . For any  $(a_{i,j})_{i \in [N], j \in [d_i]}, (d'_i)_{i \in [N]}, (P_{U_i|Y_i, \bar{U}'_i}, P_{X_i|Y_i, U_i, \bar{U}'_i})_{i \in [N]}$  as defined in Theorem 3, which induce the joint distribution of  $X^N, Y^N, U^N$ , and any set  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq (\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{X}_i) \times (\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}_i)$ , there is a deterministic coding scheme  $(f_i)_{i \in [N]}$  such that  $\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N$  induced by the scheme satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}((\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N) \in \mathcal{E}) \\ & \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbf{1}\{(X^N, Y^N) \in \mathcal{E}\} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{d'_i} B_{i,j}, 1 \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $B_{i,j}$  is defined in Theorem 3.

Theorem 3 implies the following result for the asymptotic ADMN [27] by directly applying the law of large numbers.

**Corollary 5:** Fix any ADN  $(P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}})_{i \in [N]}$ . Fix any  $(a_{i,j})_{i \in [N], j \in [d_i]}, (d'_i)_{i \in [N]}, (P_{U_i|Y_i, \bar{U}'_i}, P_{X_i|Y_i, U_i, \bar{U}'_i})_{i \in [N]}$  as defined in Theorem 3, which induces the joint distribution of  $X^N, Y^N, U^N$ . If for every  $i \in [N], j \in [d'_i]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & I(\bar{U}_{i,j}; \bar{U}_{i,[d_i] \setminus \{j\}}, Y_i) - I(\bar{U}_{i,j}; \bar{U}'_{a_{i,j}}, Y_{a_{i,j}}) > \\ & \sum_{k=j+1}^{d_i} \left( \max \{ I(\bar{U}_{i,k}; \bar{U}'_{a_{i,k}}, Y_{a_{i,k}}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - I(\bar{U}_{i,k}; \bar{U}_{i,[d_i] \setminus [j..k]}, Y_i), 0 \} \right), \end{aligned}$$

then there is a sequence of public-randomness coding (indexed by  $n$ ) for the  $n$ -fold ADN  $(P_{Y_i|X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}}^n)_{i \in [N]}$  such that the induced  $\tilde{X}^{N,n}, \tilde{Y}^{N,n}$  (write  $\tilde{X}^{N,n} = (\tilde{X}_{i,j})_{i \in [N], j \in [n]}$ ) satisfy

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_{\text{TV}}(P_{X^N, Y^N}^n, P_{\tilde{X}^{N,n}, \tilde{Y}^{N,n}}) = 0. \quad (6)$$

While this result is not as strong as the general asymptotic result in [27], a one-shot analogue of [27] will likely be significantly more complicated than Theorem 3. We choose to present Theorem 3 since it is simple but already general and powerful enough to give a wide range of tight one-shot results.

<sup>4</sup>Note the logarithmic terms  $\gamma_{i,j}$  do not affect the first and second order results.

## V. ONE-SHOT RELAY CHANNEL

To explain our scheme, we first discuss a *one-shot relay channel* in Figure 3. An encoder observes  $M \sim \text{Unif}[\mathcal{L}]$  and outputs  $X$ , which is passed through the channel  $P_{Y_r|X}$ . The relay observes  $Y_r$  and outputs  $X_r$ . Then  $(X, X_r, Y_r)$  is passed through the channel  $P_{Y|X, X_r, Y_r}$ . The decoder observes  $Y$  and recovers  $\hat{M}$ . For generality, we allow  $Y$  to depend on all of  $X, X_r, Y_r$ , and  $X_r$  may interfere with  $(X, Y_r)$ , which can happen if the relay outputs  $X_r$  instantaneously or the channel has a long memory, or it is a storage device. It is a one-shot version of the *relay-without-delay* and *relay-with-unlimited-look-ahead* [34], [35], and is an ADN by taking  $Y_1 = M$ ,  $X_1 = X$ ,  $Y_2 = Y_r$ ,  $X_2 = X_r$ ,  $Y_3 = Y$ , and  $X_3 = M$  (in the ideal distributions).

In case if  $Y = (Y', Y'')$  consists of two components and the channel  $P_{Y|X, X_r, Y_r} = P_{Y'|X, Y_r} P_{Y''|X_r}$  can be decomposed into two orthogonal components (so  $X_r$  does not interfere with  $(X, Y_r)$ ), this becomes the one-shot version of the *primitive relay channel* [1], [28]–[31] since the  $n$ -fold version of this ADN (with  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) is precisely the asymptotic primitive relay channel. However, the  $n$ -fold version of the ADN in Figure 3 in general is not the conventional relay channel [1], [46], [47] (it is the relay-with-unlimited-look-ahead instead). The conventional relay channel, due to its causal assumption that the relay can only look at past  $Y_{r,t}$ 's, has no one-shot counterpart.




Fig. 3. One-shot relay channel setting.

We use the following corollary of Theorem 4 to demonstrate the use of the exponential process refinement lemma (Lemma 2).

*Corollary 6:* For any  $P_X$ ,  $P_{U|Y_r}$ , function  $x_r(y_r, u)$ , there is a deterministic coding scheme for the one-shot relay channel such that the error probability satisfies

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \gamma L 2^{-\iota(X; U, Y)} \left( 2^{-\iota(U; Y) + \iota(U; Y_r)} + 1 \right), 1 \right\} \right], \quad (7)$$

where  $(X, Y_r, U, X_r, Y) \sim P_X P_{Y_r|X} P_{U|Y_r} \delta_{x_r(Y_r, U)} P_{Y|X, Y_r, X_r}$ , and  $\gamma := \ln |\mathcal{U}| + 1$ .

*Proof:* For the sake of demonstration, we first give a detailed proof via the exponential process refinement lemma without invoking Theorem 4. Let  $U_1 := (X, M)$ ,  $U_2 := U$ . Let  $\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2$  be two independent exponential processes, which serve as the “random codebooks”. The encoder (node 1) uses the Poisson functional representation (1) to compute  $U_1 = (\mathbf{U}_1)_{P_{U_1} \times \delta_M}$  and outputs  $X$ -component of  $U_1$ . The relay (node 2) computes  $U_2 = (\mathbf{U}_2)_{P_{U_2|Y_r}(\cdot|Y_r)}$  and outputs  $X_r = x_r(Y_r, U_2)$ . Note that  $X, Y_r, U_2, X_r, Y$  follow the ideal distribution in the corollary due to the property of Poisson functional representation, and hence we write  $X_r$  instead of  $\tilde{X}_r$ . The decoder (node 3) observes  $Y$ , and performs the following steps.

- 1) Refine  $P_{U_2|Y}(\cdot|Y)$  (written as  $P_{U_2|Y}$  for brevity) to  $Q_{U_2} := P_{U_2|Y}^{U_2}$  using Definition 1. By the exponential process refinement lemma (Lemma 2, with  $V = \emptyset$ ),

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Q_{U_2}(U_2)} \middle| U_2, Y, Y_r \right] \leq (\ln |\mathcal{U}_2| + 1) \left( \frac{P_{U_2|Y_r}(U_2)}{P_{U_2|Y}(U_2)} + 1 \right).$$

- 2) Compute the joint distribution  $Q_{U_2} P_{U_1|U_2, Y}$  over  $\mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_2$ , the semidirect product between  $Q_{U_2}$  and  $P_{U_1|U_2, Y}(\cdot|Y)$ . Let its  $U_1$ -marginal be  $\tilde{Q}_{U_1}$ .

- 3) Let  $\tilde{U}_1 = (\mathbf{U}_1)_{\tilde{Q}_{U_1} \times P_M}$ , and output its  $M$ -component.

Let  $A := (X, Y_r, U_2, X_r, Y, M)$  and  $\gamma := \ln |\mathcal{U}_2| + 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}(\tilde{U}_1 \neq U_1 | A) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \frac{P_{U_1}(U_1) \delta_M(M)}{P_{U_1|U_2,Y}(U_1|U_2,Y) Q_{U_2}(U_2) P_M(M)}, 1 \right\} \middle| A \right] \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbb{L} \frac{P_{U_1}(U_1)}{P_{U_1|U_2,Y}(U_1|U_2,Y) Q_{U_2}(U_2)}, 1 \right\} \middle| A \right] \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \min \left\{ \mathbb{L} \frac{P_{U_1}(U_1)}{P_{U_1|U_2,Y}(U_1|U_2,Y)} \gamma \left( \frac{P_{U_2|Y_r}(U_2)}{P_{U_2|Y}(U_2)} + 1 \right), 1 \right\} \\
& = \min \left\{ \gamma \mathbb{L} 2^{-\iota(X;U_2,Y)} (2^{-\iota(U_2;Y) + \iota(U_2;Y_r)} + 1), 1 \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is by the generalized Poisson matching lemma [16] (Lemma 1), (b) is by  $\delta_M(M) = 1$  and  $P_M(M) = 1/\mathbb{L}$ , and (c) is by step 1) and Jensen's inequality. Taking expectation over  $A$  gives the desired error bound. Although the codebooks  $\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2$  are random (so this is a public-randomness scheme), we can convert it to a deterministic scheme by fixing one particular choice  $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2)$  that satisfies the error bound.

Alternatively, Theorem 4 allows us to derive bounds for general acyclic discrete networks in a systematic manner, without going through the above arguments for every specific ADN. To prove Corollary 6, we can invoke Theorem 4 on the ADN with nodes 1, 2, 3, with inputs  $Y_i$ 's, outputs  $X_i$ 's, auxiliaries  $U_i$ 's and the terms  $B_{i,j}$ 's as follows:

- 1) Node 1 has input  $Y_1 = M$ , output  $X_1 = X$  and auxiliary  $U_1 = (X, M)$ .
- 2) Node 2 has input  $Y_2 = Y_r$ , output  $X_2 = X_r$  and auxiliary  $U_2 = U$ .
- 3) Node 3 has input  $Y_3 = Y$ , output  $X_3 = M$  and decodes with the order " $U_1, U_2$ ". Applying Theorem 4 (note that  $d_3 = 2$  and  $d'_3 = 1$ ), we have

$$B_{3,1} = (\ln |\mathcal{U}_2| + 1) \mathbb{L} 2^{-\iota(X;U_2,Y)} (2^{-\iota(U_2;Y) + \iota(U_2;Y_r)} + 1),$$

and hence we obtain the bound (7) by invoking Theorem 4. ■

Corollary 6 yields the following asymptotic achievable rate:

$$R \leq I(X; U, Y) - \max \{I(U; Y_r) - I(U; Y), 0\}$$

for some  $P_{U|Y_r}$  and function  $x_r(y_r, u_2)$ .

We also consider a one-shot primitive relay channel (as shown in Figure 4), where  $P_{Y|X, X_r, Y_r} = P_{Y'|X, Y_r} P_{Y''|X_r}$  can be decomposed into two orthogonal components. Consider  $(X, Y_r, Y')$  independent of  $(X_r, Y'')$  in the ideal distribution and take  $U = (U', X_r)$  where  $U'$  follows  $P_{U'|Y_r}$ , Corollary 6 specializes to the following Corollary 7.




Fig. 4. One-shot primitive relay channel setting.

*Corollary 7:* For any  $P_X, P_{X_r}, P_{U'|Y_r}$ , there is a deterministic coding scheme for the one-shot primitive relay channel with  $M \sim \text{Unif}[\mathbb{L}]$  such that the error probability satisfies

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \gamma \mathbb{L} 2^{-\iota(X;U',Y')} (2^{-\iota(X_r;Y'') + \iota(U';Y_r|Y')} + 1), 1 \right\} \right],$$

where  $(X, Y_r, U', Y') \sim P_X P_{Y_r|X} P_{U'|Y_r} P_{Y'|X, Y_r}$  is independent of  $(X_r, Y'') \sim P_{X_r} P_{Y''|X_r}$ , and  $\gamma := \ln(|\mathcal{U}'||\mathcal{X}_r|) + 1$ .

This gives the asymptotic achievable rate  $R \leq I(X; U', Y') - \max \{I(U'; Y_r|Y') - C_r, 0\}$  where  $C_r = \max_{P_{X_r}} I(X_r; Y'')$  is the capacity of the channel  $P_{Y''|X_r}$ . It implies the compress-and-forward bound [28], which is the maximum of  $I(X; U', Y')$  subject to the constraint  $C_r \geq I(U'; Y_r|Y')$  (where the random variables are distributed as in Corollary 7). Hence, Corollary 7 can be treated as a one-shot compress-and-forward bound.

### A. Partial-Decode-and-Forward Bound

We extend Corollary 6 to allow partial decoding of the message [28], [35], [47]. To this end, we split the message and encoder into two. The message  $M \sim \text{Unif}[\mathcal{L}]$  is split into  $M_1 \sim \text{Unif}[\mathcal{J}]$  and  $M_2 \sim \text{Unif}[\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{J}]$  (assume  $\mathcal{J}$  is a factor of  $\mathcal{L}$ ). The encoder controls two nodes (node 1 and 2), where node 1 observes  $Y_1 = M_1$ , outputs  $X_1 = V$ , and has an auxiliary  $U_1 = (M_1, V)$ ; node 2 observes  $Y_2 = (M_1, M_2, V)$ , outputs  $X_2 = X$ , and has an auxiliary  $U_2 = (M_1, M_2, X)$ . The relay (node 3) observes  $Y_3 = Y_r$ , decodes  $U_1$ , outputs  $X_3 = X_r$ , and has an auxiliary  $U_3 = (M_1, U)$ . The decoder (node 4) observes  $Y_4 = Y$  and uses the decoding order “ $U_2, U_3?, U_1?$ ”.

*Corollary 8:* Fix any  $P_{X,V}$ ,  $P_{U|Y_r,V}$ , function  $x_r(y_r, u, v)$ , and  $\mathcal{J}$  which is a factor of  $\mathcal{L}$ . There exists a deterministic coding scheme for the one-shot relay channel with

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ J 2^{-\iota(V;Y_r)} + \gamma \mathcal{L} J^{-1} 2^{-\iota(X;U,Y|V)} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \cdot (2^{-\iota(U;V,Y)+\iota(U;V,Y_r)} + 1) (J 2^{-\iota(V;Y)} + 1), 1 \right\} \right],$$

where  $(X, V, Y_r, U, X_r, Y) \sim P_{X,V} P_{Y_r|X,V} P_{U|Y_r,V} \delta_{x_r(Y_r,U,V)} P_{Y|X,Y_r,X_r}$  and  $\gamma := (\ln(\mathcal{J}|\mathcal{U}|) + 1)(\ln(\mathcal{J}|\mathcal{V}|) + 1)$ .

Applying the law of large numbers to Corollary 8, and Fourier-Motzkin elimination (using the PSITIP software [51]), we obtain the following asymptotic achievable rate:

$$\min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} I(V;Y) + I(U,Y;X|V), \\ I(V;Y_r) + I(U,Y;X|V), \\ I(V,U;Y) + I(U,Y;X|V) - I(U;Y_r|V), \\ I(V;Y_r) + I(U;Y|V) + I(U,Y;X|V) - I(U;Y_r|V) \end{array} \right\},$$

where  $(X, V, Y_r, U, X_r, Y) \sim P_{X,V} P_{Y_r|X,V} P_{U|Y_r,V} \delta_{x_r(Y_r,U,V)} P_{Y|X,Y_r,X_r}$ , subject to the constraint  $I(U;Y_r|V) \leq I(U;Y|V) + I(U,Y;X|V)$ .

Taking  $x_r(y_r, (v', x'_r)) = x'_r$ ,  $U = \emptyset$ ,  $V = (V', X'_r)$ , it gives an achievable rate  $\min\{I(X, X_r; Y), I(V'; Y_r) + I(X; Y|X_r, V')\}$ , recovering the partial noncausal decode-forward bound for relay-with-unlimited-look-ahead [35, Prop. 3].

Specializing to the primitive relay channel, and again substituting  $U = \emptyset$ ,  $V = (V', X'_r)$ ,  $x_r(y_r, (v', x'_r)) = x'_r$ , we have

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ J 2^{-\iota(V';Y_r)} + 2\gamma \mathcal{L} J^{-1} 2^{-\iota(X;Y'|V')} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \cdot (J 2^{-\iota(V';Y')-\iota(X_r;Y'')} + 1), 1 \right\} \right],$$

where  $\gamma := (\ln \mathcal{J} + 1)(\ln(\mathcal{J}|\mathcal{V}'||\mathcal{X}_r|) + 1)$  and  $(X, V', Y_r, Y') \sim P_{X,V'} P_{Y_r|X,V'} P_{Y'|X,Y_r}$  is independent of  $(X_r, Y'') \sim P_{X_r} P_{Y''|X_r}$ . It gives the asymptotic rate  $\min\{I(V'; Y_r) + I(X; Y|V'), I(X; Y) + C_r\}$  and recovers the partial decode-forward lower bound for primitive relay channels [28], [47]. One-shot versions of other asymptotic bounds for primitive relay channels (e.g., [29], [30]) are left for future studies.

## VI. CASCADE MULTITERMINAL SOURCE CODING WITH COMPUTING

We consider the cascade multiterminal source coding problem [43] (which is also called the *cascade coding for computing* in [1, Section 21.4]). It is similar to the traditional multiterminal source coding problem introduced by Berger and Tung [52], [53], where two information sources are encoded in a distributed fashion with loss, though the communication between encoders replaces one of the direct channels to the decoder in the cascade case. It can include different variations, e.g., the decoder desires to estimate both  $X$  and  $Y$ ,  $X$  only,  $Y$  only and some functions of both. It is tightly related to real problems where it is required to pass messages to neighbors in order to compute functions of data, e.g., distributed data collection, aggregating measurements in sensor networks, interactive coding for computing and distributed lossy averaging (see [43] and references therein).

The asymptotic rate-distortion region for the general cascade multiterminal source coding problem is unknown, even for the case where  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent. We study the one-shot setting of this problem, which has not been discussed in literature to the best of our knowledge. We provide a novel one-shot bound on the cascade multiterminal source coding problem, and show that our one-shot achievability result recovers the best known asymptotic inner bound, i.e., the *local-computing-and-forwarding inner bound* [43] (which in turn recovers various other existing bounds as special cases, also see [1, Section 21.4] for a detailed discussion).

The one-shot cascade multiterminal source coding problem is described as follows (see Figure 5). Consider two sources  $X$  and  $Y$  that are jointly distributed according to  $P_{X,Y}$ . They will be described by separate encoders and passed to a single decoder in a cascade fashion. Upon observing  $X$ , encoder a sends a message  $M \in [\mathcal{L}_1]$  about  $X$  to encoder b. Encoder b then creates a final message  $M' \in [\mathcal{L}_2]$  summarizing both sources  $X$  and  $Y$  and sends it to the decoder. We investigate the error probability  $P_e$ , which is the probability of the decoder recovers  $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}$  with excess distortion  $P_e := \mathbf{P}\{d(X, Y, \tilde{Z}) > D\}$ ,






Fig. 5. One-shot cascade multiterminal source coding setting.

where  $d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a distortion measure. Due to the flexibility of the distortion function  $d$ , in general one can estimate any function of  $X$  and  $Y$  to tackle various objectives in practice [43].

By Theorem 4, we bound  $P_e$  by the following corollary.

*Corollary 9:* Fix  $P_{X,Y}$ ,  $P_{U,V|X}$ , function  $z : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$  and  $\tilde{L}_i, i = 1, 2, 3$  with  $\tilde{L}_1 \tilde{L}_2 \leq L_1$  and  $\tilde{L}_2 \tilde{L}_3 \leq L_2$ , there exists a deterministic coding scheme for the one-shot cascade multiterminal source coding problem such that the probability of excess distortion is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_e &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbf{1}\{d(X, Y, Z) > D\} + \gamma \tilde{L}_1^{-1} \tilde{L}_2^{-1} 2^{\iota(U, V; X|Y)} \right. \right. \\
 &\quad + \gamma \tilde{L}_1^{-1} 2^{-\iota(V; U, Y) + \iota(V; U, X)} \\
 &\quad + \tilde{L}_2^{-1} 2^{-\iota(U; V, Y) + \iota(U; X)} \\
 &\quad \left. \left. + \gamma \tilde{L}_3^{-1} 2^{\iota(Z; V, Y|U)} \left( \tilde{L}_2^{-1} 2^{\iota(U; X)} + 1 \right), 1 \right\} \right],
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma = \ln(|\mathcal{U}| \tilde{L}_2) + 1$  and  $X, Y, Z, U, V \sim P_X P_{Y|X} P_{U,V|X} P_{Z|Y,U,V}$ .

*Proof:* We adapt the problem into our ADN framework by splitting the encoder a, as shown in Figure 6. The encoder a1, encoder a2, encoder b and decoder are referred to as nodes 1, 2, 3, 4, respectively.




Fig. 6. One-shot cascade multiterminal source coding in ADN framework by splitting the first encoder.

Let  $M_i \in [L_i]$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Encoder a1 (node 1) observes  $X$ , outputs  $U$ , and has an auxiliary  $U_1 = (U, M_2)$ . Encoder a2 (node 2) observes  $(U, X)$ , outputs  $(M_1, M_2)$ , and has an auxiliary  $U_2 = (V, M_1)$ . Encoder b (node 3) observes  $M_1, M_2$  and  $Y$ , outputs  $(M_2, M_3)$ , and has an auxiliary  $U_3 = (Z, M_3)$ . The decoder observes  $M_2, M_3$  and recovers  $Z$  by using the function  $z$  and our coding scheme.

For each node  $i = 1, \dots, 4$  in the ADN, we describe its input  $Y_i$ , output  $X_i$ , auxiliary  $U_i$  and the terms  $B_{i,j}$  in Theorem 4 as follows:

- 1) Node 1 has input  $Y_1 = X$ , output  $X_1 = U$  and auxiliary  $U_1 = (U, M_2)$ .
- 2) Node 2 has input  $Y_2 = (U, X)$ , output  $X_2 = M_1$  and auxiliary  $U_2 = (V, M_1)$ .
- 3) Node 3 has input  $Y_3 = (Y, M_1, M_2)$ , output  $X_3 = M_3$ , auxiliary  $U_3 = (Z, M_3)$ , and decodes with the order “ $U_2, U_1$ ” (i.e., “ $U_{\text{Enc } 1b}, U_{\text{Enc } 1a}$ ”). We have  $d'_3 = d_3 = 2$ , and

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_{3,1} &= \gamma \tilde{L}_1^{-1} \tilde{L}_2^{-1} 2^{\iota(U, V; X|Y)} + \\
 &\quad \gamma \tilde{L}_1^{-1} 2^{-\iota(V; U, Y) + \iota(V; U, X)}, \\
 B_{3,2} &= \tilde{L}_2^{-1} 2^{-\iota(U; V, Y) + \iota(U; X)},
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma = \ln(|\mathcal{U}| \tilde{L}_2) + 1$ .

- 4) Node 4 has input  $Y_4 = (M_2, M_3)$ , output  $X_4 = Z$ , and decodes with the order “ $U_3, U_1$ ?” (i.e., “ $U_{\text{Enc } 2}, U_{\text{Enc } 1a}$ ?”). By applying Theorem 4 (note that  $d'_4 = 1$  and  $d_4 = 2$ ), it gives

$$B_{4,1} = \gamma \tilde{L}_3^{-1} 2^{\iota(Z; V, Y|U)} \left( \tilde{L}_2^{-1} 2^{\iota(U; X)} + 1 \right),$$

where  $\gamma = \ln(|\mathcal{U}|\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2) + 1$ .

Therefore, by applying Theorem 4, the probability of distortion exceeds the limit  $P_e := \mathbf{P}\{d(X, Y, \tilde{Z}) > D\}$  can be bounded as the result stated in this corollary:

$$\begin{aligned} P_e &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbf{1}\{d(X, Y, Z) > D\} + B_{3,1} + B_{3,2} + B_{4,1}, 1 \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbf{1}\{d(X, Y, Z) > D\} + \gamma \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_1^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2^{-1} 2^{\iota(U, V; X|Y)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \gamma \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_1^{-1} 2^{-\iota(V; U, Y) + \iota(V; U, X)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2^{-1} 2^{-\iota(U; V, Y) + \iota(U; X)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \gamma \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_3^{-1} 2^{\iota(Z; V, Y|U)} \left( \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2^{-1} 2^{\iota(U; X)} + 1 \right), 1 \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma = \ln(|\mathcal{U}|\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2) + 1$ . ■

Following the one-shot bound as shown above, we let  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_i = 2^{n\tilde{R}_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and apply the law of large numbers. We obtain the asymptotic achievable region

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_1 + \tilde{R}_2 &> I(X; U, V|Y), \\ \tilde{R}_1 &> I(V; U, X) - I(V; U, Y), \\ \tilde{R}_2 &> I(X; U) - I(V, Y; U), \\ \tilde{R}_2 + \tilde{R}_3 &> I(X; U) + I(Z; V, Y|U), \\ \tilde{R}_3 &> I(Z; V, Y|U), \end{aligned}$$

and  $D > \mathbf{E}[d(X, Y, Z)]$ . By  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2 \leq \mathbf{L}_1$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_2 \tilde{\mathbf{L}}_3 \leq \mathbf{L}_2$  and consider  $R_1 = \tilde{R}_1 + \tilde{R}_2$  and  $R_2 = \tilde{R}_2 + \tilde{R}_3$ , by applying the Fourier-Motzkin elimination (using the PSITIP software [51]), we recover an asymptotic achievable region for the cascade multiterminal source coding problem:

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &> I(X; U, V|Y), \\ R_2 &> I(X; U) + I(Z; V, Y|U), \end{aligned}$$

and  $D > \mathbf{E}[d(X, Y, Z)]$ , where  $X, Y, Z, U, V \sim P_X P_{Y|X} P_{U,V|X} P_{Z|Y,U,V}$ . This is the local-computing-and-forwarding inner bound in asymptotic case, as discussed in [43] and also in [1, Section 21.4].

## VII. EXAMPLES OF ACYCLIC DISCRETE NETWORKS

In this section, to demonstrate the use of our main results, we apply Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 on several settings in network information theory: Gelfand-Pinsker [32], [33], Wyner-Ziv [36], [37], coding for computing [38], multiple access channels [39]–[41] and broadcast channels [42], recovering similar results as the results in [16] and other works.

### A. Gelfand-Pinsker Problem

The one-shot version of the Gelfand-Pinsker problem [32] is described as follows.

Upon observing  $M \sim \text{Unif}[\mathbf{L}]$  and  $S \sim P_S$ , the encoder generates  $X$  and sends  $X$  through a channel  $P_{Y|X,S}$ . The decoder receives  $Y$  and recovers  $\hat{M}$ . This can be considered as an ADN as follows (see Figure 7 for an illustration): in the ideal situation, let  $Y_1 := (M, S)$  represent all the information coming into node 1,  $Y_2 := Y$ ,  $P_{Y_2|Y_1, X_1}$  be  $P_{Y|S, X}$ , and  $X_2 := M$ . The auxiliary of node 1 is  $U_1 = (U, M)$  for some  $U$  following  $P_{U|S}$  given  $S$ . The decoding order of node 2 is “ $U_1$ ” (i.e., it only wants  $U_1$ ). Since node 2 has decoded  $U_1$ ,  $X_2$  is allowed to depend on  $U_1 = (U, M)$ , and hence the choice  $X_2 := M$  is valid in the ideal situation. Nevertheless, in the actual situation where we have  $\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}$  instead of  $X, Y$ , the actual output  $\tilde{X}_2$  will not be exactly  $M$ , though the error probability  $P_e := \mathbf{P}(\tilde{X}_2 \neq M)$  can still be bounded. Applying Theorem 4, we obtain the following Corollary 10.

*Corollary 10:* Fix  $P_{U|S}$  and function  $x : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . There exists a deterministic coding scheme for the channel  $P_{Y|X,S}$  with state  $S \sim P_S$  and message  $M \sim \text{Unif}[\mathbf{L}]$  such that

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbf{L} 2^{-\iota(U; Y) + \iota(U; S)}, 1 \right\} \right],$$

where  $S, U, X, Y \sim P_S P_{U|S} \delta_{x(U, S)} P_{Y|X, S}$ .

This bound is similar to the one given in [16] (which is stronger than the one-shot bounds in [10], [11], [14] in the second order). Both of them attain the second-order result in [54].




Fig. 7. Gelfand-Pinsker problem in ADN framework.

### B. Wyner-Ziv Problem and Coding for Computing

The Wyner-Ziv problem [36], [37] in a one-shot setting is described as follows (see Figure 9 for an illustration).

Upon observing  $X \sim P_X$ , the encoder outputs  $M \in [L]$ . The decoder receives  $M$  and the side information  $T \sim P_{T|X}$ , and recovers  $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}$  with probability of excess distortion  $P_e := \mathbf{P}\{d(X, \tilde{Z}) > D\}$ , where  $d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a distortion measure. This can be considered as an ADN: in the ideal situation,  $Y_1 := X$ ,  $X_1 := M$ ,  $Y_2 := (M, T)$ ,  $X_2 := Z$ . The auxiliary of node 1 is  $U_1 = (U, M)$  for some  $U$  following  $P_{U|X}$  given  $X$ . By Theorem 4, we bound  $P_e$  as follows.




Fig. 8. Wyner-Ziv problem in ADN framework.

*Corollary 11:* Fix  $P_{U|X}$  and function  $z : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ . There exists a deterministic coding scheme for lossy source coding with source  $X \sim P_X$ , side information at the decoder  $T \sim P_{T|X}$  and description  $M \in [L]$  such that

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbf{1}\{d(X, Z) > D\} + L^{-1} 2^{-\iota(U;T) + \iota(U;X)}, 1 \right\} \right], \quad (8)$$

where  $X, Y, U, Z \sim P_X P_{Y|X} P_{U|X} \delta_z(U, Y)$ .

This bound is similar to the one given in [16] (which in turn is stronger than the one-shot bounds in [10], [14]).

This reduces to lossy source coding with  $T = \emptyset$ . Let  $U = Z$ , we have  $P_e \leq \mathbf{P}(d(X, Z) > D) + \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ L^{-1} 2^{\iota(Z;X)}, 1 \right\} \right]$ .

We also consider coding for computing [38], where node 2 recovers a function  $f(X, T)$  of  $X$  and  $T$  with respect to distortion level  $D$  with a distortion measure  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ . The probability of excess distortion is  $P_e := \mathbf{P}\{d(f(X, T), \tilde{Z}) > D\}$ . We obtain a result similar to Corollary 11, where (8) is changed to

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \mathbf{1}\{d(f(X, T), Z) > D\} + L^{-1} 2^{-\iota(U;T) + \iota(U;X)}, 1 \right\} \right].$$

### C. Multiple Access Channel

The multiple access channel [39]–[41] in a one-shot setting is described as follows.

There are two encoders, one decoder, and two independent messages  $M_j \sim \text{Unif}[L_j]$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . Encoder  $j$  observes  $M_j$  and creates  $X_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . The decoder observes the output  $Y$  of the channel  $P_{Y|X_1, X_2}$  and produces the reconstructions  $(\hat{M}_1, \hat{M}_2)$  of the messages. The error probability is defined as  $P_e := \mathbf{P}\{(M_1, M_2) \neq (\hat{M}_1, \hat{M}_2)\}$ . To consider this as an ADN, in the ideal situation, we let  $Y_1 := M_1$ ,  $Y_2 := M_2$ ,  $Y_3 := Y$  and  $X_3 := (M_1, M_2)$ . We let  $U_1 := (X_1, M_1)$  and  $U_2 := (X_2, M_2)$ . The decoding order of node 3 is “ $U_2, U_1$ ” (i.e., decode  $U_1$  (soft), and then  $U_2$  (unique), and then  $U_1$  (unique)). By Theorem 4, we have the following result.

*Corollary 12:* Fix  $P_{X_1}, P_{X_2}$ . There exists a deterministic coding scheme for the multiple access channel  $P_{Y|X_1, X_2}$  for messages  $M_j \sim \text{Unif}[1 : L_j]$  for  $j = 1, 2$  such that

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ \gamma L_1 L_2 2^{-\iota(X_1, X_2; Y)} + \gamma L_2 2^{-\iota(X_2; Y|X_1)} + L_1 2^{-\iota(X_1; Y|X_2)}, 1 \right\} \right],$$




Fig. 9. Multiple access channel in ADN framework.

where  $\gamma := \ln(L_1|\mathcal{X}_1|) + 1$ ,  $(X_1, X_2, Y) \sim P_{X_1}P_{X_2}P_{Y|X_1, X_2}$ .

This bound is similar to the one-shot bounds in [10], [16]. In the asymptotic setting, this will give the region  $R_1 < I(X_1; Y|X_2)$ ,  $R_2 < I(X_2; Y|X_1)$ ,  $R_1 + R_2 < I(X_1, X_2; Y)$ .

#### D. Broadcast Channel with Private Messages

The broadcast channel with private messages [42] in a one-shot setting is described as follows.

Upon observing independent messages  $M_j \sim \text{Unif}[\mathcal{L}_j]$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , the encoder produces  $X$  and sends it through a channel  $P_{Y_1, Y_2|X}$ . Decoder  $j$  observes  $Y_j$  and reconstructs  $\hat{M}_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$ . By Theorem 4, we have the following result.

*Corollary 13:* Fix any  $P_{U_1, U_2}$  and function  $x : \mathcal{U}_1 \times \mathcal{U}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . There exists a deterministic coding scheme for the broadcast channel  $P_{Y_1, Y_2|X}$  for independent messages  $M_k \sim \text{Unif}[\mathcal{L}_j]$  for  $j = 1, 2$ , with the error probability bounded by

$$P_e \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \min \left\{ L_1 2^{-\iota(U_1; Y_1)} + L_2 2^{-\iota(U_2; Y_2) + \iota(U_1; U_2)}, 1 \right\} \right],$$

where  $(U_1, U_2, X, Y_1, Y_2) \sim P_{U_1, U_2} \delta_{x(U_1, U_2)} P_{Y_1, Y_2|X}$ .

In the asymptotic case, this gives a corner point in Marton's region [42]:  $R_1 < I(U_1; Y_1)$ ,  $R_2 < I(U_2; Y_2) - I(U_1; U_2)$ . Another corner point can be obtained by swapping the decoders.

### VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we have provided a unified one-shot coding framework over a general noisy network, applicable to any combination of source coding, channel coding and coding for computing problems. A unified coding scheme may be useful for designing automated theorem proving tools for one-shot results. For example, [51] gives an algorithm for deriving asymptotic inner and outer bounds for general ADMN [27]. Extension of [51] to one-shot results is left for future study.

### IX. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially supported by two grants from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China [Project No.s: CUHK 24205621 (ECS), CUHK 14209823 (GRF)].

The authors are grateful to Prof. Amin Gohari, Prof. Chandra Nair and Prof. Raymond W. Yeung for their valuable comments and suggestions at the early stage of this work. They would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive and helpful comments on the earlier conference version of the manuscript [26].

### APPENDIX

#### Proof of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4

We first generate  $N$  independent exponential processes  $\mathbf{U}_i$  for  $i \in [N]$  according to Section II, which serve as the random codebooks. Each node  $i$  will perform two steps: the *decoding step* and the *encoding step*.

We describe the decoding step at node  $i$ . The node observes  $Y_i$  and wants to decode  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}'_i = (U_{a_{i,j}})_{j \in [d'_i]}$ , while utilizing  $(U_{a_{i,j}})_{j \in [d'_i+1..d_i]}$  by non-unique decoding. For the sake of notational simplicity, we omit the subscript  $i$  and write  $d = d_i$ ,  $d' = d'_i$ ,  $a_k = a_{i,k}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_S = \bar{\mathbf{U}}_{i,S} = (U_{a_{i,j}})_{j \in S}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_k := \mathbf{U}_{a_{i,k}}$ . For each  $j = 1, \dots, d'$ , the node will perform soft decoding via the exponential process refinement (see Section II) on  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_d$ , and then on  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_{d-1}$ , and so on up to  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_{j+1}$ , and then use all the distributions obtained to decode  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_j$  uniquely using the Poisson functional representation. For example, when  $d = 3$ ,  $d' = 2$ , the decoding process will be:  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_3$  (soft),  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_2$  (soft),  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_1$  (unique),  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_3$  (soft),  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_2$  (unique). The choice of the sequence  $a_{i,k}$  controls the decoding ordering of the random variables. The goal is to obtain the decoded variables  $\hat{\bar{\mathbf{U}}}_1, \dots, \hat{\bar{\mathbf{U}}}_{d'}$  that equal  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{U}}_{d'}$  with high probability.

More precisely, for  $j = 1, \dots, d'$ , the node computes the decoded variable  $\hat{\bar{U}}_j \in \bar{\mathcal{U}}_j$  by first computing the joint distributions  $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[k..d]}}^{(j)}$  over  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_k \times \dots \times \bar{\mathcal{U}}_d$  for  $k = d, d-1, \dots, j+1$  recursively using the exponential process refinement as

$$Q_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[k..d]}}^{(j)} := (Q_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[k+1..d]}}^{(j)} P_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_k | \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[k+1..d]}, \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[j-1]}, Y_i}(\cdot | \cdot, \hat{\bar{U}}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_k,$$

i.e., first compute the semidirect product between  $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[k+1..d]}}^{(j)}$  and the conditional distribution  $P_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_k | \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[k+1..d]}, \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[j-1]}, Y_i}(\cdot | \cdot, \hat{\bar{U}}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)$  (computed using the ideal joint distribution of  $X^N, Y^N, U^N$ ) to obtain a distribution over  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_k \times \dots \times \bar{\mathcal{U}}_d$ , and then refine it by  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_k$  using Definition 1. For the base case, we assume  $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[d+1..d]}}^{(j)}$  is the degenerate distribution. After we have computed  $Q_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[j+1..d]}}^{(j)}$ , we can obtain  $\hat{\bar{U}}_j$  using the Poisson functional representation (1) as  $\hat{\bar{U}}_j = (\bar{\mathcal{U}}_j)_{\tilde{Q}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_j}^{(j)}}$ , where  $\tilde{Q}_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_j}^{(j)}$  is the  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_j$ -marginal of

$$Q_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[j+1..d]}}^{(j)} P_{\bar{\mathcal{U}}_j | \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[j+1..d]}, \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[j-1]}, Y_i}(\cdot | \cdot, \hat{\bar{U}}_{[j-1]}, Y_i). \quad (9)$$

The node repeats this process for  $j = 1, \dots, d'$  to obtain  $\hat{\bar{U}}'_i = (\hat{\bar{U}}_1, \dots, \hat{\bar{U}}_{d'})$ .

We then describe the encoding step at node  $i$ . It uses the Poisson functional representation (see Section II) to obtain

$$U_i = (\mathbf{U}_i)_{P_{U_i | Y_i, \bar{\mathcal{U}}'_i}(\cdot | Y_i, \hat{\bar{U}}'_i)}. \quad (10)$$

Finally, it generates  $X_i$  from the conditional distribution  $P_{X_i | Y_i, U_i, \bar{\mathcal{U}}'_i}(\cdot | Y_i, U_i, \hat{\bar{U}}'_i)$ .

For the error analysis, we create a fictitious “ideal network” (with  $N$  “ideal nodes”) that is almost identical to the actual network. The only difference is that the ideal node  $i$  uses the true  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}'_i$  (supplied by a genie) instead of the decoded  $\hat{\bar{U}}'_i$  for the encoding step. The random variables induced by the ideal network will have the same distribution as the ideal distribution of  $X^N, Y^N, U^N$  in Theorem 3. Hence, we assume  $X^N, Y^N, U^N$  are induced by the ideal network. We couple the channels in the ideal network and the channels in the actual network, such that  $Y_i = \tilde{Y}_i$  if  $(X^{i-1}, Y^{i-1}) = (\tilde{X}^{i-1}, \tilde{Y}^{i-1})$  (i.e., the “channel noises” in the two networks are the same). If none of the actual nodes makes an error (i.e.,  $\hat{\bar{U}}'_i = \bar{\mathcal{U}}'_i$  for all  $i$ ), the actual network would coincide with the ideal network, and  $(\hat{X}^N, \hat{Y}^N) = (X^N, Y^N)$ . We consider the error probability conditional on  $A := (X^N, Y^N, U^N)$ :

$$F := \mathbf{P}(\exists i : \hat{\bar{U}}'_i \neq \bar{\mathcal{U}}'_i | A).$$

Note that  $F$  is a random variable and is a function of  $A = (X^N, Y^N, U^N)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \mathbf{P}(\exists i \in [N], j \in [d'_i] : \hat{\bar{U}}_{i,j} \neq \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{i,j} | A) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{d'_i} \mathbf{P}(\hat{\bar{U}}_{[i-1]}' = \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{[i-1]}', \hat{\bar{U}}_{i,[j-1]} = \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{i,[j-1]}, \\ &\quad \hat{\bar{U}}_{i,j} \neq \bar{\mathcal{U}}_{i,j} | A). \end{aligned}$$

For the term inside the summation (which is the probability that the first error we make is at  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_{i,j}$ ), by (9), (10) and the Poisson matching lemma [16] (we again omit the subscripts  $i$  as in the description of the decoding step, e.g., we write

$\bar{U}_j = \bar{U}_{i,j} = U_{a_j} = U_{a_{i,j}}$ ; we also simply write  $P(\bar{U}_j|Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j}) = P_{\bar{U}_j|Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j}}(\bar{U}_j|Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}(\hat{\bar{U}}'_{[i-1]} = \bar{U}'_{[i-1]}, \hat{\bar{U}}_{i,[j-1]} = \bar{U}_{i,[j-1]}, \hat{\bar{U}}_{i,j} \neq \bar{U}_{i,j} | A) \\
& \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{P(\bar{U}_j|Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j})}{Q^{(j)}(\bar{U}_{[j+1..d]})P(\bar{U}_j | \bar{U}_{[j+1..d]}, \bar{U}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)} \middle| A \right] \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{P(\bar{U}_j|Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j})}{P(\bar{U}_j | \bar{U}_{[j+1..d]}, \bar{U}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)} \right. \\
& \quad \cdot \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{1}{Q^{(j)}(\bar{U}_{[j+1..d]})} \middle| \bar{U}_{[d]}, Y_i, Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j}, \bar{U}_{[j+1..d]} \right] \middle| A \Big] \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{P(\bar{U}_j|Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j})}{P(\bar{U}_j | \bar{U}_{[j+1..d]}, \bar{U}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)} (\ln |\bar{U}_{j+1}| + 1) \right. \\
& \quad \cdot \frac{1}{Q^{(j)}(\bar{U}_{[j+2..d]})} \left( \frac{P(\bar{U}_{j+1}|Y_{a_{j+1}}, \bar{U}'_{a_{j+1}})}{P(\bar{U}_{j+1} | \bar{U}_{[j+2..d]}, \bar{U}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)} + 1 \right) \middle| A \Big] \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{P(\bar{U}_j|Y_{a_j}, \bar{U}'_{a_j})}{P(\bar{U}_j | \bar{U}_{[j+1..d]}, \bar{U}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)} \right. \\
& \quad \cdot \prod_{k=j+1}^{d'} (\ln |\bar{U}_k| + 1) \left( \frac{P(\bar{U}_k|Y_{a_k}, \bar{U}'_{a_k})}{P(\bar{U}_k | \bar{U}_{[k+1..d]}, \bar{U}_{[j-1]}, Y_i)} + 1 \right) \middle| A \Big] \\
& = B_{i,j},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is by Jensen's inequality, (b) is due to Lemma 2, (c) is by applying the same steps as (a) and (b)  $d' - j - 1$  times, and  $\beta_{i,j}$  is given in (4). The proof of Theorem 3 is completed by noting that  $\delta_{\text{TV}}(P_{X^N, Y^N}, P_{\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N}) \leq \mathbf{P}((X^N, Y^N) \neq (\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N)) \leq \mathbf{E}[F] = \mathbf{E}[\min\{F, 1\}]$ .

We now prove Theorem 4. Recall that the scheme we have constructed requires the public randomness  $W$ , which we have to fix in order to construct a deterministic coding scheme for Theorem 4. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}((\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N) \in \mathcal{E} | W)] \\
& = \mathbf{P}((\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N) \in \mathcal{E}) \\
& \leq \mathbf{P}((X^N, Y^N) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ or } (X^N, Y^N) \neq (\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N)) \\
& = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}((X^N, Y^N) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ or } (X^N, Y^N) \neq (\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N) | A)] \\
& \leq \mathbf{E}[\min\{\mathbf{1}\{(X^N, Y^N) \in \mathcal{E}\} \\
& \quad + \mathbf{P}((X^N, Y^N) \neq (\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N) | A), 1\}] \\
& \leq \mathbf{E}[\min\{\mathbf{1}\{(X^N, Y^N) \in \mathcal{E}\} + F, 1\}].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists a value  $w$  such that  $\mathbf{P}((\tilde{X}^N, \tilde{Y}^N) \in \mathcal{E} | W = w)$  satisfies the upper bound. Fixing the value of  $W$  to  $w$  gives a deterministic coding scheme.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge university press, 2011.
- [2] G. Durisi, T. Koch, and P. Popovski, "Toward massive, ultrareliable, and low-latency wireless communication with short packets," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 104, no. 9, pp. 1711–1726, 2016.
- [3] V. Kostina and S. Verdú, "Lossy joint source-channel coding in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 2545–2575, 2013.
- [4] D. Wang, A. Ingber, and Y. Kochman, "The dispersion of joint source-channel coding," in *2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, Sep. 2011, pp. 180–187.
- [5] V. Y. Tan and O. Kosut, "On the dispersions of three network information theory problems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 881–903, 2013.
- [6] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú, "Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2307–2359, 2010.
- [7] A. Feinstein, "A new basic theorem of information theory," *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory*, no. 4, pp. 2–22, 1954.
- [8] C. E. Shannon, "Certain results in coding theory for noisy channels," *Information and control*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 6–25, 1957.
- [9] M. Hayashi, "Information spectrum approach to second-order coding rate in channel coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 4947–4966, 2009.
- [10] S. Verdú, "Non-asymptotic achievability bounds in multiuser information theory," in *2012 50th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 1–8.
- [11] M. H. Yassaee, M. R. Aref, and A. Gohari, "A technique for deriving one-shot achievability results in network information theory," in *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1287–1291.

- [12] J. Liu, P. Cuff, and S. Verdú, "One-shot mutual covering lemma and Marton's inner bound with a common message," in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1457–1461.
- [13] E. C. Song, P. Cuff, and H. V. Poor, "The likelihood encoder for lossy compression," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1836–1849, 2016.
- [14] S. Watanabe, S. Kuzuoka, and V. Y. Tan, "Nonasymptotic and second-order achievability bounds for coding with side-information," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 1574–1605, 2015.
- [15] M. H. Yassaee, M. R. Aref, and A. Gohari, "Non-asymptotic output statistics of random binning and its applications," in *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1849–1853.
- [16] C. T. Li and V. Anantharam, "A unified framework for one-shot achievability via the poisson matching lemma," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2624–2651, 2021.
- [17] S. Verdú and T. S. Han, "A general formula for channel capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 1147–1157, 1994.
- [18] Y. Liu and C. T. Li, "One-shot information hiding," in *accepted at the IEEE Information Theory Workshop*. IEEE, 2024.
- [19] A. Khisti, A. Behboodi, G. Cesa, and P. Kumar, "Unequal message protection: One-shot analysis via poisson matching lemma," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2024.
- [20] Y. Guo, S. Salehkalaibar, S. C. Draper, and W. Yu, "One-shot achievability region for hypothesis testing with communication constraint," in *accepted at the IEEE Information Theory Workshop*. IEEE, 2024.
- [21] H. Hentilä, Y. Y. Shkel, and V. Koivunen, "Communication-constrained secret key generation: Second-order bounds," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2024.
- [22] C. T. Li and A. El Gamal, "Strong functional representation lemma and applications to coding theorems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 6967–6978, 2018.
- [23] E. Lei, H. Hassani, and S. S. Bidokhti, "Neural estimation of the rate-distortion function with applications to operational source coding," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 674–686, 2022.
- [24] C. T. Li, X. Wu, A. Ozgur, and A. El Gamal, "Minimax learning for distributed inference," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 12, pp. 7929–7938, 2020.
- [25] Y. Liu, W.-N. Chen, A. Özgür, and C. T. Li, "Universal exact compression of differentially private mechanisms," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024.
- [26] Y. Liu and C. T. Li, "One-shot coding over general noisy networks," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2024, pp. 3124–3129.
- [27] S.-H. Lee and S.-Y. Chung, "A unified random coding bound," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 6779–6802, 2018.
- [28] Y.-H. Kim, "Coding techniques for primitive relay channels," in *Proc. Forty-Fifth Annual Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr. Comput.*, 2007, p. 2007.
- [29] M. Mondelli, S. H. Hassani, and R. Urbanke, "A new coding paradigm for the primitive relay channel," *Algorithms*, vol. 12, no. 10, p. 218, 2019.
- [30] A. El Gamal, A. Gohari, and C. Nair, "Achievable rates for the relay channel with orthogonal receiver components," in *2021 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [31] —, "A strengthened cutset upper bound on the capacity of the relay channel and applications," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 5013–5043, 2022.
- [32] S. I. Gel'fand and M. S. Pinsker, "Coding for channel with random parameters," *Probl. Contr. and Inf. Theory*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 19–31, 1980.
- [33] C. Heegard and A. El Gamal, "On the capacity of computer memory with defects," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 731–739, 1983.
- [34] A. El Gamal and N. Hassanpour, "Relay-without-delay," in *Proceedings. International Symposium on Information Theory, 2005. ISIT 2005*. IEEE, 2005, pp. 1078–1080.
- [35] A. El Gamal, N. Hassanpour, and J. Mammen, "Relay networks with delays," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 3413–3431, 2007.
- [36] A. Wyner and J. Ziv, "The rate-distortion function for source coding with side information at the decoder," *IEEE Transactions on information Theory*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 1976.
- [37] A. D. Wyner, "The rate-distortion function for source coding with side information at the decoder-ii. general sources," *Information and control*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 60–80, 1978.
- [38] H. Yamamoto, "Wyner-ziv theory for a general function of the correlated sources (corresp.)," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 803–807, 1982.
- [39] R. Ahlswede, "Multi-way communication channels," in *2nd Int. Symp. Inform. Theory, Tsahkadzor, Armenian SSR*, 1971, pp. 23–52.
- [40] H. Liao, "Multiple access channels," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI, 1972.
- [41] R. Ahlswede, "The capacity region of a channel with two senders and two receivers," *The annals of probability*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 805–814, 1974.
- [42] K. Marton, "A coding theorem for the discrete memoryless broadcast channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 306–311, 1979.
- [43] P. Cuff, H.-I. Su, and A. El Gamal, "Cascade multiterminal source coding," in *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 1199–1203.
- [44] C. E. Shannon, "Two-way communication channels," in *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, vol. 4. University of California Press, 1961, pp. 611–645.
- [45] S. H. Lim, Y.-H. Kim, A. El Gamal, and S.-Y. Chung, "Noisy network coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 3132–3152, 2011.
- [46] E. C. Van Der Meulen, "Three-terminal communication channels," *Advances in applied Probability*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 120–154, 1971.
- [47] T. Cover and A. E. Gamal, "Capacity theorems for the relay channel," *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 572–584, 1979.
- [48] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, "Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 2637–2655, 2002.
- [49] P. Cuff, "Distributed channel synthesis," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7071–7096, 2013.
- [50] P. Cuff, H. Permuter, and T. M. Cover, "Coordination capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4181–4206, Sept 2010.
- [51] C. T. Li, "An automated theorem proving framework for information-theoretic results," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 69, no. 11, pp. 6857–6877, 2023.
- [52] T. Berger, "Multiterminal source coding," in *The Information Theory Approach to Communications*, G. Longo, Ed. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1978, pp. 171–231.
- [53] S.-Y. Tung, "Multiterminal source coding," Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 1978.
- [54] J. Scarlett, "On the dispersions of the Gel'fand–Pinsker channel and dirty paper coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 4569–4586, 2015.