

Communication-Assisted Sensing Systems: Fundamental Limits and ISAC Waveform Design

Fuwang Dong, *Member, IEEE*, Fan Liu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Yifeng Xiong, *Member, IEEE*, Yuanhao Cui, *Member, IEEE*, Wei Wang, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Shi Jin, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The communication-assisted sensing (CAS) systems are expected to endow the users with beyond-line-of-sight sensing capabilities without the aid of additional sensors. In this paper, we study the dual-functional signaling strategy, focusing on three primary aspects, namely, the information-theoretic framework, the optimal distribution of channel input, and the optimal waveform design for Gaussian signals. First, we establish the information-theoretic framework and develop a modified source-channel separation theorem (MSST) tailored for CAS systems. The proposed MSST elucidates the relationship between achievable distortion, coding rate, and communication channel capacity in cases where the distortion metric is separable for sensing and communication (S&C) processes. Second, we present an optimal channel input design for dual-functional signaling, which aims to minimize total distortion under the constraints of the MSST and resource budget. We then conceive a two-step Blahut-Arimoto (BA)-based optimal search algorithm to numerically solve the functional optimization problem. Third, in light of the current signaling strategy, we further propose an optimal waveform design for Gaussian signaling in multi-input multi-output (MIMO) CAS systems. The associated covariance matrix optimization problem is addressed using a successive convex approximation (SCA)-based waveform design algorithm. Finally, we provide numerical simulation results to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms and to show the unique performance tradeoff between S&C processes.

Index Terms—Integrated sensing and communication, communication assisted sensing, rate-distortion theory, source-channel separation theorem, Blahut-Arimoto algorithm.

I. INTRODUCTION

Integrated sensing and communication (ISAC) systems are widely acknowledged for their potential to enhance sensing and communications (S&C) performance by sharing hardware and spectrum resources [2], [3]. Over the past few decades, substantial research efforts have focused on improving resource efficiency and mitigating mutual interference through waveform design [4], beamforming [5], and dedicated signal processing techniques [6]. To further explore the coordination

(Corresponding author: Fan Liu.)

Part of this paper was presented at IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), 2024 [1].

Fuwang Dong, and Fan Liu are with the School of System Design and Intelligent Manufacturing, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China. (email: {dongfw, liuf6}@sustech.edu.cn).

Yifeng Xiong, and Yuanhao Cui are with the School of Information and Electronic Engineering, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, China. (email: {yifengxiong, cuiyuanhao}@bupt.edu.cn).

Wei Wang is with the College of Intelligent System Science and Engineering, Harbin Engineering University, Harbin 150001, China. (email: wangwei407@hrbeu.edu.cn).

Shi Jin is with the National Mobile Communications Research Laboratory, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China. (e-mail: jinshi@seu.edu.cn).




Fig. 1. The application scenarios of the CAS system.

gains between S&C, the authors of [7] proposed a sensing-assisted communication scheme, which leverages sensing capability of the transmitting ISAC signal, such as beam tracking and prediction, to establish user links thereby reducing the communication overhead. On the other hand, sensing-as-a-service is expected to become a key feature of upcoming 6G perceptive networks [8]. This necessitates the exploration of how the sensing quality can be enhanced by leveraging communication functionality, namely, the communication-assisted sensing (CAS) techniques.

A. Communication-Assisted Sensing Systems

The effective sensing range may be significantly extended by leveraging the data transmission capabilities of communication systems. This capability, referred to as beyond-line-of-sight (BLoS) sensing, allows for detecting obstructed or exceptionally distant targets. In [9], BLoS sensing was investigated by sharing measurements collected by vehicle-mounted sensors among users. Recently, a novel CAS system has been proposed in [10], [11], which enables BLoS sensing as an intrinsic network capability. Unlike the techniques proposed in [9], the CAS system eliminates the need for additional sensors.

As shown in Fig. 1, the base station (BS) or roadside unit (RSU) with favorable visibility illuminates targets and captures observations during the sensing process while simultaneously transmitting the acquired sensory information to the end-users during the communication process. Therefore, the S&C processes are coupled at the BS and concurrently determine the sensing quality attained by the user. The authors of [11] have proposed two signaling strategies, i.e., the separated S&C and the dual-functional signaling, to minimize the total distortion

between the ground truth and the corresponding reconstruction at end-users.

In the dual-functional signaling strategy, the BS transmits a sophisticatedly tailored ISAC waveform to simultaneously perform S&C tasks. Namely, the ISAC waveform is used to sense the current targets' states and to convey the previously acquired state information to the end-users. However, in this strategy, where there is strong S&C coupling, two critical problems still remain unclear. 1) The problem formulation in [11] is established at an information theoretical level, whose operational meaning is not proved from a coding theory perspective. 2) The ISAC waveform is assumed to be a Gaussian distribution, which may not be necessarily optimal for the considered CAS scenario. For instance, Gaussian distribution is communication-optimal under Gaussian channels, whereas 2-ary pulse amplitude modulation is sensing-optimal [12]. This motivates us to delve into the fundamental limits and the resulting S&C tradeoff of the dual-functional signaling strategy for CAS systems.

B. Related Works

Exploring the fundamental limits plays an important role in the ISAC systems [13]. The groundbreaking studies [12], [14] have considered a scenario where the transmitter (Tx) communicates with a user through a memoryless state-dependent channel while simultaneously estimating the state from generalized feedback. The capacity-distortion-cost tradeoff of this channel is characterized to illustrate the optimal achievable rate for reliable communication while maintaining a preset state estimation distortion. Concurrently, the work of [15] has addressed a general scenario where the Tx senses arbitrary targets rather than the specified communication channel state. This study reveals the deterministic-random tradeoff between S&C within the dual-functional signaling strategy by characterizing the Cramér-Rao bound (CRB)-communication rate region. Unfortunately, the fundamental limits of CAS systems, whose setups significantly differ from the existing literature, remain widely unexplored.

The information-theoretic framework of the dual-functional signaling strategy for CAS systems is depicted in Fig 2. The ISAC channel input X is employed both to acquire the observation Z of the original state S from the sensing channel, and to carry the estimate \hat{S} to the communication channel. Although this framework shares some similarities with conventional *remote source coding* and *remote estimation* problems, it exhibits a unique challenge in ISAC channel input design. In *Remote source coding* [16]–[20], the encoder cannot access the original source information S but only its noisy observation Z . In this context, $S \leftrightarrow Z \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow \hat{S}$ forms a Markov chain, where the observation Z does not depend on the communication channel input X . However, in our scheme, the sensing channel output Z is determined by the ISAC channel input X due to the dual-functional signaling strategy. This implies that the process is no longer a Markov chain in CAS systems, complicating the characterization of the rate-distortion relationship using remote source coding theory.

The *remote estimation* problem involves a sensor measuring the state of a linear system and transmitting its observations to

a remote estimator over a wireless fading channel [21]–[24]. A typical application of the *remote estimation* problem in the ISAC field is vehicular networks, such as the sensory data-sharing scheme considered in [9]. This widely investigated problem differs from the proposed CAS system in two ways. First, remote estimation requires additional sensors, whereas sensing capability is an intrinsic function in CAS system. Second, similar to the remote source coding problem, the observations and channel inputs are not coupling. Consequently, the S&C performance tradeoff leads to a significantly different working pipeline and unique challenges in CAS system design.

It would be worthwhile to remark that, in most works on remote source coding and remote estimation, the encoder directly transmits the observation Z , which is estimated at the user-end. This strategy is referred to as the compress-and-estimation. In the proposed CAS systems, however, we focus on a scenario where the BS transmits the estimate \hat{S} instead of the observation. This estimate-and-compress strategy achieves an optimal tradeoff between rate and distortion, as discussed in [25]. We will leave the compress-and-estimate strategy for future research.

C. Our contributions

To fill the aforementioned research gap, we aim to bring new insights into the dual-functional signaling strategy for CAS systems, from the fundamental limits to the specific waveform design. Compared to the conference version [1], which only discussed the corresponding information-theoretic framework, we further elaborate on the the optimal distribution of channel input and propose a novel method for Gaussian waveform design in MIMO CAS systems. For clarity, the main contributions of this work are summarized as follows.

- First, we establish the information-theoretic framework for CAS systems to illustrate the relationship between achievable distortion, coding rate, and communication channel capacity. We develop a modified source-channel separation theorem (MSST) specific to the cases of separable distortion metric for S&C processes. Compared to the existing works [10], [11], we provide a rigorous proof of the operational meaning for the MSST.
- Second, we formulate a unified optimization problem for the input distribution design of the ISAC channel, where the total distortion is minimized while adhering to the MSST and resource constraints. To cope with the functional optimization problem, we conceive a two-step Blahut-Arimoto (BA)-based optimal search algorithm in an effort to tackle the challenges of lacking explicit expressions for the rate-distortion bound and channel capacity.
- Third, we propose an optimal waveform design scheme for Gaussian signaling in MIMO CAS systems. The associated covariance matrix optimization problem is solved using an successive convex approximation (SCA)-based waveform design algorithm.
- Finally, we provide numerical simulation results to show the effectiveness of the proposed algorithms, while demonstrating the unique performance tradeoff between S&C in the considered CAS systems.




Fig. 2. The comparisons of the information-theoretic frameworks between the CAS system, remote source coding, and remote estimation.

This paper is structured as follows. We commence with establishing the information-theoretic framework in Section II, including the definitions of distortions, rate-distortion function, and constrained channel capacity. In Section III, we prove the achievability and converse of the proposed MSST. Then, we formulate the optimization problem for ISAC channel input design and develop a two-step BA-based optimal search algorithm in Section IV. In Section V, we present the Gaussian ISAC waveform design method for the MIMO CAS systems. Finally, we provide the simulation results and conclude this paper in Section VI and VII, respectively.

The notations used in this paper are as follows. The uppercase normal letter A , lowercase italic letter a , and fraktur letter \mathcal{A} denote a random variable, its realization and a set, respectively. $P_A(a)$ represent a probability distribution function and $Q_{A|B}(a|b)$ specifies to channel transition probability. Uppercase and lowercase bold letters \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{a} denote the matrix and column vector. $(\cdot)^T$, $(\cdot)^*$, and $(\cdot)^H$ represent the transpose, conjugate, and complex conjugate transpose operations, respectively. $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ is the statistical expectation, and $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$ is the trace of a matrix.

II. INFORMATION-THEORETIC FRAMEWORK OF CAS

A. Sensing and Communication Processes

As shown in Fig. 2, $X \in \mathcal{X}$ serves as the input to both the S&C channel. The random variables of the target's state S , the sensing channel output Z , and the communication channel output Y take values in the sets \mathcal{S} , \mathcal{Z} , and \mathcal{Y} , respectively. Here, the state sequence $\{S_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) subject to a prior distribution $P_S(s)$. In general, the CAS system may be described as the following S&C processes.

- **Sensing Process:** The sensing channel output, Z_i , at a given time i is generated based on the sensing channel law $Q_{Z|XS}(\cdot|x_i, s_i)$ given the i th channel input $X_i = x_i$ and the state realization $S_i = s_i$. We assume that the sensing channel output Z_i is independent of past inputs, outputs and state signals. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ denote the estimate alphabet. The state estimator is a map from the acquired observations \mathcal{Z}^n to $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^n$. Thus, the

expected average per-block estimation distortion in the sensing process can be defined by

$$\Delta_s^{(n)} := \mathbb{E} \left[d(S^n, \tilde{S}^n) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(S_i, \tilde{S}_i) \right], \quad (1)$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the distortion function bounded by d_{\max} .

- **Communication Process:** The BS encodes the estimate \tilde{S}_{i-1} into the communication channel input X_i . The user receives the communication channel output Y_i in accordance with channel law $Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$. The decoder is a map from \mathcal{Y}^n to $\hat{\mathcal{S}}^n$, where $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ denotes the reconstruction alphabet. Therefore, the expected average per-block estimation distortion in the communication process can be defined by

$$\Delta_c^{(n)} := \mathbb{E} \left[d(\tilde{S}^n, \hat{S}^n) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(\tilde{S}_i, \hat{S}_i) \right]. \quad (2)$$

Additionally, the performance of the CAS systems may be evaluated by the total distortion between the ground truth and its reconstruction at the user,

$$\Delta^{(n)} := \mathbb{E} \left[d(S^n, \hat{S}^n) \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(S_i, \hat{S}_i) \right]. \quad (3)$$

By denoting R as the bit rate, a $(2^{nR}, n)$ coding scheme for the CAS systems consists of

- 1) A state parameter estimator $h: \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{n-1}$;
- 2) A message set (also the estimate set) $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}^n = [1 : 2^{nR}]$;
- 3) An encoder $\phi: \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$;
- 4) A decoder $\psi: \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{S}}^n$.

In practical systems, the S&C channel input X may be restricted by limited system resources. Let us define the cost-function $b(x) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as the channel cost, then a rate-distortion-cost tuple (R, D, B) is said achievable if there exists a sequence of $(2^{nR}, n)$ codes that satisfy

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta^{(n)} \leq D, \quad \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[b(X^n)] \leq B, \quad (4)$$

where D and B represent the total distortion and resource budget, respectively.

¹We will show that the optimal estimator h can be achieved by a symbol-by-symbol estimation later in Lemma 1. Namely, the estimate \tilde{S}_i only depends on X_i and Z_i but independent of past inputs and outputs. Here, we define the mapping in block form to maintain generality.

B. Optimal Sensing Estimator

The estimate \tilde{S} , as well as the communication source, is determined by the choice of sensing estimator at the BS. The optimal estimator is given through the following lemma.

Lemma 1 [14]: By recalling that $S \leftrightarrow XZ \leftrightarrow \tilde{S}$ forms a Markov chain, the sensing distortion $\Delta_s^{(n)}$ is minimized by the deterministic estimator

$$h^*(x^n, z^n) := (\tilde{s}^*(x_1, z_1), \tilde{s}^*(x_2, z_2), \dots, \tilde{s}^*(x_n, z_n)), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\tilde{s}^*(x, z) := \arg \min_{s' \in \tilde{S}} \sum_{s \in S} Q_{S|XZ}(s|x, z) d(s, s'), \quad (6)$$

with posterior transition probability being

$$Q_{S|XZ}(s|x, z) = \frac{P_S(s) Q_{Z|XS}(z|x, s)}{\sum_{s' \in S} P_S(s') Q_{Z|XS}(z|x, s')},$$

which is independent to the choice of encoder and decoder.

The detailed proof can be found in [14]. By applying the estimator (6), the estimation-cost function with respect to (w.r.t.) the channel input realization can be defined by

$$e(x) = \mathbb{E} [d(S, \tilde{s}^*(X, Z)) | X = x]. \quad (7)$$

Thus, a given estimation (or sensing) distortion D_s satisfies

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_s^{(n)} = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [e(X)] \leq D_s. \quad (8)$$

C. Constrained Communication Channel Capacity

The S&C processes are strongly coupled through the common S&C channel input, leading to a performance tradeoff between the sensing distortion and the achievable communication channel capacity. To proceed, let us define the channel capacity and the rate-distortion function under the CAS regime.

Definition 1: The information-theoretic channel capacity constrained by the desired sensing distortion D_s and resource cost B can be defined by

$$C^{\text{IT}}(D_s, B) = \max_{P_X(x) \in \mathcal{P}_{D_s} \cap \mathcal{P}_B} I(X; Y), \quad (9)$$

where $I(X; Y)$ denotes the mutual information (MI) between the communication channel input and output, \mathcal{P}_{D_s} is the sensing feasible probability set whose element satisfies

$$\mathcal{P}_{D_s} = \{P_X(x) | \mathbb{E} [e(X)] \leq D_s\}, \quad (10)$$

and \mathcal{P}_B is the resource feasible probability set described by

$$\mathcal{P}_B = \{P_X(x) | \mathbb{E} [b(X)] \leq B\}. \quad (11)$$

Note that the sequence $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is i.i.d. with distribution $P_X(x)$ for achieving the capacity-distortion region. By recalling the i.i.d. state sequence $\{S_i\}_{i \geq 1}$, the sensing channel output $\{Z_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is also i.i.d. subject to the distribution $P_Z(z) = \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_{Z|XS}(z|x, s) P_S(s) P_X(x)$. Furthermore, according to the symbol-by-symbol optimal sensing estimator in Lemma 1, we have the fact that the estimate $\{\tilde{S}_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ is i.i.d.

with the following distribution

$$P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{s \in S} Q_{Z|XS}(z|x, s) P_S(s) P_X(x) \mathbb{I}\{\tilde{s}^*(x, z) = \tilde{s}\}, \quad (12)$$

with $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ being the indicator function. Therefore, for the i.i.d. source \tilde{S} , the relationship between communication distortion D_c and bit rate R can be characterized by the rate-distortion theory.

Definition 2: The information-theoretic rate distortion function can be defined by

$$R^{\text{IT}}(D_c) = \min_{P_{\tilde{S}|\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}|\tilde{s}): \mathbb{E}[d(\tilde{S}, \hat{S})] \leq D_c} I(\tilde{S}; \hat{S}). \quad (13)$$

Here, we have

$$I(\tilde{S}; \hat{S}) \stackrel{(a)}{=} I(X, Z; \hat{S}) \stackrel{(b)}{=} I(X; \hat{S}), \quad (14)$$

where (a) is due to the deterministic sensing estimator (6) in Lemma 1, and (b) follows the fact that \hat{S} is conditionally independent to Z with a given X .

III. MODIFIED SOURCE-CHANNEL SEPARATION THEOREM

In this section, we develop the modified source-channel separation theorem tailored for the dual-functional signaling CAS systems, aiming to elucidate the relationships between total distortion, coding rate and communication channel capacity. The MSST retains a form analogous to the conventional source-channel separation theorem with distortion in lossy data transmission [26, Theorem 10.4.1].

Theorem 1: Under the condition that the distortion metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is separable for the S&C processes, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} [d(S, \hat{S})] = \mathbb{E} [d(S, \tilde{S})] + \mathbb{E} [d(\tilde{S}, \hat{S})], \quad (15)$$

the total distortion D can be achieved by the sum of S&C distortions, if and only if

$$R^{\text{IT}}(D_c) \leq C^{\text{IT}}(D_s, B), \quad (16)$$

where $C^{\text{IT}}(D_s, B)$ and $R^{\text{IT}}(D_c)$ are the constrained channel capacity (9) and the rate-distortion function (13), respectively.

The above MSST is proposed mathematically within the framework of information theory. Next, we elucidate the operational meaning of the MSST by proving that there must exist a practical coding scheme satisfying it.

A. Converse

We start with a converse to show that any achievable coding scheme must satisfy (16). Consider a $(2^{nR}, n)$ coding scheme defined by the encoding and decoding functions ϕ and ψ . Let $\tilde{S}^n = h^*(X^n, Z^n)$ be the estimate sequence as given in (5) and $\hat{S}^n = \psi(\phi(\tilde{S}^n))$ be the reconstruction sequence corresponding to \tilde{S}^n .

Let us focus on the communication process $\tilde{S} \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow \hat{S}$. By recalling from the proof of the converse in lossy source

coding, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R &\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(\tilde{S}_i; \hat{S}_i) \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n R^{\text{IT}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[d(\tilde{S}_i, \hat{S}_i) \right] \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} R^{\text{IT}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(\tilde{S}_i, \hat{S}_i) \right] \right) \stackrel{(c)}{\geq} R^{\text{IT}}(D_c), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where (a) follows the Definition 2 that R^{IT} is the minimum required MI, (b) and (c) are due to the convexity and non-increasing properties of the rate distortion function.

On the other hand, by recalling from the proof of the converse in channel coding, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; Y_i) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n C^{\text{IT}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X_i}(x) c(x), \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X_i}(x) b(x) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} C^{\text{IT}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X_i}(x) c(x), \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X_i}(x) b(x) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(f)}{\leq} C^{\text{IT}}(D_s, B), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where (d) follows the Definition 1 that the channel capacity is the maximum MI, (e) and (f) are due to the concavity and non-decreasing properties of the capacity constrained by estimation and resource costs [14]. By combing the inequalities (17), (18) and the data processing inequality $I(\tilde{S}; \hat{S}) = I(X; \hat{S}) \leq I(X; Y)$ benefit from the Markov chain $X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow \hat{S}$, we complete the proof of the converse.

B. Achievability

Let S^n be drawn i.i.d. $\sim P_S(s)$, we will show that there exists a coding scheme for a sufficiently large n and rate R , the distortion Δ^n can be achieved by D if (16) holds. The core idea follows the famous *random coding argument and source channel separation theorem with distortion*.

1) *Codebook Generation*: In source coding with rate distortion code, randomly generate a codebook \mathcal{C}_s consisting of 2^{nR} sequences \hat{S}^n which is drawn i.i.d. $\sim P_{\hat{S}}(\hat{s})$. The probability distribution is calculated by $P_{\hat{S}}(\hat{s}) = \sum_{\tilde{s}} P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}) Q_{\hat{S}|\tilde{S}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s})$, where $P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s})$ is defined in (12) and $Q_{\hat{S}|\tilde{S}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s})$ achieves the equality in (13). In channel coding, randomly generate a codebook \mathcal{C}_c consisting of 2^{nR} sequences X^n which is drawn i.i.d. $\sim P_X(x)$. The $P_X(x)$ is chosen by satisfying the constrained capacity with estimation- and resource-cost in (9). Index the codeword \hat{S}^n and X^n by $w \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{nR}\}$.

2) *Encoding*: Encode the \hat{S}^n by w such that

$$(\tilde{S}^n, \hat{S}^n(w)) \in \mathcal{T}_{d, \epsilon_s}^{(n)}(P_{\tilde{S}\hat{S}}(\tilde{s}, \hat{s})), \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{d, \epsilon_s}^{(n)}(P_{\tilde{S}\hat{S}}(\tilde{s}, \hat{s}))$ represents the distortion typical set [26] with joint probability distribution $P_{\tilde{S}\hat{S}}(\tilde{s}, \hat{s}) = P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}) Q_{\hat{S}|\tilde{S}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s})$. To send the message w , the encoder transmits $x^n(w)$.

3) *Decoding*: The decoder observes the communication channel output $Y^n = y^n$ and look for the index \hat{w} such that

$$(x^n(\hat{w}), y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_c}^{(n)}(P_{XY}(x, y)), \quad (20)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_c}^{(n)}(P_{XY}(x, y))$ represents the typical set with joint probability distribution $P_{XY}(x, y) = P_X(x) Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$. If there exists such \hat{w} , it declares $\hat{S}^n = \hat{S}^n(\hat{w})$. Otherwise, it declares an error.

4) *Estimation*: The encoder observes the channel output $Z^n = z^n$, and computes the estimate sequence with the knowledge of channel input x^n by using the estimator $\tilde{s}^n = h^*(x^n, z^n)$ given in (5).

5) *Distortion Analysis*: We start by analyzing the expected communication distortion (averaged over the random codebooks, state and channel noise). In lossy source coding, for a fixed codebook \mathcal{C}_s and choice of $\epsilon_s > 0$, the sequence $\tilde{s}^n \in \tilde{S}^n$ can be divided into two categories:

- $(\tilde{s}^n, \hat{S}^n(w)) \in \mathcal{T}_{d, \epsilon_s}^{(n)}$, we have $d(\tilde{s}^n, \hat{S}^n(w)) < D_c + \epsilon_s$;
- $(\tilde{s}^n, \hat{S}^n(w)) \notin \mathcal{T}_{d, \epsilon_s}^{(n)}$, we denote P_{e_s} as the total probability of these sequences. Thus, these sequence contribute at most $P_{e_s} d_{\max}$ to the expected distortion since the distortion for any individual sequence is bounded by d_{\max} .

According to the achievability of lossy source coding [26, Theorem 10.2.1], we have P_{e_s} tends to zero for sufficiently large n whenever $R \geq R^{\text{IT}}(D_c)$.

In channel coding, the decoder declares an error when the following events occur:

- $(x^n(w), y^n) \notin \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_c}^{(n)}$;
- $(x^n(w'), y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_c}^{(n)}$, for some $w' \neq w$, we denote P_{e_c} as the probability of the error occurred in decoder. The error decoding contribute at most $P_{e_c} d_{\max}$ to the expected distortion. Similarly, we have $P_{e_c} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ whenever $R \leq C^{\text{IT}}(D_s, B)$ according to channel coding theorem [26].

On the other hand, the expected estimation distortion can be upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_s^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(S_i, \tilde{S}_i) | \hat{W} \neq w \right] \Pr(\hat{W} \neq w) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(S_i, \tilde{S}_i) | \hat{W} = w \right] \Pr(\hat{W} = w) \\ &\leq P_{e_c} d_{\max} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(S_i, \tilde{S}_i) | \hat{W} = w \right] (1 - P_{e_c}). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that $(s^n, x^n(w), \tilde{s}^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_e}^{(n)}(P_{S X \tilde{S}}(s, x, \tilde{s}))$ where $P_{S X \tilde{S}}(s, x, \tilde{s})$ denotes the joint marginal distribution of $P_{S X Z \tilde{S}}(s, x, z, \tilde{s}) = P_S(s) P_X(x) Q_{Z|SX}(z|s, x) \mathbb{I}\{\tilde{s} = \tilde{s}^*(x, z)\}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[d(S_i, \tilde{S}_i) | \hat{W} = w \right] \leq (1 + \epsilon_e) \mathbb{E} \left[d(S, \tilde{S}) \right], \quad (22)$$

according to the typical average lemma [14]. In summary, the total distortion can be attained by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{(n)} &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Delta_s^{(n)} + \Delta_c^{(n)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} D_c + (P_{e_s} + 2P_{e_c}) d_{\max} + (1 + \epsilon_e)(1 - P_{e_c}) D_s, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where (a) follows the condition of the separable distortion metric in MSST and we omit the terms containing the product of P_{e_s} and P_{e_c} in step (b). Consequently, taking $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$P_{e_s}, P_{e_c}, \epsilon_c, \epsilon_e, \epsilon_s \rightarrow 0$, we can conclude that the expected total distortion (averaged over the random codebooks, state and channel noise) tends to be $D \rightarrow D_c + D_s$ whenever $R^{\text{IT}}(D_c) \leq R \leq C^{\text{IT}}(D_s, B)$.

This completes the proof of the proposed MSST. \blacksquare

Remark: The sensing process determines the accuracy of the state information acquisition at the BS, whereas the communication process governs the quantity of information transmitted to the user. Overemphasis on either process can result in substantial performance degradation. For instance, achieving optimal sensing performance alone may not ensure the accurate reconstruction at the end-user's side due to limitations in the communication channel capacity. Conversely, excessive communication capacity may be wasted if the sensory data lacks sufficient accuracy. This underscores the need to investigate optimal channel input as well as the waveform design that minimize the total distortion.

IV. CHANNEL INPUT DISTRIBUTION OPTIMIZATION FOR THE CAS SYSTEMS

In this section, we explore the optimal input distribution for the CAS system under scalar channels, aiming to minimize total distortion under the MMST constraint. It should be noted that the MSST applies only when the distortion metric is separable. Fortunately, we demonstrate that the mean squared error (MSE) or quadratic distortion, a widely used distortion metric in parameter estimation, satisfies the separability condition. Specifically, we have

$$D = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| S - \hat{S} \right\|_2^2 \right] \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| S - \tilde{S} \right\|_2^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \tilde{S} - \hat{S} \right\|_2^2 \right] \triangleq D_s + D_c, \quad (24)$$

where (a) holds from the properties of the conditional expectation [20, Appendix A]

$$\mathbb{E}[(S - \tilde{S})^T (\tilde{S} - \hat{S})] = \mathbb{E}[(S - \mathbb{E}[S|Z, X])^T f(Z, X)] = 0,$$

with $\tilde{S} = \mathbb{E}[S|Z, X]$ being the optimal estimator in (6) ².

Hereinafter, we adopt the MSE as the distortion metric to guarantee the MSST. Meanwhile, we drop the superscript "IT" in the MSST.

A. Problem Formulation

The ISAC channel input design can be formulated by the following optimization problem ³

$$\mathcal{P}_0 \begin{cases} \min_{P_X(x)} D = D_c + D_s \\ \text{subject to } R(D_c) \leq I(D_s, B). \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

²We highlight that the (6) is exactly the minimum MSE (MMSE) estimator. An arbitrary non-optimal estimator except MMSE, which cannot apply the conditional expectation properties, may not satisfy the separability condition.

³Here, we use the symbol $I(D_s, B)$ instead of $C(D_s, B)$ to emphasize that the optimal distribution does not necessarily achieve the channel capacity.

By substituting the associated expressions into (25), problem \mathcal{P}_0 can be reformulated by

$$\mathcal{P}_1 \begin{cases} \min_{P_X(x)} \mathbb{E} [d(S, \tilde{S})] + \mathbb{E} [d(\tilde{S}, \hat{S})] \\ \text{subject to } I(\tilde{S}; \hat{S}) \leq I(X; Y), \\ \mathbb{E} [b(X)] \leq B. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

It is challenging to directly solve the functional optimization problem \mathcal{P}_1 due to the difficulty in obtaining explicit expressions of distortions and MI for arbitrary distributions. Typically, the BA algorithm can be employed to solve problem \mathcal{P}_1 numerically. Inspired by this idea, we expand the expectation operation and the MI w.r.t. the variable $P_X(x)$ as follows.

- *Sensing distortion:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [d(S, \tilde{S})] &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [d(S, \tilde{s}(X, Z)) | X, Z]] \\ &= \sum_{x, z} P_{XZ}(x, z) \sum_s Q_{S|XZ}(s|x, z) d(s, \tilde{s}(x, z)) \\ &\triangleq \sum_x P_X(x) e(x), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where the sensing cost $e(x)$ defined in (7) can be expressed by

$$e(x) = \sum_z Q_{Z|X}(z|x) \sum_s Q_{S|XZ}(s|x, z) d(s, \tilde{s}(x, z)). \quad (28)$$

- *Channel MI:*

$$I(X; Y) = \sum_{x, y} P_X(x) Q_{Y|X}(y|x) \log \frac{Q_{X|Y}(x|y)}{P_X(x)}. \quad (29)$$

- *Resource budget:*

$$\mathbb{E} [b(X)] = \sum_x P_X(x) b(x). \quad (30)$$

- *Communication distortion:*

$$\mathbb{E} [d(\tilde{S}, \hat{S})] = \sum_{\tilde{s}} P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}) \sum_{\hat{s}} Q_{\hat{S}|\tilde{S}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s}) d(\tilde{s}, \hat{s}). \quad (31)$$

- *Rate distortion function:*

$$I(\tilde{S}; \hat{S}) = \sum_{\tilde{s}, \hat{s}} P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}) Q_{\hat{S}|\tilde{S}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s}) \log \frac{Q_{\tilde{S}|\hat{S}}(\tilde{s}|\hat{s})}{P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s})}. \quad (32)$$

Here, we emphasize the unique challenge in solving problem \mathcal{P}_1 . In the conventional BA algorithm, the primary approach involves constructing the Lagrangian function w.r.t. the variable and obtaining the optimal solution based on the first-order necessary condition. However, the probability distribution $P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s})$ in (31) and (32) is indeed a function of the variable $P_X(x)$ as describe in (12). Consequently, deriving a closed-form expression of $P_X(x)$ from first-order necessary condition is challenging, which imposes a significant obstacle to solving problem \mathcal{P}_1 by using the conventional BA algorithm. To address this issue, we propose a two-step BA-based optimal search method to seek for a sub-optimal solution in the following subsection.

B. Two-step BA-based Optimal Search Algorithm

We divide the original problem \mathcal{P}_1 into two sub-problems.

1) *Sub-problem 1*: We determine the constrained communication channel capacity $I(X, Y)$ for a given sensing distortion D_s and identify the optimal distribution $P_X(x)$.

2) *Sub-problem 2*: We calculate the minimum communication distortion D_c for the given channel input distribution $P_X(x)$ and determine the communication distortion D_c , thereby obtaining the total distortion D .

By varying the preset sensing distortions, one may generate a set \mathcal{D} collecting the total distortions calculated through the above two steps. Thus, the minimum total distortion and its corresponding distribution $P_X(x)$ can be identified by the minimum value search. The detailed procedure is as follows.

• **Constrained communication channel Capacity for a given sensing distortion.**

In this sub-problem, $I(X; Y)$ is maximized under the constraints of sensing distortion D_s and resource budget B , which can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{P_X(x)} I(X; Y) \\ & \text{subject to } \sum_x P_X(x)e(x) \leq D_s, \quad \sum_x P_X(x)b(x) \leq B. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Inspired by [12], we reformulate (33) by incorporating the sensing distortion cost as a penalty term in the objective function, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{P_X(x)} I(P_X(x), Q_{Y|X}(y|x)) - \mu \sum_x P_X(x)e(x) \\ & \text{subject to } \sum_x P_X(x)b(x) \leq B, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where μ is the penalty factor to balance the weight of S&C performance. For a given μ , the Lagrangian function of (34) can be written by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(P_X(x), \lambda) = & I(P_X(x), Q_{Y|X}(y|x)) \\ & - \mu \sum_x P_X(x)e(x) + \lambda \sum_x P_X(x)b(x). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

By setting the derivative $\partial \mathcal{L}(P_X(x), \lambda) / \partial P_X(x)$ to zero and taking the fact that $\sum_x P_X(x) = 1$ into account, we have

$$P_X(x) = \frac{e^{h(x)}}{\sum_{x'} e^{h(x')}} \quad (36)$$

with

$$h(x) = \sum_y Q_{Y|X}(y|x) \log Q_{X|Y}(x|y) - \mu e(x) - \lambda b(x). \quad (37)$$

In formula (36), the Lagrangian multiplier λ and the posterior distribution $Q_{X|Y}(x|y)$ are unknown. The former may be determined by a bisection search method such that $\sum_x P_X(x)b(x) \rightarrow B$. For the latter, we have the optimal posterior distribution which maximizes the MI with given $P_X(x)$ and $Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$, expressed by [27, Lemma 9.1]

$$Q_{X|Y}(x|y) = \frac{P_X(x)Q_{Y|X}(y|x)}{\sum_{x'} P_X(x')Q_{Y|X}(y|x')}. \quad (38)$$

After setting an initial distribution $P_{X_0}(x)$, problem (34) can be solved by updating (38) and (36) iteratively. The detailed

Algorithm 1: Modified Iteration BA Algorithm

Input: $P_S(s)$, $Q_{Z|SX}(z|s, x)$ and $Q_{Y|X}(y|x)$, B , μ , K .

- 1 **Initialize:** Set $P_{X_0}(x)$ as uniform distribution;
 - 2 **for** $k \leq K$ **do**
 - 3 **Step 1:** Compute sensing cost $e(x)$ in (6) ;
 - 4 **Step 2:** Update posterior distribution in (38) ;
 - 5 **Step 3:** Update $P_X(x)$ in (36) ;
 - 6 **Step 4:** Find λ^* by bisection searching ;
 - 7 **end**
- Output:** Optimal $P_X(x)$, D_s and $I(X; Y)$.
-

procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1, whose convergence can be guaranteed [14], [28].

• **Source distribution** $P_S(\tilde{s})$.

The tradeoff between sensing distortion and constrained communication capacity can be adjusted by varying the penalty factor μ . Let us denote the optimal channel input distribution, sensing distortion, and channel MI obtained by Algorithm 1 as $P_X^{(\mu)}(x)$, $D_s^{(\mu)}$, and $I^{(\mu)}(X; Y)$, respectively, to highlight their dependence on the factor μ .

Subsequently, given a specific channel input distribution $P_X^{(\mu)}(x)$, our objective is to compute the estimate distribution $P_S^{(\mu)}(\tilde{s})$, which is essential for determining the rate-distortion function. However, deriving the explicit expression of the estimate distribution for an arbitrary state distribution $P_S(s)$ is a challenging task. Instead, we can compute the estimate \tilde{S} and its distribution $P_S^{(\mu)}(\tilde{s})$ using formulas (6) and (12), respectively, by performing a sufficiently large number of random trials. For analytical convenience, we consider a Gaussian state distribution and a linear sensing model, which allows for explicit expressions to be derived.

Assume that the target's state follows Gaussian distribution with $\mathcal{CN}(0, \nu_s^2)$. Let us consider the following linear sensing model

$$Z = XS + N, \quad (39)$$

where $N \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ represents Gaussian channel noise. In such a Gaussian linear model, the estimator (6) is indeed an MMSE estimator for each channel realization x . Therefore, the estimate \tilde{S} and the corresponding conditional probability distribution of $P_{\tilde{S}|X}(\tilde{s}|x)$ can be expressed by

$$\tilde{S} = \frac{x^2 \nu_s^4}{(1 + x^2 \nu_s^2)^2} Z, \quad P_{\tilde{S}|X}(\tilde{s}|x) \sim \mathcal{CN}\left(0, \frac{x^2 \nu_s^4}{1 + x^2 \nu_s^2}\right). \quad (40)$$

Moreover, sensing cost is the MSE with the given realization x , which can be written by

$$e(x) = \frac{\nu_s^2}{(1 + x^2 \nu_s^2)}. \quad (41)$$

Consequently, the source distribution can be given by

$$P_S^{(\mu)}(\tilde{s}) = P_X^{(\mu)}(x) P_{\tilde{S}|X}(\tilde{s}|x). \quad (42)$$

• **Communication and total distortions.**

In this sub-problem, we aim to evaluate the minimum communication distortion $D_c^{(\mu)}$ achieved under the source distribution $P_S^{(\mu)}(\tilde{s})$ and the channel capacity $I^{(\mu)}(X; Y)$. This

Algorithm 2: Communication Distortion Algorithm

Input: $P_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\tilde{s}), I^{(u)}(X; Y), K$, a set of the slopes \mathcal{A} .

- 1 **for** $\lambda_s \in \mathcal{A}$ **do**
- 2 **Initialize:** Set $Q_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s})$ as uniform distribution ;
- 3 **for** $k \leq K$ **do**
- 4 **Step 1:** Update output distribution in (45) ;
- 5 **Step 2:** Update $Q_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s})$ in (44) ;
- 6 **end**
- 7 **Step 3:** Collect data $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow (D_c^{(\lambda_s)}, I^{(\lambda_s)}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}; \hat{\mathcal{S}}))$;
- 8 **end**
- 9 **Step 4:** Characterize the $D(R)$ function base on \mathcal{I} ;

Output: Communication distortion in 46.

scenario corresponds to a typical rate-distortion problem in lossy data transmission. The distortion-rate curve can be obtained by the optimization problem [27, Chapter 9]

$$\min_{Q_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s})} I(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}; \hat{\mathcal{S}}) - \lambda_s D_c \quad (43)$$

where λ_s represents the slope of the distortion-rate curve. The conventional BA algorithm can be leveraged to solve problem (43). By following a similar procedure in sub-problem 1, the optimal solution can be calculated by

$$Q_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s}) = \frac{P_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s})e^{\lambda_s d(\tilde{s}, \hat{s})}}{\sum_{\hat{s}} P_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}')e^{\lambda_s d(\tilde{s}, \hat{s}')}}. \quad (44)$$

The unknown nuisance term $P_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s})$ can be updated by

$$P_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}) = \sum_{\tilde{s}} P_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\tilde{s}) Q_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s}). \quad (45)$$

By setting an initial distribution $Q_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}(\hat{s}|\tilde{s})$, the optimal solution of (43) can be obtained by updating (45) and (44) iteratively. The detailed derivations can be found in [27].

For a given slop λ_s , the tangent point $(D_c^{(\lambda_s)}, I^{(\lambda_s)}(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}; \hat{\mathcal{S}}))$ of the distortion-rate curve can be obtained by solving problem (43). We may collect a series of distortion-rate data points to fit a distortion-rate function by varying the slop λ_s . Thus, the communication distortion constrained by a given channel capacity is attained by

$$D_c^{(u)} = D(I^{(u)}(X; Y)). \quad (46)$$

We summarize the communication distortion computation algorithm into Algorithm 2.

In the outer loop, we may collect a set \mathcal{D} of total distortion $D^{(\mu)}$ and the associated channel input distribution $P_X^{(\mu)}(x)$ by repeating the above steps with various penalty factor μ . Therefore, the optimal channel distribution that minimizes the total distortion can be found by

$$D^{(\mu^*)} = \arg \min_{D \in \mathcal{D}} D, \quad P_X^{(\mu^*)}(x) = P_X^{(\mu^*)}(x). \quad (47)$$

The proposed two-step BA-based optimal search algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: Two-step BA-based Optimal Search

Input: The set of penalty factor $\mathcal{U} \subset [0, \mu_{\max}]$.

- 1 **for** $u \in \mathcal{U}$ **do**
- 2 **Step 1:** Obtain $P_X^{(\mu)}(x), D^{(\mu)}$, and $I^{(u)}(X; Y)$ through Algorithm 1 ;
- 3 **Step 2:** Calculate estimate distribution $P_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}^{(\mu)}(\tilde{s})$;
- 4 **Step 3:** Obtain $D_c^{(\mu)}$ through Algorithm 2 ;
- 5 **Step 4:** $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow D^{(\mu)} = D_s^{(\mu)} + D_c^{(\mu)}$;
- 6 **end**

Output: Optimal solution in (47).

V. WAVEFORM DESIGN FOR GAUSSIAN CHANNEL INPUT

The previous section illustrates that using Gaussian channel input may not be optimal for CAS systems. Despite this limitation, the assumption of Gaussian signals is prevalent in communications research literature. In this section, we introduce an ISAC waveform design scheme specifically developed for multi-input multi-output (MIMO) systems, while adhering to the framework of Gaussian signaling.

A. System Model

The widely employed signal models of the S&C processes for the MIMO systems are expressed by

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{H}_s \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{N}_s, \quad \mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{H}_c \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{N}_c, \quad (48)$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times T}$, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_s \times T}$, and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{C}^{M_c \times T}$ represent the transmitting ISAC signal, the received signals at the BS and the end-user, respectively; \mathbf{H}_s and \mathbf{H}_c denote the S&C channel state information (CSI) matrices; \mathbf{N}_s and \mathbf{N}_c are the channel noises whose entries follow the complex Gaussian distribution with $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_s^2)$ and $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_c^2)$; Finally, N_t , M_s , M_c , and T denote the numbers of Tx antennas, S&C receiver (Rx) antennas, and the transmitting symbols, respectively.

We focus on the sensing task of target response matrix (TRM) estimation, where the to-be-estimate parameters can be written by $\mathbf{s} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{H}_s)$. After vectorization operations, the sensing signal observed at the BS can be recast by

$$\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{I}_{M_s} \otimes \mathbf{X}^H) \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{n}_s, \quad (49)$$

with $\mathbf{z} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}^H)$, and $\mathbf{n}_s = \text{vec}(\mathbf{N}_s^H)$. In the CAS process, the BS estimates TRM $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$ from the observations \mathbf{z} , then transmits it to the user through communication channel \mathbf{H}_c . Subsequently, the user can reconstruct $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$ from the communication received data \mathbf{Y} . Here, we adopt the quadratic distortion metric (MSE), which meets the separable condition as shown in (24). Before proceeding the ISAC waveform design, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 1: The ISAC waveform \mathbf{X} follows complex Gaussian distribution with $\mathcal{CN}(0, \mathbf{R}_x)$, where $\mathbf{R}_x \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times N_t}$ is the covariance matrix.

Assumption 2: The TRM vector \mathbf{s} follows complex Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{CN}(0, \mathbf{I}_{M_s} \otimes \mathbf{\Sigma}_s)$, where $\mathbf{\Sigma}_s \in \mathbb{C}^{N_t \times N_t}$

Algorithm 4: SCA-based Waveform Design Algorithm

Input: An initial covariance matrix \mathbf{R}_0 , K .

1 **for** $k \leq K$ **do**

2 **Step 1:** Obtain optimal \mathbf{R}_x^* by solving \mathcal{P}_3 ;

3 **Step 2:** $\mathbf{R}_0 = \mathbf{R}_x^*$;

4 **end**

Output: Optimal solution \mathbf{R}_x^* .

denotes the covariance matrix of each column of \mathbf{H}_s .⁴

The above assumptions enable us to derive the explicit expressions of the S&C distortions, the estimate distribution $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$, and the communication channel capacity w.r.t. the ISAC waveform matrix \mathbf{X} .

1) *Sensing distortion:* For the Gaussian linear model (49), the optimal estimator (6), i.e., the well-known minimum mean squared error (MMSE) estimator, is leveraged to obtain the estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$ by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{s}} = \left(\mathbf{I}_{M_s} \otimes \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^H \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s \mathbf{X} + \sigma_s^2 \mathbf{I}_T)^{-1} \right) \right) \mathbf{z}, \quad (50)$$

Furthermore, the sensing distortion is attained by [31]

$$D_s(\mathbf{R}_x) = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{s} - \tilde{\mathbf{s}}\|^2] = M_s \text{Tr} \left(\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} \mathbf{R}_x + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s^{-1} \right)^{-1} \right). \quad (51)$$

2) *Communication distortion:* The estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$ in (50) follows the complex Gaussian distribution with $\mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{M_s} \otimes \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}})$, with the covariance matrix of [31]

$$\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s - \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} \mathbf{R}_x + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s^{-1} \right)^{-1}. \quad (52)$$

Let us temporarily omit the Kronecker product. For a Gaussian source $\mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}})$, the rate-distortion function can be characterized by the following optimization problem [32]

$$R(D_c) = \min_{\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{S}_{N_t}^+} \log \left(\frac{\det(\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}})}{\det(\mathbf{D})} \right) \quad (53)$$

subject to $\mathbf{D} \preceq \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}}$, $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}) \leq D_c$,

where $\mathbb{S}_{N_t}^+$ denotes the set of all $N_t \times N_t$ positive definite matrices. More details on (53) can be found in the proof of [32, Theorem 2].

3) *Channel Capacity:* The MIMO Gaussian channel capacity can be expressed by

$$C(\mathbf{R}_x) = I(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{H}_c) = \log \det \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_c^2} \mathbf{H}_c \mathbf{R}_x \mathbf{H}_c^H + \mathbf{I}_{M_c} \right). \quad (54)$$

B. ISAC Waveform Design

Observe that the expressions (51) to (54) are all related to the covariance matrix \mathbf{R}_x rather than the specific waveform matrix \mathbf{X} . Consequently, our ISAC waveform design problem

⁴This assumption corresponds to the scenario that the Rx antennas for sensing are sufficiently separated so that the correlations among the rows of \mathbf{H}_s can be ignored [29]. Here, we specify this Kronecker structure in TRM covariance matrix to simplify the expression of sensing distortion [30]. To avoid the deviation of our core contribution in this paper, we will leave the general TRM covariance matrix cases for future research.

can be transformed into determining the optimal covariance matrix that minimizes the total distortion. Regarding the system resource constraint, we only consider the transmit power at the BS. By substituting the expressions into the original problem \mathcal{P}_1 and introducing an auxiliary variable of positive definite matrix \mathbf{D} , the ISAC waveform design problem can be reformulated by

$$\mathcal{P}_2 \begin{cases} \min_{\mathbf{R}_x, \mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{S}_{N_t}^+} D_s(\mathbf{R}_x) + \text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}) \\ \text{subject to } C(\mathbf{R}_x) - M_s \log \left(\frac{\det(\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}})}{\det(\mathbf{D})} \right) \geq 0, \\ \mathbf{D} \preceq \mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{R}_x \succeq \mathbf{0}, \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}_x) \leq P_T, \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

where P_T is the power budget. \mathcal{P}_2 is non-convex due to the nonlinear intermediate variables $\log \det(\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}})$ and $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}}$. To relax \mathcal{P}_2 into a convex problem, we employ an SCA technique based on Taylor series expansion. To be specified, for any given point \mathbf{R}_0 , the matrix $\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}}$ can be approximated by

$$\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}} \simeq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s - \mathbf{P} + \frac{1}{\sigma_s} \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{R}_x - \mathbf{R}_0) \mathbf{P} \triangleq \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}}, \quad (56)$$

with the constant matrix defined by

$$\mathbf{P} = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} \mathbf{R}_0 + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s^{-1} \right)^{-1}.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \det(\mathbf{R}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}}) &\simeq \log \det(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s - \mathbf{P}) \\ &+ \text{Tr} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s - \mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{R}_x - \mathbf{R}_0) \mathbf{P} \right) \triangleq f(\mathbf{R}_x). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}}$ and $f(\mathbf{R}_x)$ are both the linear functions w.r.t. variable \mathbf{R}_x with a given point \mathbf{R}_0 . By substituting (56) and (57) into \mathcal{P}_2 , the problem can be relaxed into

$$\mathcal{P}_3 \begin{cases} \min_{\mathbf{R}_x, \mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{S}_{N_t}^+} D_s(\mathbf{R}_x) + \text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}) \\ \text{subject to } C(\mathbf{R}_x) - M_s (f(\mathbf{R}_x) - \log \det(\mathbf{D})) \geq 0, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{\tilde{\mathbf{s}}} - \mathbf{D} \succeq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R}_x \succeq \mathbf{0}, \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}_x) \leq P_T. \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

For a given point \mathbf{R}_0 , \mathcal{P}_3 is convex since both the objective and constraints are either convex or linear. Therefore, it can be efficiently solved by using the off-the-shelf CVX toolbox [33]. For an initial covariance matrix, e.g., $\mathbf{R}_0 = P_T/N_t \mathbf{I}$, the non-convex problem \mathcal{P}_2 can be addressed by iteratively computing the optimal solution \mathbf{R}_x^* of \mathcal{P}_3 and updating $\mathbf{R}_0 = \mathbf{R}_x^*$ until convergence. The procedure is outlined in Algorithm 4.

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

The simulation results are divided into two sections. The first section evaluates the optimal distribution for the ISAC channel input in scalar cases, demonstrating the effectiveness of the proposed MSST and the two-step BA-based optimal search algorithm. Moreover, the unique distortion-capacity (D-C) curves of the CAS system are provided to illustrate the performance tradeoff between S&C processes. The second section presents the results of the optimal waveform design for the Gaussian MIMO channel, showing its superiority over the S&C-optimal schemes.




Fig. 3. The changes of the S&C distortions with various factor μ .




Fig. 4. The total distortion versus the communication channel capacity.

A. Optimal Distribution for ISAC Channel Input

In this subsection, we aim to reveal the unique performance tradeoff between S&C processes. The simulation parameters are set as follows. The prior distribution of the target's state is assumed to be $P_S(s) \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$, i.e., $\nu_s^2 = 1$. We define the normalized signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) for the S&C channels as $10 \log(1/\sigma^2)$ dB and set the power budget to be $B = 5$. Unless otherwise specified, the S&C channel SNRs are set to be $\text{SNR}_s = \text{SNR}_c = 0$ dB in this subsection. To improve the computational efficiency, the weighted factor μ takes values from the sets $[0, 1]$, $[1, 5]$, and $[5, 30]$ with non-uniform spacings of 0.1, 0.5, and 5, respectively.

1) *The D-C curves and the optimal distribution of ISAC channel input:* Fig. 3 presents the D-C curves for both S&C processes. As expected, sensing distortion D_s increases as the values of μ decrease, implying that the estimation performance at the BS becomes less significant. Conversely, the communication channel capacity increases accordingly, leading to a reduction in communication distortion D_c . Consequently, these opposing trends in S&C distortions result in an uncertain total distortion. In Fig. 4, we show the resultant D-C curve for the CAS systems with different sensing SNRs. A CAS-optimal point that minimizes the total distortion is evident, highlighting a unique phenomenon in CAS systems compared




Fig. 5. The channel input distribution of S&C-optimal and CAS-optimal.




Fig. 6. The distortion-capacity curves with various state variances.

to the existing studies [14], [15].

Fig. 5 depicts the specific channel input distributions corresponding to three special points in Fig.4, namely, the S&C-optimal and CAS-optimal points. The channel capacity is maximized without the sensing constraint when $\mu = 0$. It is well-known that Gaussian channel input achieves the maximum MI for the Gaussian channels. By contrast, at the sensing-optimal point, as μ becomes sufficiently large, the channel input exhibits a 2-ary pulse amplitude modulation. These results are consistent with the findings in [12]. However, the unique CAS-optimal distribution, presenting a compromise between the S&C-optimal distributions, is attained at $\mu = 2.5$.

2) *The impact of the target's prior variance:* Subsequently, we investigate the impact of the target's state variance by selecting the values of $\nu_s^2 \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 5\}$. Due to the significant differences in the order of magnitude of the values for MI and sensing distortions in (34), we adjust the interval of μ for each state variance rather than using a fixed interval. The essential purpose of the CAS systems is to reduce the uncertainty of the target's prior information, specifically the variance of the state's prior distribution.

In Fig. 6, each point represents a lower total distortion compared to the prior variance, even at the S&C-optimal points. This reduction is attributed to the resource multiplexing gain achieved through the dual-functional signaling strategy.




Fig. 7. The CAS-optimal distribution for various state variances.

Additionally, we observe that the CAS-optimal point gradually shifts from sensing-optimal to communication-optimal as variance increases. A small variance indicates relatively accurate prior information about the target's state, necessitating an ISAC channel input with strong sensing capabilities for better accuracy performance. Conversely, as variance increases, greater emphasis on communication performance is required to convey more information.

We provide the detailed distributions of the CAS-optimal channel input for different state variances. For a small variance (e.g., $\nu_s^2 = 0.1$), the sensing distortion becomes small accordingly. It is at least less than the prior variance; otherwise, the user can 'guess' the state information in terms of the prior distribution. Therefore, a large weighted factor is required, e.g., $\mu = 690$, to balance the values of MI and sensing distortion in (34). In this case, the CAS-optimal distribution aligns with the sensing-optimal distribution, specifically a standard 2-ary pulse amplitude modulation. As anticipated, the optimal μ values decrease with increasing state variance, and the CAS-optimal distribution changes accordingly.

B. Optimal Waveform Design for Gaussian Signal

In this subsection, we demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed ISAC waveform design scheme for Gaussian signaling. The general system setups are as follows. The communication channel is modeled by Rayleigh fading, where each entry of \mathbf{H}_c obeys the standard complex Gaussian distribution. All results are obtained by the average of 100 Monte Carlo trials and the average distortion in each Monte Carlo trial is calculated by $D/(M_s N_t)$.

1) *Waveform design for a 2-D special case:* We begin with a two-dimensional (2-D) special case where the state covariance matrix, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_s = \text{diag}\{a_1, a_2\}$, is assumed to be diagonal. In this scenario, the global optimal solution of problem \mathcal{P}_2 can be attained through a 2-D exhaustive search, as outlined in [11]. Thus, this optimal solution⁵ can serve

⁵The optimal eigenspace of \mathbf{R}_x must align with the communication eigenspace of $\mathbf{H}_c^H \mathbf{H}_c$ as the sensing eigenspace is an arbitrary unitary matrix. Thus, the original problem can be reduced to finding two optimal eigenvalues over 2-D grids, with the sum of each 2-D point equal to P_T .




Fig. 8. The average distortion versus sensing channel SNRs for various methods, $a_1 = 0.4, a_2 = 0.1, N_t = M_c = M_s = 2$.

as a benchmark for comparing the superiority of our method. Accordingly, the numbers of the Tx and S&C Rx antennas are set by $N_t = M_c = M_s = 2$.

Fig. 8 illustrates the impact of sensing channel quality on the achievable average distortion. The sensing SNRs vary from 0 dB to 20 dB with a spacing 2 dB. Besides the global optimal benchmark, the S&C optimal waveform schemes refer to the solutions that minimize the MMSE in (51) and maximize the channel capacity in (54), respectively. At a glance, we observe that the achievable average distortion decreases with increasing sensing channel SNRs. Furthermore, the sensing-optimal scheme is preferable for acquiring accurate target information when the communication channel is sufficiently good at $\text{SNR}_c = 5$ dB. However, the sensing-optimal scheme may cause significant performance degradation as the communication SNR decreases. Particularly, the sensing-optimal curve even tends to be flat at $\text{SNR}_c = -5$ dB, implying that a poor communication channel severely limits performance improvement. This clearly highlights the unique tradeoff between S&C processes in CAS systems. Finally, it is worth noting that the proposed algorithm achieves satisfactory performance compared to the global optimal solution.

In Fig. 9, we investigate the impact of state variances on the achievable average distortion in the MIMO systems. The state variances are scaled by a factor ranging from 2 to 10. Two interesting observations emerge. 1) For small state variances, the global optimal scheme coincides with the sensing-optimal scheme at $\text{SNR}_c = 10$ dB. However, both the S&C-optimal schemes experience performance degradation as state variances increase. 2) When the communication channel quality is insufficient at $\text{SNR}_c = -5$ dB, the global optimal scheme tends towards the communication-optimal scheme to enhance communication capabilities. As state variances increase, the performance degradation of the sensing-optimal scheme becomes more significant. Nevertheless, our proposed algorithm can effectively balance the S&C processes, resulting in improved average distortion.

2) *Waveform design for general MIMO cases:* Subsequently, we extend the results to high-dimensional matrix




Fig. 9. The impact of the state variances on the CAS performance, $\text{SNR}_s = 5$ dB, $N_t = M_c = M_s = 2$.




Fig. 10. The average distortion versus sensing channel SNRs for various methods, $N_t = 10, M_s = 2, M_c = 5$.

scenarios, where the number of Tx antennas is $N_t = 10$, and the numbers of S&C Rx antennas are $M_s = 2$ and $M_c = 5$, respectively. The state covariance matrix Σ_s is randomly generated as an $N_t \times N_t$ Hermitian matrix. It is worth noting that obtaining the global optimal solution is challenging due to the highly coupled S&C processes. For comparison purposes, we provide the results of the Heuristic algorithm proposed in [11], whose formulation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{R}_x} \quad & \beta I(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{H}_c) + (1 - \beta) I(\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{H}_s | \mathbf{X}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \text{Tr}(\mathbf{R}_x) \leq P_T, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where $I(\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{H}_s | \mathbf{X}) = \log \det \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} \Sigma_s \mathbf{R}_x + \mathbf{I}_{N_t} \right)$ is defined by sensing MI and $I(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{X} | \mathbf{H}_c)$ is defined in (54). The weighted factor β takes values over the interval $[0, 1]$ with L grid points. In our simulations, L is set to be 11.

Fig. 10 illustrates the average distortions versus sensing channel SNRs for various waveform design schemes. It can be observed that the proposed algorithm outperforms its counterparts. Similar trends to those shown in Fig. 8 for the 2-D case are also noticeable. Besides, we can observe that the




Fig. 11. The average distortion versus the number of sensing Rx antennas, $N_t = 10, M_c = 5, \text{SNR}_s = 0$ dB, $\text{SNR}_c = 10$ dB.




Fig. 12. The average distortion versus the number of communication Rx antennas, $N_t = 10, M_s = 2, \text{SNR}_c = 0$ dB.

proposed ISAC waveform design achieves significantly greater performance gains in high-dimensional scenarios.

Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 demonstrate the influence of S&C Rx antennas on average distortion across various waveform design schemes. Fig. 11 exhibits a linear increase in average distortion with the addition of sensing Rx antennas. The linearity feature consistent with the Kronecker product form in assumption 2. Moreover, regarding the TRM estimation, an increase in sensing Rx antennas necessitates more channel information to be estimated, leading to a larger average distortion.

In contrast, Fig. 12 shows a declining trend in average distortion as the number of communication Rx antennas increases. This performance improvement is attributed to enhanced communication channel capacity facilitated by multiple Rx antenna gain, thereby improving overall system performance. Additionally, under the communication-optimal scheme, there is a gradual performance degradation as channel capacity increases. This trend arises because improving sensing performance becomes critical in scenarios with excessive communication channel capacity. Once again, the proposed ISAC waveform design method is superior to the other coun-

terparts in all scenarios.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we delve into the dual-functional signaling strategy for communication-assisted sensing (CAS) systems across three primary aspects. Firstly, we develop a modified source-channel separation theorem (MSST) tailored for CAS systems under the condition of separable distortion metric. We elucidate the operational meaning of the proposed MSST from the perspective of coding theory. Secondly, we develop an input distribution optimization scheme for the CAS system under scalar channels, which minimizes the total distortion while adhering to the MSST and resource constraints. We determine the optimal distribution for CAS systems, balancing between the conventional communication-optimal (Gaussian distribution) and sensing-optimal (2-ary pulse amplitude modulation) schemes. Thirdly, we propose an ISAC waveform design method for Gaussian signaling in MIMO CAS systems, where a successive convex approximation (SCA) algorithm is conceived to solve for the optimal covariance matrix. Simulation results show the unique performance tradeoff between the sensing and communication processes.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Dong, F. Liu, S. Liu, Y. Xiong, W. Yuan, and Y. Cui, "Fundamental limits of communication-assisted sensing in ISAC systems," *accepted by IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2024.
- [2] F. Liu, Y. Cui, C. Masouros, J. Xu, T. X. Han, Y. C. Eldar, and S. Buzzi, "Integrated sensing and communications: Toward dual-functional wireless networks for 6g and beyond," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1728–1767, 2022.
- [3] S. Lu, F. Liu, Y. Li, K. Zhang, H. Huang, J. Zou, X. Li, Y. Dong, F. Dong, J. Zhu, Y. Xiong, W. Yuan, Y. Cui, and L. Hanzo, "Integrated sensing and communications: Recent advances and ten open challenges," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 11, no. 11, pp. 19094–19120, 2024.
- [4] F. Liu, L. Zhou, C. Masouros, A. Li, W. Luo, and A. Petropulu, "Toward dual-functional radar-communication systems: Optimal waveform design," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 66, no. 16, pp. 4264–4279, 2018.
- [5] X. Liu, T. Huang, N. Shlezinger, Y. Liu, J. Zhou, and Y. C. Eldar, "Joint transmit beamforming for multiuser mimo communications and mimo radar," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 3929–3944, 2020.
- [6] J. A. Zhang, F. Liu, C. Masouros, R. W. Heath, Z. Feng, L. Zheng, and A. Petropulu, "An overview of signal processing techniques for joint communication and radar sensing," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1295–1315, 2021.
- [7] F. Liu, W. Yuan, C. Masouros, and J. Yuan, "Radar-assisted predictive beamforming for vehicular links: Communication served by sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 7704–7719, 2020.
- [8] F. Dong, F. Liu, Y. Cui, W. Wang, K. Han, and Z. Wang, "Sensing as a service in 6g perceptive networks: A unified framework for isac resource allocation," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 3522–3536, 2023.
- [9] Q. Zhang, X. Wang, Z. Li, and Z. Wei, "Design and performance evaluation of joint sensing and communication integrated system for 5g mmwave enabled cavs," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1500–1514, 2021.
- [10] F. Dong, F. Liu, S. Lu, W. Yuan, Y. Cui, Y. Xiong, and F. Gao, "Waveform design for communication-assisted sensing in 6G perceptive networks," in *2023 IEEE/CIC International Conference on Communications in China (ICCC)*, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [11] F. Dong, F. Liu, S. Lu, Y. Xiong, Q. Zhang, Z. Feng, and F. Gao, "Communication-assisted sensing in 6G networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07157*, 2023.
- [12] M. Kobayashi, G. Caire, and G. Kramer, "Joint state sensing and communication: Optimal tradeoff for a memoryless case," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2018, pp. 111–115.
- [13] A. Liu, Z. Huang, M. Li, Y. Wan, W. Li, T. X. Han, C. Liu, R. Du, D. K. P. Tan, J. Lu, Y. Shen, F. Colone, and K. Chetty, "A survey on fundamental limits of integrated sensing and communication," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 994–1034, 2022.
- [14] M. Ahmadipour, M. Kobayashi, M. Wigger, and G. Caire, "An information-theoretic approach to joint sensing and communication," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 1124–1146, 2024.
- [15] Y. Xiong, F. Liu, Y. Cui, W. Yuan, T. X. Han, and G. Caire, "On the fundamental tradeoff of integrated sensing and communications under gaussian channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 5723–5751, 2023.
- [16] T. Berger, *Rate Distortion Theory: A Mathematical Basis for Data Compression (Information and System Science Series)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- [17] H. Viswanathan and T. Berger, "The quadratic Gaussian CEO problem," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1549–1559, 1997.
- [18] Y. Oohama, "Indirect and direct Gaussian distributed source coding problems," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 7506–7539, 2014.
- [19] V. Kostina and S. Verdú, "Nonasymptotic noisy lossy source coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 6111–6123, 2016.
- [20] K. Eswaran and M. Gastpar, "Remote source coding under Gaussian noise: Dueling roles of power and entropy power," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 4486–4498, 2019.
- [21] J. Wu, Q.-S. Jia, K. H. Johansson, and L. Shi, "Event-based sensor data scheduling: Trade-off between communication rate and estimation quality," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 1041–1046, 2013.
- [22] V. Kostina and B. Hassibi, "Rate-cost tradeoffs in scalar lqg control and tracking with side information," in *2018 56th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2018, pp. 421–428.
- [23] X. Gao, E. Akyol, and T. Başar, "Optimal communication scheduling and remote estimation over an additive noise channel," *Automatica*, vol. 88, pp. 57–69, 2018.
- [24] X. Ren, J. Wu, K. H. Johansson, G. Shi, and L. Shi, "Infinite horizon optimal transmission power control for remote state estimation over fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 85–100, 2018.
- [25] S. Rini, A. Kipnis, R. Song, and A. J. Goldsmith, "The compress-and-estimate coding scheme for Gaussian sources," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 18, no. 9, pp. 4344–4356, 2019.
- [26] M. Thomas and A. T. Joy, *Elements of information theory*. Wiley Interscience, 2006.
- [27] R. W. Yeung, *Information theory and network coding*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [28] X. Li, V. C. Andrei, A. Djuhera, U. J. Mönich, and H. Boche, "An analysis of capacity-distortion trade-offs in memoryless ISAC systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17058*, 2024.
- [29] B. Tang and J. Li, "Spectrally constrained MIMO radar waveform design based on mutual information," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 821–834, 2019.
- [30] Y. Yang, R. S. Blum, Z. He, and D. R. Fuhrmann, "MIMO radar waveform design via alternating projection," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1440–1445, 2010.
- [31] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of statistical signal processing: Estimation theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- [32] J. Liu, S. Shao, W. Zhang, and H. V. Poor, "An indirect rate-distortion characterization for semantic sources: General model and the case of gaussian observation," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 70, no. 9, pp. 5946–5959, 2022.
- [33] M. Grant and S. Boyd, "CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.2., 2020," Available: <http://cvxr.com/cvx>.