

Degradedness Under Cooperation

Yossef Steinberg

Department of ECE

Technion - IIT

Haifa 3200003, ISRAEL

Email: ysteinbe@technion.ac.il

Abstract—We study cooperation problems in broadcast and relay networks, where the receivers do not satisfy the classical physical degradedness assumptions. New notions of degradedness, *strongly less noisy* and *strongly more capable* are introduced. We show that under these conditions, decode and forward (D&F) is optimal for classes of cooperative systems with limited conference rates, thus yielding new capacity results for these systems. In particular, we derive bounds on the capacity region of a class of broadcast channels with cooperation, that are tight on part of the capacity region. It is shown that the cut-set bound is tight for classes of primitive relay and diamond channels, beyond the physically or stochastically degraded models.

Index Terms—Conference links, cooperative broadcast channel, degraded channels, diamond channels, primitive relay, strong data processing inequalities.

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of degraded users plays a key role in the analysis of communication networks with many receivers. When the receivers can be ordered according to their channel quality, the stronger receiver can do everything that the weaker receiver can, independently of the coding scheme used. While well understood in the context of broadcast channels (BCs), the notion of degradedness becomes quite subtle once cooperation links are introduced between receivers. Under cooperation, the quality of measurements available at a given site depends on the channel, and on the signals sent from other users, thus also on their coding schemes. This raises the question of how to define and quantify degradedness in cooperative systems, beyond the stringent physical degradedness condition.

To set ideas, let us briefly overview degraded BCs. The capacity of the BC is still unknown in general. However, restricted families of models have been solved. These include mainly physically and stochastically degraded channels. A key observation in the study of the general BC is that its capacity region depends only on the channel conditional marginals. Thus, for the purpose of capacity analysis, a stochastically degraded channel is equivalent to its physically degraded version, and they are commonly referred to as degraded BCs (DBC). The less noisy (LN) and more capable (MC) [1], [2] and the *essentially* LN and MC [3] are weaker forms of degradedness, that do not possess a physically degraded version. A property common to all the degraded models mentioned above is the optimality of superposition coding: if there is an order between the users, layered coding does not impose penalty, since anyway the stronger user can decode the messages of the weaker one. Superposition coding achieves capacity

also for the two users BC with degraded message sets [4] - termed as asymmetric BC (ABC) in [5] - although the channel distribution does not imply order between the users. Here the degradation is present due to the problem definition: user 1 is required to decode both private and common messages, while user 2 decodes only the common message. Formal definitions of these families of channels, and their respective capacity regions, can be found in [6].

The situation changes fundamentally once cooperation links between users are introduced. A cooperation link enables one user to send a compressed version of its output to the other user, thus making their joint distribution relevant. Consequently, under cooperation the capacity region of a stochastically degraded BC does not coincide with that of its physically degraded version, and the models are studied separately. Thus far, only the physically degraded BC and the ABC are solved under cooperation [7]–[10]. In these works it is shown that the optimal strategy for this class of channels consists of superposition coding at the transmitter, and decode and forward (D&F) at the stronger user.

This work focuses on less noisy BCs with cooperation links from the stronger user to the weaker, where D&F can be useful. One difficulty that arises in the study of these problems, is that the order of the users is not necessarily kept under cooperation. In fact, depending on the cooperation rate, the order can be flipped. This is in contrast to the physically degraded channel and the ABC, where cooperation cannot alter the order of users: the former due to the Markov structure, and the latter due to the inherent degradation imposed by the problem definition. Engineering insights would suggest that if the difference between the channels is large enough (in some sense) compared to the cooperation rate, the order between users should not be altered, independently of the coding and cooperation strategies. But thus far, each definition of degradedness relations is binary: a channel is either (physically, stochastically, less noisy, more capable) degraded, or not. Therefore, a first step would be to *quantify* degradedness relations, in a way that they can be compared to cooperation rates. In the current work we put these ideas on a firm ground, and provide quantitative degradedness conditions under which cooperative systems can be solved. The new definitions are extensions of Körner and Marton's LN and MC conditions [1], and strong data processing inequalities (SDPIs) [11], [12].

The primitive relay channel (PRC) is a special case of the BC with cooperation. It should be noted that thus far

only physically degraded relay channels were defined in the literature. Stochastically degraded PRC were not defined and studied as separate models. Due to the similarity between the models, our results are relevant also to a class of stochastically degraded primitive relay channels, and to classes of primitive relay networks, like the diamond channel (DC). The new classes of cooperative systems inherit a few desirable properties from the BC without cooperation:

- The class definitions and the results depend on the BC, PRC and DC only via their conditional marginals
- The order of users is kept under cooperation

In stochastically degraded channels where the cooperation direction is from the weaker user to the stronger, D&F cannot increase capacity, since even without the help, the stronger user can decode the messages forwarded by the weaker user. Therefore in this case some form of compress and forward (C&F) should be employed. This class of problems is studied elsewhere.

The structure of this work is as follows. In Section II we define new forms of degradedness - *strongly less noisy* and *strongly more capable*, which are extensions of the classical LN and MC conditions, in the spirit of strong data processing inequalities (SDPI) [12]. In Section III the main result for the broadcast channel with cooperation is presented and discussed. Our results for the PRC and relay networks (diamond channels) are presented in sections IV and V, respectively. Finally, the proofs are given in Section VII.

II. STRONG DEGRADEDNESS RELATIONS

Let $P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}$ be a pair of channels with output alphabets $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2$, respectively, and common input alphabet \mathcal{X} . For a given distribution P on \mathcal{X} , we denote by $P_{Y|X} \circ P$ the distribution on \mathcal{Y} induced by P at the input. Fix a real number $0 < \eta \leq 1$. We define the following extensions of the less noisy and more capable properties.

Definition 1: Let $\{P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}\}$ be a pair of channels with the same input alphabet. Then

- 1) $P_{Y_1|X}$ is said to be strongly less noisy than $P_{Y_2|X}$, denoted $P_{Y_1|X} \succ_{\eta_{\text{ln}}} P_{Y_2|X}$, if

$$\eta I(U; Y_1) \geq I(U; Y_2) \quad (1)$$

for all P_{UX} such that $U \text{---} X \text{---} (Y_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, are Markov chains. The minimal η for which (1) holds is denoted by $\eta_{\text{ln}}(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X})$.

- 2) $P_{Y_1|X}$ is said to be strongly more capable than $P_{Y_2|X}$, denoted $P_{Y_1|X} \succ_{\eta_{\text{mc}}} P_{Y_2|X}$, if

$$\eta I(X; Y_1) \geq I(X; Y_2) \quad (2)$$

for all P_X . The minimal η for which (2) holds is denoted by $\eta_{\text{mc}}(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X})$.

To stress the dependence on the parameter η , we will sometimes use the nomenclature η -LN (resp. η -MC) to denote channels that are strongly less noisy (resp. strongly more capable) with parameter η . For $\eta = 1$, (1) and (2) reduce to the classical definitions of less noisy and more capable relations.

When clear from the context, we omit the dependence of the minimal η 's on the conditional marginals $P_{Y_i|X}$, $i = 1, 2$, and use the notation η_{ln} and η_{mc} . By their definitions, η_{ln} and η_{mc} can be expressed as

$$\eta_{\text{ln}} = \sup_{P_{UX}} \frac{I(U; Y_2)}{I(U; Y_1)} \quad (3)$$

$$\eta_{\text{mc}} = \sup_{P_X} \frac{I(X; Y_2)}{I(X; Y_1)} \quad (4)$$

where the supremum in (3) (resp. (4)) is taken over all P_{UX} such that $I(U; Y_1) > 0$ (resp. $I(X; Y_1) > 0$). The next statement suggests a simple criterion to verify whether a pair $\{P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}\}$ satisfies the SLN condition, in the spirit of a parallel result for the classical LN condition [13, Theorem 2].

Lemma 1: A pair $\{P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}\}$ is η -LN if and only if

$$J(\eta, P_X) \triangleq \eta I(X; Y_1) - I(X; Y_2) \quad (5)$$

is concave in P_X .

Proof: We can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta I(U; Y_1) - I(U; Y_2) &= \eta I(UX; Y_1) - I(UX; Y_2) \\ &\quad - [\eta I(X; Y_1|U) - I(X; Y_2|U)] \\ &= \eta I(X; Y_1) - I(X; Y_2) \\ &\quad - [\eta I(X; Y_1|U) - I(X; Y_2|U)], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and the assertion follows since $I(X; Y_i|U)$ is a convex combination of $I(X_u; Y_i)$ according to the distribution of U , for $i = 1, 2$. \square

The strong LN condition is related to strong data processing inequalities (SDPIs) [12]. Specifically, a channel $P_{Y|X}$ is said to satisfy an SDPI with contraction coefficient η if

$$\eta I(U; Y) \geq I(U; X) \quad (7)$$

for every P_{UX} such that $U \text{---} X \text{---} Y$ is a Markov chain. The minimal η for which (7) holds is denoted by $\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y|X})$, and is given by

$$\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y|X}) = \sup \frac{I(U; Y)}{I(U; X)} \quad (8)$$

where the supremum is taken over all P_{UX} such that $I(U; X) > 0$. By their definitions,

$$\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y|X}) = \eta_{\text{ln}}(W_{\mathcal{X}}^1, P_{Y|X}) \quad (9)$$

where $W_{\mathcal{X}}^1$ stands for the identity channel with input alphabet \mathcal{X} . In view of Lemma 1 and (9) we have

Corollary 1: A channel $P_{Y|X}$ satisfies SDPI with constant η if and only if $\eta H(X) - I(X; Y)$ is concave in P_X .

The SDPI constant η_{kl} is a property of a single channel, measuring the dissipation of information over $P_{Y|X}$ [12]. By contrast, η_{ln} is a property of a pair $\{P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}\}$, measuring the dominance of one channel over the other. To cast η_{kl} in the notation of η_{ln} (3), assume that the pair $\{P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}\}$ is stochastically or physically degraded, i.e. there exists a channel

$P_{Y_2|Y_1}$ such that $P_{Y_2|X} = P_{Y_2|Y_1} \circ P_{Y_1|X}$. Then we can write

$$\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y_2|Y_1}) = \sup_{P_{U,Y_1}} \frac{I(U; Y_2)}{I(U; Y_1)} = \sup_{P_{U,X}} \sup_{P_{Y_1|X}} \frac{I(U; Y_2)}{I(U; Y_1)} \quad (10)$$

where the supremum is over all the conditional distributions $P_{Y_1|U}$ such that $I(U; Y_1) > 0$. Comparing (10) to (3), we see the following differences between the two definitions:

- 1) Part of the channel over which (10) is optimized, is held fixed in (3)
- 2) In (3) we dispense with the Markov structure $X \text{---} Y_1 \text{---} Y_2$.

The subscript kl is used in (8) since the minimal η can be expressed as a solution of Kullback-Leibler divergence optimization problem [12], [14]:

$$\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y|X}) = \sup_Q \tilde{\eta}(Q) \quad (11)$$

where

$$\tilde{\eta}(Q) \triangleq \sup_{P: 0 < D(P||Q) < \infty} \frac{D(P_{Y|X} \circ P || P_{Y|X} \circ Q)}{D(P || Q)}, \quad (12)$$

P, Q are distributions on the input alphabet \mathcal{X} , and for notational convenience we dropped the dependence of $\tilde{\eta}(Q)$ on $P_{Y|X}$. In Lemma 2 we state a few properties of η_{ln} , along with a characterization that parallels (11-12).

Lemma 2: For any strongly LN pair $\{P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}\}$, the following hold:

1)

$$\eta_{\text{ln}}(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}) \geq \frac{\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y_2|X})}{\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y_1|X})}. \quad (13)$$

2) If the pair is further stochastically degraded, then

$$\eta_{\text{ln}}(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}) \leq \eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y_2|Y_1}). \quad (14)$$

3) η_{ln} can be expressed as

$$\eta_{\text{ln}}(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}) = \sup_Q \tilde{\eta}^e(Q) \quad (15)$$

where

$$\tilde{\eta}^e(Q) \triangleq \sup \frac{D(P_{Y_2|X} \circ P || P_{Y_2|X} \circ Q)}{D(P_{Y_1|X} \circ P || P_{Y_1|X} \circ Q)}, \quad (16)$$

P, Q are distributions on \mathcal{X} , and the sup in (16) is taken over all P such that

$$0 < D(P_{Y_1|X} \circ P || P_{Y_1|X} \circ Q) < \infty. \quad (17)$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is given in Section VII-A. The definition of $\tilde{\eta}^e(Q)$ in (16) is an extension of (12), to include a channel in the denominator, hence the superscript e.

Remarks 1 (Input constraints and the Gaussian channel): The definitions of η_{ln} and η_{mc} and the bound (13) can be extended to include input constraints. In [15], [16] it is shown that the Gaussian channel with input moment constraints do not satisfy linear SDPI, i.e. $\eta_{\text{kl}} = 1$. Hence (13) implies that $\eta_{\text{ln}} = 1$ for the Gaussian BC. As in the SPDI case, non-linear degradedness relations are needed in order to derive results for the Gaussian BC and PRC. This is treated briefly in Section VI.




Fig. 1. Curves of η_{ln} (solid) and $\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p))/\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{Z}(0.3))$ (dashed). For $p < 0.19$ the channel is not degraded

In the following examples we evaluate η_{ln} for pairs of common channels, and compare the results to the bounds in Lemma 2. Proofs of the examples are given in Appendix A.

Example 1 (Binary erasure channels): Let $P_{Y_i|X}$ be a binary erasure channel with parameter p_i ($\text{BEC}(p_i)$), $i = 1, 2$, $0 \leq p_1 < p_2 \leq 1$. Then the pair is stochastically degraded, and

$$\eta_{\text{mc}} = \eta_{\text{ln}} = \frac{\bar{p}_2}{\bar{p}_1} = \frac{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BEC}(p_2))}{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BEC}(p_1))} \quad (18)$$

where $\bar{p} = 1 - p$. Thus, for a pair of erasure channels, η_{mc} and η_{ln} coincide, and the lower bound in Lemma 2 is tight.

Example 2 (Binary symmetric channels): In this example $P_{Y_i|X}$, $i = 1, 2$ are binary symmetric channels (BSCs) with parameters p_i , $0 \leq p_1 \leq p_2 \leq 1/2$. The pair of BSCs is stochastically degraded, i.e., $P_{Y_2|X} = P_{Y_2|Y_1} \circ P_{Y_1|X}$, where $P_{Y_2|Y_1} = \text{BSC}((p_2 - p_1)/(1 - 2p_1))$. We have

$$\eta_{\text{ln}} = \frac{(1 - 2p_2)^2}{(1 - 2p_1)^2} = \frac{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p_2))}{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p_1))} = \eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y_2|Y_1}) \quad (19)$$

and

$$\eta_{\text{mc}} = \max_{0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2} \frac{H_b(\theta * p_2) - H_b(p_2)}{H_b(\theta * p_1) - H_b(p_1)} = \frac{1 - H_b(p_2)}{1 - H_b(p_1)}. \quad (20)$$

We conclude that for a pair of BSCs, the lower and upper bounds of Lemma 2 are tight, and $\eta_{\text{mc}} < \eta_{\text{ln}}$ for $0 < p_1 < p_2 < 1/2$.

Example 3 (Z channel and BSC): Consider now the pair $\{\text{Z}(\epsilon), \text{BSC}(p)\}$ where for the Z channel $P_{Y_1|X}(1|0) = \epsilon$, $P_{Y_1|X}(0|1) = 0$. Due to the asymmetry of the Z channel, an exact expression of η_{kl} in terms of ϵ, θ is quite involved. It is solved numerically. Figure 1 depicts η_{ln} and the ratio $\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p))/\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{Z}(\epsilon))$ for $\epsilon = 0.3$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1/2$. The lower bound (13) is not tight in this example, and for $p < 0.19$ the channel is not degraded.

III. COOPERATIVE BC

In this section we present our result on the BC with conference link. Let $P_{Y_1, Y_2|X}$ be a broadcast channel with input alphabet \mathcal{X} and output alphabets $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2$. Observe that due to the cooperation, the capacity region depends, in general, on the joint distribution of the outputs. Let n be the transmission length, and $\mathcal{N}_k = [1 : \nu_k]$ the message set for user k , of size ν_k , $k = 1, 2$. A cooperation link from user 1 to user 2 is present, with capacity C_{12} . Denote by $\mathcal{N}_c = [1 : 2^{nC_{12}}]$ the cooperation message set.

Definition 2: An $(n, \nu_1, \nu_2, 2^{nC_{12}}, \epsilon)$ code for the cooperative broadcast channel is an encoder

$$f : \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n, \quad (21a)$$

a cooperation encoder

$$f_c : \mathcal{Y}_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_c \quad (21b)$$

and a pair of decoders:

$$\phi_1 : \mathcal{Y}_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_1 \quad (21c)$$

$$\phi_2 : \mathcal{Y}_2^n \times \mathcal{N}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_2 \quad (21d)$$

with probability of error bounded by ϵ :

$$\frac{1}{\nu_1 \nu_2} \sum_{(j_1, j_2) \in \mathcal{N}_1 \times \mathcal{N}_2} P_{Y_1^n, Y_2^n | X^n} (D_{j_1, j_2}^c | f(j_1, j_2)) \leq \epsilon \quad (22)$$

where D_{j_1, j_2} is the decoding set of the message pair (j_1, j_2)

$$D_{j_1, j_2} = \{(y_1^n, y_2^n) : \{\phi_1(y_1^n) = j_1\} \cap \{\phi_2(y_2^n, f_c(y_1^n)) = j_2\}\} \quad (23)$$

and D_{j_1, j_2}^c its complement. The rates R_1, R_2 of the code are the pair

$$R_k = \frac{\log \nu_k}{n}, \quad k = 1, 2. \quad (24)$$

A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is said to be achievable with cooperation capacity C_{12} if for every $\delta > 0, \epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large n , there exists an $(n, 2^{n(R_1 - \delta)}, 2^{n(R_2 - \delta)}, 2^{nC_{12}}, \epsilon)$ code for the channel. The capacity region with cooperation link of capacity C_{12} is the closure of all achievable pairs (R_1, R_2) , and is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(C_{12})$.

Let $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12})$ be the set of all pairs (R_1, R_2) satisfying

$$R_1 \leq I(X; Y_1 | U) \quad (25a)$$

$$R_2 \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (25b)$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \leq I(X; Y_1) \quad (25c)$$

for some joint distribution $P_{U, X} P_{Y_1, Y_2 | X}$. The region $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12})$ is achievable for any cooperative BC, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(C_{12}) \quad (26)$$

and equals the capacity region for physically degraded channels (see [7],[8] and note that physical degradedness is not used there in the direct part). The proof of (26) is outlined in Section VII-B, for completeness.

Denote by C_k the capacity of $P_{Y_k | X}$, i.e. $C_k =$

$\max_{P_X} I(X; Y_k)$, $k = 1, 2$. If $C_2 = 0$, then $P_{Y_1, Y_2 | X}$ can be presented as a physically degraded channel, and $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12}) = \mathcal{C}(C_{12})$. Therefore, in our main result, stated next, we focus on channels with $C_2 > 0$.

Theorem 1: Let $P_{Y_1, Y_2 | X}$ be a cooperative BC with $C_2 > 0$, $P_{Y_1 | X} \succ_{\eta \ln} P_{Y_2 | X}$ and

$$C_{12} \leq \frac{1 - \eta \ln}{\eta \ln} C_2. \quad (27a)$$

Then $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12})$ is tight for

$$R_2 \geq \frac{C_{12}}{1 - \eta \ln}. \quad (27b)$$

Furthermore, under (27), the inequalities (25a) and (25b) dominate (25c) for any U , and the sum rate bound can be dropped.

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section VII-B. We make the following observations:

- 1) The strong LN property and the characterization given in Theorem 1, depend on the channel $P_{Y_1, Y_2 | X}$ only via its conditional marginals $P_{Y_1 | X}, P_{Y_2 | X}$.
- 2) The fact that D&F is optimal means that under (27) the order of the users is kept.

IV. PRIMITIVE RELAY CHANNELS

The primitive relay channel (PRC) can be viewed as a cooperative BC, with link capacity C_{12} from user 1 to user 2, where the rate for user 1 is 0. I.e, user 1 is not required to decode any messages. Hence it is a special case of Definition 2. Denote its capacity by $C_{\Gamma}(C_{12})$. Using Theorem 1 with $R_1 = 0$, and ignoring the lower bound on R_2 (since we maximize it), we conclude that for any PRC with $P_{Y_1 | X} \succ_{\eta \ln} P_{Y_2 | X}$ and conference link satisfying (27a),

$$C_{\Gamma}(C_{12}) = C_1 + C_{12}. \quad (28)$$

But we can do slightly better. We can extend the range of conference capacities C_{12} , and class of channels, by using the strong MC relations, instead of strong LN. This is stated in the next theorem.

Theorem 2: Let $P_{Y_1, Y_2 | X}$ be a PRC with $P_{Y_1 | X} \succ_{\eta \text{mc}} P_{Y_2 | X}$, and conference link of capacity

$$C_{12} \leq \frac{1 - \eta \text{mc}}{\eta \text{mc}} C_2. \quad (29)$$

Then

$$C_{\Gamma}(C_{12}) = C_1 + C_{12}. \quad (30)$$

Proof:

The D&F lower bound on the capacity of the PRC is:

$$C_{\Gamma} \geq \max_{P_X} \min \{I(X; Y_1), I(X; Y_2) + C_{12}\} \quad (31)$$

(this lower bound follows from classical results, e.g [17], [6] or [18]. It can be deduced also from (25), after ignoring R_1). Then

$$I(X; Y_1) \geq \frac{1}{\eta \text{mc}} I(X; Y_2)$$




Fig. 2. The broadcast diamond channel, composed of two primitive relay channels with common input and destination.

$$= I(X; Y_2) + \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}}{\eta_{mc}} I(X; Y_2), \quad (32)$$

hence

$$I(X^*; Y_1) \geq C_2 + \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}}{\eta_{mc}} C_2 \geq C_2 + C_{12} \quad (33)$$

where X^* is the capacity achieving distribution of $P_{Y_2|X}$. Therefore, $I(X; Y_2) + C_{12}$ is the dominating term in the r.h.s. of (31). It is tight by the cut-set bound. \square

V. DIAMOND CHANNELS

In the general diamond channel (DC) model, a source is connected to the destination via a K -users BC, followed by a K -users multiple access channel (MAC). The BC outputs are forwarded to the MAC inputs via relays - units that are not required to decode any messages, and act only as intermediate nodes between the source and the destination. The relays can either be non cooperating, or cooperating with given conference capacities. Two main sub-models exist in the literature. The MAC diamond channel (MDC) is a diamond channel whose broadcast stage consists of orthogonal links with given finite capacities. Similarly, the broadcast diamond channel (BDC) is a diamond channel whose MAC stage consists of orthogonal links with given finite capacities. This channel can be viewed also as K primitive relay channels with common input and destination. A broadcast diamond channel with two relays is depicted in Fig. 2.

In [19] the two-relay BDC was studied, under the assumption of oblivious relays - i.e., relays that are not informed about the codebook used by the main encoder, thus refer to the coding scheme at the BC input as a random code. Various models of MDC, with and without side information, were studied in [20]–[25].

In this section we focus on the BDC with two separated (i.e., non cooperating) relays, as depicted in Fig. 2. A formal definition of capacity is omitted, for space considerations. We first derive a lower bound on the capacity, based on superposition coding, double binning of the messages and D&F at both relays. We then show that under suitable strong-MC conditions, the lower bound is tight, and achieves the cut-set bound. Define

$$R_i = \max_{P_X} \min\{I(X; Y_1), I(X; Y_2) + C_{13}, I(X; Y_3) + C_{13} + C_{23}\}. \quad (34)$$

Denote by C_k the capacity of $P_{Y_k|X}$, i.e. $C_k = \max_{P_X} I(X; Y_k)$, $k = 2, 3$. Our main result on the BDC is stated next.

Theorem 3:

- 1) For any BDC with link capacities C_{13} and C_{23} , R_i is achievable.
- 2) If $C_3 > 0$, $P_{Y_k|X} \succ_{\eta^{k3} mc} P_{Y_3|X}$ for $k = 1, 2$ and

$$C_{23} \leq \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}^{23}}{\eta_{mc}^{23}} C_3 \quad (35a)$$

$$C_{13} + C_{23} \leq \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}^{13}}{\eta_{mc}^{13}} C_3, \quad (35b)$$

then R_i is tight, and the capacity is given by

$$C = C_3 + C_{13} + C_{23}. \quad (35c)$$

- 3) If $C_3 = 0$, $C_2 > 0$, $P_{Y_1|X} \succ_{\eta^{12} mc} P_{Y_2|X}$ and

$$C_{13} \leq \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}^{12}}{\eta_{mc}^{12}} C_2 \quad (36a)$$

then R_i is tight, and the capacity is given by

$$C = \min\{C_2, C_{23}\} + C_{13}. \quad (36b)$$

The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Section VII-C.

Remarks 2:

- 1) Note that for conditions (35a,35b) to hold, we must have $\eta_{mc}^{13} < \eta_{mc}^{23}$.
- 2) The broadcast channel $P_{Y_1, Y_2, Y_3|X}$ need not be physically nor stochastically degraded.
- 3) Similarly to Theorems 1 and 2, the conditions under which the results of Theorem 3 hold, and the capacity characterizations, depend on the channel $P_{Y_1, Y_2, Y_3|X}$ only via its conditional marginals.

VI. NONLINEAR DEGRADEDNESS CONDITIONS

In this section we define strong LN functions, in the spirit of data processing function of [15]. The purpose is to show that a version of Theorem 1 holds in cases where $\eta_{ln} = 1$. Moreover, when $\eta_{ln} < 1$, the use of nonlinear strong LN relations can yield larger range of C_{12} and R_2 for which D&F is optimal.

The nonlinear SDPI function developed in [15] is basically an extension of the contraction coefficient to functions. It turns out that in our case, it is more convenient to work with expansion, or domination function. It can be viewed as an inverse of the nonlinear SDPI function. For completeness, we give a short overview of both approaches.

We start with an LN pair, in the sense of [1], i.e. $P_{Y_1|X} \succ_{ln} P_{Y_2|X}$. Let C_k be the capacity of $P_{Y_k|X}$, $k = 1, 2$. To make the discussion relevant also for the Gaussian channel, we include an input constraint. Let \mathcal{P} be a convex set of distributions on \mathcal{X} . Let $\mathcal{F}(C_1, C_2)$, $\mathcal{G}(C_1, C_2)$ be collections of functions:

$$\mathcal{F}(C_1, C_2) = \{F : [0, C_1] \rightarrow [0, C_2], \text{ increasing, } F(0) = 0, F(t) \leq t\} \quad (37)$$

$$\mathcal{G}(C_1, C_2) = \{G : [0, C_2] \rightarrow [0, C_1], \text{ increasing, } G(0) = 0, G(t) \geq t\}. \quad (38)$$

Denote by $\mathcal{F}^\cap(C_1, C_2)$ the set of all concave functions in $\mathcal{F}(C_1, C_2)$. Note that all the members of $\mathcal{F}^\cap(C_1, C_2)$ are sub-additive. Similarly, denote by $\mathcal{G}^\cup(C_1, C_2)$ the set of all convex functions in $\mathcal{G}(C_1, C_2)$. All the members of $\mathcal{G}^\cup(C_1, C_2)$ are superadditive

Definition 3: A pair $P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}$ is said to satisfy strong LN property with degradation function $F \in \mathcal{F}(C_1, C_2)$ if

$$I(U; Y_2) \leq F(I(U; Y_1)) \quad \forall P_{U|X}, P_X \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (39)$$

It is said to satisfy strong LN property with domination function $G \in \mathcal{G}(C_1, C_2)$ if

$$I(U; Y_1) \geq G(I(U; Y_2)) \quad \forall P_{U|X}, P_X \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (40)$$

The minimal degradation function $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}(C_1, C_2)$ is given by

$$F_1(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}, \mathcal{P}, t) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{P_{U|X}: \\ P_X \in \mathcal{P}}} \{I(U; Y_2) : I(U; Y_1) \leq t\}. \quad (41)$$

Following the discussion leading to (9), the SDPI function F_I defined in [15] can be expressed as

$$F_I(t) = F_1(W_{\mathcal{X}}^1, P_{Y_2|X}, \mathcal{P}, t) \quad (42)$$

where $W_{\mathcal{X}}^1$ is the identity channel with input alphabet \mathcal{X} . From this point on, when clear from the context, we drop the dependence of F_1 on the pair $\{P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}\}$ and on \mathcal{P} . The upper concave envelope of F_1 is defined as

$$F_1^c(t) = \inf\{f(t) : f(t) \geq F_1(t), \quad f(t) \text{ concave}\} \\ \in \mathcal{F}^\cap(C_1, C_2) \quad (43)$$

and is given by ([12]):

$$F_1^c(t) = \sup_{\substack{P_{V|X}: \\ P_X \in \mathcal{P}}} \{I(U; Y_2|V) : I(U; Y_1|V) \leq t\}. \quad (44)$$

We next present the domination function that is basically an inverse of F_1 . The maximal domination function $G_1 \in \mathcal{G}(C_1, C_2)$ is given by

$$G_1(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X}, \mathcal{P}, t) \triangleq \inf_{\substack{P_{U|X}: \\ P_X \in \mathcal{P}}} \{I(U; Y_1) : I(U; Y_2) \geq t\} \quad (45)$$

The lower convex envelope of G_1 is defined as

$$G_1^c(t) = \sup\{g(t) : g(t) \leq G_1(t), \quad g(t) \text{ convex}\} \\ \in \mathcal{G}^\cup(C_1, C_2) \quad (46)$$

and is given by

$$G_1^c(t) = \inf_{\substack{P_{V|X}: \\ P_X \in \mathcal{P}}} \{I(U; Y_1|V) : I(U; Y_2|V) \geq t\}. \quad (47)$$

For any domination function $G(t)$, define

$$G_0(t) = G(t) - t. \quad (48)$$

Our main result on nonlinear domination is the following

Theorem 4: Let $P_{Y_1, Y_2|X}$ be a cooperative BC with $C_2 > 0$,

domination function G and

$$C_{12} \leq G_0(C_2). \quad (49a)$$

Assume that G_0 is invertible. Then $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12})$ is tight for

$$R_2 \geq G_0^{-1}(C_{12}) + C_{12} \quad (49b)$$

Furthermore, under (49), the inequalities (25a) and (25b) dominate (25c) for any U , and the sum rate bound can be dropped.

The proof of Theorem 4 is quite similar to the proof of Theorem 1. A sketch of the proof is given in Section VII-D.

VII. PROOFS

A. Proof of Lemma 2

Part 1. By the definitions of η_{\ln} , η_{kl} we can write

$$\frac{I(U; Y_2)}{I(U; X)} \leq \frac{\eta_{\ln}(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X})I(U; Y_1)}{I(U; X)} \\ \leq \eta_{\ln}(P_{Y_1|X}, P_{Y_2|X})\eta_{\text{kl}}(P_{Y_1|X}) \quad (50)$$

and Part 1 follows by taking the sup in the l.h.s. of (50).

The proof of Part 2 follows from (10) and (3).

Part 3. The result for η_{kl} , (11-12), was proved in [14] for the discrete case, and extended in [12] for continuous alphabets. The proof of Part 3 uses similar ideas, and is given here for completeness.

Given two distributions P, Q on \mathcal{X} and a channel $P_{U|X}$, we use the shorthand

$$P_U = P_{U|X} \circ P \\ Q_U = P_{U|X} \circ Q \\ P_{Y_1} = P_{Y_1|X} \circ P \\ Q_{Y_1} = P_{Y_1|X} \circ Q \\ P_{Y_1|U} = \frac{(P_{Y_1|X} P_{U|X}) \circ P}{P_{U|X} \circ P} \\ Q_{Y_1|U} = \frac{(P_{Y_1|X} P_{U|X}) \circ Q}{P_{U|X} \circ Q}$$

and similarly for P_{Y_2} and Q_{Y_2} . Fix Q that is not a point mass, and define

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\ln}(Q) \triangleq \sup_{P_{U|X}} \frac{I(U; Y_2)}{I(U; Y_1)} = \sup_{P_{U|X}} \frac{D(Q_{Y_2|U} \| Q_{Y_2}|Q_U)}{D(Q_{Y_1|U} \| Q_{Y_1}|Q_U)} \quad (51)$$

where X is distributed according to Q . Then

$$I(U; Y_2) = D(Q_{Y_2|U} \| Q_{Y_2}|Q_U) \\ \leq \tilde{\eta}^e(Q) D(Q_{Y_1|U} \| Q_{Y_1}|Q_U) \\ = \tilde{\eta}^e(Q) I(U; Y_1). \quad (52)$$

Therefore

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\ln}(Q) \leq \tilde{\eta}^e(Q), \quad (53)$$

implying

$$\eta_{\ln} \leq \sup_Q \tilde{\eta}^e(Q). \quad (54)$$

We now show that an inequality holds also in the opposite direction. Fix Q , and choose P such that $D(P \parallel Q) < \infty$ and $0 < D(P_{Y_1} \parallel Q_{Y_1})$. Let $U \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\epsilon)$, and define

$$\tilde{Q} = \frac{Q - \epsilon P}{\epsilon} \quad (55)$$

$$Q_{X|U=u} = \begin{cases} P & \text{if } u = 1 \\ \tilde{Q} & \text{if } u = 0. \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

Note that with (55)-(56), $Q_X = Q$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I(U; Y_2)}{I(U; Y_1)} &= \frac{D(Q_{Y_2|U} \parallel Q_{Y_2}|Q_U)}{D(Q_{Y_1|U} \parallel Q_{Y_1}|Q_U)} \\ &= \frac{\bar{\epsilon} D(\tilde{Q}_{Y_2} \parallel Q_{Y_2}) + \epsilon D(P_{Y_2} \parallel Q_{Y_2})}{\bar{\epsilon} D(\tilde{Q}_{Y_1} \parallel Q_{Y_1}) + \epsilon D(P_{Y_1} \parallel Q_{Y_1})}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Taking now the limit of small ϵ , we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} D(\tilde{Q}_{Y_1} \parallel Q_{Y_1}) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} D(\tilde{Q} \parallel Q) \stackrel{(b)}{=} 0 \quad (58)$$

where (a) follows from data processing inequality for divergence, and (b) is one of the steps in [12, Theorem 4]. It can be verified by L'Hôpital's rule. In a similar manner

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{\epsilon} D(\tilde{Q}_{Y_2} \parallel Q_{Y_2}) = 0. \quad (59)$$

Therefore, taking the supremum over $P_{U|X}$ in the l.h.s. of (57), we conclude that

$$\tilde{\eta}_{\ln}(Q) \geq \frac{D(P_{Y_2} \parallel Q_{Y_2})}{D(P_{Y_1} \parallel Q_{Y_1})} \quad (60)$$

for every pair P, Q . The claim now follows by maximizing over P, Q . \square

B. Proof of Theorem 1

1) *Direct Part:* The proof of the direct part is based on superposition coding and D&F. This technique is standard. An outline of the proof is given here for completeness. We use the definitions and δ -convention of [5].

Code construction: Pick a joint distribution P_{U_X} .

- Generate 2^{nR_2} codewords of length n , $\mathbf{u}(m_2)$, $m_2 \in \mathcal{N}_2$, iid according to P_U .
- For every $m_2 \in \mathcal{N}_2$, generate 2^{nR_1} codewords of length n , $\mathbf{x}(m_1|m_2)$, $m_1 \in \mathcal{N}_1$, according to $\prod_{i=1}^n P_{X|U}(\cdot|u_i(m_2))$.
- Divide the set \mathcal{N}_2 into $2^{nC_{12}}$ bins, each containing $2^{n[R_2 - C_{12}]}$. Denote by $l(m_2)$ the bin number in which m_2 resides.

Encoding. To transmit the pair (m_1, m_2) , the encoder sends $\mathbf{x}(m_1|m_2)$ via the channel.

Decoding. We start with user 1. Upon receiving the channel output \mathbf{y}_1 , the decoder looks for the unique pair (j_1, j_2) such that

$$(\mathbf{u}(j_2), \mathbf{x}(j_1|j_2), \mathbf{y}_1) \in \mathcal{T}_{UXY_1}. \quad (61)$$

If such a pair exists and is unique, the decoder declares $(\hat{m}_1, \hat{m}_2) = (j_1, j_2)$. Otherwise, an error is declared. Note that the decoder performs joint decoding of m_1 and m_2 . Using

standard results, for this step to succeed with high probability it suffices to require

$$R_1 < I(X; Y_1|U) \quad (62a)$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \leq I(X; Y_1). \quad (62b)$$

After decoding, the decoder sends the bin number $l(\hat{m}_2)$ via the conference link, to user 2.

Assume that the decoding process of user 1 succeeded. Upon receiving the bin number $l(m_2)$ from user 1 via the conference link, and his output \mathbf{y}_2 , the decoder looks in bin number $l(m_2)$ for the unique index j_2 such that

$$(\mathbf{u}(j_2), \mathbf{y}_2) \in \mathcal{T}_{U,Y}. \quad (63)$$

If such an index exists and is unique, the decoder declares that $\hat{m}_2 = j_2$. Otherwise, an error is declared. For this step to succeed with high probability it suffices to require

$$R_2 - C_{12} < I(U; Y_2). \quad (64)$$

The bounds (62), (64) coincide with (25), thus proving the achievability of \mathcal{R}_i .

2) *Converse Part:* Let $(n, 2^{nR_1}, 2^{nR_2}, 2^{nC_{12}}, \tilde{\epsilon}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of codes for the cooperative BC with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\epsilon}_n = 0$. Let M_k stand for the random messages of user k , $k = 1, 2$, and Z^n for the random cooperation message sent from user 1 to user 2. By the code definition, $H(Z^n) \leq nC_{12}$. Starting with Fano's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} n(R_2 - \epsilon_n) &\leq I(M_2; Y_2^n Z^n) \\ &= I(M_2; Y_2^n) + I(M_2; Z^n | Y_2^n) \\ &\leq I(M_2; Y_2^n) + H(Z^n) \\ &\leq I(M_2; Y_2^n) + nC_{12} \end{aligned} \quad (65a)$$

where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n = 0$. Similarly, we bound the sum rate

$$\begin{aligned} n(R_1 + R_2 - \epsilon_n) &\leq I(M_1; Y_1^n | M_2) + I(M_2; Y^n Z^n) \\ &\leq I(M_1; Y_1^n | M_2) + I(M_2; Y^n) + nC_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (65b)$$

Following now the steps in the converse proof for the LN and MC broadcast channels (e.g., [1], [2], see also [6, Sec. 5.6.1]), we arrive to

$$R_2 - \epsilon_n \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(U_i; Y_{2,i}) + C_{12} \quad (66a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 + R_2 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [I(X_i; Y_{1,i} | U_i) + I(U_i; Y_{2,i})] \\ &\quad + C_{12} \end{aligned} \quad (66b)$$

where

$$U_i = M_2 Y_1^{i-1} Y_{2,i+1}^n. \quad (67)$$

Applying the classical time sharing argument, and taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at:

$$R_2 \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (68a)$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \leq I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_2) + C_{12}. \quad (68b)$$

Next, we show that subject to a lower bound on the rate of user 2, (68b) implies a sum rate bound of the form of (25c). Thus, let us focus on rates R_2 satisfying the conditions (27) of the theorem, which we repeat here for convenience:

$$R_2 \geq \frac{C_{12}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} = \frac{\eta_{\text{in}}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} C_{12} + C_{12} \quad (69a)$$

and

$$C_{12} \leq \frac{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}}{\eta_{\text{in}}} C_2. \quad (69b)$$

Using (69a) in the l.h.s of (68a) gives

$$\frac{\eta_{\text{in}}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} C_{12} + C_{12} \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12}, \quad (70)$$

hence

$$I(U; Y_2) \geq \frac{\eta_{\text{in}}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} C_{12}. \quad (71)$$

Note that (69b) ensures that the r.h.s. of (71) does not exceed C_2 , the maximal value of $I(U; Y_2)$. By the strong LN property, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} I(U; Y_1) &\geq \frac{1}{\eta_{\text{in}}} I(U; Y_2) = I(U; Y_2) + \frac{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}}{\eta_{\text{in}}} I(U; Y_2) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where in (a) we used (71). Substituting (72) in (68b) results in the sum rate bound

$$R_1 + R_2 \leq I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_1) = I(X; Y_1), \quad (73)$$

which is (25c). Moreover, since (25a) and (25b) imply (68b), we conclude that, subject to (69), the sum rate bound in $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12})$ is dominated by the individual rate bounds. Therefore, it suffices to focus on the modified inner and outer bounds defined below, that take into account the constraints (69):

The modified inner bound $\mathcal{R}'_i(C_{12})$ is the collection of all pairs (R_1, R_2) satisfying

$$\frac{C_{12}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} \leq R_2 \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (74a)$$

$$R_1 \leq I(X; Y_1|U) \quad (74b)$$

for some joint distribution $P_{U,X}P_{Y_1,Y_2|X}$.

The modified outer bound $\mathcal{R}'_o(C_{12})$ is the collection of all pairs (R_1, R_2) satisfying

$$\frac{C_{12}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} \leq R_2 \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (75a)$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \leq I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (75b)$$

for some joint distribution $P_{U,X}P_{Y_1,Y_2|X}$.

To conclude the proof of Theorem 1, we have to show that $\mathcal{R}'_i(C_{12}) = \mathcal{R}'_o(C_{12})$. The direction $\mathcal{R}'_i(C_{12}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_o(C_{12})$ is immediate. We show next that $\mathcal{R}'_i(C_{12}) \supseteq \mathcal{R}'_o(C_{12})$. If C_{12} equals its maximal value, then by (69b) and (70) we must have $I(U; Y_2) = C_2$, (74), (75) coincide, and there is nothing to prove. Thus assume that a strict inequality holds in (69b). In particular, it implies that there exists $\gamma > 0$ and $P_{U,X}$ such

that

$$\frac{C_{12}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} - \gamma. \quad (76)$$

We have to show that for any γ and $P_{U,X}$ satisfying (76), the point

$$\frac{C_{12}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} \leq R_2^{(o)} = I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} - \gamma \quad (77a)$$

$$R_1^{(o)} + R_2^{(o)} = I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (77b)$$

resides in the region

$$\frac{C_{12}}{1 - \eta_{\text{in}}} \leq R_2 \leq I(\tilde{U}; \tilde{Y}_2) + C_{12} \quad (78a)$$

$$R_1 \leq I(\tilde{X}; \tilde{Y}_1|\tilde{U}) \quad (78b)$$

for some $P_{\tilde{U},\tilde{X}}$, where \tilde{Y}_k , $k = 1, 2$ are the channel outputs with \tilde{X} at the input. Equivalently, we have to show that

$$I(\tilde{U}; \tilde{Y}_2) \geq I(U; Y_2) - \gamma \quad (79a)$$

$$I(\tilde{X}; \tilde{Y}_1|\tilde{U}) \geq I(X; Y_1|U) + \gamma. \quad (79b)$$

Let S be a random switch with $P_S(1) = \lambda$, $P_S(0) = \bar{\lambda}$. Define the random variables

$$\tilde{\tilde{U}} = \begin{cases} U & \text{if } S = 1, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } S = 0, \end{cases} \quad (80)$$

$$\tilde{U} = (\tilde{\tilde{U}}, S) \quad (81)$$

and the channel from \tilde{U} to \tilde{X} :

$$P_{\tilde{X}|\tilde{U}} = \begin{cases} P_{X|U} & \text{if } S = 1, \\ P_X & \text{if } S = 0. \end{cases} \quad (82)$$

We have

$$P_{\tilde{X}} = P_X \quad (83a)$$

$$I(\tilde{U}; \tilde{Y}_2) = \lambda I(U; Y_2). \quad (83b)$$

Choose now

$$\lambda = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{I(U; Y_2)} \quad (84)$$

and note that by (76), $\gamma \leq I(U; Y_2)$, hence (84) is a valid choice for λ . Using (84) in (83b) we get

$$I(\tilde{U}; \tilde{Y}_2) = I(U; Y_2) - \gamma, \quad (85)$$

proving (79a).

Turning to R_1 , note that

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{X}; \tilde{Y}_1|\tilde{U}) &= \lambda I(\tilde{X}; \tilde{Y}_1|U, S = 1) + \bar{\lambda} I(I(\tilde{X}; \tilde{Y}_1|\emptyset, S = 0)) \\ &= \lambda I(X; Y_1|U) + \bar{\lambda} I(X; Y_1) \\ &= \lambda I(X; Y_1|U) \\ &\quad + (1 - \lambda)[I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_1)] \\ &= I(X; Y_1|U) + (1 - \lambda)I(U; Y_1) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} I(X; Y_1|U) + \gamma \frac{I(U; Y_1)}{I(U; Y_2)} \\ &\geq I(X; Y_1|U) + \gamma \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

proving (79b), where in (a) we used (84). This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

C. Proof of Theorem 3

1) *Achievability of R_i* : We use rate splitting with superposition coding and binning. Fix a rate R_3 to user 3, and set $R_3 = R_{13} + R_{23}$.

Code construction: Pick a joint distribution P_{UX} .

- Generate $2^{nR_{23}}$ codewords of length n , $\mathbf{u}(m_{23})$, $m_{23} \in \mathcal{N}_{23} \triangleq [1 : 2^{nR_{23}}]$ iid according to P_U .
- Divide the set \mathcal{N}_{23} into $2^{nC_{23}}$ bins, each containing $2^{n[R_{23}-C_{23}]_+}$ messages. Denote by $l_2(m_{23})$ the bin number in which m_{23} resides, and by $\mathcal{B}_2(l_2(m_{23}))$ the bin itself.
- For every $m_{23} \in \mathcal{N}_{23}$, generate $2^{nR_{13}}$ codewords of length n , $\mathbf{x}(m_{13}|m_{23})$, $m_{13} \in \mathcal{N}_{13} \triangleq [1 : 2^{nR_{13}}]$, according to $\prod_{i=1}^n P_{X|U}(\cdot|u_i(m_{23}))$.
- Divide the set \mathcal{N}_{13} into $2^{nC_{13}}$ bins, each containing $2^{n[R_{13}-C_{13}]_+}$ messages. Denote by $l_1(m_{13})$ the bin number in which m_{13} resides, and by $\mathcal{B}_1(l_1(m_{13}))$ the bin itself.

Encoding: To transmit the message $m_3 = (m_{13}, m_{23})$, the encoder sends $\mathbf{x}(m_{13}|m_{23})$ via the channel.

Decoding: We start with relay node 2. The relay receives the signal \mathbf{y}_2 . He looks for an index j such that

$$(\mathbf{u}(j), \mathbf{y}_2) \in \mathcal{T}_{UY_2}. \quad (87)$$

If such index j exists and is unique, relay 2 sets $\hat{m}_{23} = j$. Otherwise, an error is declared. For this step to succeed with high probability, it suffices to require

$$R_{23} < I(U; Y_2). \quad (88)$$

Relay 2 sends via the conference link C_{23} the bin index in which \hat{m}_{23} resides, $l_2(\hat{m}_{23})$.

Relay 1 decodes m_3 . For this purpose, he looks for a pair (j_1, j_2) such that

$$(\mathbf{x}(j_1|j_2), \mathbf{y}_1) \in \mathcal{T}_{XY_1}. \quad (89)$$

If such pair exists, and is unique, the relay sets $\hat{m}_3 = (\hat{m}_{13}, \hat{m}_{23}) = (j_1, j_2)$. Otherwise, an error is declared. For this step to succeed with high probability, it suffices to require

$$R_{13} + R_{23} < I(X; Y_1). \quad (90)$$

Relay 1 then sends via the conference link C_{13} the bin index in which \hat{m}_{13} resides, $l_1(\hat{m}_{13})$.

Assume from this point on that the decodings at the relays were successful. Thus, the decoder gets the correct bin numbers, via the links C_{13} and C_{23} . At the destination, the decoder performs joint decoding of m_{23} and m_{13} . Specifically, he looks for a pair of indices (j_1, j_2) , $j_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1(l_1(m_{13}))$, $j_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2(l_2(m_{23}))$, such that

$$(\mathbf{u}(j_2), \mathbf{x}(j_1|j_2), \mathbf{y}_3) \in \mathcal{T}_{UXY_3}. \quad (91)$$

If such pair exists, and is unique, the decoder sets its decision as $\tilde{m}_3 = (\tilde{m}_{13}, \tilde{m}_{23}) = (j_1, j_2)$. Otherwise, he declares an

error. The error events associated with decoding in the two bins, are listed in Table I, with the resulting rate constraints. Applying Fourier-Motzkin elimination to (88), (90) and the

TABLE I
DECODING ERROR EVENTS AT THE DESTINATION

$(\tilde{m}_{13}, \tilde{m}_{23})$	Joint PMF	Rate constraints
(1,e)	$P_U P_{X U} P_{Y_3}$	$R_{23} - C_{23} < I(UX; Y_3)$
(e,1)	$P_U P_{X U} P_{Y_3 U}$	$R_{13} - C_{13} < I(X; Y_3 U)$
(e,e)	$P_U P_{X U} P_{Y_3}$	$R_{13} - C_{13} + R_{23} - C_{23} < I(UX; Y_3)$

rate constraints of Table I, we get the achievability result:

$$R_3 < \max_{P_{UX}} \min \{ I(X; Y_1), I(X; Y_3|U) + I(U; Y_2) + C_{13}, I(X; Y_3) + C_{13} + C_{23} \}. \quad (92)$$

The r.h.s. of (34) is obtained by substituting $U = X$ in (92). This proves Part 1 of Theorem 3.

2) *Part 2 - capacity when $C_3 > 0$* : We first compare the second and the third terms in (34). Note that they have a common additive term, C_{13} . Thus:

$$I(X^*; Y_2) \geq \frac{1}{\eta_{mc}^{23}} C_3 = C_3 + \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}^{23}}{\eta_{mc}^{23}} C_3 \geq C_3 + C_{23}, \quad (93)$$

where X^* is the capacity achieving distribution of $P_{Y_3|X}$, and in the last inequality we used (35a). Similarly,

$$I(X^*; Y_1) \geq \frac{1}{\eta_{mc}^{13}} C_3 = C_3 + \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}^{13}}{\eta_{mc}^{13}} C_3 \geq C_3 + C_{13} + C_{23}, \quad (94)$$

where in the last inequality we used (35b). Therefore the third term in the minimum in (34) dominate the first and the second terms. The tightness follows from the cut set bound.

3) *Part 3 - capacity when $C_3 = 0$* : The proof follows the same line as the proof of Part 2:

$$I(X^*; Y_1) \geq \frac{1}{\eta_{mc}^{12}} C_2 = C_2 + \frac{1 - \eta_{mc}^{12}}{\eta_{mc}^{12}} C_2 \geq C_2 + C_{13}. \quad (95)$$

Therefore the minimum in (34) is dominated by the second and third terms, and the claim follows. Tightness is implied by the cut set bound. This completes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

D. Proof of Theorem 4

The proof follows the lines of the proof of Theorem 1. Likewise, we repeat the standard steps to conclude the inner bound $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12})$ of (25) and the outer bound (68). By the definition of $G_0(t)$, we have

$$I(U; Y_1) \geq G_0(I(U; Y_2)) + I(U; Y_2). \quad (96)$$

By (68a) and (49b)

$$I(U; Y_2) \geq G_0^{-1}(C_{12}) \quad (97)$$

or

$$C_{12} \leq G_0(I(U; Y_2)). \quad (98)$$

Substituting (98) in (68b) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 + R_2 &\leq I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \\ &\leq I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_2) + G_0(I(U; Y_2)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_1) = I(X; Y_1) \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

where in (a) we used (96). Hence, the outer bound (68), the conditions of Theorem 4 (49a), (49b) and (96) imply a sum rate bound like (25c). Since (25a) and (25b) imply (68a) and (68b), we conclude that the sum rate bound of $\mathcal{R}_i(C_{12})$ is implied by the individual rate bounds.

We present now two modified bounds, parallel to (74) and (75)

The modified inner bound $\mathcal{R}'_i(C_{12})$ is the collection of all pairs (R_1, R_2) satisfying

$$G_0^{-1}(C_{12}) + C_{12} \leq R_2 \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (100a)$$

$$R_1 \leq I(X; Y_1|U) \quad (100b)$$

for some joint distribution $P_{U,X}P_{Y_1,Y_2|X}$.

The modified outer bound $\mathcal{R}'_o(C_{12})$ is the collection of all pairs (R_1, R_2) satisfying

$$G_0^{-1}(C_{12}) + C_{12} \leq R_2 \leq I(U; Y_2) + C_{12} \quad (101a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 + R_2 &\leq I(X; Y_1|U) + I(U; Y_2) \\ &\quad + C_{12} \end{aligned} \quad (101b)$$

for some joint distribution $P_{U,X}P_{Y_1,Y_2|X}$. We have to show that the bounds are equivalent. The proof proceeds exactly along the lines of the proof of equivalence of (74) and (75). The details are omitted. \square

APPENDIX

A. Derivation of Examples 1, 2, 3

Proof of Example 1. For BEC(p) we have $I(X; Y) = \bar{p}H_b(\theta)$ where H_b is the binary entropy function, $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta)$ and $\bar{p} = 1 - p$. Therefore

$$\eta_{\text{mc}} = \sup_{P_X} \frac{I(X; Y_2)}{I(X; Y_1)} = \frac{\bar{p}_2}{\bar{p}_1}. \quad (102)$$

By Corollary 1, η_{kl} is the maximal η for which $\eta H_b(\theta) - \bar{p}H_b(\theta)$ is concave in θ . Since $H_b(\theta)$ is concave in θ , we conclude that $\eta_{\text{kl}} = \bar{p}$. Similarly, by Lemma 1, η_{ln} is the maximal η for which $\eta \bar{p}_1 H_b(\theta) - \bar{p}_2 H_b(\theta)$ is concave in θ . Therefore

$$\eta_{\text{ln}} = \frac{\bar{p}_2}{\bar{p}_1} = \frac{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BEC}(p_2))}{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BEC}(p_1))} = \eta_{\text{mc}}. \quad (103)$$

\square

Proof of Example 2. For BSC,

$$I(X; Y_i) = H_b(\theta * p_i) - H_b(p_i) \quad (104)$$

where $\theta * p$ is the cyclic convolution $\theta * p = \bar{\theta}p + \theta\bar{p}$. From Corollary 1 we conclude that

$$\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p)) = (1 - 2p)^2. \quad (105)$$

By Lemma 1, η_{ln} is the minimal $\eta \leq 1$ such that

$$J(\eta, \theta) \triangleq \eta(H_b(\theta * p_2) - H_b(p_2)) - (H_b(\theta * p_1) - H_b(p_1)) \quad (106)$$

is concave in θ . To guarantee concavity of $J(\eta, \theta)$, we require that its second derivative w.r.t θ is negative for every θ . This results in the condition:

$$\eta \geq \frac{(1 - 2p_2)^2}{(1 - 2p_1)^2} A(\theta, p_1, p_2) \quad \forall 0 \leq \theta \leq 1/2 \quad (107)$$

where

$$A(\theta, p_1, p_2) = \frac{(\theta * p_1)(\bar{\theta} * p_1)}{(\theta * p_2)(\bar{\theta} * p_2)}. \quad (108)$$

The maximal value of $A(\theta, p_1, p_2)$ is 1, attained at $\theta = 1/2$. Therefore, using also (105)

$$\eta_{\text{ln}} = \frac{(1 - 2p_2)^2}{(1 - 2p_1)^2} = \frac{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p_2))}{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p_1))}. \quad (109)$$

The last equality in (19) is obtained by substituting $p = (p_2 - p_1)/(1 - 2p_1)$ in (105). Finally, for η_{mc} , the maximum in (20) is attained at $\theta = 0.5$ (this is verified numerically). \square

Proof of Example 3. For the Z channel

$$I(X; Y_1) = H_b(\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}) - \bar{\theta}H_b(\epsilon), \quad (110)$$

hence the function $J(\eta, P_X)$ is given by:

$$J(\eta, \theta) = \eta[H_b(\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}) - \bar{\theta}H_b(\epsilon)] - H_b(\theta * p) + H_b(\theta). \quad (111)$$

As in example 2, we take the second derivative of $J(\eta, \theta)$ w.r.t θ and require it to be negative for every θ . Therefore:

$$\frac{\partial^2 J(\eta, \theta)}{\partial \theta^2} = -\frac{\eta\bar{\epsilon}^2}{\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon}(1 - \bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon})} + \frac{(1 - 2p)^2}{(\theta * p)(\bar{\theta} * p)} \leq 0 \quad \forall 0 \leq \theta \leq 1, \quad (112)$$

and the condition on η is

$$\eta \geq \frac{(1 - 2p)^2}{\bar{\epsilon}} \frac{\bar{\theta}(\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon} + \epsilon)}{(\theta * p)(\bar{\theta} * p)} \quad \forall 0 \leq \theta \leq 1. \quad (113)$$

If, for some pair (ϵ, p) , (113) does not hold for $\eta = 1$, then $Z(\epsilon) \not\geq_{\eta_{\text{ln}}} \text{BSC}$ for any $\eta \leq 1$ and, in particular, $Z(\epsilon)$ is not less noisy than the BSC(p). Since degradedness implies less noisy relations, we also conclude that the BSC is not degraded relative to the Z channel, with these parameters. Define

$$K(\theta, \epsilon, p) \triangleq \frac{\bar{\theta}(\bar{\theta}\bar{\epsilon} + \epsilon)}{(\theta * p)(\bar{\theta} * p)} \quad (114a)$$

$$K^* \triangleq \max_{0 \leq \theta \leq 1} K(\theta, \epsilon, p). \quad (114b)$$

If

$$K^* \leq \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{(1 - 2p)^2}, \quad (115)$$

then (113) holds for some $\eta \leq 1$, $Z(\epsilon) \geq_{\eta_{\text{ln}}} \text{BSC}(p)$, and

$$\eta_{\text{ln}} = \frac{(1 - 2p)^2}{\bar{\epsilon}} K^* = \frac{\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p))}{\eta_{\text{kl}}(Z(\epsilon))} K^*. \quad (116)$$

Fig. 1 depicts η_{ln} (computed numerically) and the ratio $\eta_{\text{kl}}(\text{BSC}(p))/\eta_{\text{kl}}(Z(\epsilon))$ for $\epsilon = 0.3$ and $0 \leq p \leq 1/2$. It is seen

that for $p \leq 0.19$ and $\epsilon = 0.3$ the channel is not degraded. Moreover, the lower bound of Lemma 2 is not tight. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Körner and K. Marton, "Comparison of two noisy channels," in *Topics in Information Theory (Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai, Keszthely, Hungary, 1975)* (I. Csiszár and P. Elias, eds.), pp. 411–423, North Holland, 1977.
- [2] A. E. Gamal, "The capacity of a class of broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 25, pp. 166–169, Mar. 1979.
- [3] C. Nair, "Capacity regions of two new classes of two-receiver broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 4207–4214, Sep. 2010.
- [4] J. Körner and K. Marton, "General broadcast channels with degraded message sets," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 23, pp. 60–64, Jan 1977.
- [5] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*. London, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed., 2011.
- [6] A. El Gamal and Y. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [7] Y. Liang and V. V. Veeravalli, "Cooperative relay broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 53, pp. 900–928, Mar. 2007.
- [8] R. Dabora and S. D. Servetto, "Broadcast channels with cooperating decoders," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 5438–5454, Dec. 2006.
- [9] Y. Steinberg, "Instances of the relay-broadcast channel and cooperation strategies," in *Proc. IEEE Int'l Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT'2015)*, (Hong Kong, China), pp. 2653–2657, June 2015.
- [10] D. Itzhak and Y. Steinberg, "The broadcast channel with degraded message sets and unreliable conference," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 67, pp. 5623–5650, Sept 2021.
- [11] R. Ahlswede and P. Gács, "Spreading of sets in product spaces and hypercontraction of the markov operator," *The Annals of Probability*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 925–939, 1976.
- [12] Y. Polyanskiy and Y. Wu, "Strong data-processing inequalities for channels and bayesian networks," in *Convexity, Concentration and Discrete Structures* (E. Carlen, M. Madiman, and E. M. Werner, eds.), vol. 161 of *The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2017.
- [13] M. Van Dijk, "On a special class of broadcast channels with confidential messages," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 712–714, 1997.
- [14] V. Anantharam, A. Gohari, S. Kamath, and C. Nair, "On maximal correlation, hypercontractivity, and the data processing inequality studied by Erkip and Cover," 2013, arXiv:1304.6133 [cs.IT].
- [15] F. P. Calmon, Y. Polyanskiy, and Y. Wu, "Strong data processing inequalities for input constrained additive noise channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 64, pp. 1879–1892, Mar. 2018.
- [16] Y. Polyanskiy and Y. Wu, "Dissipation of information in channels with input constraints," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 62, pp. 35–55, Jan. 2016.
- [17] Y. H. Kim, "Coding techniques for primitive relay channels," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control, Computing*, (Monticello, Illinois), pp. 129–135, Sep 2007.
- [18] M. Mondelli, S. H. Hassani, and R. Urbanke, "A new coding paradigm for the primitive relay channel," *Algorithms*, vol. 12, no. 10, 2019.
- [19] A. Sanderovich, S. Shamai, Y. Steinberg, and G. Kramer, "Communication via decentralized processing," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 3008–3023, 2008.
- [20] M. Li, O. Simeone, and A. Yener, "Degraded broadcast diamond channels with noncausal state information at the source," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 8210–8223, 2013.
- [21] W. Zhao, D. Y. Ding, and A. Khisti, "Capacity bounds for a class of diamond networks with conferencing relays," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 1881–1884, 2015.
- [22] S. Saeedi Bidokhti and G. Kramer, "Capacity bounds for diamond networks with an orthogonal broadcast channel," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 12, pp. 7103–7122, 2016.
- [23] S. Saeedi Bidokhti, G. Kramer, and S. Shamai, "Capacity bounds on the downlink of symmetric, multi-relay, single-receiver c-ran networks," *Entropy*, vol. 19, no. 11, 2017.
- [24] C.-Y. Wang, M. Wigger, and A. Zaidi, "On achievability for downlink cloud radio access networks with base station cooperation," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 5726–5742, 2018.
- [25] M. Dikshstein, S. S. Bidokhti, and S. Shamai, "Bounds on the capacity of the multiple access diamond channel with cooperating base-stations," in *Proc. IEEE Int'l Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT'2022)*, (Espoo, Finland), pp. 3031–3036, 2022.