

Coded Caching for Heterogeneous Wireless Networks with Multi-level Access

Jad Hachem

University of California, Los Angeles

Email: jadhachem@ucla.edu

Nikhil Karamchandani

University of California, Los Angeles

Email: nikhil@ee.ucla.edu

Suhas Diggavi

University of California, Los Angeles

Email: suhas@ee.ucla.edu

Abstract

Content distribution networks, enabled through replicated caching, have enabled broadband content delivery over the wired Internet. In this paper we propose a wireless content distribution scheme based on a new *multi-level* storage, access, and distribution architecture that is tailored for next generation wireless networks. This scheme significantly outperforms conventional translation of ideas from the wired Internet to wireless. Our starting point is the observation that wireless network architecture is converging towards a dense deployment of wireless access points (APs) with small coverage, combined with cellular base-stations (BS) with larger coverage. The consequence of this heterogeneous architecture is that a user could access the BS as well as multiple APs. Therefore an optimal design is to trade-off the cost (transmission rate) at the BS, with the caching cost (memory) at the APs and the access cost of connecting to multiple APs at the user, for a given content popularity profile. In this paper we propose a caching scheme with provable performance trading off these costs and theoretically demonstrate its order optimality with respect to information-theoretic bounds. Our solution is to use coded cache storage and the inherent broadcast property of wireless through network coding. We also validate the scheme on several real datasets and quantify the trade-off in rate, memory, and access. These numerical evaluations also suggest an intriguing possibility that categorizing content into a small number of popularity levels is sufficient.

I. INTRODUCTION

Broadband data consumption, driven by large bandwidth applications such as high-definition video streaming, has been enabled through large-scale Content Distribution Networks (CDN) in the wired Internet. Such networks mirror content in several locations in order to bring frequently requested content closer to where it is consumed. Recently, wireless data demand, driven by large-scale consumption of video content in mobile devices [1], has been pushing current wireless systems to their limits [2]. Unfortunately, the CDN solution for wired Internet cannot be directly translated to wireless. In this paper, we propose a wireless content distribution scheme, based on a new *multi-level* storage, access, and distribution architecture that is tailored for next generation wireless networks, with provable performance guarantees, and we validate it on Netflix and YouTube data.

There are several reasons why the traditional CDN architecture cannot be translated to wireless. In the wired Internet, CDNs replicate content in several locations and carefully manage what is stored locally based on demand. Such caching through local storage removes the bottleneck at the content distribution server by utilizing repeated demand of particular content. It has the most gains when the local storage is large enough to store most of the popular content and the local communication link is not the bottleneck [3]. In wireless cellular usage, these are typically not true; the (cellular) wireless hop is a bottleneck link and the wireless cellular base-station typically has limited storage.

Moreover, improvements in the cellular data rates in successive generations of wireless networks are insufficient. Despite the significant improvement in data-rates, the deployment of 4G wireless networks is projected to only give temporary relief [2], [4]–[6]. In order to deal with the exploding data demand, a heterogeneous wireless network (HetNet) architecture is emerging for 5G. It consists of a dense deployment of wireless access points (APs) with small coverage and relatively large data rates, in combination with cellular base-stations (BS) with large coverage and smaller data rates. For example, the access points could be WiFi or emerging small-cells (or femto-cells), which provide high data rate for short ranges. The consequence of this emerging architecture is that a user could potentially connect to the BS as well as several wireless APs. The APs themselves do not solve the problem as they are connected to the rest of the network through best-effort backhaul, which are bottlenecks [5]. Even when a wireless service provider jointly managing both APs and the BS can enable a (projected) hundred-fold increase in system throughput over 4G [2], [5], the projected increases in users and demand imply that this will not solve the wireless content distribution problem [1].

In summary, both the traditional CDN approach and the improved wireless network design fail as they optimize only one aspect of the wireless content delivery problem. Traditional CDN solutions focus on content placement and the wireless network design focuses only on data delivery, agnostic to content.

Recently, [7] proposed a *coded caching* scheme that jointly optimizes the broadcast delivery with content placement and demonstrated a significant improvement over conventional schemes. This was enabled by content placement that created (network-coded) multicast opportunities for users across caches, even if they have different demands. Their focus was for a *single-class* of content, i.e., files are uniformly demanded. It is well understood that content demand is non-uniform in practice, with some content being more popular than others. In this paper we model this with a *multi-level* popularity profile, where we

divide content into discrete levels based on popularity and user content demand profiles; we develop our ideas for this distinct setup. Another closely related work is that in [8] which proposed a caching architecture for heterogeneous wireless networks, where the caching problem is posed in an optimization framework. There are several distinctions in our approach from this. We develop a new scheme based on *multi-level* coded caching and prove approximate optimality through information-theoretic impossibility results, which do not have any restrictions on the structure of the placement and delivery schemes. A more detailed comparison with the related literature is given in Section VII.

Given the above discussion, in this paper, we advocate and design a joint optimization of content placement, access, and delivery which uses the heterogeneous wireless architecture and content popularity to address this problem (see Figure 1). The solution consists of the following components: (i) *Caching*: Use APs to locally store (coded) content; (ii) *Multi-level popularity*: Divide content into discrete levels based on popularity and user content demand profiles; (iii) *Multi-level access*: Different user access structures to APs depending on the content requested, *i.e.*, how many APs should a user connect to? (iv) *Broadcast delivery*: Use the inherent broadcast property¹ of wireless for efficient coded delivery. The design trades off the cost (transmission rate) at the BS, with the storage cost (memory) at the APs and the access cost of connecting to multiple APs at the user, for a given content popularity profile.

To solve this trade-off, the core theoretical contribution of this work is to design and analyze a multi-level content placement and delivery algorithm that minimizes the worst case delivery cost of the BS for a given memory size at the APs, user AP access structure, and content demand structure (based on popularity). The basic idea is to place content at multiple APs (depending on popularity), without *a priori* knowing the user requests, so as to maximally create network-coding opportunities during delivery. We solve the optimal memory-sharing problem for the different files, given multi-level popularity profiles. We prove the order optimality of our memory-sharing placement scheme combined with a network-coded delivery scheme, with respect to information-theoretic lower bounds² for the case with two popularity levels³. A striking aspect of this optimal solution is that, even when AP memory is available, in some regimes, it is better to store less popular content without completely storing the more popular content first. A unique aspect of the scheme is enabling multi-level access structures, where users' access to APs depends on the requested content. We demonstrate that this can give significant gains; for example, in many regimes it is better to have users demanding popular content to connect to a single AP, whereas users demanding less popular content connect to multiple APs.

We also do an extensive evaluation of the proposed multi-level caching and delivery scheme using traces from Netflix and YouTube [10], [11]. These traces provide a “continuous” popularity (based on the number of requests) versus content profile. We examine the effect of clustering content into discrete levels of popularity. The evaluation strikingly suggests that dividing content into at most 3–4 levels of popularity is enough for both Netflix and YouTube datasets. Moreover, the scheme developed in this paper gives an order of magnitude improvement in performance over traditional caching schemes in several regimes. These gains demonstrate the importance of jointly optimizing the content placement, delivery, and access structures, as our scheme does.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we formally state the problem and establish the notation used throughout the paper. Section III gives an overview of the results and their implications. We illustrate the multi-level caching and delivery scheme through the special case of two popularity levels in Section IV, for which it is information-theoretically order-optimal. We generalize this to arbitrary number of levels in Section V. In Section VI, we do an extensive evaluation of the main ideas based on real data traces and draw insights from it. We place our work in context of the literature in Section VII. Detailed proofs are provided in the Appendices.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND NOTATION

Figure 1 illustrates the multi-level wireless content distribution architecture studied in this paper. The macro-cellular base station (BS) has access to a collection \mathcal{W} of N files W_1, W_2, \dots, W_N , each of size F bits⁴. Based on popularity, the collection \mathcal{W} is divided into L classes $\mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{W}_2, \dots, \mathcal{W}_L$, with class \mathcal{W}_i consisting of N_i files. There are K access points (APs) in the macrocell, each equipped with a cache of size MF bits. Each user can connect to up to $D \ll K$ APs and listen to the BS broadcast transmission.

The system operates in two phases: a content *placement phase* and a broadcast *delivery phase*. The placement phase is the period of low network traffic during which the caches can store any function of the N files while respecting their individual memory size restrictions. This is done without the knowledge of future requests, but with statistical knowledge of popularity profiles. On the other hand, the delivery phase is the period of high network traffic (after the placement phase) during which

¹Broadcast does *not* imply that the same message is sent to all users. It just means that the same physical signal is received by all users, who may then use it to decode different messages.

²The information-theoretic lower bounds do not assume memory-sharing placement or any given delivery scheme.

³We conjecture that the memory-sharing solution is in fact order-optimal for an arbitrary number of levels and general access structures. We have been able to prove this for the single-access case with any number of levels, and we refer the interested reader to [9] for details.

⁴We use the same file size for notational convenience; the ideas would carry over to different file sizes.




Fig. 1: Multi-level storage, access, and delivery architecture, illustrated for $L = 2$ classes of files, with $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 2$.

users request files by contacting the APs. For each class \mathcal{W}_i and every AP, we assume that U_i users contact the AP with requests for files from class \mathcal{W}_i . Thus, the total number of users requesting files from an AP is given by $U = \sum_{i=1}^L U_i$. Since each user could connect to multiple APs, for simplicity of exposition we associate each user to an AP, with the understanding that they could potentially get data from other APs as well. Therefore the total number of users in the system is given by $K \cdot U$ and we let

$$\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{KU})$$

denote the request vector, such that user i requests file W_{r_i} .

Given a request vector, each user requesting a file from the class \mathcal{W}_i is allowed access to a *given* subset of neighboring APs with cardinality d_i and is able to receive parts of their stored content relevant to their request⁵. We will refer to d_i as the access-degree for the class \mathcal{W}_i . Since D is the maximum number of APs any user can access, $d_i \leq D$ for all i .

If all the requests are not satisfied by accessing the assigned APs, the request vector \mathbf{r} is forwarded to the BS. Knowing the stored contents of the AP caches, the BS makes a broadcast transmission $X^{\mathbf{r}}$ to the users, of size at most RF bits. Using the content downloaded from the APs and the broadcast BS transmission⁶ $X^{\mathbf{r}}$, each user i attempts to recover its requested file W_{r_i} .

We say that the pair (M, R) is *feasible*, if for *every* request vector \mathbf{r} , each user i in the system is able to recover its requested file W_{r_i} . For any value of the memory size M , denote the optimal BS transmission rate over all possible schemes by

$$R^*(M) = \inf \{R : (M, R) \text{ is feasible}\},$$

where the minimization is over *all* strategies. Given the above setup, the problem is to design a scheme for the placement of content prior to knowing the request vector \mathbf{r} , and later delivering the requested files to the users such that the rate $R(M)$ is minimized. $R^*(M)$ denotes the lowest rate for *any* scheme and we bound this using information-theoretic arguments. We compare the relative performance of a given scheme to this information-theoretic bound, and call a scheme *order-optimal* if $\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq c$, where c is independent of K, U, N , and M .

Note that the problem is parametrized by N, K, U which are given as part of the setup, as well as the multi-level popularity and access parameters $L, \{\mathcal{W}_i\}, \{U_i\}, \{d_i\}$, which are subject to design and which we will further optimize in Section VI. For convenience we summarize the notation used in Table I below.

III. MAIN RESULTS

We develop a scheme that optimally shares the memory among the files from different popularity classes and minimizes the broadcast transmission rate through network coding matched to such placements. We show that this scheme is order-optimal with respect to information-theoretic⁷ lower bounds, for the case of two classes ($L = 2$), and we believe that it is also order-optimal in general. As an example, Figure 2 shows that our proposed scheme can reduce the transmission rate by an order of magnitude over a conventional scheme based on Least-Frequently-Used (LFU) placement (accounting for file popularity) and simple orthogonal unicast delivery.

⁵The wireless HetNet architecture implies that the AP download rates are much larger than the rates from the BS and therefore are not the bottleneck in terms of rate. However, there might be a cost to accessing multiple APs in terms of connection times and delays.

⁶Given the coverage area, the BS transmission rate is limited and is to be used efficiently.

⁷Information-theoretic impossibility results do not restrict one to memory-sharing placement and network coded delivery. For example, one can develop schemes where linear combinations of files could be stored as seen in Section III-A.

TABLE I: Notation

N	Total # of files
L	# of file classes
N_i	# of files in the i^{th} class
K	# of APs
M	Memory size of cache at each AP
U	# of users requesting files from an AP
U_i	# of users per AP requesting i^{th} class files
d_i	# of AP caches accessed by a user requesting an i^{th} class file
R	Rate of BS transmission




Fig. 2: Comparison of conventional Least-Frequently-Used (LFU) placement with unicast delivery versus our scheme, for a YouTube dataset.

We will develop these results in a sequence of steps. In Section III-A, we start with a simple example with $K = 2$ caches and $L = 2$ classes for which we can give a complete (information-theoretically optimal) characterization of $R^*(M)$. This example illustrates the idea of joint optimization of placement and delivery. In Section III-B, we present our memory-sharing scheme for a general number of caches and popularity levels, which is order optimal (with respect to information-theoretic bounds) when $L = 2$. The information-theoretic bounds do not follow from standard (cut-set) arguments, and we develop some new bounds as outlined in Appendix E. In Section VI, we evaluate this scheme over Netflix and YouTube datasets.

A. Example




Fig. 3: $L = 2$, $K = 2$, $N_1 = 2$ popular files and $N_2 \geq 4$ less popular files. $U = 3$ users, with two requesting popular files and one requesting a less popular file.

We consider a special case with $L = 2$ classes of files, with each file of size F bits. The first class has $N_1 = 2$ files and the second class has $N_2 \geq 4$ files (see Figure 3). We denote the more popular files (in class 1) by A, B and the less popular files (class 2) by C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{N_2} . There are $K = 2$ APs, each with a cache memory of size MF bits. We have $U_1 = 1$ user per AP requesting a file from the first class of files and a single user which requests any file from the second class. We have $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 2$, *i.e.*, users requesting class 1 files only get access to their own AP's cache and the user requesting a class 2 file can access both the AP caches during the delivery phase. We will refer to the users requesting class 1 files as users 1 and 2. We will refer to the user requesting a class 2 file as user 3.

We are able to prove the following result characterizing $R^*(M)$, the minimum achievable rate of BS transmission for any given cache memory size M (illustrated in Figure 4).




Fig. 4: Optimal rate R^* vs. M

Theorem 1. For the setup in Figure 3, the minimum achievable rate of BS transmission $R^*(M)$ is given by

$$R^*(M) = \max \left\{ 3 - 2M, \frac{5}{2} - M, 2 - \frac{M}{2}, 1 + \frac{4 - 2M}{N_2} \right\}.$$

Proof: The proof involves two parts: an explicit placement and delivery scheme and a matching impossibility result using information-theoretic tools. In this section we focus on the explicit scheme, and the impossibility result is outlined in Appendix B. Note that we only need to show the rate achievability for the five (M, R) corner points: $(0, 3)$, $(\frac{1}{2}, 2)$, $(1, \frac{3}{2})$, $(2, 1)$, and $(2 + \frac{N_2}{2}, 0)$. This is because the other (M, R) points can all be achieved by appropriate memory-sharing between the schemes achieving these corner points.

Let Z_1, Z_2 denote the cache contents, the request vector $\mathbf{r} = (W_1, W_2, W_3)$ where W_i denotes the file requested by user i , and let $X^{\mathbf{r}}$ denote the corresponding BS transmission. We now present the placement and delivery schemes for the five corner points.

- $(M = 0, R = 3)$: $Z_1 = Z_2 = \phi$, and $X^{\mathbf{r}} = (W_1, W_2, W_3)$ satisfies all demands.
- $(M = 1/2, R = 2)$: Split the files A and B as $A = (A_1, A_2)$ and $B = (B_1, B_2)$, where each part is of size $F/2$. Set $Z_1 = (A_1 \oplus B_1)$ and $Z_2 = (A_2 \oplus B_2)$, where \oplus denotes the bit-wise XOR operation. Then, we set $X^{\mathbf{r}} = (X_1^{\mathbf{r}}, X_2^{\mathbf{r}})$ where $X_1^{\mathbf{r}} = W_3$ satisfies the request of user 3, and $X_2^{\mathbf{r}}$ can satisfy the requests for user 1 and user 2 as follows:

$$(W_1, W_2) = \begin{cases} (A, A) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = A, \\ (B, B) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = B, \\ (A, B) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = (B_1, A_2), \\ (B, A) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = (A_1, B_2). \end{cases}$$

- $(M = 1, R = 3/2)$: We split A and B as in the previous case, and set $Z_1 = (A_1, B_1)$ and $Z_2 = (A_2, B_2)$. Then, we set $X^{\mathbf{r}} = (X_1^{\mathbf{r}}, X_2^{\mathbf{r}})$ where $X_1^{\mathbf{r}} = W_3$ satisfies the request of user 3, and $X_2^{\mathbf{r}}$ can satisfy the requests of user 1 and user 2 as follows:

$$(W_1, W_2) = \begin{cases} (A, A) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = A_1 \oplus A_2, \\ (B, B) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = B_1 \oplus B_2, \\ (A, B) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = A_2 \oplus B_1, \\ (B, A) \implies X_2^{\mathbf{r}} = A_1 \oplus B_2. \end{cases}$$

- ($M = 2, R = 1$): Set $Z_1 = Z_2 = (A, B)$. Note that user 1's and user 2's requests for a class 1 file is satisfied by accessing their corresponding caches. For the demand of user 3, the BS transmits $X^{\mathbf{r}} = W_3$.
- ($M = 2 + N_2/2, R = 0$): Let each class two file $C_i = (C_{i1}, C_{i2})$, where each part is of size $F/2$. Set $Z_1 = (A, B, \{C_{i1}\})$ and $Z_2 = (A, B, \{C_{i2}\})$. Any request can be satisfied without the need for a BS transmission. ■

This example illustrates several important points that we will carry forward. First, the broadcast transmission critically uses the stored (side-information) content in the caches to fulfill the request; it sends information that is maximally useful to all users through network coding. Second, the memory is shared between the popular and unpopular files, depending on the memory size constraint. A third aspect that is particular to this example is that in some regimes we store linear combinations of files; this aspect is not used in our general memory-sharing scheme given in Section III-B. Extending this scheme and the impossibility result to the general case is still an open question. We therefore look for order-optimal solutions in Section III-B.

B. General case

For the case of $L = 1$ and arbitrary number of caches and files, we prove the following result when each user gets to access d neighboring AP caches.

Lemma 1. *Given $K, L = 1, N_1 = N, U_1 = U, d_1 = d$, and M , there exists a feasible scheme for delivering the requested files, with an achievable BS transmission rate given by*

$$R_d\left(\frac{M}{N}, K, U\right) = \frac{KU\left(1 - \frac{dM}{N}\right)}{1 + K\frac{M}{N}}, \quad (1)$$

when the cache memory $\frac{M}{N} \in \frac{1}{K} \cdot \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{K}{d}\}$, and the lower convex envelope of these points for any $\frac{M}{N} \in [0, \frac{1}{d}]$. This scheme is order-optimal with respect to the information-theoretic lower bound.

Note that when $M \geq \frac{N}{d}$, each file can be split into d equal parts and then one part stored in each cache, so that every user accessing d caches can recover their requested file, without requiring any BS transmission. The content placement and delivery scheme in Lemma 1 is a generalization of [7, Theorem 1] and we discuss it in Appendix A.

We generalize the scheme to the case of L file classes as follows. Consider $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_L \in [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^L \alpha_i = 1$, let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_L)$. Then for a cache size of MF bits, the placement phase splits each cache memory into L parts, with the i^{th} part of size $\alpha_i MF$ bits, which only stores content corresponding to the files belonging to class \mathcal{W}_i . The placement for each class works in a manner similar to the scheme in Lemma 1.

In the delivery phase, requests corresponding to the same class are grouped together and served together. Thus the total BS transmission rate for the scheme is given by the sum of the rates over the L classes. During both the placement and the delivery phases of the achievability scheme, different file classes are treated in isolation and thus we can treat them as separate sub-systems during the analysis. For each such sub-system, we use the scheme corresponding to Lemma 1 and thus the total BS transmission rate over the L classes is given by

$$R(M) = \sum_{i=1}^L R_{d_i}\left(\frac{\alpha_i M}{N_i}, K, U_i\right), \quad (2)$$

where again $R_{d_i}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ is evaluated as in (1) when $\frac{\alpha_i M}{N_i} \in \frac{1}{K} \cdot \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{K}{d_i}\}$ and is the lower convex envelope of these points for any $\frac{\alpha_i M}{N_i} \in [0, \frac{1}{d_i}]$. Note that different choices of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ will lead to different transmission rates in the above expression, as illustrated in the following example.

Example: For $L = 2$ file classes, let $N_1 = 100$ and $N_2 = 5N_1 = 500$. Further, let there be $K = 50$ APs and $U = 21$ users requesting files from each AP. Out of the 21 users, $U_1 = 20$ request class 1 files and $U_2 = 1$ user requests a class 2 file. Finally, let the access degrees $d_1 = d_2 = 1$ and $M = N_1 = 100$, *i.e.*, each cache can store all the files from class 1. Let us choose $(\alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = 0)$ so that each cache only stores all the files belonging to the first class. Then $K \cdot U_1 = 1000$ users requesting class 1 files will need no delivery from the BS. However, the BS will need to completely send the class 2 files requested by the $K \cdot U_2 = 50$ users, resulting in $50F$ bits of BS transmission in the worst case.

Next, consider the case of $(\alpha_1 = 2/3, \alpha_2 = 1/3)$ so that we allocate two-thirds of each cache memory to storing files from the first class and the remaining one-third is used for storing the files from the second class. Then the resulting BS transmission size is approximately

$$F \cdot \left(R_1\left(\frac{2/3N_1}{N_1}, 50, 20\right) + R_1\left(\frac{1/3N_1}{5N_1}, 50, 1\right) \right) \approx 20.5F$$

which is an improvement over the previous case by a factor of about 2.44.

Also note that the optimal choice of (α_1, α_2) varies with the cache memory size M . For example, let us consider $M = 10$ instead of $M = 100$ and again compare the BS transmission rates for the two choices $(\alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = 0)$ and $(\alpha_1 = 2/3, \alpha_2 = 1/3)$. Then for $(\alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = 0)$, the BS transmission size is approximately

$$F \cdot \left(R_1 \left(\frac{10}{100}, 50, 20 \right) + R_1 (0, 50, 1) \right) \approx 200F.$$

On the other hand, the BS transmission size for $(\alpha_1 = 2/3, \alpha_2 = 1/3)$ is given by

$$F \cdot \left(R_1 \left(\frac{2/3 \cdot 10}{100}, 50, 20 \right) + R_1 \left(\frac{1/3 \cdot 10}{500}, 50, 1 \right) \right) \approx 253F.$$

Thus unlike for $M = 100$, the BS transmission rate is in fact smaller for $(\alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = 0)$ where we devote the entire memory to storing the files in the first class. ■




Fig. 5: Comparison of true and approximate rate expressions.

What remains is to identify the choice of α for which the BS transmission rate is minimized. This is a *convex* problem and therefore can be solved *efficiently and optimally* [12]. However, in order to get more structural insight into the optimal choice of α , we consider an approximation to the rate expression in (2). This methodology will also enable us to prove order-optimality of the memory-sharing scheme. For any of the L terms in the R.H.S of (2), say the i^{th} term, the approximation uses the corresponding expression from (1) for all values in the domain and not just when $\frac{\alpha_i M}{N_i} \in \frac{1}{K} \cdot \left\{ 0, 1, \dots, \frac{K}{d_i} \right\}$. This approximate expression can be analytically shown to be (conservatively) within a small constant factor of the actual rate and in fact, as illustrated in Figure 5, is very tight for most cases. Also, note that the approximate expression is also convex in α and is more amenable to getting structural insights. We develop an algorithm that enables us to explicitly identify the structure of the optimal α_i 's depending on $2L - 1$ regimes of M . This structure enables us to prove the order-optimality of the scheme for the case of $L = 2$ classes. As a bonus, this algorithm obtains the optimal α_i 's in finite time, unlike a conventional convex optimization method applied to the problem. The following theorem characterizes the achievable rate of our memory-sharing scheme.

Theorem 2. *Given $K, L, \{N_i, U_i, d_i\}$, and M , there exists a feasible scheme for delivering the requested files, with an achievable BS transmission rate $R(M)$ given by*

$$\frac{R(M)}{\gamma} = \frac{S_I^2}{K(M - T_J + V_I)} - \sum_{i \in I} d_i U_i + \sum_{h \in H} K U_h, \quad (3)$$

where (H, I, J) is an M -feasible partition⁸ of $\{1, \dots, L\}$ and $\gamma > 1$ is a constant independent of $K, \{N_i, U_i\}, M$.

The constant γ is due to the approximation of the rate expression, as mentioned before. We can prove analytically that $\gamma \leq 4/(1 - D/K)$, and recall that D denotes the maximum access degree of any user and is typically small compared to K . However, since the approximation is very tight in practice, γ is usually quite close to 1.

The next result shows that for the case of $L = 2$ classes, the memory-sharing algorithm using the optimal α computed by our algorithm is in fact order-optimal.

⁸See Definition 1 in Section V.




Fig. 6: Setup for the two popularity levels case.

Theorem 3. Given $K \geq 130$, $L = 2$, $\{N_i, U_i\}$ with $U_2 = 1$ and $N_2 \geq N_1 \geq KU_1$, $(d_1, d_2) = (1, 2)$, and such that $\frac{U_1/N_1}{U_2/N_2} \geq 100$, the achievable BS transmission rate $R(M)$ for any cache size M , given in Theorem 2, satisfies

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq c,$$

where $R^*(M)$ denotes the information-theoretically optimal rate and $c \leq 164$ is a constant independent of $K, \{N_i, U_i\}, M$.

As we will illustrate through numerical evaluations over real datasets in Section VI, our proposed scheme performs very well in general and we suspect that its order-optimality extends to more general scenarios than the one stated in the above theorem. The next sections will describe the scheme in detail; we will begin by illustrating the main ideas for the case of two classes.

IV. SCHEME FOR TWO LEVELS

In this section, we will describe our scheme for the special case of $L = 2$, *i.e.*, two popularity levels, to explain the main ideas in a simpler setup (see⁹ Figure 6). We label the two file classes as *popular* and *unpopular* classes, with N_1 and N_2 files respectively. As one would expect, we will assume that the number of popular files is smaller than the number of unpopular files, *i.e.*, $N_2 > N_1$. Furthermore, we expect that the number of users (U_1) per AP requesting popular files will be much larger than the number of users (U_2) requesting unpopular files. For ease of exposition, let us consider the case where $U_2 = 1$ and $U_1 \geq 2$. Finally, users requesting popular files access $d_1 = 1$ AP cache, whereas users requesting unpopular files are penalized by having to access $d_2 = 2$ AP caches.

As described in Section III, our scheme picks $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (\alpha_1, (1 - \alpha_1))$ and then divides each cache memory into two parts, one of size $\alpha_1 MF$ bits dedicated to storing the popular files, and another of size $(1 - \alpha_1)MF$ allotted to the unpopular files. Then, by operating the sub-systems corresponding to the popular and unpopular files separately as described in Appendix A, the following BS transmission rate¹⁰ is achievable from (2):

$$\begin{aligned} R(\alpha, M) &= R_1\left(\frac{\alpha_1 M}{N_1}, K, U_1\right) + R_2\left(\frac{(1 - \alpha_1)M}{N_2}, K, 1\right) \\ &= \frac{KU_1\left(1 - \frac{\alpha_1 M}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K\frac{\alpha_1 M}{N_1}} + \frac{K\left(1 - \frac{2(1 - \alpha_1)M}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K\frac{(1 - \alpha_1)M}{N_2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We also have the following constraints on α_1 and α_2 :

$$\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [0, 1]; \quad \alpha_1 \leq \frac{N_1}{M}; \quad 1 - \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \leq \frac{N_2}{2M}.$$

The last two inequalities follow from the fact that, for values of α_1 and α_2 larger than their respective thresholds, the BS transmission rate for the corresponding popularity class is 0. Since $R(\alpha, M)$ is a convex function of (α_1, α_2) , we find the optimal choice $\alpha^* = (\alpha_1^*, 1 - \alpha_1^*)$ by satisfying the KKT conditions [12], and get

$$\alpha_1^* = \min \left\{ \max \left\{ \hat{\alpha}_1, 0, 1 - \frac{N_2}{2M} \right\}, 1, \frac{N_1}{M} \right\},$$

⁹We assume a cyclic access structure for ease of exposition, this assumption can be easily relaxed.

¹⁰We will work with the approximate expression for the rate in order to get structural insights into α_1, α_2 .

where

$$\hat{\alpha}_1 = \frac{\sqrt{N_1 U_1 (K+1)} (1 + (N_1 + N_2)/KM)}{\sqrt{N_1 U_1 (K+1)} + \sqrt{N_2 U_2 (K+2)}} - \frac{N_1}{KM}.$$

Note that α_1^* above takes different values depending on the value of M . In particular, using $U_1 \geq 2$ and $N_2 \geq N_1$, one can show that

$$\alpha^* = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } M \leq M_1, \\ \hat{\alpha}_1 & \text{for } M_1 < M < M_2, \\ \frac{N_1}{M} & \text{for } M_2 \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where

$$M_1 = \min \left\{ N_1, \frac{N_1}{K} \left(\sqrt{\frac{U_1 N_2 (K+1)}{N_1 (K+2)}} - 1 \right) \right\},$$

$$M_2 = \max \left\{ N_1, N_1 \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{N_2 (K+1)(K+2)}{N_1 U_1 K^2}} - \frac{N_2}{K N_1} \right) \right\}.$$

Note that we only consider $M \leq N_1 + N_2/2$ since, from (4), the BS transmission rate can be made zero for larger values of M by choosing $\alpha_1 = N_1/M$.

The above characterization of α^* indicates how, for any given M , the memory should be shared between the two classes. An alternate representation of this characterization can be in terms of a partition (H, I, J) of the set $\{1, 2\}$ of file classes, where H represents the file classes which are assigned no memory, J represents the file classes j which have been assigned the maximum memory $\alpha_j = \frac{N_j}{d_j M}$, and I includes the rest of the classes among which the remaining memory is shared optimally. Analogous to (5), this alternate representation provides the following characterization of the optimal sharing at any M :

$$(H, I, J) = \begin{cases} (\{2\}, \{1\}, \phi) & \text{for } M \leq M_1, \\ (\phi, \{1, 2\}, \phi) & \text{for } M_1 < M < M_2, \\ (\phi, \{2\}, \{1\}) & \text{for } M_2 \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

This alternate representation of the optimal memory-sharing scheme will prove useful when we generalize the scheme to more than two levels in the next section.

For $(K+1)(K+2) \leq U_1 N_2 / N_1$, we have $M_1 = M_2 = N_1$ and thus, from (5), we only have two regimes in this case: $M \in [0, N_1]$ for which $\alpha_1^* = 1$ and $M \in (N_1, N_1 + N_2/2]$ for which $\alpha_1^* = N_1/M$. This implies that for this case, we first store as much of the popular files in each cache as possible and memory is assigned to the unpopular files only if all the popular files have been stored in each cache. Note that this is similar in spirit to the Least-Frequently-Used (LFU) [13] placement scheme, but with the key difference that content is not just replicated across caches.

On the other hand, for $(K+1)(K+2) > U_1 N_2 / N_1$, we have $M_1 < N_1 < M_2$. This implies that in addition to the two regimes $M \leq M_1$ and $M \geq M_2$ discussed above, a third middle regime of $M_1 < M < M_2$ also exists for this case. In this regime, we have $\alpha_1^* = \hat{\alpha}_1$ from (5) and in contrast to the previous case, each cache stores some content from the unpopular files even though not all the popular content has been stored yet. Evaluating the BS transmission rate in (4) for this regime, we have for $M_1 < M < M_2$:

$$R(\alpha^*, M) \leq \frac{N_1}{M} \left(\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{\frac{N_2}{N_1}} \right)^2 - U_1. \quad (7)$$

The proof outline of Theorem 3 in Appendix E shows that the proposed memory-sharing scheme is in fact order-optimal with respect to the information-theoretic lower bound for all values of M . Furthermore, a scheme which assigns all the memory to the popular files will require a much higher BS transmission rate than the one proposed here.

V. SCHEME FOR THE GENERAL CASE

Recall that our proposed scheme for L levels chooses a memory allocation vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_L)$, where $\alpha_i \in [0, \frac{N_i}{d_i M}]$ and $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$, and results in the following achievable rate:

$$R(\alpha, M) = \sum_{i=1}^L R_{d_i} \left(\frac{\alpha_i M}{N}, K, U_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{K U_i \left(1 - \frac{d_i \alpha_i M}{N_i} \right)}{1 + K \frac{\alpha_i M}{N_i}}, \quad (8)$$

where, as argued before, we use an approximate expression of the rate in (1) to get an analytical characterization of the optimal choice of α , say α^* , for any given M . Since the approximation is tight, $R(\alpha^*, M)$ is indeed very close to the minimum achievable rate using a memory-sharing scheme.

We start with the following definition.

Definition 1. A partition (H, I, J) of $\{1, \dots, L\}$ is said to be M -feasible if:

$$\begin{aligned} M &< m_h^{I,J} && \text{for every } h \in H, \\ m_i^{I,J} &\leq M \leq M_i^{I,J} && \text{for every } i \in I, \\ M_j^{I,J} &< M && \text{for every } j \in J, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_i^{I,J} &= \frac{\sqrt{K+d_i}}{K^2+Kd_i} \sqrt{\frac{N_i}{U_i}} S_I + T_J - V_I, \\ M_i^{I,J} &= \frac{\sqrt{K+d_i}}{Kd_i} \sqrt{\frac{N_i}{U_i}} S_I + T_J - V_I, \end{aligned}$$

and for any subset $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, L\}$,

$$S_A = \sum_{i \in A} \sqrt{N_i U_i (K + d_i)}; \quad T_A = \sum_{i \in A} \frac{N_i}{d_i}; \quad V_A = \sum_{i \in A} \frac{N_i}{K}.$$

For every M , the above definition considers a particular partition of the set of L file classes. As we will see in the next lemma, the optimal choice α^* will be characterized in terms of an M -feasible partition (H, I, J) of the classes.

Lemma 2. Given K , $\{N_i, U_i, d_i\}$, and M , the α^* which minimizes $R(\alpha, M)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_h^* &= 0 && \text{for every } h \in H, \\ \alpha_i^* &= \alpha_i^{I,J} && \text{for every } i \in I, \\ \alpha_j^* &= \frac{N_j}{d_j M} && \text{for every } j \in J, \end{aligned}$$

where (H, I, J) is an M -feasible partition of $\{1, \dots, L\}$, and

$$\alpha_i^{I,J} = \frac{\sqrt{N_i U_i (K + d_i)}}{S_I} \left(1 - \frac{T_J}{M} + \frac{V_I}{M} \right) - \frac{N_i}{KM}.$$

The above lemma shows that for any given M , the optimal solution partitions the L classes into three sets. The first set H represents those unpopular file classes which are assigned no cache memory. On the other hand, the set J contains those popular classes that will be allotted enough cache memory so that any user requesting a file from one of these classes can recover the file by just accessing the assigned AP caches; thus from Lemma 1, we have $\alpha_j = \frac{N_j}{d_j M}$ for $j \in J$. Finally, the set I contains the rest of the classes, among which the remaining cache memory is divided optimally. Since the optimal choice α^* corresponds to the solution of a convex optimization problem, the proof of the above lemma involves showing that the proposed solution satisfies the KKT conditions. We omit the proof here for brevity.

Next, we use (8) to evaluate $R(\alpha^*, M)$ corresponding to the optimal choice α^* described above. Consider an M -feasible partition (H, I, J) . For $h \in H$, we have $\alpha_h^* = 0$ and from (8),

$$R_{d_h} \left(\frac{\alpha_h^* M}{N}, K, U_h \right) = R_{d_h} (0, K, U_h) = KU_h.$$

On the other hand, for $j \in J$, we have $\alpha_j^* = \frac{N_j}{d_j M}$ and thus

$$R_{d_j} \left(\frac{\alpha_j^* M}{N}, K, U_j \right) = R_{d_j} \left(\frac{1}{d_j}, K, U_j \right) = 0.$$

Finally, for $i \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{d_i} \left(\frac{\alpha_i^* M}{N}, K, U_i \right) &= \frac{KU_i \left(1 - \frac{d_i \alpha_i^{I,J} M}{N_i} \right)}{1 + K \frac{\alpha_i^{I,J} M}{N_i}} \\ &= \frac{S_I \sqrt{N_i U_i (K + d_i)}}{K(M - T_J + V_I)} - d_i U_i, \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 7: Netflix: Popularity profile.

where the last equation follows by substituting $\alpha_i^{I,J}$ from Lemma 2 and using some simple algebraic manipulations. Thus, the total rate $R(\alpha^*, M)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 R(\alpha^*, M) &= 0 + \sum_{h \in H} KU_h + \sum_{i \in I} \left(\frac{S_I \sqrt{N_i U_i (K + d_i)}}{K(M - T_J + V_I)} - d_i U_i \right) \\
 &= \sum_{h \in H} KU_h + \frac{S_I \sum_{i \in I} \sqrt{N_i U_i (K + d_i)}}{K(M - T_J + V_I)} - \sum_{i \in I} d_i U_i \\
 &= \sum_{h \in H} KU_h + \frac{S_I^2}{K(M - T_J + V_I)} - \sum_{i \in I} d_i U_i,
 \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

Finally, notice that for any given M , the minimum rate characterization above requires the identification of an M -feasible partition (H, I, J) . As mentioned before, we construct an efficient algorithm that identifies such a partition in finite time, the details of which are provided in Appendix D.

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In the previous sections, we studied the rate of transmission for a given (multi-level) set of file popularity classes and corresponding (multi-level) user access structures. However, in practice, what is available is a popularity distribution over the total set of files, and one can choose the number of popularity classes, divide the files into these different classes, and assign different access structures to users requesting files from different classes. For each such choice, our results in the previous sections characterize the minimum rate of transmission using a memory-sharing scheme for given parameters of the design (memory, number of caches, file classes, user request profile, and multi-level access structure).

In this section we will explore the dependence of the minimum rate on the number of popularity levels, the different access structures, and the choice of the content placement scheme through memory splitting parameters α_i 's. We do this by evaluating our theoretical results on real datasets from Netflix and YouTube [10], [11].

Figures 7 and 8 show the popularity distribution of about 18,000 Netflix movies and 500,000 YouTube videos, respectively. We base popularity on the number of requests of a video, for the YouTube dataset, and on the number of ratings of a movie, for the Netflix dataset, similarly to the approach in [10]. The popularity distribution curves for the two datasets are similar to those frequently observed for multimedia content [10], [14]: the popularity of the Netflix movies, in Figure 7, demonstrates a ‘flat head’ for the first 500 or so movies, followed by a power law tail; and the YouTube video popularities in Figure 8 follow a Zipf distribution.

In our numerical results we use $K = 60$ APs and a total of $U = 20$ users requesting files from each AP (hence there are 1200 users). The total number of files N will be around 18,000 or 500,000 for the Netflix and YouTube datasets respectively. For several of the plots, we will plot the transmission rate R vs. the normalized memory size M/N . To get a sense of these numbers, an average high-definition Netflix movie of size 2 GB and a cache size of 10 TB will correspond to $M/N \approx 5000/18000 \approx 0.3$. In the following sub-sections, we will analyze the transmission rate R , while varying the number of levels, the different access structures, and the choice of the memory splitting parameters α_i 's.




Fig. 8: Youtube: Popularity profile.




Fig. 9: Netflix: ratio of rate with L levels to rate with a single level, for different values of M/N .

In Section VI-A, we explore the splitting of the “continuous” popularity profiles of Figures 7 and 8 into discrete popularity levels and its impact on our system. The results show that just 3 levels are sufficient and further splits give very little benefits. Section VI-B explores how to optimize the access structures (d_i ’s) of the users with respect to rate, memory and average access degree. We see that in several regimes, it is better to have $d_i < d_j$, for $j > i$, *i.e.*, users requesting more popular files should access fewer APs. The impact of different memory-sharing placement strategies is explored in Section VI-C. In particular, coded Least-Frequently-Used (LFU) placement and other memory sharing schemes can result in a rate which is up to a factor of 7 greater compared to our optimized placement for network coded delivery scheme.

A. Multi-level popularity

We choose small, moderate, and large values of M/N :

$$M/N \in \{0.03, 0.2, 0.7\}.$$

For each M/N , we examine the BS rate for an increasing number of levels L . For each choice of L , we pick N_1, N_2, \dots, N_L such that the most popular N_1 files are assigned to the first class, the next N_2 files to the second class, and so on. The fraction of the U users per AP requesting files from class i is set to be the sum of the request probabilities corresponding to the files in the class. To study the impact of the number of popularity levels in isolation, we set the access degree $d_i = 1$ for every level i . We find the minimum BS rate, using our memory-splitting scheme in Section V. This is optimized over the choice of the number of files in each level, $\{N_i\}$. The results are shown in Figures 9 and 10. Note that file classes can be chosen to be empty and hence the achievable rate with $L + 1$ levels is no larger than the one with L levels.

As can be seen in both plots, for each choice of M/N , there is a drastic drop in rate from $L = 1$ to $L = 2$, and thereafter, the rate decreases with diminishing returns as L grows. In fact, beyond $L = 4$, there is no significant decrease in rate. These




Fig. 10: YouTube: ratio of rate R with L levels to rate with a single level, for different values of M/N .




Fig. 11: Netflix: R versus M/N for different access structures.

results show the importance of distinguishing between popularity classes (90% decrease in rate between $L = 1$ and $L = 2$ for $M/N = 0.7$ in the Netflix dataset), but also suggest that using just a few popularity classes (3–4) is enough to achieve almost all the gains in performance.

B. Multi-level access structures

In Figures 11 and 12, we set $L = 2$ with $N_1 = 0.2N$, $N_2 = 0.8N$ files in the two levels, and plot the BS rate R versus the normalized cache memory M/N for four choices of access structures $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2)$: $(1, 1)$, $(1, 2)$, $(2, 1)$, and $(2, 2)$.

As is to be expected, the rate decreases as we give greater cache access to the users. The two cases $\mathbf{d} = (1, 2)$ and $\mathbf{d} = (2, 1)$ provide an interesting comparison. The former gives a lower rate for small M , whereas the latter is the better choice for larger M . Indeed, for small M , the cache memory is dominated by the class 1 files corresponding to higher popularity, and so improving the rate associated with them is more desirable. However, as M grows, the files from the second class also start occupying a significant part of the memory. Since there are many more files of class 2 than of class 1, it becomes more efficient to give higher access to the users of class 2 instead.

While greater cache access brings reductions in the transmission rate, there is a cost associated with it that arises from both the delay in *sequentially* establishing these multiple connections and the reduction in rate when connecting to farther and farther APs. This cost can be included in our rate optimization framework by including both a maximum access degree constraint $d_i \leq d_{\max} \forall i$, as well as an average degree constraint $\frac{1}{U} \sum_i U_i d_i \leq d_{\text{avg}}$. To study the impact of these constraints, we consider a setup with $L = 3$ levels of files and $N_1 = 0.04N$, $N_2 = 0.13N$, and $N_3 = 0.83N$ files in the three levels, and set $d_{\max} = 3$, $d_{\text{avg}} = 2$. The results are shown in Figures 13 and 14. The main observation from these plots is that, except for small M/N , the optimal access degrees follow a clear ordering: $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq d_3$. In words, this implies that users requesting more popular files need to access fewer AP caches for recovering their requested files, while users requesting unpopular content are penalized by being required to establish connections to more APs.




Fig. 12: Youtube: R versus M/N for different access structures.




Fig. 13: Netflix: Optimal access structure with $d_{\max} = 3$, $d_{\text{avg}} = 2$.

C. Memory-sharing placement strategies

We compare the rate achieved using our choice of memory allocation vector α^* from Section V with other possible choices. We consider a setup with $L = 3$ levels of files and $N_1 = 0.04N$, $N_2 = 0.13N$, and $N_3 = 0.83N$ files in the three levels, and set the access structure $\mathbf{d} = (1, 1, 1)$.

The first choice is similar in spirit to the Least-Frequently-Used (LFU) caching scheme [13], with the cache memory allocated to completely storing files from the most popular classes, with as many such levels as the total memory permits. However, this is not the conventional LFU since it does not just replicate the popular content across the caches, and hence we name it Coded LFU. There will be a class t such that the maximum memory is given to classes $\{1, \dots, t-1\}$ ($\alpha_i = \frac{N_i}{d_i M}$ for $i < t$), no memory is given to levels $\{t+1, \dots, L\}$ ($\alpha_i = 0$ for $i > t$), and the remaining memory is given to level t ($\alpha_t = 1 - \sum_{i < t} \frac{N_i}{d_i M}$). We will denote this choice by α^{LFU} . The second choice is the one that gives an equal share of the cache to all popularity levels [15], *i.e.*, $\alpha_i = 1/L$ for all i . We call this α^{EQ} .

Figures 15 and 16 compare the achievable rate with our choice α^* to the rates with α^{LFU} and α^{EQ} for the Netflix and YouTube datasets. As can be seen in the figures, there is a gain of up to a factor of 7 in using α^* over both other choices. Indeed, for small to medium values of M/N , we can see a distinct gap between the rate with α^* and α^{LFU} . For larger values of M , not only is there an apparent gap between the performance with α^* and α^{EQ} , but also the rate hits zero for a smaller value of M with the former choice.

VII. RELATED WORK

Content caching has a rich history and has been studied extensively, see for example [16] and references therein. More recently, it has been studied in the context of Video-on-Demand systems where efficient content placement and delivery schemes have been proposed in [3], [17]–[19]. The impact of content popularity distributions on caching schemes has also




Fig. 14: YouTube: Optimal access structure with $d_{\max} = 3$, $d_{\text{avg}} = 2$.




Fig. 15: R versus M/N for memory allocations α^* , α^{LFU} , for both Netflix and YouTube.

been widely investigated, see for example [20]–[22]. Our work differs from these in the use of coded cache placement and network-coded broadcast delivery schemes.

Further, most of the literature has focused on wired networks and, as argued before, the solutions there do not carry directly to cellular networks. Recently, [8] proposed a caching architecture for heterogeneous wireless networks, with the small-cell or WiFi access points acting as helpers by storing part of the content. A content placement scheme is formulated and posed as a linear program. However, the (information-theoretic) optimality of such schemes is not examined and we believe that such schemes will not be order-optimal. The idea proposed in this paper differs from [8] in several aspects: utilizing the macro-cell base station broadcast to assist in content delivery, and allowing different access structures for different popularity classes, which help improve the system performance significantly. Moreover, our scheme is compared against the best possible through information-theoretic impossibility results, which do not have any restrictions on the structure of the placement and delivery schemes.

Another feature common to most of the papers in the content caching literature is that the delivery phase typically uses independent unicasts to serve the different users. The inherent broadcast nature of wireless transmission provides the opportunity to improve system performance by serving multiple users simultaneously. The idea of combining broadcast with caching was proposed in [7], [23] which formulated the problem with a single level of files and single cache access during delivery, and proposed order-optimal coded caching schemes with broadcast transmissions during the delivery phase. They demonstrated the significant benefits of the coded placement and delivery scheme over the conventional approach with uncoded placement and unicast delivery. Recently, [15] studied the case of different file popularities and proposed a memory-sharing scheme for content placement, where the set of files is first divided into L levels such that within each level, all files have roughly the same popularity, and then each level is assigned an equal fraction of the memory. Further, they were able to prove a tightness result of the following form: if each cache memory is of size ML instead of M and their proposed scheme is used, then




Fig. 16: R versus M/N for memory allocations α^* , α^{EQ} , for both Netflix and YouTube.

the resulting rate is at most cL times larger than the information-theoretically optimum rate when each cache has memory size M . Our work differs in several aspects: firstly, we analytically characterize the (near) optimal splitting parameters for the memory-sharing scheme and demonstrate the order-optimality of the scheme for two levels; and secondly, we utilize the ability of users to access multiple AP caches to design a multi-level access scheme, which helps improve performance significantly. We also optimize the number of popularity levels to match the placement and delivery schemes and demonstrate that 3 - 4 levels are sufficient to accumulate most of the gains of memory-sharing.

Other related work includes [24] which derives scaling laws for content replication in multihop wireless networks; [25] which explores distributed caching in mobile networks using device-to-device communications; [26] which studies the benefit of coded caching when the caches are distributed randomly; and [27] which explores the benefits of adaptive content placement, using knowledge of user requests.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Cisco visual networking index (vni) global mobile data traffic forecast update," 2013, http://www.gsma.com/spectrum/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Cisco_VNI-global-mobile-data-traffic-forecast-update.pdf.
- [2] "Qualcomm: The 1000x challenge," 2013, <http://www.qualcomm.com/solutions/wireless-networks/technologies/1000x-data/small-cells>.
- [3] M. R. Korupolu, C. G. Plaxton, and R. Rajaraman, "Placement algorithms for hierarchical cooperative caching," in *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 1999, pp. 586–595.
- [4] "Intel heterogeneous network solution brief," 2013, <http://www.intel.com/content/dam/www/public/us/en/documents/solution-briefs/communications-heterogeneous-network-brief.pdf>.
- [5] "Intel: Rethinking the small cell business model," 2012, <http://www.intel.com/content/dam/www/public/us/en/documents/white-papers/communications-small-cell-study.pdf>.
- [6] "Deloitte: The impact of 4g technology on commercial interactions, economic growth and u.s. competitiveness," 2012, http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-UnitedStates/Local%20Assets/Documents/TMT_us_tmt/us_tmt_impactof4g_edited060612.pdf.
- [7] M. A. Maddah-Ali and U. Niesen, "Fundamental limits of caching," *pre-print*, 2012, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1209.5807>.
- [8] N. Golrezaei, K. Shanmugam, A. G. Dimakis, A. F. Molisch, and G. Caire, "Femtocaching: Wireless video content delivery through distributed caching helpers," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, 2012, pp. 1107–1115. [Online]. Available: <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/infocom/infocom2012.html#GolrezaeiSDMC12>
- [9] J. Hachem, N. Karamchandani, and S. Diggavi, "Multi-level coded caching," *arXiv pre-print*, Apr. 2014.
- [10] M. Cha, H. Kwak, P. Rodriguez, Y.-Y. Ahn, and S. Moon, "I tube, you tube, everybody tubes: Analyzing the world's largest user generated content video system," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, 2007, pp. 1–14. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1298306.1298309>
- [11] "UMass trace repository," <http://traces.cs.umass.edu/index.php/network/network>.
- [12] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [13] M. Hefeeda and O. Saleh, "Traffic modeling and proportional partial caching for peer-to-peer systems," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1447–1460, Dec. 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2008.918081>
- [14] K. P. Gummadi, R. J. Dunn, S. Saroiu, S. D. Gribble, H. M. Levy, and J. Zahorjan, "Measurement, modeling, and analysis of a peer-to-peer file-sharing workload," in *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, 2003, pp. 314–329. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/945445.945475>
- [15] U. Niesen and M. A. Maddah-Ali, "Coded caching with nonuniform demands," *pre-print*, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1308.0178>.
- [16] D. Wessels, *Web Caching*, N. Torkington, Ed. Sebastopol, CA, USA: O'Reilly & Associates, Inc., 2001.
- [17] S. Borst, V. Gupta, and A. Walid, "Distributed caching algorithms for content distribution networks," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, 2010, pp. 1478–1486. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1833515.1833726>
- [18] B. Tan and L. Massoulié, "Optimal content placement for peer-to-peer video-on-demand systems," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 566–579, Apr. 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2012.2208199>
- [19] J. Llorca, A. M. Tulino, K. Guan, J. Esteban, M. Varvello, N. Choi, and D. C. Kilper, "Dynamic in-network caching for energy efficient content delivery," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, 2013, pp. 245–249.




Fig. 17: A comparison between the coded caching (a) and the conventional caching (b) schemes.

- [20] A. Wolman, G. M. Voelker, N. Sharma, N. Cardwell, A. Karlin, and H. M. Levy, "On the scale and performance of cooperative web proxy caching," in *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, 1999, pp. 16–31.
- [21] L. Breslau, P. Cao, L. Fan, G. Phillips, and S. Shenker, "Web caching and zipf-like distributions: evidence and implications," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, 1999, pp. 126–134.
- [22] D. Applegate, A. Archer, V. Gopalakrishnan, S. Lee, and K. K. Ramakrishnan, "Optimal content placement for a large-scale vod system," in *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies (CoNEXT)*, 2010, pp. 4:1–4:12. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1921168.1921174>
- [23] M. A. Maddah-Ali and U. Niesen, "Decentralized caching attains order-optimal memory-rate tradeoff," *pre-print*, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.5848>.
- [24] S. Gitsenis, G. S. Paschos, and L. Tassiulas, "Asymptotic laws for joint content replication and delivery in wireless networks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 2760–2776, May 2013.
- [25] S. Ioannidis, L. Massoulié, and A. Chaintreau, "Distributed caching over heterogeneous mobile networks," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMETRICS International Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*, 2010, pp. 311–322. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1811039.1811075>
- [26] E. Altman, K. Avrachenkov, and J. Goseling, "Coding for caches in the plane," *pre-print*, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1309.0604>.
- [27] J. Y. Yang and B. Hajek, "Single video performance analysis for video-on-demand systems," *pre-print*, 2013, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.0849>.
- [28] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley-Interscience, 1991.

APPENDIX A SCHEME FOR A SINGLE CLASS

Consider a special case of our problem setup with $L = 1$ class, $U = U_1 = 1$ user per AP and $d_1 = 1$ AP cache access for each user. This setup was recently studied in [7] where a coding-based placement scheme with network-coded broadcast transmission was proposed, whose performance is much superior to the conventional scheme with replication and unicast transmission.

The scheme proposed in [7] is as follows. For $t = \frac{MK}{N}$, each file is split into $\binom{K}{t}$ parts of equal size, one corresponding to each subset of cardinality t of the K AP caches in the system. Every such part is placed in each of the t AP caches corresponding to its assigned subset and it is shown that this satisfies the memory size constraint. During the delivery phase, for each subset of $(t + 1)$ users, the BS broadcasts an XOR of the file parts that are requested by a user and available to everyone else through their assigned caches. Thus each user can recover their requested part, since they have access to all but one element in the XOR. The BS transmission rate achieved by this scheme is given by

$$R_1 \left(\frac{M}{N}, K, 1 \right) = \frac{K \left(1 - \frac{M}{N} \right)}{1 + \frac{KM}{N}}$$

for $M \in \frac{N}{K} \cdot \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$, and the lower convex envelope of these points for $M \in [0, N]$. See the example below.

Example: See Figure 17(a). Let the BS hold $N = 2$ files A and B , each of size F bits. Let there be $K = 2$ APs, each with a cache memory of size F bits ($M = 1$). Then $t = \frac{MK}{N} = 1$ and each file is split into $\binom{2}{1} = 2$ parts, let $A = (A_1, A_2), B = (B_1, B_2)$. The two caches store (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) respectively. Now, suppose the two users accessing AP1 and AP2 request the files A, B respectively. Then, by broadcasting $A_2 \oplus B_1$, where \oplus denotes the bit-wise XOR operation, the server can satisfy both requests simultaneously. For this scheme, the BS transmits $F/2$ bits, so that the transmission rate is $1/2$.

Next, consider the conventional placement and delivery scheme in Figure 17(b). This scheme would store the same content, say A_1, B_1 in both caches. Then, during the delivery phase the BS will have to unicast A_2, B_2 to the first and second user respectively. Note that this scheme requires the BS to transmit $2 \times \frac{F}{2} = F$ bits, so that the resulting transmission rate is 1. Thus, the conventional scheme requires twice the transmission rate of the coded caching scheme.

Lemma 1 generalizes the above described scheme to when there are $U_1 > 1$ users per AP, each accessing $d_1 > 1$ consecutive APs. Since each user has access to d caches, content can be placed such that each user can fully utilize the dM cache memory available to them, without conflicting with other users with overlapping access. Figure 18 illustrates how a cache memory of




Fig. 18: A placement of subfiles (A_1, A_2, A_3) of file A for $d = 3$ and cache memory of $M = \frac{N}{d}$. Three users requesting A are shown, to indicate how accessing any d consecutive caches allows file recovery.

N/d is now enough to fully serve all requests, the cyclic access structure is for ease of exposition and can be easily generalized. Handling the presence of multiple users per AP is done by applying the same placement scheme, and performing the delivery phase in U stages, where one unique user per AP is served in each stage.

APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let $X^{\mathbf{r}}$ denote the BS transmission that serves request vector $\mathbf{r} = (W_1, W_2, W_3)$, where W_i denotes the file request of user i . We will prove one of the four inequalities needed to prove Theorem 1, the others use similar ideas. The proof uses the entropy $H(\cdot)$ of a random variable and the mutual information $I(\cdot; \cdot)$ between random variables [28]. It is worth noting that this inequality is not a cut-set bound [28].

Proof of $R \geq \frac{5}{2} - M$:

$$\begin{aligned}
2(R + M)F &\geq H(Z_1, X^{(A,B,C_1)}) + H(Z_2, X^{(B,A,C_2)}) \\
&\geq H(Z_1, X^{(A,B,C_1)}|A) + I(A; Z_1, X^{(A,B,C_1)}) \\
&\quad + H(Z_2, X^{(B,A,C_2)}|A) + I(A; Z_2, X^{(B,A,C_2)}) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} H(Z_1, Z_2, X^{(A,B,C_1)}, X^{(B,A,C_2)}|A) + 2F(1 - \varepsilon_F) \\
&\geq H(Z_1, Z_2, X^{(A,B,C_1)}, X^{(B,A,C_2)}|A, B, C_1, C_2) \\
&\quad + I(B, C_1, C_2; Z_1, Z_2, X^{(A,B,C_1)}, X^{(B,A,C_2)}|A) \\
&\quad + 2F(1 - \varepsilon_F) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} 5F(1 - \varepsilon_F).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that step (a) and (b) are a result of Fano's inequality. The bound follows from taking $F \rightarrow \infty$.

APPENDIX C IMPOSSIBILITY RESULT FOR $L = 2$

We have $L = 2$ classes of files, which we will refer to as the *popular* and *unpopular* classes. There are $U_1 \geq 1$ users per AP requesting popular files and are required to connect to only $d_1 = 1$ cache, while $U_2 = 1$ user per AP requests an unpopular file and is required to connect to $d_2 = 2$ caches. There are N_1 popular files: $W_{1,1}, \dots, W_{1,N_1}$, and $N_2 \geq N_1$ unpopular files: $W_{2,1}, \dots, W_{2,N_2}$. We define $z = N_2/N_1$.

The following two lemmas give information-theoretic lower bounds on the optimal achievable rate $R^*(M)$. The first is the standard cut-set bound [28]: for a feasible (M, R) tuple, the total information contained in the memory of any subset of caches and the BS transmissions must be at least the size of the files that the users accessing these caches can recover when listening to the broadcasts.

Lemma 3 (General cut-set bounds). *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ be any level, and let $v \in \{1, \dots, KU_i\}$. Then,*

$$R^*(M) \geq v - \frac{\lceil v/U_i \rceil + (d_i - 1)}{\lfloor N_i/v \rfloor} M$$

Proof: Choose the v users connected to caches Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_k} , where n_k is the smallest number of caches that can hold v users:

$$n_k = \min \left\{ \left\lceil \frac{v}{U_i} \right\rceil + (d_i - 1), K \right\}.$$

Now consider $b = \lfloor \frac{N_i}{v} \rfloor$ broadcasts X_1, \dots, X_b that, in total, satisfy the requests of the v users for $vb = v \lfloor \frac{N_i}{v} \rfloor$ files of level i . Then, by Fano's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lfloor \frac{N_i}{v} \right\rfloor R + n_k M &\geq H(Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_k}, X_1, \dots, X_b) \\ &\geq H(Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_k}, X_1, \dots, X_b | W_1^i, \dots, W_{vb}^i) + v \left\lfloor \frac{N_i}{v} \right\rfloor (1 - \varepsilon_F) \\ &\geq v \left\lfloor \frac{N_i}{v} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

By taking $F \rightarrow \infty$, $\varepsilon_F \rightarrow 0$, and:

$$R \geq v - \frac{n_k}{b} M \geq v - \frac{\lceil v/U_i \rceil + (d_i - 1)}{\lfloor N_i/v \rfloor} M.$$

■

Applied to this $L = 2$ scenario, Lemma 3 can be rephrased:

Corollary 1 (Two-level cut-set bounds). *Let $s \in \{1, \dots, KU_1\}$ and $t \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} R^*(M) &\geq s - \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{s}{U_1} \right\rfloor}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_1}{s} \right\rfloor} M; && \text{(cut-set bound for level 1)} \\ R^*(M) &\geq t - \frac{t+1}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{t} \right\rfloor} M. && \text{(cut-set bound for level 2)} \end{aligned}$$

However, the cut-set bounds are not enough to prove order-optimality for our setup, and hence we derived the following non-standard bound to fill this gap.

Lemma 4 (Non-cut-set bound). *Let $n_k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and b be a positive integer. Define $\tilde{n}_k = n_k - 1$ if $n_k \leq K - 1$ and $\tilde{n}_k = K$ if $n_k = K$. Then, for any memory M , the optimal broadcast rate must satisfy:*

$$R^*(M) \geq \min \left\{ U_1, \frac{N_1}{b} \right\} + \min \left\{ \tilde{n}_k, \frac{N_2}{n_k b} \right\} - \frac{M}{b}$$

In general, when using the non-cut-set bound, we must evaluate the two minimizations in the inequality. In particular, we want to get lower bounds on:

$$* \min \left\{ U_1, \frac{N_1}{b} \right\}; \tag{9a}$$

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{n}_k, \frac{N_2}{n_k b} \right\}. \tag{10}$$

Proof of Lemma 4: Consider the first n_k caches, Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_k} . There are $n_k U_1$ users of level 1 connected to these caches, and \tilde{n}_k users of level 2 fully connected to them.

We will now assume that a total of $n_k b$ broadcasts are transmitted, which we will label as $X_1^{(i)}, \dots, X_b^{(i)}$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n_k\}$, to satisfy the following demands:

- At each cache, the U_1 level-1 users collectively make b requests for a total of up to $\min\{U_1 b, N_1\}$ level-1 files;
- All the \tilde{n}_k level-2 users collectively make $n_k b$ requests for a total of up to $\min\{n_k \tilde{n}_k b, N_2\}$ level-2.

Any (M, R) pair that can correctly serve these requests must obey the inequalities below. The inequalities marked with (a) and (b) show where Fano's inequality is used for the recovery of level-1 and level-2 files, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} n_k b R + n_k M &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} H(Z_i, X_b^{(i)}, \dots, X_b^{(i)}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left[H(Z_i, X_1^{(i)}, \dots, X_b^{(i)} | W_1^1, \dots, W_{\min\{U_1 b, N_1\}}^1) + \min\{U_1 b, N_1\} (1 - \varepsilon_F) \right] \\ &\geq H(Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_k}, X_1^{(1)}, \dots, X_b^{(n_k)} | W_1^1, \dots, W_{\min\{U_1 b, N_1\}}^1) + \min\{n_k U_1 b, n_k N_1\} (1 - \varepsilon_F) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} H(Z_1, \dots, Z_{n_k}, X_1^{(1)}, \dots, X_b^{(n_k)} | W_1^1, \dots, W_{\min\{U_1 b, N_1\}}^1, W_1^2, \dots, W_{\min\{\tilde{n}_k n_k b, N_2\}}^2) \\ &\quad + (\min\{n_k U_1 b, n_k N_1\} + \min\{\tilde{n}_k n_k b, N_2\}) (1 - \varepsilon_F) \\ &\geq (\min\{n_k U_1 b, n_k N_1\} + \min\{\tilde{n}_k n_k b, N_2\}) (1 - \varepsilon_F) \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 19: Lower bound (upto a constant factor) on the minimum rate $R^*(M)$, for $K + 1 > \sqrt{zU_1}$ and $z < 4U_1$.

As $F \rightarrow \infty$, $\varepsilon_F \rightarrow 0$, and therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} n_k b R + n_k M &\geq \min \{n_k U_1 b, n_k N_1\} + \min \{\tilde{n}_k n_k b, N_2\} \\ R &\geq \min \left\{ U_1, \frac{N_1}{b} \right\} + \min \left\{ \tilde{n}_k, \frac{N_2}{n_k b} \right\} - \frac{M}{b} \end{aligned}$$

■

Using a combination of the above lemmas, we are able to identify a good lower bound on $R^*(M)$ for all values of M . We can show that the rate achieved by our memory-sharing scheme, as described in Section IV, is within a constant multiplicative factor of this lower bound.

Figure 19 shows these bounds for the case $K + 1 > \sqrt{zU_1}$ and $z < 4U_1$. As an example, consider the point $M = N_1$. Here, each AP has sufficient memory to store exactly all the popular files. If we do that, we require a BS transmission of size KF bits to serve all the users requesting unpopular files. However, when $K + 1 > \sqrt{zU_1}$ and $z < 4U_1$, we know from (7) that our proposed scheme can deliver all the files using a BS transmission of size $2\sqrt{zU_1}F$ bits, thus resulting in a rate of $2\sqrt{zU_1}$. Figure 19 shows that for $M = N_1$, this rate is indeed within a constant factor of the lower bound.

APPENDIX D

ALGORITHM FOR OPTIMAL MEMORY-SHARING

In Algorithm 1, we give a procedure that finds an M -feasible partition (H, I, J) and computes the corresponding memory allocation vector α , for all possible values of M . The algorithm terminates in finite time, in particular in $\Theta(L^2)$ time.

Recall that an M -feasible partition (H, I, J) defines certain inequality constraints on M , as in Definition 1. The terms involved in these inequalities can be written as $f_{I,J}(\tilde{m}_i)$ and $f_{I,J}(\tilde{M}_i)$, where $f_{I,J}(x) = xS_I + T_J - V_I$, and, for all i ,

$$\tilde{m}_i = \frac{\sqrt{K + d_i}}{K^2 + Kd_i} \sqrt{\frac{N_i}{U_i}}; \quad \tilde{M}_i = \frac{\sqrt{K + d_i}}{Kd_i} \sqrt{\frac{N_i}{U_i}}$$

are terms that depend only on i , and in particular are independent of the choice of the partition. Note that $\tilde{m}_i < \tilde{M}_i$.

The inequalities define certain ranges of M . Each range is of the form (Y_t, Y_{t+1}) , where Y_t is equal to $m_i^{I_t, J_t}$ or $M_i^{I_t, J_t}$ for some pair (I_t, J_t) . In each range, the same set of inequalities is satisfied, and thus the same partition (H, I, J) is M -feasible for all M in the range.

Since the algorithm does not know *a priori* the different (I_t, J_t) pairs for each M , it is not straightforward to find the ranges (Y_t, Y_{t+1}) . What it does instead is to sort the values $\{\tilde{m}_i, \tilde{M}_i\}$, and then derive (I_t, J_t) and $(m_i^{I_t, J_t}, M_i^{I_t, J_t})$ from this sorting.

Finally, for any M , we can now determine the range it falls in, and hence the corresponding M -feasible partition, which itself determines the α vector as per Lemma 2.

Algorithm 1 Finds an M -feasible partition for all M .

```

1: Sort  $\{\tilde{m}_i, \tilde{M}_i\}_i$  in ascending order, and label the resulting sequence as  $(x_1, \dots, x_{2L})$ 
2:
3: Step 1: First, determine  $(I, J)$  for each range, symbolized by the pair  $(x_t, x_{t+1})$ :
4: Set  $I_0 \leftarrow \phi$  and  $J_0 \leftarrow \phi$ .
5: for  $t \in \{1, \dots, 2L\}$  do
6:   if  $x_t = \tilde{m}_i$  then
7:      $(I_t, J_t) \leftarrow (I_{t-1} \cup \{i\}, J_{t-1})$ 
8:   else if  $x_t = \tilde{M}_i$  then
9:      $(I_t, J_t) \leftarrow (I_{t-1} \setminus \{i\}, J_{t-1} \cup \{i\})$ 
10:  end if
11: end for
12:
13: Step 2: Now that we have  $(I, J)$  for each range, we compute the limits of the ranges as  $(Y_t, Y_{t+1})$ :
14: for  $t \in \{1, \dots, 2L\}$  do
15:   if  $x_t = \tilde{m}_i$  then
16:      $Y_t \leftarrow m_i^{I_t, J_t}$ 
17:   else if  $x_t = \tilde{M}_i$  then
18:      $Y_t \leftarrow M_i^{I_{t-1}, J_{t-1}}$ 
19:   end if
20: end for
21:
22: Step 3: Finally, determine  $(H, I, J)$  for all  $M$  depending on the ranges:
23: for all  $M$  do
24:   Find  $t$  such that  $M \in [Y_t, Y_{t+1})$ 
25:   Set  $H_t \leftarrow (I_t \cup J_t)^c$ 
26:   Set  $M$ -feasible partition as:  $(H_t, I_t, J_t)$ .
27: end for

```

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF THEOREM 3

For the analysis, we will define $z = \frac{N_2}{N_1} \geq 1$. Recall that we are assuming:

$$*U_2 = 1 \tag{11a}$$

$$N_1 \geq KU_1 \tag{12}$$

$$K \geq k_0 = 130 \tag{13}$$

$$\frac{U_1/N_1}{U_2/N_2} = zU_1 \geq q_0 = 100 \tag{14}$$

Further recall, from Section IV, that the achievability scheme operates in one of three regimes. The first regime is when all the cache memory is given to level 1, the second regime is when the memory is shared between levels 1 and 2, and the third regime is when the memory available for the first regime is maximal. As a result, each regime uses a different value for α^* , as shown in (5). However, in the analysis in this section, we will choose, for simplicity, the following values of α^* :

$$\alpha^*(M) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 0 \leq M \leq M'_1, \\ \frac{\sqrt{U_1}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}} & \text{for } M'_1 < M < M'_2, \\ \frac{N_1}{M} & \text{for } M'_2 \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}, \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where

$$M'_1 = \min \left\{ N_1, \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \right\},$$

$$M'_2 = \min \left\{ N_1, N_1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K} \right) \right\}.$$

We thus have the following three regimes:

$$\text{* Lower regime : } \quad 0 \leq M \leq M'_1; \quad (16a)$$

$$\text{Middle regime : } \quad M'_1 < M < M'_2; \quad (17)$$

$$\text{Upper regime : } \quad M'_2 \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}. \quad (18)$$

Note that the way we defined the regimes in (15) implies that $\alpha^*(M'_1) = 1$ and $\alpha^*(M'_2) = \frac{N_1}{M'_2}$. Furthermore, the defined values of $\alpha^*(M)$ are valid, since $\alpha^*(M) \in [0, 1]$ for all M .

We will analyze the gap between the achievability and the lower bounds in each of the three regimes. Note that, when $K \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$, then $M'_1 = M'_2 = N_1$, and the middle regime is empty. Conversely, $K > \sqrt{zU_1}$ implies that $M'_1 < N_1 < M'_2$, and thus the middle regime is not empty:

$$K > \sqrt{zU_1} \iff M'_1 < N_1 < M'_2 \iff \text{middle regime is not empty.} \quad (19)$$

Note: when the middle regime *is* empty, and $M'_1 = M'_2 = N_1$, then the memory value N_1 can be considered in either of the upper and lower regimes. Indeed, the value of $\alpha^*(N_1)$ is the same, namely $\alpha^*(N_1) = 1$, in both cases. For simplicity of future reference:

$$K \leq \sqrt{zU_1} \implies \alpha^*(N_1) = 1. \quad (20)$$

Finally, we define $R_P(\cdot)$ and $R_Q(\cdot)$ as the rate functions of levels 1 and 2, respectively. In particular,

$$R_P(M) = R_1\left(\frac{M}{N_1}, K, U_1\right),$$

$$R_Q(M) = R_2\left(\frac{M}{N_2}, K, 1\right),$$

where $R_1(\cdot)$ and $R_2(\cdot)$ are as defined in Lemma 1. The total rate is therefore:

$$R(M) = R_P(\alpha^*(M)M) + R_Q((1 - \alpha^*(M))M). \quad (21)$$

A. *Lower regime:* $0 \leq M \leq M'_1$

In this regime, we set $\alpha^*(M) = 1$. Hence, by substituting in (21), the rate for all M in this interval is:

$$R(M) \leq R_P(M) + R_Q(0) = R_P(M) + K \quad (22)$$

We will subdivide the regime into three intervals:

$$0 \leq M \leq \frac{N_1}{K}$$

$$\frac{N_1}{K} \leq M \leq \min\left\{U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}, \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}, 0.3N_1\right\}$$

$$\min\left\{U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}, 0.3N_1\right\} \leq M \leq \min\left\{\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}, N_1\right\}$$

1) *Interval* $0 \leq M \leq \frac{N_1}{K}$: We have, from (22):

$$R(M) \leq R(0) = R_P(0) + R_Q(0) = (K + 1)U_1 \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{k_0}\right)KU_1 \leq 1.01KU_1. \quad (23)$$

For the lower bound, use the cut-set bound for level 1 in Corollary 1, and pick $s = \lfloor \gamma KU_1 \rfloor$, with $\gamma = 0.2$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq s - \frac{\left\lceil \frac{s}{U_1} \right\rceil}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_1}{s} \right\rfloor} M \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \lfloor \gamma KU_1 \rfloor - \frac{\left\lceil \frac{\lfloor \gamma KU_1 \rfloor}{U_1} \right\rceil N_1}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_1}{\lfloor \gamma KU_1 \rfloor} \right\rfloor} K \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \gamma KU_1 - 1 - \frac{\left(\gamma + \frac{1}{k_0}\right) N_1}{\frac{N_1}{\gamma KU_1} - 1} \\
&\geq KU_1 \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{KU_1} - \frac{\gamma \left(\gamma + \frac{1}{k_0}\right)}{1 - \frac{\gamma KU_1}{N_1}} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} KU_1 \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{k_0} - \frac{\gamma \left(\gamma + \frac{1}{k_0}\right)}{1 - \gamma} \right) \\
&\geq 0.14KU_1. \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above inequalities, (a) uses $M \leq \frac{N_1}{K}$, (b) uses the fact that $\lfloor x \rfloor \geq x - 1$ and $\lceil x \rceil \leq x + 1$, and (c) uses $N_1 \geq KU_1$ as in (12).

By combining (23) and (24), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{1.01KU_1}{0.14KU_1} \leq 8. \tag{25}$$

2) *Interval* $\frac{N_1}{K} \leq M \leq \min \left\{ U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}, \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}, 0.3N_1 \right\}$: For a given M in this range, we choose \tilde{M} to be the largest multiple of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ that is no larger than M . As a result, using Lemma 1:

$$R_P(\tilde{M}) = \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}}. \tag{26}$$

Since $M \geq \frac{N_1}{K}$, we have:

$$0 \leq M - \frac{N_1}{K} \leq \tilde{M} \leq M$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
R(M) &\leq R(\tilde{M}) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} R_P(\tilde{M}) + R_Q(0) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} + K \\
&\leq \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{M - \frac{N_1}{K}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{M}{N_1} - 1} + K \\
&\leq U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left(1 - \frac{M - \frac{N_1}{K}}{N_1}\right) + K \\
&\leq U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} + K \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} + U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \\
&\leq 2U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}. \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, (a) uses (22), (b) uses (26), and (c) uses $M \leq U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}$.

Now use the cut-set bound for level 1 (Corollary 1), with $s = \lfloor \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \rfloor$, where $\gamma = 0.19$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq s - \frac{\left\lceil \frac{s}{U_1} \right\rceil}{\lfloor N_1/s \rfloor} M \\
&\geq \left\lfloor \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \right\rfloor - \frac{\left\lceil \frac{\lfloor \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \rfloor}{U_1} \right\rceil}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_1}{\lfloor \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \rfloor} \right\rfloor} M \\
&\geq \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} - 1 - \frac{\gamma \frac{N_1}{M} + 1}{\frac{N_1}{\gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}} - 1} M \\
&\geq \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} - 1 - \frac{\gamma N_1 + M}{\frac{M}{\gamma U_1} - 1} \\
&\geq \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} - 1 - \frac{\gamma U_1}{M} \cdot \frac{\gamma N_1 + M}{1 - \frac{\gamma U_1}{M}} \\
&\geq U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left[\gamma - \frac{M}{N_1 U_1} - \frac{\gamma \left(\gamma + \frac{M}{N_1} \right)}{1 - \frac{\gamma U_1}{M}} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left[\gamma - \frac{1}{K} - \frac{\gamma \left(\gamma + \frac{0.3 N_1}{N_1} \right)}{1 - \frac{\gamma K U_1}{N_1}} \right] \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{k_0} - \frac{\gamma(\gamma + 0.3)}{1 - \gamma} \right) \\
&\geq 0.067 U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}. \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, (a) uses the fact that $\frac{N_1}{K} \leq M \leq 0.3 N_1$ and $M \leq U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}$, and (b) uses $N_1 \geq K U_1$.

By combining (28) and (29), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{2}{0.067} \leq 30. \tag{30}$$

3) *Interval* $\min \{U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}, 0.3 N_1\} \leq M \leq \min \{ \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{z U_1}, N_1 \}$: This interval must be split into two cases, depending on which of $U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}$ and $0.3 N_1$ is smaller.

a) *Case 1*: $U_1 \frac{N_1}{K} \leq 0.3 N_1$: Here, the interval is

$$U_1 \frac{N_1}{K} \leq M \leq \min \left\{ \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{z U_1}, N_1 \right\}$$

The computations in the previous section up to (27) still hold in this section. Beyond (27), we use, this time, $M \geq U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}$, and then:

$$\begin{aligned}
R(M) &\leq U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} + K \\
&\leq K + K \\
&\leq 2K. \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

We now use the cut-set bound for level 2 (from Corollary 1), with $t = \lfloor \gamma K \rfloor$, where $\gamma = 0.25$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq t - \frac{t+1}{\lfloor N_2/t \rfloor} M \\
&\geq \lfloor \gamma K \rfloor - \frac{(\lfloor \gamma K \rfloor + 1) M}{\lfloor \frac{N_2}{\lfloor \gamma K \rfloor} \rfloor} \\
&\geq \gamma K - 1 - \frac{(\gamma K + 1) M}{\frac{N_2}{\gamma K} - 1} \\
&\geq \gamma K - 1 - \frac{\gamma K}{N_2} \cdot \frac{(\gamma K + 1) M}{1 - \frac{\gamma K}{N_2}} \\
&\geq K \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{K} - \frac{\frac{\gamma(\gamma K + 1)}{z} \cdot \frac{M}{N_1}}{1 - \frac{\gamma K}{z N_1}} \right) \\
&\geq K \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{K} - \frac{\gamma(\gamma K + 1) M}{z N_1} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{z U_1}} \right) \\
&\geq K \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{K} - \frac{\gamma^2 K M}{z N_1} \cdot \frac{1 + \frac{1}{\gamma K}}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{z U_1}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, recall that $U_1 \frac{N_1}{K} \leq M \leq \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{z U_1}$. This gives two conclusions: the first is that $U_1 \leq \sqrt{z U_1}$, and hence $U_1 \leq z$; and the second is that $\frac{K M}{N_1} \leq \sqrt{z U_1}$. Combined, they give $\frac{K M}{N_1} \leq z$, which means $\frac{K M}{z N_1} \leq 1$, and hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq K \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{K} - \frac{\gamma \left(\gamma + \frac{1}{K} \right)}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{z U_1}} \right) \\
&\geq K \left(\gamma - \frac{1}{k_0} - \frac{\gamma \left(\gamma + \frac{1}{k_0} \right)}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{q_0}} \right) \\
&\geq 0.177K.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

By combining (31) with (32), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{2}{0.177} \leq 12. \tag{33}$$

b) *Case 2:* $0.3N_1 \leq U_1 \frac{N_1}{K}$: In this case, the interval becomes:

$$0.3N_1 \leq M \leq \min \left\{ \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{z U_1}, N_1 \right\}$$

First, we must bound the rate at N_1 .

Let \tilde{M} be the largest multiple of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ that is less than $0.3N_1$. Then, we have:

$$0.3N_1 - \frac{N_1}{K} \leq \tilde{M} < 0.3N_1 \leq M \leq N_1$$

By the convexity of $R(\cdot)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{R(M) - R(N_1)}{N_1 - M} &\leq \frac{R(\tilde{M}) - R(N_1)}{N_1 - \tilde{M}} \\
R(M) &\leq R(N_1) + \frac{N_1 - M}{N_1 - \tilde{M}} \left(R(\tilde{M}) - R(N_1) \right) \\
&\leq R(N_1) + \frac{1 - \frac{M}{N_1}}{1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} \left(R(\tilde{M}) - R(N_1) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Again because of the convexity of $R(\cdot)$, (34) still holds for any upper bound on $R(N_1)$. Let us first compute this upper bound.

Claim 1. For a cache memory of N_1 , the rate achieved by the memory-sharing scheme can be bounded by:

$$R(N_1) \leq 4K.$$

Proof: Recall, from (21), that:

$$R(N_1) = R_P(\alpha^*(N_1)N_1) + R_Q((1 - \alpha^*(N_1))N_1).$$

If $K \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$, then, by (19), the middle regime is empty, and thus $M'_1 = M'_2 = N_1$, and $\alpha^*(M) = 1$. As a result:

$$R(N_1) = R_P(N_1) + R_Q(0) = 0 + K = K \leq 4K.$$

On the other hand, if $K > \sqrt{zU_1}$, then, again by (19), the middle regime is not empty and includes the point N_1 . Therefore, $\alpha^*(N_1) = \frac{\sqrt{U_1}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}$. First, notice that we can always bound $R_Q(\cdot)$ by:

$$R_Q((1 - \alpha^*(N_1))N_1) \leq R_Q(0) \leq K. \quad (35)$$

For $R_P(\cdot)$, let \check{M} be the largest multiple of $\frac{N_1}{K}$, that is less than $\alpha^*(N_1)N_1$. Thus:

$$\alpha^*(N_1)N_1 - \frac{N_1}{K} \leq \check{M} < \alpha^*(N_1)N_1.$$

It follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} R_P(\alpha^*(N_1)N_1) &\leq \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\check{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\check{M}}{N_1}} \\ &\leq \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^*(N_1)N_1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{K}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\alpha^*(N_1)N_1}{N_1} - 1} \\ &= \frac{U_1 \left(1 - \alpha^*(N_1) + \frac{1}{K}\right)}{\alpha^*(N_1)} \\ &= \frac{U_1 \left(\frac{\sqrt{z}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}} + \frac{1}{K}\right)}{\frac{\sqrt{U_1}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}} \\ &= \sqrt{U_1} \left(\sqrt{z} + \frac{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}{K}\right) \\ &= \sqrt{zU_1} + \frac{\sqrt{U_1}(\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z})}{K} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sqrt{zU_1} + \frac{\sqrt{U_1} \cdot 2\sqrt{zU_1}}{K} \\ &\leq \sqrt{zU_1} + 2\sqrt{U_1} \\ &\leq 3\sqrt{zU_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where (a) uses the fact that $a, b \geq 1 \implies a + b \leq 2ab$.

By combining (35) and (36), we get:

$$R(N_1) \leq 3\sqrt{zU_1} + K \leq 4K.$$

Therefore, $R(N_1) \leq 4K$ whether $K \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$ or $K > \sqrt{zU_1}$. ■

We can now substitute the bound on $R(N_1)$ from Claim 1 into (34):

$$R(M) \leq 4K + \frac{1 - \frac{M}{N_1}}{1 - \frac{\check{M}}{N_1}} \left(R(\check{M}) - 4K\right) \leq 4K + \frac{1 - \frac{M}{N_1}}{1 - \frac{\check{M}}{N_1}} \left(R(\check{M}) - K\right) \quad (37)$$

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} R(\check{M}) &= R_P(\check{M}) + R_Q(0) \\ &= \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\check{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\check{M}}{N_1}} + K \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
R(M) &\leq 4K + \frac{1 - \frac{M}{N_1}}{1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} \left(\frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} + K - K \right) \\
&\leq 4K + \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} \\
&\leq 4K + \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{0.3N_1 - \frac{N_1}{K}}{N_1}} \\
&\leq 4K + \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right)}{1 + 0.3K - 1} \\
&\leq 4K + \frac{1}{0.3} U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) \\
&\leq 4 \left[K + U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Consider now the lower bound from Lemma 4. Use $n_k = K$ and $b = \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil$. Then, $\tilde{n}_k = K$. Regarding minimization (9a) in the lower bound:

$$\frac{N_1}{b} = \frac{N_1}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \leq \frac{N_1}{\frac{N_1}{U_1}} = U_1.$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq \min \left\{ U_1, \frac{N_1}{b} \right\} + \min \left\{ \tilde{n}_k, \frac{N_2}{n_k b} \right\} - \frac{M}{b} \\
&\geq \frac{N_1}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} + \min \left\{ K, \frac{N_2}{K \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \right\} - \frac{M}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \\
&\geq \frac{N_1 - M}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} + \min \left\{ K, \frac{N_2}{K \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Regarding minimization (10), we consider two subcases:

$$\text{Subcase 1: } N_1 \leq \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}$$

$$\text{Subcase 2: } N_1 > \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}$$

Subcase 1: $N_1 \leq \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}$

First, note that we have, in this subcase, $K \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
K^2 \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil &\leq K^2 \frac{N_1}{U_1} \leq zU_1 \frac{N_1}{U_1} = zN_1 = N_2 \\
\Rightarrow K \frac{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} &\leq \frac{N_2}{K \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil}
\end{aligned}$$

Since we also have $\left\lfloor \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil$, (39) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq \frac{N_1 - M}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} + K \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rfloor}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \\
&\geq \frac{N_1 - M}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} + K \frac{\frac{N_1}{U_1} - 1}{\frac{N_1}{U_1} + 1} \\
&\geq \frac{N_1 - M}{\frac{N_1}{U_1} + 1} + K \frac{1 - \frac{U_1}{N_1}}{1 + \frac{U_1}{N_1}} \\
&\geq \frac{U_1}{N_1} \cdot \frac{N_1 - M}{1 + \frac{U_1}{N_1}} + K \frac{1 - \frac{1}{K}}{1 + \frac{1}{K}} \\
&\geq U_1 \frac{1 - \frac{M}{N_1}}{1 + \frac{U_1}{KU_1}} + K \frac{1 - \frac{1}{K}}{1 + \frac{1}{K}} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \cdot U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + K \frac{1 - \frac{1}{k_0}}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \\
&\geq \frac{1 - \frac{1}{k_0}}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \left[U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + K \right] \\
&\geq 0.98 \left[U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + K \right]. \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (38) and (40), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{4}{0.98} \leq 4.1. \tag{41}$$

Subcase 2: $N_1 > \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}$

Now, we have $K > \sqrt{zU_1}$. Therefore, $K^2 \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil \geq zU_1 \frac{N_1}{U_1} = N_2$. However, we also have:

$$\begin{aligned}
0.3N_1 &\leq \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \\
\implies \sqrt{zU_1} &\geq 0.3K \\
\implies zU_1 &\geq 0.09K^2
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the outer bound becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq \frac{N_1 - M}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} + \frac{N_2}{K \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \cdot U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + \frac{zN_1}{K \frac{N_1}{U_1} + K} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \cdot U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + \frac{zU_1}{K \left(1 + \frac{U_1}{N_1}\right)} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \cdot U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + \frac{0.09K}{1 + \frac{U_1}{KU_1}} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \cdot U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + \frac{0.09}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} K \\
&\geq 0.089 \left[U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) + K \right]. \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (38) and (42), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{4}{0.089} \leq 45.0. \tag{43}$$

Gap for the regime: By combining (25), (30), (33), (41), and (43), we get that:

$$\forall M \in [0, M'_1], \quad \frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq 45.0. \quad (44)$$

B. Middle regime: $M'_1 < M < M'_2$

Recall that this regime occurs only when $K > \sqrt{zU_1}$. Therefore, by (17), the range of M 's that fall in this regime is:

$$\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} < M < N_1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K} \right)$$

Note that the value $M = N_1$ always falls into this range.

Further recall that in this regime, we choose, from (15), $\alpha^*(M) = \frac{\sqrt{U_1}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}$ for all $M \in (M'_1, M'_2)$. Therefore:

$$R(M) = R_P \left(\frac{\sqrt{U_1}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}} M \right) + R_Q \left(\frac{\sqrt{z}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}} M \right). \quad (45)$$

For simplicity, we will henceforth define:

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\sqrt{U_1}}{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}. \quad (46)$$

This regime must be analyzed in two different cases. The first is when $z \geq 4U_1$, and the second is when $z < 4U_1$.

1) Case 1: $z \geq 4U_1$: In this case, we subdivide the regime (17) into the following intervals:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} &\leq M \leq \frac{N_2}{2K} \\ \frac{N_2}{2K} &\leq M \leq \frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{zU_1}} \\ \frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{zU_1}} &\leq M \leq N_1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Throughout the analysis, any inequality that uses the condition $z \geq 4U_1$ will be denoted by a (*).

a) Interval 1: $\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \leq M \leq \frac{N_2}{2K}$: First, recall that the memory value $\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}$ is considered in the lower regime, as per (16a). Therefore, $\alpha^* \left(\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \right) = 1$, and, as in (22):

$$R(M) \leq R \left(\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \right) = R_P \left(\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \right) + R_Q(0) = R_P \left(\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \right) + K.$$

Let \tilde{M} be the largest multiple of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ such that $\tilde{M} < \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1}$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} R(M) &\leq R \left(\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \right) \\ &\leq R_P \left(\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} \right) + R_Q(0) \\ &\leq R_P(\tilde{M}) + K \\ &\leq \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1} \right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} + K \\ &\leq \frac{KU_1}{1 + \frac{K}{N_1} \cdot \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} - 1} + K \\ &\leq K \sqrt{\frac{U_1}{z}} + K \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} K. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Consider now the cut-set bound for level 2 (Corollary 1), with $t = K$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq K - \frac{K}{\lfloor \frac{N_2}{K} \rfloor} M \\
&\geq K - \frac{K}{\frac{N_2}{K} - 1} M \\
&= K \left(1 - \frac{K \frac{M}{N_2}}{1 - \frac{K}{N_2}} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} K \left(1 - \frac{\frac{K}{N_2} \cdot \frac{N_2}{2K}}{1 - \frac{1}{zU_1}} \right) \\
&\geq K \left(1 - \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{1 - \frac{1}{q_0}} \right) \\
&\geq 0.49K,
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where (a) uses $N_2 = zN_1 \geq zKU_1$.

By now combining (47) and (48), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{3/2}{0.49} \leq 3.1. \tag{49}$$

b) *Interval 2:* $\frac{N_2}{2K} \leq M \leq \frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{z}U_1}$: Let \tilde{M} be the largest multiple of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ less than $\tilde{\alpha}M$, and \tilde{M}' the largest multiple of $\frac{N_2}{K}$ less than $(1 - \tilde{\alpha})M$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_P(\tilde{\alpha}M) &\leq R_P(\tilde{M}) \\
&= \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{M_1}{N_1} \right)}{1 + K \frac{M_1}{N_1}} \\
&\leq \frac{KU_1}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{\alpha}M}{N_1} - 1} \\
&= U_1 \frac{N_1}{\tilde{\alpha}M} \\
&= U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}{\sqrt{U_1}} \\
&= \frac{N_1}{M} \left(U_1 + \sqrt{zU_1} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \frac{N_1}{M} \left(\frac{z}{4} + \frac{1}{2}z \right) \\
&= \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{N_2}{M}.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

As discussed above, (*) uses the condition of Case 1, namely $z \geq 4U_1$.

On the other hand:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha})M) &\leq R(\tilde{M}') \\
&= \frac{K \left(1 - 2\frac{M_2}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K\frac{M_2}{N_2}} \\
&\leq \frac{K}{1 + K\frac{(1-\alpha)M}{N_2} - 1} \\
&= \frac{N_2}{M} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}{\sqrt{z}} \\
&= \frac{N_2}{M} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{U_1}{z}}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \frac{N_2}{M} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) \\
&= \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{N_2}{M},
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where $(*)$ uses $z \geq 4U_1$. We can combine (50) and (51) to get the total rate at M :

$$R(M) = R_P(\tilde{\alpha}M) + R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha})M) \leq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{N_2}{M} + \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{N_2}{M} = \frac{9}{4} \cdot \frac{N_2}{M}. \tag{52}$$

Using the cut-set bound for level 2 (Corollary 1), we set $t = \lfloor \frac{N_2}{2M} \rfloor$. Note that, in this interval:

$$t = \left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{2M} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{N_2}{2M} \leq \frac{N_2}{2\frac{N_2}{2K}} = K,$$

which makes the above choice of t a valid one. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq t - \frac{t+1}{\lfloor \frac{N_2}{t} \rfloor} M \\
&\geq \frac{N_2}{2M} - 1 - \frac{\frac{N_2}{2M} + 1}{\frac{N_2}{2M} - 1} M \\
&= \frac{N_2}{2M} \left(1 - \frac{2M}{N_2} - \left(1 + \frac{2M}{N_2}\right) \frac{M}{2M-1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We have:

$$\frac{2M}{N_2} \leq \frac{2}{N_2} \cdot \frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{zU_1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}},$$

and also, since $M \geq \frac{N_2}{2K} \geq \frac{zKU_1}{2K} = \frac{zU_1}{2} > \frac{1}{2}$, then $\frac{M}{2M-1}$ is a decreasing function of M , and:

$$\frac{M}{2M-1} \leq \frac{\frac{N_2}{2K}}{2\frac{N_2}{2K} - 1} = \frac{N_2}{2N_2 - 2K} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{1 - \frac{K}{N_2}} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{1 - \frac{1}{q_0}}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq \frac{N_2}{2M} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}}\right) \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{1 - \frac{1}{q_0}}\right) \\
&\geq 0.172 \frac{N_2}{M}.
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

By combining (52) with (53), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{9/4}{0.172} \leq 13.1. \tag{54}$$

c) *Interval 3*: $\frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{zU_1}} \leq M \leq N_1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K} \right)$: Define $M_0 = \frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{zU_1}}$. Since $M \geq M_0$, we have:

$$R(M) \leq R(M_0) = R_P(\tilde{\alpha}M_0) + R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha})M_0). \quad (55)$$

Let \tilde{M} and \tilde{M}' be the largest multiples of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ and $\frac{N_2}{K}$, respectively, such that $\tilde{M} < \tilde{\alpha}M_0$ and $\tilde{M}' < (1 - \tilde{\alpha})M_0$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} R_P(\alpha M_0) &\leq R_P(\tilde{M}) \\ &= \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} \\ &\leq \frac{KU_1}{1 + K \frac{\alpha M_0}{N_1} - 1} \\ &= U_1 \frac{N_1}{M_0} \cdot \frac{1}{\alpha} \\ &= U_1 \frac{N_1}{\frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{zU_1}}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}}{\sqrt{U_1}} \\ &= \frac{2U_1 \sqrt{zU_1}}{z} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{z}{U_1}}\right) \\ &= \frac{2U_1}{z} \sqrt{zU_1} + 2U_1 \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{zU_1} + 2\sqrt{U_1} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}z} \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \sqrt{zU_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha})M_0) &\leq R_Q(\tilde{M}') \\ &= \frac{K \left(1 - 2\frac{\tilde{M}'}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}'}{N_2}} \\ &\leq \frac{K}{1 + K \frac{(1 - \alpha)M_0}{N_2} - 1} \\ &= \frac{N_2}{M_0} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \\ &= \frac{N_2}{\frac{N_2}{2\sqrt{zU_1}}} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{U_1}{z}}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 2\sqrt{zU_1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) \\ &\leq 3\sqrt{zU_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

By substituting (56) and (57) into (55), we get:

$$R(M) \leq R(M_0) \leq R_P(\alpha M_0) + R_Q((1 - \alpha)M_0) \leq \frac{3}{2} \sqrt{zU_1} + 3\sqrt{zU_1} \leq \frac{9}{2} \sqrt{zU_1}. \quad (58)$$

The following claim gives a lower bound on the rate that will be useful now as well as later on.

Claim 2. For all $M \leq N_1 + \sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}}$, we have:

$$R^*(M) \geq 0.049 \sqrt{zU_1}.$$

Proof: Consider the non-cut-set bound from Lemma 4. Set $\gamma = 0.5$, and choose $n_k = \lfloor \gamma \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor < K$, and thus $\tilde{n}_k = n_k - 1$. Furthermore, choose $b = \lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \rfloor$. Evaluating the minimization in (9a), we have:

$$\frac{N_1}{b} = \frac{N_1}{\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \rfloor} \leq \frac{N_1}{\frac{N_2}{n_k} - 1} \leq \frac{N_1}{\frac{N_2}{\gamma^2 z U_1} - 1} = \frac{\gamma^2 U_1}{1 - \frac{\gamma^2 z U_1}{N_2}} \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{1 - \frac{\gamma^2 z U_1}{z K U_1}} U_1 \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{K_0}} U_1 \leq 0.251 U_1 \leq U_1$$

As for the minimization in (10), we have:

$$\frac{N_2}{n_k b} = \frac{N_2}{n_k \left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k-1)} \right\rfloor} \geq n_k - 1$$

Using the above two inequalities in the non-cut-set bound of Lemma 4, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} R^*(M) &\geq \frac{N_1}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k-1)} \right\rfloor} + (n_k - 1) - \frac{M}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k-1)} \right\rfloor} \\ &= n_k - 1 - \frac{M - N_1}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k-1)} \right\rfloor} \\ &\geq n_k - 1 - \frac{M - N_1}{\frac{N_2}{n_k} - 1} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \gamma \sqrt{zU_1} - 2 - \frac{\sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}}}{\frac{N_2}{\gamma^2 z U_1} - 1} \\ &= \gamma \sqrt{zU_1} - 2 - \frac{\gamma^2 z U_1}{N_2} \cdot \frac{\frac{N_2}{\sqrt{zU_1}}}{1 - \frac{\gamma^2 z U_1}{N_2}} \\ &= \gamma \sqrt{zU_1} - 2 - \frac{\gamma^2 \sqrt{zU_1}}{1 - \frac{\gamma^2 z U_1}{N_2}} \\ &= \sqrt{zU_1} \left(\gamma - \frac{2}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{\gamma^2}{1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{K}} \right) \\ &\geq \sqrt{zU_1} \left(\gamma - \frac{2}{\sqrt{q_0}} - \frac{\gamma^2}{1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} \right) \\ &\geq 0.049 \sqrt{zU_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) uses $n_k = \left\lfloor \gamma \sqrt{zU_1} \right\rfloor \geq \gamma \sqrt{zU_1} - 1$, as well as $M - N_1 \geq \sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}}$. ■

For this interval, we have $M \leq N_1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K} \right) \leq N_1 + \sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}}$. Therefore, we can use Claim 2 as a lower bound, and hence:

$$R^*(M) \geq 0.049 \sqrt{zU_1}, \quad (59)$$

By combining (58) and (59), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{9/2}{0.049} \leq 92. \quad (60)$$

2) *Case 2:* $z < 4U_1$: We subdivide this case into the following intervals:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{zU_1} &\leq M \leq 0.1N_1 \\ 0.1N_1 &\leq M \leq N_1 \\ N_1 &\leq M \leq N_1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Throughout the analysis of this case, any inequality that uses the condition $z < 4U_1$ will be denoted by a (**).

a) *Interval 1*: $\frac{N_1}{K}\sqrt{zU_1} \leq M \leq 0.1N_1$: Let \tilde{M} and \tilde{M}' be the largest multiples of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ and $\frac{N_2}{K}$, respectively, such that $\tilde{M} < \tilde{\alpha}M$ and $\tilde{M}' < (1 - \tilde{\alpha})M$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_P(\tilde{\alpha}M) &\leq R_P(\tilde{M}) \\
&= \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K\frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} \\
&\leq \frac{KU_1}{1 + K\frac{\alpha M}{N_1} - 1} \\
&= U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{z}{U_1}}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} 3U_1 \frac{N_1}{M},
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where (**) uses $z < 4U_1$, as discussed previously.

Similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha})M) &\leq R_Q(\tilde{M}') \\
&= \frac{K \left(1 - 2\frac{\tilde{M}'}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K\frac{\tilde{M}'}{N_2}} \\
&\leq \frac{K}{1 + K\frac{(1-\alpha)M}{N_2} - 1} \\
&= \frac{N_2}{M} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{U_1}{z}}\right) \\
&= \frac{N_1}{M} \left(z + \sqrt{zU_1}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} \frac{N_1}{M} (4U_1 + 2U_1) \\
&\leq 6U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Using (61) and (62) in (45), we get:

$$R(M) = R_P(\alpha M) + R_Q((1 - \alpha)M) \leq 3U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} + 6U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} = 9U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}. \tag{63}$$

Consider the cut-set bound for level 1 (Corollary 1), and set $s = \lceil \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \rceil$, for $\gamma = 0.32$. First, notice that:

$$\gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} = 0.32U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \geq 0.32U_1 \frac{N_1}{0.1N_1} = 3.2U_1 > 1,$$

and therefore $\lceil \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \rceil \leq 2\gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}$. Therefore:

$$s \leq 2\gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \leq U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \leq \frac{U_1 N_1}{\frac{N_1}{K}\sqrt{zU_1}} = K\sqrt{\frac{U_1}{N_1}} \leq KU_1$$

Since also $s \geq 1$, the above choice of s is valid.

Then, the lower bound on the rate is:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq s - \frac{\left\lceil \frac{s}{U_1} \right\rceil}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_1}{s} \right\rfloor} M \\
&\geq \gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} - \frac{\gamma \frac{N_1}{M} + \frac{1}{U_1} + 1}{\frac{N_1}{\gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} + 1} - 1} M \\
&= U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left(\gamma - \frac{\gamma N_1 + \frac{M}{U_1} + M}{\frac{U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \cdot N_1}{\gamma U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} + 1} - U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}} \right) \\
&\geq U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left(\gamma - \frac{\gamma + 2 \frac{M}{N_1}}{\frac{1}{\gamma + \frac{M}{N_1 U_1}} - \frac{U_1}{M}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

We can bound the following terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{M}{N_1} &\leq \frac{0.1 N_1}{N_1} \leq 0.1 \\
\frac{U_1}{M} &\leq \frac{U_1}{\frac{N_1}{K} \sqrt{z U_1}} = \frac{K U_1}{N_1} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{z U_1}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}}
\end{aligned}$$

and then use them in the previous inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq U_1 \frac{N_1}{M} \left(\gamma - \frac{\gamma + 0.2}{\frac{1}{\gamma + 0.1} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_0}}} \right) \\
&\geq 0.092 U_1 \frac{N_1}{M}.
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Combining (63) with (64), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{9}{0.092} \leq 98. \tag{65}$$

b) *Interval 2:* $0.1 N_1 \leq M \leq N_1$: Let us first compute the rate at N_1 .

Claim 3. When $K > \sqrt{z U_1}$ and $z < 4 U_1$, then,

$$R(N_1) \leq 6 \sqrt{z U_1}.$$

Proof: We have

$$R(N_1) = R_P(\tilde{\alpha} N_1) + R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha}) N_1). \tag{66}$$

Let \check{M} and \check{M}' be the largest multiples of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ and $\frac{N_2}{K}$, respectively, such that $\check{M} < \tilde{\alpha}N_1$ and $\check{M}' < (1 - \tilde{\alpha})N_1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_P(\tilde{\alpha}N_1) &\leq R_P(\check{M}) \\
&= \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\check{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K\frac{\check{M}}{N_1}} \\
&\leq \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha N_1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{K}\right)}{1 + K\frac{\alpha N_1}{N_1} - 1} \\
&= \frac{U_1}{\alpha} \left(1 - \alpha + \frac{1}{K}\right) \\
&= \frac{U_1}{\alpha} - U_1 + \frac{U_1}{\alpha K} \\
&= \sqrt{U_1} \left(\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}\right) - U_1 + \frac{\sqrt{U_1}(\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z})}{K} \\
&= \sqrt{zU_1} + \frac{U_1 + \sqrt{zU_1}}{\sqrt{zU_1}} \\
&= \sqrt{zU_1} + \sqrt{\frac{U_1}{z}} + 1 \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 3\sqrt{zU_1},
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

where (a) is due to $\sqrt{zU_1} \geq 1$ and $\sqrt{\frac{U_1}{z}} \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha})N_1) &\leq R_Q(\check{M}') \\
&= \frac{K \left(1 - 2\frac{\check{M}'}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K\frac{\check{M}'}{N_2}} \\
&\leq \frac{K}{1 + K\frac{(1-\alpha)N_1}{N_2} - 1} \\
&= \frac{z}{1 - \alpha} \\
&= \sqrt{z} \left(\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} \sqrt{z} \left(\sqrt{U_1} + 2\sqrt{U_1}\right) \\
&\leq 3\sqrt{zU_1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

By using (67) and (68) in (66), we get that $R(N_1) \leq 6\sqrt{zU_1}$. ■

To recapitulate, using Claim 3, we have:

$$R(N_1) \leq 6\sqrt{zU_1}. \tag{69}$$

Now consider $M'_0 = 0.1N_1$. Let \tilde{M} and \tilde{M}' be the largest multiples of $\frac{N_1}{K}$ and $\frac{N_2}{K}$, respectively, such that $\tilde{M} < \tilde{\alpha}M'_0$ and

$\tilde{M}' < (1 - \tilde{\alpha})M'_0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_P(\alpha M'_0) &\leq R_P(\tilde{M}) \\
&= \frac{KU_1 \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}}{N_1}} \\
&\leq \frac{KU_1}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{\alpha} M'_0}{N_1} - 1} \\
&= \frac{U_1}{0.1\tilde{\alpha}} \\
&= \frac{1}{0.1} \sqrt{U_1} \left(\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} \frac{3}{0.1} U_1 \\
&= 30U_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
R_Q((1 - \tilde{\alpha})M'_0) &\leq R_Q(\tilde{M}') \\
&= \frac{K \left(1 - 2\frac{\tilde{M}'}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M}'}{N_2}} \\
&\leq \frac{K}{1 + K \frac{(1 - \tilde{\alpha})M'_0}{N_2} - 1} \\
&= \frac{z}{0.1(1 - \tilde{\alpha})} \\
&= \frac{1}{0.1} \sqrt{z} \left(\sqrt{U_1} + \sqrt{z}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} \frac{6}{0.1} U_1 \\
&= 60U_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Therefore, by combining (70) and (71), we get:

$$R(0.1N_1) = R(M'_0) \leq 90U_1. \tag{72}$$

For any $M \in [0.1N_1, N_1]$, we have, by convexity of $R(\cdot)$:

$$\frac{R(M) - R(N_1)}{N_1 - M} \leq \frac{R(0.1N_1) - R(N_1)}{N_1 - 0.1N_1}$$

Using (69) and (72) in the above, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
R(M) &\leq R(N_1) + \frac{N_1 - M}{N_1 - 0.1N_1} (R(0.1N_1) - R(N_1)) \\
&\leq 6\sqrt{zU_1} + \frac{1 - \frac{M}{N_1}}{1 - 0.1} \left(90U_1 - 6\sqrt{zU_1}\right) \\
&\leq 6\sqrt{zU_1} + \frac{1 - \frac{M}{N_1}}{0.9} \cdot 90U_1 \\
&= 6\sqrt{zU_1} + \frac{90}{0.9} U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) \\
&\leq 100 \left[\sqrt{zU_1} + U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1}\right) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Consider now the non-cut-set bound of Lemma 4, with $n_k = \lfloor \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor$, and $b = \lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \rceil$. Note that $\tilde{n}_k \geq n_k - 1$. Then:

$$R^*(M) \geq \min \left\{ U_1, \frac{N_1}{\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \rceil} \right\} + \min \left\{ \lfloor \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor - 1, \frac{N_2}{\lfloor \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor \cdot \lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \rceil} \right\} - \frac{M}{\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \rceil} \tag{74}$$

We will now evaluate the minimizations in (9a) and (10). For (9a), we have:

$$\min \left\{ U_1, \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil \right\} = \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil. \quad (75)$$

For (10), note the following:

$$\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil \leq \frac{N_1}{U_1} + 1 = \frac{N_1}{U_1} \left(1 + \frac{U_1}{N_1} \right) \leq \frac{N_1}{U_1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{K} \right) \leq \frac{N_1}{U_1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k_0} \right) \leq 1.01 \frac{N_1}{U_1}. \quad (76)$$

Therefore:

$$\frac{N_2}{\lfloor \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \geq \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{zU_1} \cdot \frac{N_1}{U_1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k_0} \right)} \geq \frac{\sqrt{zU_1}}{1 + \frac{1}{k_0}} \geq 0.99 \sqrt{zU_1}.$$

Moreover,

$$\lfloor \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor - 1 \geq \sqrt{zU_1} - 2 \geq \sqrt{zU_1} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{q_0}} \right) = 0.8 \sqrt{zU_1}.$$

Therefore:

$$\min \left\{ \lfloor \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor - 1, \frac{N_2}{\lfloor \sqrt{zU_1} \rfloor \cdot \left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \right\} \geq \min \left\{ 0.8 \sqrt{zU_1}, 0.99 \sqrt{zU_1} \right\} = 0.8 \sqrt{zU_1}. \quad (77)$$

Substituting (75) and (77) in (74), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} R^*(M) &\geq 0.8 \sqrt{zU_1} + \frac{N_1 - M}{\left\lceil \frac{N_1}{U_1} \right\rceil} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} 0.8 \sqrt{zU_1} + 0.99 \frac{U_1}{N_1} (N_1 - M) \\ &= 0.8 \sqrt{zU_1} + 0.99 U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1} \right) \\ &\geq 0.8 \left[\sqrt{zU_1} + U_1 \left(1 - \frac{M}{N_1} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

where (a) uses (76), as well as the fact that $N_1 - M \geq 0$.

Combining (73) and (78), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{100}{0.8} \leq 125. \quad (79)$$

c) *Interval 3:* $N_1 \leq M \leq N_1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K} \right)$: Here, we have $R(M) \leq R(N_1)$. Using Claim 3, we get:

$$R(M) \leq R(N_1) \leq 6 \sqrt{zU_1}. \quad (80)$$

Once more, we can use the lower bound derived in Claim 2. Combining it with (80), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{6}{0.049} \leq 123. \quad (81)$$

Gap for the regime: By combining (49), (54), (60), (65), (79), and (81), we get:

$$\forall M \in (M'_1, M'_2), \quad \frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq 125. \quad (82)$$

C. *Upper regime:* $M'_2 \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}$

In this regime, we set $\alpha^*(M) = \frac{N_1}{M}$. As a result, for all M in this regime, we have:

$$R(M) = R_P(\alpha^*(M)M) + R_Q((1 - \alpha^*(M))M) = R_P(N_1) + R_Q(M - N_1) = R_Q(M - N_1), \quad (83)$$

because $R_P(N_1) = 0$ by Lemma 1. In particular, at the last point in the regime:

$$R\left(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}\right) = R_Q\left(\frac{N_2}{2}\right) = 0, \quad (84)$$

again because of Lemma 1.

We will subdivide the regime into three intervals:

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 + \max\left\{0, N_2\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K}\right)\right\} &\leq M \leq N_1 + \max\left\{\frac{N_2}{K}, \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{zU_1}}\right\} \\ N_1 + \max\left\{\frac{N_2}{K}, \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{zU_1}}\right\} &\leq M \leq N_1 + 0.1N_2 \\ N_1 + 0.1N_2 &\leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} \end{aligned}$$

1) *Interval* $N_1 + \max\left\{0, \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{N_2}{K}\right\} \leq M \leq N_1 + \max\left\{\frac{N_2}{K}, \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{zU_1}}\right\}$: This interval requires analyzing two cases: $K \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$ and $K > \sqrt{zU_1}$.

a) *Case 1:* $K \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$: This allows us to rewrite the interval as $N_1 \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{K}$.

Since $K \leq \sqrt{zU_1}$, the middle regime is empty, and thus $\alpha^*(N_1) = 1$, as per (20). Therefore, we have:

$$R(M) \leq R(N_1) = R_P(N_1) + R_Q(0) = 0 + K = K. \quad (85)$$

Consider the non-cut-set bound from Lemma 4, with $n_k = \lfloor \gamma K \rfloor$ caches, $\gamma = 0.4$, and $b = \left\lceil \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{N_2}{\lfloor \gamma K \rfloor^2} \right\rceil$ broadcasts. Recall that the bound is:

$$R^*(M) \geq \min\left\{U_1, \frac{N_1}{b}\right\} + \min\left\{n_k - 1, \frac{N_2}{n_k b}\right\} - \frac{M}{b}, \quad (86)$$

where we have used the fact that $n_k < K$ implies $\tilde{n}_k = n_k - 1$, by definition (see Lemma 4). We must now evaluate the two minimizations (9a) and (10). For (9a), notice that:

$$\frac{N_1}{b} = \frac{N_1}{\left\lceil \frac{N_2}{\lfloor \gamma K \rfloor^2} \right\rceil} \leq \frac{N_1}{\frac{N_2}{\gamma^2 K^2}} = \frac{\gamma^2 K^2}{z} \leq \frac{\gamma^2 z U_1}{z} = \gamma^2 U_1 \leq U_1. \quad (87)$$

For (10), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \min\left\{\tilde{n}_k, \frac{N_2}{n_k b}\right\} &= \frac{1}{n_k b} \cdot \min\{\tilde{n}_k n_k b, N_2\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n_k b} \cdot \min\left\{\tilde{n}_k n_k \left\lceil \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rceil, n_k^2 \frac{N_2}{n_k^2}\right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n_k b} \cdot \tilde{n}_k n_k \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \\ &= \tilde{n}_k \cdot \frac{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2}}{\left\lceil \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rceil}. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Using (87) and (88) in (86), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq \frac{N_1}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rfloor} + \tilde{n}_k \cdot \frac{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2}}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rfloor} - \frac{M}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rfloor} \\
&= \tilde{n}_k \cdot \frac{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2}}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rfloor} - \frac{M - N_1}{\left\lfloor \frac{N_2}{n_k^2} \right\rfloor} \\
&\geq \tilde{n}_k \cdot \frac{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2}}{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2} + 1} - \frac{M - N_1}{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2}} \\
&= \tilde{n}_k \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{n_k^2}{N_2}} - \frac{n_k^2}{N_2} (M - N_1) \\
&= (\lfloor \gamma K \rfloor - 1) \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\lfloor \gamma K \rfloor^2}{N_2}} - \frac{\lfloor \gamma K \rfloor^2}{N_2} (M - N_1) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} (\gamma K - 2) \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2 K^2}{z N_1}} - \frac{\gamma^2 K^2}{N_2} \cdot \frac{N_2}{K} \\
&\geq K \left(\gamma - \frac{2}{k_0} \right) \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2 K^2}{z K U_1}} - \gamma^2 K \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} K \left(\gamma - \frac{2}{k_0} \right) \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2 z U_1}{z K U_1}} - \gamma^2 K \\
&\geq K \left[\frac{\gamma - \frac{2}{k_0}}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \gamma^2 \right] \\
&\geq 0.22K,
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

where (a) uses the fact that $M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{K}$, and (b) uses $K \leq \sqrt{z U_1}$.

Combining (85) and (89), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{1}{0.22} \leq 4.6. \tag{90}$$

b) *Case 2: $K > \sqrt{z U_1}$:* This allows us to rewrite the interval as $N_1 + \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{z U_1}} - \frac{N_2}{K} \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{z U_1}}$. If $K \leq 2\sqrt{z U_1}$, then, using Claim 1, and since $M \geq N_1$ in this regime (18), we have:

$$R(M) \leq R(N_1) \leq 4K \leq 8\sqrt{z U_1}. \tag{91}$$

Otherwise, *i.e.*, if $K > 2\sqrt{z U_1}$, notice that:

$$\begin{aligned}
R(M) &\leq R(M'_2) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} R_Q(M'_2 - N_1) \\
&= R_Q \left(\sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}} - \frac{N_2}{K} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

where (a) is due to (83).

Let \tilde{M} be the (unique) number such that $(\tilde{M} - N_1)$ is a multiple of $\frac{N_2}{K}$, and:

$$\sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}} - 2\frac{N_2}{K} \leq \tilde{M} - N_1 < \sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}} - \frac{N_2}{K}. \tag{93}$$

Notice that $\tilde{M} \geq N_1$, and:

$$M - \frac{N_2}{K} \leq \tilde{M} \leq M. \tag{94}$$

Since $K > 2\sqrt{zU_1}$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
R(M) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} R_Q(M'_2 - N_1) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} R_Q(\tilde{M} - N_1) \\
&= \frac{K \left(1 - \frac{2(\tilde{M} - N_1)}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{K}{1 + K \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{2}{K}\right)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{K}} \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{zU_1}} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{zU_1}}} \\
&= 2\sqrt{zU_1},
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

where (a) uses (92), (b) follows from (94), (c) follows from $\tilde{M} \geq 0$ and (93), and (d) uses $K > 2\sqrt{zU_1}$.

Therefore, (91) and (95) give:

$$R(M) \leq 8\sqrt{zU_1}. \tag{96}$$

For the lower bound, since we have $M \leq N_1 + \sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}}$, we can use Claim 2. By combining it with (96), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{8}{0.049} \leq 164. \tag{97}$$

2) *Interval* $N_1 + \max\left\{\frac{N_2}{K}, \frac{N_2}{\sqrt{zU_1}}\right\} \leq M \leq N_1 + 0.1N_2$: Let \tilde{M} be the largest number less than M such that $(\tilde{M} - N_1)$ is a multiple of $\frac{N_2}{K}$. Then,

$$\max\left\{N_1, N_1 + \sqrt{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}} - \frac{N_2}{K}\right\} \leq M - \frac{N_2}{K} \leq \tilde{M} < M$$

and hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
R(M) &\leq R(\tilde{M}) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} R_Q(\tilde{M} - N_1) \\
&= \frac{K \left(1 - 2\frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K \frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}} \\
&\leq \frac{K \left(1 - 2\frac{M - N_1 - \frac{N_2}{K}}{N_2}\right)}{1 + K \frac{M - N_1}{N_2} - 1} \\
&\leq \frac{N_2}{M - N_1},
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

where (a) uses (83).

Consider again the non-cut-set bound (Lemma 4), with $n_k = \left\lceil \gamma \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} \right\rceil \leq K$ for $\gamma = 0.5$, and let $b = \left\lceil \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \right\rceil$. Note that $\tilde{n}_k = n_k - 1$. For the minimization in (9a), we have:

$$\frac{N_1}{b} = \frac{N_1}{\left\lceil \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \right\rceil} \leq \frac{N_1}{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2}} \leq \frac{n_k^2}{z} \leq \frac{\gamma^2 \frac{N_2^2}{(M - N_1)^2}}{z} = \frac{\gamma^2 N_1 N_2}{(M - N_1)^2} \leq \frac{\gamma^2 N_1 N_2}{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}} \leq \gamma^2 U_1 \leq U_1.$$

For the minimization in (10), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
b &= \left\lceil \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \right\rceil \leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} + 1 \leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{n_k(n_k - 1)}{N_2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{n_k^2}{N_2} \right) \leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma^2 \frac{N_2^2}{(M - N_1)^2}}{N_2} \right) \leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma^2 N_2}{(M - N_1)^2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma^2 N_2}{\frac{N_1 N_2}{U_1}} \right) \leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma^2 U_1}{N_1} \right) \leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{K} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which results in

$$\frac{N_2}{n_k b} \geq \frac{n_k - 1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}}.$$

Combining the above inequality with:

$$\tilde{n}_k = n_k - 1 \geq \frac{n_k - 1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}},$$

we can lower bound (10) by:

$$\min \left\{ \tilde{n}_k, \frac{N_2}{n_k b} \right\} \geq \frac{n_k - 1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}}.$$

Therefore, the bound becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq \frac{N_1}{b} + \frac{n_k - 1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \frac{M}{b} \\
&= \frac{n_k - 1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \frac{M - N_1}{b} \\
&= \frac{\left\lceil \gamma \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} \right\rceil - 1}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \frac{M - N_1}{\left\lceil \frac{N_2}{n_k(n_k - 1)} \right\rceil} \\
&\geq \frac{\gamma \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} - 2}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \frac{M - N_1}{\frac{N_2}{n_k^2}} \\
&= \frac{\gamma \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} - 2}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \frac{M - N_1}{N_2} \cdot n_k^2 \\
&\geq \frac{\gamma \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} - 2}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \frac{M - N_1}{N_2} \cdot \gamma^2 \frac{N_2^2}{(M - N_1)^2} \\
&= \frac{\gamma \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} - 2}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \gamma^2 \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} \\
&= \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} \left(\frac{\gamma - \frac{2(M - N_1)}{N_2}}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \gamma^2 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{N_2}{M - N_1} \left(\frac{\gamma - 0.2}{1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{k_0}} - \gamma^2 \right) \\
&\geq 0.049 \frac{N_2}{M - N_1}. \tag{99}
\end{aligned}$$

By combining (98) with (99), we get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{1}{0.049} \leq 21. \tag{100}$$

3) *Interval* $N_1 + 0.1N_2 \leq M \leq N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}$: Let \tilde{M} be the unique number such that $(\tilde{M} - N_1)$ is a multiple of $\frac{N_2}{K}$, and:

$$N_1 + 0.1N_2 - \frac{N_2}{K} \leq \tilde{M} < N_1 + 0.1N_2 \leq M \quad (101)$$

By convexity of $R(\cdot)$, we have:

$$\frac{R(M) - R(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2})}{N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} - M} \leq \frac{R(\tilde{M}) - R(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2})}{N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} - \tilde{M}} \quad (102)$$

Since the memory value $N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}$ is in the upper regime, its rate can be computed, using (83), as:

$$R\left(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2}\right) = R_P(N_1) + R_Q\left(\frac{N_2}{2}\right) = 0 + 0 = 0. \quad (103)$$

Substituting (103) in (102):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R(M)}{N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} - M} &\leq \frac{R(\tilde{M})}{N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} - \tilde{M}} \\ R(M) &\leq \frac{R(\tilde{M})}{N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} - \tilde{M}} \left(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} - M\right) \\ &= \frac{R_Q(\tilde{M} - N_1)}{1 - 2^{\frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}}} \left(1 - 2^{\frac{M - N_1}{N_2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{K \left(1 - 2^{\frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}}\right)}{1 + K^{\frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}}} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - 2^{\frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}}} \cdot \left(1 - 2^{\frac{M - N_1}{N_2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{K}{1 + K^{\frac{\tilde{M} - N_1}{N_2}}} \cdot \left(1 - 2^{\frac{M - N_1}{N_2}}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{K}{1 + K^{\frac{0.1N_2 - \frac{N_2}{K}}{N_2}}} \cdot \left(1 - 2^{\frac{M - N_1}{N_2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{K \left(1 - 2^{\frac{M - N_1}{N_2}}\right)}{1 + 0.1K - 1} \\ &= \frac{1}{0.1} \left(1 - 2^{\frac{M - N_1}{N_2}}\right) \\ &= 10 \left(1 - 2^{\frac{M - N_1}{N_2}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

We now use the non-cut-set bound from Lemma 4. Choose $n_k = 2$ (and thus $\tilde{n}_k = 1$) and $b = \lceil \frac{N_2}{2} \rceil$. Then, we can evaluate the two minimizations (9a) and (10):

$$\begin{aligned} \min \left\{ U_1, \frac{N_1}{b} \right\} &= \min \left\{ U_1, \frac{N_1}{\lceil N_2/2 \rceil} \right\} = \frac{N_1}{\lceil N_2/2 \rceil}, \\ \min \left\{ \tilde{n}_k, \frac{N_2}{n_k b} \right\} &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{N_2/2}{\lceil N_2/2 \rceil} \right\} = \frac{N_2/2}{\lceil N_2/2 \rceil}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
R^*(M) &\geq \frac{\frac{N_2}{2}}{\lceil \frac{N_2}{2} \rceil} - \frac{M - N_1}{\lceil \frac{N_2}{2} \rceil} \\
&= \frac{1 - 2\frac{M-N_1}{N_2}}{\frac{2}{N_2} \lceil \frac{N_2}{2} \rceil} \\
&\geq \frac{1 - 2\frac{M-N_1}{N_2}}{\frac{2}{N_2} \left(\frac{N_2}{2} + 1\right)} \\
&= \frac{1 - 2\frac{M-N_1}{N_2}}{1 + \frac{2}{N_2}} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \left(1 - 2\frac{M-N_1}{N_2}\right) \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{zKU_1}} \\
&\geq \left(1 - 2\frac{M-N_1}{N_2}\right) \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{k_0q_0}} \\
&\geq 0.999 \left(1 - 2\frac{M-N_1}{N_2}\right), \tag{105}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) uses $N_2 = zN_1 \geq zKU_1$, as well as assumptions (13) and (14).

We can now combine (104) and (105) to get:

$$\frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq \frac{10}{0.999} \leq 10.1. \tag{106}$$

Gap for the regime: By combining (90), (97), (100), and (106), we get:

$$\forall M \in \left[M'_2, N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} \right], \quad \frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq 164. \tag{107}$$

D. Gap

Equations (44), (82), and (107) each gave a bound on the multiplicative gap between the achievable rate and the optimal rate. The equations handled complementary regimes. Combining them, we get a bound on the gap for all M :

$$\forall M \in \left[0, N_1 + \frac{N_2}{2} \right], \quad \frac{R(M)}{R^*(M)} \leq 164,$$

thus proving Theorem 3.