

Transformers are Provably Optimal In-context Estimators for Wireless Communications

Vishnu Teja Kunde^{1,*} Vicram Rajagopalan^{2,*}
 Chandra Shekhara Kaushik Valmeekam^{1,*}
 Krishna Narayanan¹ Srinivas Shakkottai¹
 Dileep Kalathil¹ Jean-Francois Chamberland¹

¹Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Texas A&M University

²Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Texas A&M University

Abstract

Pre-trained transformers exhibit the capability of adapting to new tasks through in-context learning (ICL), where they efficiently utilize a limited set of prompts without explicit model optimization. The canonical communication problem of estimating transmitted symbols from received observations can be modelled as an in-context learning problem: Received observations are essentially a noisy function of transmitted symbols, and this function can be represented by an unknown parameter whose statistics depend on an (also unknown) latent context. This problem, which we term in-context estimation (ICE), has significantly greater complexity than the extensively studied linear regression problem. The optimal solution to the ICE problem is a non-linear function of the underlying context. In this paper, we prove that, for a subclass of such problems, a single layer softmax attention transformer (SAT) computes the optimal solution of the above estimation problem in the limit of large prompt length. We also prove that the optimal configuration of such transformer is indeed the minimizer of the corresponding training loss. Further, we empirically demonstrate the proficiency of multi-layer transformers in efficiently solving broader in-context estimation problems. Through extensive simulations, we show that solving ICE problems using transformers significantly outperforms standard approaches. Moreover, just with a few context examples, it achieves the same performance as an estimator with perfect knowledge of the latent context.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent advances in our understanding of transformers Vaswani et al. (2017) have brought to the fore the notion that they are capable of in-context learning (ICL). Here, a pre-trained transformer is presented with example prompts followed by a query to be answered of the form $(\mathbf{x}_1, f(\mathbf{x}_1, \theta), \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, f(\mathbf{x}_k, \theta), \mathbf{x}_{k+1})$, where θ is a context common to all the prompts. The finding is that the transformer is able to respond with a good approximation to $f(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \theta)$ for many function classes Garg et al. (2022); Panwar et al. (2024). The transformer itself is pre-trained, either implicitly or explicitly over a variety of contexts and so acquires the ability to generate in-distribution outputs conditioned on a specific context.

Although the interpretability of in-context learning for solving rich classes of problems can be very challenging, there have been attempts to understand the theoretical aspects of in-context learning for simpler problems, specifically linear regression. The work Zhang et al. (2024) characterizes the convergence of the training dynamics of a single layer linear attention (LA) for solving a linear regression problem over random regression instances. It shows that this configuration of the trained transformer is optimal in the limit of large prompt length.

In this paper, we introduce an in-context estimation problem where we are presented with the sequence $(g(\mathbf{x}_1, \theta), \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, g(\mathbf{x}_k, \theta), \mathbf{x}_k, g(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \theta))$ where $g(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$ is a stochastic function whose distribution is parameterized by θ , and our goal is to estimate \mathbf{x}_{k+1} . This inverse problem is inherently more challenging than predicting $f(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}, \theta)$ for \mathbf{x}_{k+1} (as in linear regression) due to the complicated dependence of the optimal estimator on noisy observations.

The above formulation of in-context estimation models many problems of interest in engineering. However, to keep the paper focused, we consider a subclass of problems that is of particular interest to communication theory. Here \mathbf{x} represents a sequence of transmitted symbols and the communication channel with the unknown state (context) θ maps \mathbf{x} into a sequence of received symbols represented by $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$. The receiver is then required to recover \mathbf{x} using in-context examples that can be constructed from the received symbols and transmitted pilot symbols. More details about the function $f(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$ and the in-context examples can be found in Section II.

Our work is motivated by the observation that a pre-trained transformer's ability to perform in-context sequence completion suggests strongly that it should be able to approximate the desired conditional mean estimator given the in-context examples for our inverse problem. Essentially, if a transformer is pre-trained on a variety of contexts, it should be able to implicitly determine the latent context from pilot symbols and then perform end-to-end in-context estimation of transmitted symbols. Once trained, such a transformer is simple to deploy because there are no runtime modifications, which could make it a potential building block of future wireless receivers. We indeed show this result both theoretically and empirically.

*Equal contribution

Our main contributions are:

- We define the inverse problem of estimating symbols from noisy observations using in-context examples, which we term in-context estimation (ICE). This is more difficult than linear regression which is a well-studied in-context learning (ICL) problem.
- For special cases of such problems (detailed in Section III), we theoretically show that there exists a configuration of single layer softmax attention transformer (SAT) that is asymptotically optimal.
- We empirically demonstrate that multi-layer transformers are capable of efficiently solving representative ICE problems with finite in-context examples.

II. IN-CONTEXT ESTIMATION

In this section, we define the problem of in-context estimation, and we discuss the complexities associated with solving it.

Definition 1: (In-Context Estimation) Let $\{\mathbf{x}_t\}_{t=1}^{n+1} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathbb{P}_x$ be the input symbols and $\{\mathbf{z}_t\}_{t=1}^{n+1} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathbb{P}_z$ be the noise samples. Let $\{\mathbf{H}_t(\theta)\}_{t=1}^{n+1} \sim \mathbb{P}_{h|\theta}$ be a random process determined by a latent parameter $\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_\Theta$. For $t \in [n+1]$, $\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{H}_t(\theta)) + \mathbf{z}_t$. Let $\mathcal{P}_\theta^n \triangleq \{(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t), t \in [n]\}$ to be the set of examples in the prompt until time n . The problem of in-context estimation (ICE) involves estimating \mathbf{x}_{n+1} from $\mathbf{y}_{n+1}, \mathcal{P}_\theta^n$ such that the mean squared error (MSE) $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_\Theta, \{\mathbf{H}_t(\theta)\} \sim \mathbb{P}_{h|\theta}, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathbb{P}_z, \mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}_x} [\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1}(\mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}) - \mathbf{x}_{n+1}\|_2^2]$ is minimized.

For the above problem, consider the following estimator. Given the past n examples \mathcal{P}_θ^n from the context $\theta \in \Theta$ and the current observation \mathbf{y}_{n+1} , the context unaware (CU) minimum mean squared error estimate (MMSE) of \mathbf{x}_{n+1} is known to be the conditional mean estimate (CME)

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1}^{\text{CU}}(\mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{n+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}]. \quad (1)$$

Having a closer look at the computation of the conditional expectation in (1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{n+1}^{\text{CU}}(\mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{n+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}] = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}_{n+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1}) \\ &\propto \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} \mid \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\theta' \in \Theta} p_\Theta(\theta') \int_{\mathbf{H}_1, \dots, \mathbf{H}_n, \mathbf{H}_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_x}} p_{h|\theta'}(\mathbf{H}_1, \dots, \mathbf{H}_n, \mathbf{H}_{n+1}) \\ &\quad p(\mathcal{P}_\theta^n, \mathbf{y}_{n+1} \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H}_1, \dots, \mathbf{H}_n, \mathbf{H}_{n+1}) d\mathbf{H}_1 \dots d\mathbf{H}_{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

The above computation involves evaluating a multi-dimensional integral. In most practical problems of estimation, computation of (1) can be very difficult or even intractable.

Why can estimation problems be more challenging than the regression problems?

To distinguish these two settings, consider the linear model $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^{d_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times d_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ defined by $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}$. In the linear regression setting with the relation $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}$, the optimal estimate $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ obtained from observation \mathbf{x} and given \mathbf{H} is simply the linear transform $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$. In other words, the optimal estimator is a linear function of the underlying context \mathbf{H} ; the optimal estimate has trivial (zero) error when the context \mathbf{H} is perfectly known. On the other hand, the optimal estimate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ of \mathbf{x} from the noisy $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$ is not straightforward due to the presence of noise. This difficulty arises due to the fact that the independent variable \mathbf{x} is to be estimated from a noisy dependent observation \mathbf{y} in the latter setting and, hence, the optimal estimate does not have a simple form.

Motivated by canonical estimation problems in wireless communication, we restrict our attention to the problem of estimating complex symbols under an unknown transformation embedded in Gaussian noise, and we show that it naturally fits into the above framework. In this class of problems, the relationship between the input symbols and the observed symbols (in the complex domain) is captured by:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta) \tilde{x}_t + \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t \in \mathbb{C}^d, \quad t \in [n+1]. \quad (2)$$

Writing the above as a real-matrix equation, we obtain

$$\mathbf{y}_t \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t) \\ \text{Im}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)) & -\text{Im}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)) \\ \text{Im}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)) & \text{Re}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\tilde{x}_t) \\ \text{Im}(\tilde{x}_t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t) \\ \text{Im}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t) \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \mathbf{H}_t(\theta) \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{z}_t, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathbf{H}_t(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2}$, $\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ which takes the form of the problem in Definition 1.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we present our theoretical analysis for a single layer softmax attention transformer (SAT) as an estimator for the problem corresponding to (2). We work with the following assumption.

Assumption 2: The distributions of the hidden process, input symbols, and noise are characterized as follows.

- (a) The hidden process is time invariant, i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta) = \tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\theta)$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\theta) \sim \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}|\theta}$ is a *fixed* hidden variable under the context $\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_\Theta$.
- (b) The inputs $\tilde{x}_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathbb{P}_x$ where \mathbb{P}_x is some distribution on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a finite subset of the unit circle in \mathbb{C} , i.e., $|z| = 1$ for any $z \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$.
- (c) The noise samples $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \tilde{\Sigma}_z)$ for some real positive definite matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

Then, the real equations are given by

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{H}(\theta)\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{z}_t, \quad t \geq 1 \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{z}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_z)$ such that $\Sigma_z \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Sigma}_z \end{bmatrix}$, and note that $\Sigma_z^{-1} = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_z^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$, and $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}$ can be identified as a subset of unit sphere \mathbb{S}^2 in \mathbb{R}^2 . From now on, we only work with the above real quantities.

We next derive the minimum mean squared error (MMSE) estimate for \mathbf{x}_t given \mathbf{y}_t and $\mathbf{H}_t = \mathbf{H}$. Note that when $\mathbf{H}_t = \mathbf{H}$ is known, the dependence of the estimation problem on θ vanishes. Further, $\{(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)\}$ are conditionally independent and identically distributed (iid) given $\mathbf{H}_t = \mathbf{H}$ for all t . Therefore, the MMSE estimation corresponds to estimating \mathbf{x} from $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$ when \mathbf{H} is known.

Lemma 1: (MMSE estimate) The optimal estimator $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{\text{MMSE}} : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2}$ where $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$ for some $\mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_z)$ is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}] = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_z^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_z^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x})},$$

where $\mathbf{H} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) & -\text{Im}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \\ \text{Im}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) & \text{Re}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \end{bmatrix}$ for some $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, and $\Sigma_z \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_z & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Sigma}_z \end{bmatrix}$ for some symmetric positive definite matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_z \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$.

Proof. This follows from elementary computations involving Bayes theorem (see Appendix A). \square

Since $\mathbf{H}(\theta)$ is not known in the problems we consider, the above estimator essentially provides a lower bound on the performance of any in-context estimator.

Let us consider a single layer softmax attention transformer (SAT) to solve the in-context estimation of \mathbf{x} given observation \mathbf{y} and n in-context examples $\mathcal{P}_\theta^n \triangleq \{(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t), t \in [n]\}$, where (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) and $(\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t)$ in \mathcal{P}_θ^n satisfy (4). Let \mathbf{T}^{SA} denote an SAT with the query, key, and value matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_Q, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_K, \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_V$ respectively, acting on $(n+1)$ tokens $\mathbf{u}_t \triangleq [\mathbf{y}_t^T \ \mathbf{x}_t^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+2}$ for $t \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{u}_{n+1} \triangleq [\mathbf{y}^T \ \mathbf{0}_2^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+2}$. Let \mathbf{U}_{n+1} be the matrix with columns \mathbf{u}_t for $t \in [n+1]$. Then, the $(n+1)$ th output token is given by

$$\mathbf{T}_{n+1}^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n+1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_V \mathbf{u}_t \exp(\mathbf{u}_{n+1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_Q^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_K \mathbf{u}_t)}{\sum_{t=1}^{n+1} \exp(\mathbf{u}_{n+1} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_Q^T \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_K \mathbf{u}_t)}. \quad (5)$$

The estimate of the SAT for \mathbf{x} using n examples, denoted by $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}$ is obtained from the last two elements of the $(n+1)$ th output token, i.e., $[\mathbf{T}_{n+1}^{\text{SA}}]_{2d+1:2d+2}$. Thus, the first n columns of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_V$ do not affect the output $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}$, hence we set them to zeros without loss of generality. Motivated by the form of the MMSE estimate, we choose to re-parameterize the remaining entries of the weights as below:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_Q = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}_Q & \mathbf{0}_{2d \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2d} & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_K = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}_K & \mathbf{0}_{2d \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2d} & \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_V = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{2d \times 2d} & \mathbf{0}_{2d \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2d} & \mathbf{I}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Denoting $\mathbf{W} \triangleq \mathbf{W}_Q^T \mathbf{W}_K \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$, using (6) in (5), we get

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n \mathbf{x}_t \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_t)}{\exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}) + \sum_{t=1}^n \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_t)}.$$

Lemma 2: (Functional form of asymptotic softmax attention) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, suppose $\mathbf{H}_i(\theta) = \mathbf{H}$ is the common hidden parameter for $i \in [n+1]$, such that $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{z}_i$, and $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$. For a prompt \mathbf{U}_{n+1} with the t th column constructed as $\mathbf{u}_t \triangleq [\mathbf{y}_t^T \ \mathbf{x}_t^T]^T$ for $t \in [n]$ and $\mathbf{u}_{n+1} \triangleq [\mathbf{y}^T \ \mathbf{0}_2^T]^T$, the estimated value by the transformer $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}$ with parameter \mathbf{W} satisfies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x})} \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. This follows by a careful application of the strong law of large numbers (see Appendix A). \square

Theorem 3: (Existence of a softmax attention estimator that is asymptotically optimal) There exists a softmax attention transformer such that, for any asymptotically long prompt, its estimate converges to the optimal MMSE estimator, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\cdot; \Sigma_z^{-1}) = \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{\text{MMSE}}(\cdot; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. This result follows directly from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. \square

This establishes the fact that the single layer softmax attention transformer architecture is expressive enough to asymptotically achieve optimal performance. We then turn to the training process: can the training of such a transformer with (asymptotically) long prompt length achieve optimal performance?

To begin answering this question, we define the training procedure as follows. Let prompt $j \in [n_p]$ in the training data be \mathbf{U}_{n+1}^j with columns $[\mathbf{u}_1^j, \mathbf{u}_2^j, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n^j, \mathbf{u}^j]$; therein, $\mathbf{u}_i^j = [(\mathbf{y}_i^j)^T (\mathbf{x}_i^j)^T]^T$, $\mathbf{u}^j = [(\mathbf{y}^j)^T (\mathbf{x}^j)^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+2}$, $\mathbf{y}_i^j = \mathbf{H}^j \mathbf{x}_i^j + \mathbf{z}_i^j$, where $\mathbf{z}^j, \mathbf{z}_i^j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_z)$, $\mathbf{x}^j, \mathbf{x}_i^j \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathcal{X})$, and $\mathbf{H}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2}$ is constructed from $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ chosen from a distribution $\mathbb{P}_{h|\theta}$ for some $\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_\Theta$.

Let us define the pre-training loss of the transformer as

$$\mathcal{L}_n^{n_p}(\mathbf{W}) \triangleq \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{j=1}^{n_p} \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) - \mathbf{x}^j\|_2^2.$$

We define the population loss as $\mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{W}) \triangleq \lim_{n_p \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_n^{n_p}(\mathbf{W})$. Thus, by the strong law of large numbers, $\mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{W}) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_\Theta, \tilde{\mathbf{h}} \sim \mathbb{P}_{h|\theta}, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_z), \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{P}_x} [\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2]$ a.s., where the expectation is over the prompts in the pre-training distribution. We write the loss as $\mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_\Theta, h)$ to indicate the dependence on the distribution of \mathbf{h} , the input set \mathcal{X} , and Σ_z during the training. Finally, we define the asymptotic loss in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ as $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}) \triangleq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{W})$, and write $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_\Theta, h)$.

Theorem 4: (Global minimizer) For any pre-training distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}$ on the latent context of the hidden parameters, and any distribution of the inputs \mathbb{P}_x , the matrix $\Sigma_z^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$ is the global minimizer of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h})$.

Proof. It follows from the properties of conditional expectation, the uniform boundedness (in n) of $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\cdot; \mathbf{W})$, and the dominated convergence theorem (see Appendix A). \square

We remark that the optimality in Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 is only in the asymptotic limit. As such, the results are about the expressiveness and the minimizer of the training loss for a softmax attention transformer, akin to the results of linear attention in Zhang et al. (2024) (barring convergence of the training procedure). Typically, we are interested in optimal algorithms given n examples. For optimal estimators in the case of finite context length, the dependence on θ becomes important. To exploit this dependence, we next introduce multi-layer transformers as viable in-context estimators and demonstrate their effectiveness.

IV. EXPERIMENTS WITH MULTI-LAYER TRANSFORMERS

In this section, we provide a comprehensive overview of our experiments with multi-layer transformers, detailing the experimental setup, training methodologies, and the relevant baselines for each scenario.




Fig. 1: Transformer model performing causal attention

A. Experimental setup

We study the performance of multi-layer transformers empirically through the following experimental setup, which is inspired by common communication systems. We choose the input space to be $\mathcal{X} \triangleq \{\pm 1 \pm i : i \triangleq \sqrt{-1}\}$, which is a finite subset of the circle of radius $\sqrt{2}$ in \mathbb{C} . We assume that these symbols are equally likely, $\mathbb{P}_x \equiv \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{X})$. The noise is distributed as $\mathbb{P}_z \equiv \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, 2\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_d)$. The quantity $1/\sigma^2$ is called the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR).

We consider two scenarios depending on the nature of the hidden parameter process $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)$.

1) *Scenario 1: Time invariant process*: The setup is similar to that of our theoretical results. The hidden context θ can be either 0 or 1, i.e., $\Theta \triangleq \{0, 1\}$. We consider $\mathbb{P}_\Theta = \mathcal{U}(\Theta)$, the uniform distribution on Θ . The distributions $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{h}|\theta}$ is described next for $\theta \in \Theta$. For $\theta = 0$, the j th component of $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(0)$ is given as

$$\tilde{h}^j(0) = \exp\left(\frac{-i\pi(j-1)\cos(\alpha)}{2}\right) \triangleq \tilde{h}_\alpha^j(0), \quad j \in [d], \quad \alpha \sim \mathcal{U}((0, \pi]),$$

where the subscript denotes the dependence on α . The above distribution corresponds to a one-ray line-of-sight channel in wireless communication Goldsmith (2005), where α is the angle of arrival of the incoming signal at the receiver, and the antenna spacing is $(1/4)$ th of the wavelength of the carrier. When $\theta = 1$, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(1) \sim \mathcal{CN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d).$$

This is referred to as the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) Rayleigh fading channel model in the wireless communication literature Goldsmith (2005).

2) *Scenario 2: Time varying process*: Let latent space Θ be a compact subset of \mathbb{R}_+ , and let $\mathbb{P}_\Theta = \mathcal{U}(\Theta)$ be the uniform distribution over Θ . Further, assume $\{h_t^j(\theta)\}_{t \geq 1}$ are iid zero-mean wide-sense stationary (WSS) Gaussian processes (Section 15.5, Kay (1997)) across $j \in [d]$ with

$$\mathbb{E}\left[h_t^j(\theta)h_{t+k}^j(\theta)\right] \triangleq R_\theta(k) = J_0\left(\frac{2\pi f_c T_s k \theta}{c}\right), \quad k \geq 0 \quad (7)$$

where $J_0(\cdot)$ is the Bessel function of the first kind of order zero. The above distribution is referred to as Clarke's model (Section 3.2.1, Goldsmith (2005)) for time varying channel processes in wireless communication. The constants T_s, f_c, c denote the carrier frequency, symbol duration, and the velocity of light respectively. The latent context θ denotes the relative velocity between the transmitter and the receiver.

B. Training

We adopt the training setup described in Panwar et al. (2024), which is in turn based on the approach used in Garg et al. (2022) with minor changes to account for complex-valued symbols. For all experiments, we train a GPT-2 Radford et al. (2019) decoder-only model from scratch. As shown in 1, we train our decoder models to perform prediction in the style of language models, where

$$((\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{x}_1), (\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{x}_2), \dots, (\mathbf{y}_n, \mathbf{x}_n), \mathbf{y}_{n+1})$$

are used to predict \mathbf{x}_{n+1} . The vectors \mathbf{x}_t are appended with $(2d-2)$ zeros to have the same dimension as $\mathbf{y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. We remark that the construction of the prompt in this way is different from that in our theoretical results, where $\mathbf{y}_t, \mathbf{x}_t$ are concatenated into a single token. We use the sum of squared errors between all $(\mathbf{x}_t, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t), t \in [n+1]$ as our loss function, where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t$ is the estimate of the transformer for \mathbf{x}_t . This is also different from that in our theoretical results where the loss is only on the last token. To generate a mini-batch of prompts, first we sample $\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_\Theta$, and then we independently sample $\{\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)\}_{t \in [n+1]}$ for each of the prompts in the mini-batch.

In all the experiments, we set $d = 4$, and the constants $f_c = 2.9 \times 10^9$ Hz, $T_s = 1$ ms, $c = 3 \times 10^8$ m/s. For scenario 2, we consider $\Theta = \{5, 15, 30\}$. These are representative of the typical values seen in practice for wireless communications.

We include our model architecture details and other hyper-parameter settings in Appendix D.

C. Baselines

In this section, we describe some feasible context-aware estimators that achieve a low MSE, along with some context-unaware estimators for both scenarios, are motivated from the wireless communications.

For scenario 1, we provide a context-aware baseline that performs the conditional mean estimate (CME) on the symbol given the context ($\text{CME}[x | \theta]$) (see (9) in Appendix). We also provide a context-unaware baseline that performs a Linear Minimum Mean Square Estimate (LMMSE) of the hidden parameter $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\theta)$, and uses this estimate to perform a CME on \mathbf{x} (denoted as $\text{CME}[x | \text{LMMSE}[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}]]$) (see Appendix C). Both these baselines require the knowledge of the statistics of the hidden parameter $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}(\theta)$.

For scenario 2, we provide four baselines, a context-aware baseline and three context unaware baselines. The context-aware baseline first performs a Minimum Mean Squared Error (MMSE) estimate on the hidden parameter process $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t$ given θ , and uses this MMSE estimate to compute the CME on the symbol given the context ($\text{CME}[x | \text{MMSE}[\tilde{\mathbf{h}} | \theta]]$). The first context-unaware baseline is $\text{CME}[x | \text{LMMSE}[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}]]$ which is similar to the one in scenario 1, albeit as the distributions are different in each scenario the computation of the quantities would vastly differ. The second context-aware estimate computes an MMSE on $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t$ (without any knowledge of θ) and uses this estimate to perform CME on the symbol ($\text{CME}[x | \text{MMSE}[\tilde{\mathbf{h}}]]$). The last context-aware baseline we provide computes a direct CME on the symbol ($\text{CME}[x]$) (without any knowledge of θ). These additional baselines were included to gain better insights into understanding which baseline the transformer closely matches in this harder scenario. Further details about the computation of the baselines are provided in Appendix A.




Fig. 2: Estimation error in scenario 1 as a function of number of in-context examples. The performance of the transformer (red) is close to that of the optimal context-aware estimator (black) while significantly outperforming a typical baseline (green) when latent context $\theta = 0$.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present experimental results for scenarios 1 and 2. In short, across the scenarios we described, we show that GPT-2 models trained on sequences sampled from these scenarios are able to approach the performance of context-aware estimates. This is surprising, as the latter benchmark estimators are given the exact realization of θ for each case, while the models have to implicitly estimate this from the context in addition to predicting the symbols \mathbf{x} .

A. Scenario 1: Estimation under Time-invariant process

We trained two GPT-2 models as described in Section IV-B on data sampled as per scenario 1. The only difference in training was the SNR used when sampling the data: we trained one model with an SNR of 0 dB and the other model with an SNR of -5 dB. In Figure 2, we present results for our trained models and our baseline methods on sequences from these two latent contexts. In these figures, for each context length t , we plot the MSE between the true \mathbf{x}_t and the predicted $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t$. We present these curves for the transformer model, context-aware estimate, and context-aware baseline (Section IV-C). We also plot a 90% confidence interval for the transformer model’s prediction errors.

Let us first discuss the case with $\theta = 0$. Here, even the zero-shot performance of the transformer model is better than the context-unaware model. This indicates that the model is able to use the statistics of the \mathbf{y} vectors to distinguish between $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = 1$. As the context length increases, for both SNR values, the transformer model performs better than the context-unaware baseline and approaches the performance of the lower-bound context-aware estimate. This shows that the model is able to determine the latent context and make a good estimate of the channel parameters, without being given any information beyond the (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) pairs themselves.

When $\theta = 1$, the three methods perform roughly the same across both SNR values and all context lengths. This is to be expected. The hidden parameter $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_1$ in this case is Gaussian, and simply estimating the mean and variance of the channel will grant the best performance. The notable aspect of this inquiry is that the transformer model is able to correctly identify the context and has learned the correct way to estimate the channel for this context.

B. Scenario 2: Estimation under Time-varying process

We train the model on data generated as per scenario 2. We present results for this scenario in Figure 3. These plots are produced in a manner similar to Figure 2, with the added challenge that the hidden parameters $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)$ vary with time t .

In Figure 3, we can see that the transformer model and other estimators have an MSE of 2 with zero examples for every θ . Because the distribution of the noise \mathbf{z}_1 and the parameter $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_1(\theta)$ is symmetric about $\mathbf{0}$, any model requires at least one (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) pair before it is able to make a meaningful prediction.

Across all θ , the performance of the transformer-based estimator matches the performance of the context-unaware estimator $\text{CME}[x | \text{MMSE}[h]]$ at every context length. As the context length increases both these estimates approach the performance of the context-aware estimator. This indicates that, with enough examples, the model is able to estimate the latent context θ and the hidden parameters $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_t(\theta)$, although the process is time-varying. There is a significant gap between the performance of the context-unaware baseline methods $\text{CME}[x | \text{MMSE}[h]]$, $\text{CME}[x | \text{LMMSE}[h]]$ and the performance of the other methods, demonstrating that performing well on this problem requires knowing or estimating θ well. The transformer model is able to accurately infer the context and use this information to perform nearly as well as the context-aware estimator.




Fig. 3: Estimation error in scenario 2 as a function of number of in-context examples. The transformer (red) computes the optimal estimator (orange) with its performance approaching the context-aware estimator (black) as the number of examples increases, while significantly outperforming typical baselines (green, blue) for latent contexts $\theta = 15, 30$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our research demonstrates that pre-trained transformers can effectively adapt to new tasks through in-context learning (ICL), leveraging a limited set of prompts without explicit model optimization. We framed the canonical communication problem of estimating transmitted symbols from received observations as an in-context learning problem, which we termed in-context estimation (ICE).

Our findings show that, for a subclass of ICE problems, a single-layer softmax attention transformer (SAT) can compute the optimal solution in the limit of large prompt lengths. We provided proof that the optimal configuration of such a transformer is indeed the minimizer of the corresponding training loss. Additionally, our empirical results highlight the efficiency of multi-layer transformers in addressing broader ICE problems. Simulations confirm that transformers not only outperform standard approaches but also match the performance of an estimator with perfect knowledge of the latent context using only a few context examples. These results underscore the potential of transformers in efficiently solving complex estimation problems in communication systems.

REFERENCES

- Ahn, K., Cheng, X., Daneshmand, H., and Sra, S. (2024). Transformers learn to implement preconditioned gradient descent for in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Ait Aoudia, F. and Hoydis, J. (2022). End-to-end learning for ofdm: From neural receivers to pilotless communication. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 21(2):1049–1063.
- Akyürek, E., Schuurmans, D., Andreas, J., Ma, T., and Zhou, D. (2023). What learning algorithm is in-context learning? investigations with linear models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Aoudia, F. A. and Hoydis, J. (2021). End-to-end learning for ofdm: From neural receivers to pilotless communication. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 21(2):1049–1063.
- Baur, M., Fesl, B., Koller, M., and Utschick, W. (2022). Variational autoencoder leveraged MMSE channel estimation. In *2022 56th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems, and Computers*, pages 527–532.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., and Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’20*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Burshtein, D. and Bery, E. (2023). Semi-supervised variational inference over nonlinear channels. In *2023 IEEE 24th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, pages 611–615. IEEE.
- Caciularu, A. and Burshtein, D. (2020a). Unsupervised linear and nonlinear channel equalization and decoding using variational autoencoders. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, 6(3):1003–1018.
- Caciularu, A. and Burshtein, D. (2020b). Unsupervised linear and nonlinear channel equalization and decoding using variational autoencoders. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, 6(3):1003–1018.
- Chan, S., Santoro, A., Lampinen, A., Wang, J., Singh, A., Richemond, P., McClelland, J., and Hill, F. (2022). Data distributional properties drive emergent in-context learning in transformers. In Koyejo, S., Mohamed, S., Agarwal, A., Belgrave, D., Cho,

- K., and Oh, A., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 18878–18891. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Garg, S., Tsipras, D., Liang, P. S., and Valiant, G. (2022). What can transformers learn in-context? a case study of simple function classes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30583–30598.
- Goldsmith, A. (2005). *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ha, A. L., Van Chien, T., Nguyen, T. H., Choi, W., and Nguyen, V. D. (2021). Deep learning-aided 5G channel estimation. In *2021 15th International Conference on Ubiquitous Information Management and Communication (IMCOM)*, pages 1–7.
- Kay, S. M. (1997). *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing: Estimation Theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Kingma, D. P. and Ba, J. (2014). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *CoRR*, abs/1412.6980.
- Lu, C., Xu, W., Shen, H., Zhu, J., and Wang, K. (2019). MIMO channel information feedback using deep recurrent network. *IEEE Communications Letters*, 23(1):188–191.
- Mahankali, A., Hashimoto, T. B., and Ma, T. (2023). One step of gradient descent is provably the optimal in-context learner with one layer of linear self-attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03576*.
- Min, S., Lyu, X., Holtzman, A., Artetxe, M., Lewis, M., Hajishirzi, H., and Zettlemoyer, L. (2022). Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064.
- Neumann, D., Wiese, T., and Utschick, W. (2018a). Learning the MMSE channel estimator. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 66(11):2905–2917.
- Neumann, D., Wiese, T., and Utschick, W. (2018b). Learning the mmse channel estimator. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 66(11):2905–2917.
- Panwar, M., Ahuja, K., and Goyal, N. (2024). In-context learning through the bayesian prism. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I., et al. (2019). Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L. u., and Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Von Oswald, J., Niklasson, E., Randazzo, E., Sacramento, J., Mordvintsev, A., Zhmoginov, A., and Vladymyrov, M. (2023). Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 35151–35174. PMLR.
- Wang, T., Wen, C.-K., Jin, S., and Li, G. Y. (2019). Deep learning-based csi feedback approach for time-varying massive mimo channels. *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, 8(2):416–419.
- Xie, S. M., Raghunathan, A., Liang, P., and Ma, T. (2022). An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Zhang, R., Frei, S., and Bartlett, P. L. (2024). Trained transformers learn linear models in-context. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(49):1–55.

APPENDIX

The in-context learning abilities of the transformer were first showcased by Brown et al. (2020) where GPT-3, a transformer-based large language model, was shown to perform well on novel, unseen tasks in a few-shot or zero-shot manner. The authors of Xie et al. (2022) used synthetic data to show that in-context learning can be interpreted as Bayesian inference, wherein a model first attempts to infer the task and then uses this prediction to carry out the task.

In Garg et al. (2022), authors look at in-context learning as a problem of learning to perform linear regression by being trained on sequence data, rather than learning in the natural language setting. The authors of Panwar et al. (2024) build on this work and provide mathematical theory to describe how this can be interpreted as the model performing Bayesian inference by estimating a posterior distribution. These two works are closely related to our work.

Other work has gone further in explaining the mechanisms by which transformers are able to perform in-context learning. Some authors have explored the behavior of simplified transformer models on synthetic linear regression problems, as compared to the globally optimal solutions for these problems Mahankali et al. (2023); Zhang et al. (2024). In Akyürek et al. (2023), it is shown by construction that transformers can learn to fit a linear model at inference time given a context. This tells us that, at least in theory, transformers can learn to literally perform regression and related computations given some data. A related line of work explores the manner by which transformer models carry out these optimization procedures and shows that transformer models can perform nontrivial gradient-based optimization procedures at inference time Von Oswald et al. (2023); Ahn et al. (2024). In Chan et al. (2022), the authors test how properties of training data impact in-context learning behaviors. The authors of Min et al. (2022) similarly study how the properties of the context itself impact in-context learning performance.

In summary, many different research directions have provided ways to interpret and understand in-context learning and the mechanisms by which transformer models do it. In our work, we primarily use the Bayesian perspective to view this ability and to understand how we can apply it to the wireless communication domain.

The problem of symbol estimation in the presence of an unknown channel is a canonical problem in wireless communication and there is a large body of literature that considers model-driven traditional signal processing approaches. When the prior distribution for the channel follows a hierarchical model with latent contexts such as what we study in this paper, optimal model-based estimators become computationally infeasible. While approximations to the optimal estimators have been studied with restricted priors, the structure and performance of such estimators are highly dependent on the priors.

Recently, there has been significant interest in using machine learning methods such as variational inference Baur et al. (2022), Caciularu and Burshtein (2020a) and deep neural network models such as fully connected neural networks Ha et al. (2021), convolutional neural networks Neumann et al. (2018a), and recurrent neural networks Lu et al. (2019) for channel estimation and for symbol estimation Aoudia and Hoydis (2021). The authors of Ait Aoudia and Hoydis (2022) design an end-to-end wireless communication system design using learning-based approach. The work of Neumann et al. (2018b) provides a principled way of designing channel estimators in the setting of wireless communication, by training CNN-based neural network to efficiently estimate the channel parameters when it follows a hierarchical prior. The authors of Caciularu and Burshtein (2020b) used variational autoencoders (VAEs) and unsupervised learning to implicitly learn and decode symbols in a wireless channel. In Burshtein and Bery (2023), the authors use VAEs in a semi-supervised setting to operate over non-linear channels. The approach in Wang et al. (2019) uses a long short-term memory (LSTM) based channel parameter estimator for a time-varying channel. They are interested in learning the spatial correlation structure of the channel coefficients across the receiver antennae.

The main distinction of our work from the previous works is that we make the connection between the in-context learning capabilities of the transformer and the symbol estimation problem in wireless communication. We show how the problem fits naturally in the setting, and provide empirical evidence that transformers achieve near-optimal performance. A comparative study of the performance of the transformers and other machine learning models is left for the future work.

Proof of Lemma 1. Let $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{H})$ denote the conditional density of \mathbf{y} for a given \mathbf{H} , and let $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H})$ denote the posterior probability of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ given \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H} . Let $p_{\mathbf{z}}$ denote the density of \mathbf{z} , which is the normal density with mean $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and covariance $\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$. Note that $\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$. Since \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H} are independent, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{H}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x})$. We can therefore write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}; \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h}] = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{H}) p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H})}{p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{H})} = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{H}) p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{H}) p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H})} = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H})}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can first compute

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{H}) &= p_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x})^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x})\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{y} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{H}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we simplify denoting $\mathbf{h}_I \triangleq \text{Re}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$, $\mathbf{h}_Q \triangleq \text{Im}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}})$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{H}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{H} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_I^T & \mathbf{h}_Q^T \\ -\mathbf{h}_Q^T & \mathbf{h}_I^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_I & -\mathbf{h}_Q \\ \mathbf{h}_Q & \mathbf{h}_I \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_I^T & \mathbf{h}_Q^T \\ -\mathbf{h}_Q^T & \mathbf{h}_I^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_I & -\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_Q \\ \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_Q & \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_I \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_I^T \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_I + \mathbf{h}_Q^T \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_Q & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{h}_I^T \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_I + \mathbf{h}_Q^T \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_Q \end{bmatrix} = \gamma_{z, \mathbf{h}} \mathbf{I}_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_{z, \mathbf{h}} \triangleq \mathbf{h}_I^T \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_I + \mathbf{h}_Q^T \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{h}_Q$ denotes the instantaneous signal to noise ratio (SNR). Thus, the expression for $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h}; \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{z}}, \mathcal{X})$ using $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x} = 1$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{h}; \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}) &= \frac{\exp(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{y}) \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\gamma_{z, \mathbf{h}} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x})}{\exp(-\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{y}) \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\gamma_{z, \mathbf{h}} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x})} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x})}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Let the prompt \mathbf{U}_{n+1} correspond to \mathbf{h} , and thus $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$, $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{z}_i$, for $i \in [n]$. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, denoting $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n \triangleq \{i \in [n] : \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}\}$, the quantity $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)}{\exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)} &= \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n} \mathbf{x}_i \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)}{\exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}) + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n} \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n|}{n} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n} \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z}_i)}{\frac{1}{n} \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}) + \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x}) \frac{|\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n|}{n} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n} \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z}_i)} \end{aligned}$$

By the strong law of large numbers, we have almost surely

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n|}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}\}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}\}}] = \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}).$$

In particular, this implies that $|\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n| \rightarrow \infty$ a.s., for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, by another application of the strong law of large numbers to the (iid log-normal random variables) $\exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z}_i)$, $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n$ of finite mean (and second moment), we obtain that almost surely

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{x}}^n} \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z}_i) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}}[\exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{z})],$$

and note that this is a strictly positive finite quantity. Thus, by cancellation, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x})} \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof of Theorem 4. From Lemma 2, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{x})} \triangleq f(\mathbf{W}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbb{P}_x) \text{ a.s.}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 = 1$ for any $i \in [n]$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W})\|_2 &= \left\| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)}{\exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \exp(\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{y}_i)} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

we have $\forall \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $\forall n \geq 0$, $0 \leq g_n(\mathbf{W}) \triangleq \|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \leq 4$. Thus, $\{g_n(\mathbf{W})\}_1^\infty$ are bounded, integrable random variables. Therefore, using the bounded convergence theorem (BCT), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}) &\triangleq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g_n(\mathbf{W})] = \mathbb{E}[\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(\mathbf{W})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\mathbf{U}_{n+1}; \mathbf{W}) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|f(\mathbf{W}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbb{P}_x) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_{\Theta}, \mathbf{H} \sim P_{h|\theta}}[\mathbb{E}[\|f(\mathbf{W}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbb{P}_x) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{H}]] \\ &\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_{\Theta}, \mathbf{H} \sim P_{h|\theta}}[\delta_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_z)}[\|f(\mathbf{W}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbb{P}_x) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{H}]$, and $\mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}$ determines the distribution of \mathbf{H} across the prompts during training.

Let $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2}$ is the channel matrix corresponding to $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ for a prompt in the training. For $n \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{H}}^n \triangleq \{f \in L^2 : f \text{ is } \sigma(\mathbf{y}, \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_1^n, \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_1^n, \mathbf{H})\text{-measurable}\}$, where the random variables satisfy $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z}$, $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{H}\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{z}_i$. Consider the minimization problem $\min_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{H}}^n} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2]$, where the expectation is over the prompt characterizing the set $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{H}}^n$. Then, the minimizer is the conditional expectation which by Lemma 1 is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}^*(\mathbf{y}, \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_1^n, \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_1^n, \mathbf{H}) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}, \{\mathbf{y}_i\}_1^n, \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_1^n, \mathbf{H}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}] \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x) = f(\Sigma_z^{-1}; \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbb{P}_x), \end{aligned}$$

and the minimum is $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_z)}[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\text{MMSE}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{H}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{H}] = \delta_{\mathbf{H}}(\Sigma_z^{-1}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x)$. Thus, we just showed that $\forall n \geq 0$, $\forall \hat{\mathbf{x}}_n \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{H}}^n$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{H}] \geq \delta_{\mathbf{H}}(\Sigma_z^{-1}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x)$. In particular, for any fixed \mathbf{H} in the training, $\forall \mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$, $\forall n \geq 0$ since $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{H}}^n$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbf{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_z)}[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_n^{\text{SA}}(\cdot; \mathbf{W}) - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2 \mid \mathbf{H}] \geq \delta_{\mathbf{H}}(\Sigma_z^{-1}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x)$. Taking

expectations on both sides with respect to the distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}$ of \mathbf{H} during pre-training, we get that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_{\Theta}, \mathbf{H} \sim P_{h|\theta}} [\delta_{\mathbf{H}}(\Sigma_z^{-1}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x)]$. Taking limit we get that for any $\mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}$ and \mathbb{P}_x on some finite set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ and $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_n(\mathbf{W}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathbb{P}_{\Theta}, \mathbf{H} \sim P_{h|\theta}} [\delta_{\mathbf{H}}(\Sigma_z^{-1}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x)] = \mathcal{L}(\Sigma_z^{-1}; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h}), \end{aligned}$$

whence $\mathbf{W}^* \triangleq \Sigma_z^{-1}$ is the global minimizer of $\mathcal{L}(\cdot; \Sigma_z, \mathbb{P}_x, \mathbb{P}_{\Theta, h})$.

Consider the problem of estimating \tilde{x}_{k+1} from $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1}$ and $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_k$.

For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ corresponding to $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{C}$, define $\mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\tilde{x}) & -\text{Im}(\tilde{x}) \\ \text{Im}(\tilde{x}) & \text{Re}(\tilde{x}) \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{I}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2d}$, where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product.

A. Scenario 1

The real equations are given by $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{h}(\theta) + \mathbf{z}_i$ for $i \in [k+1]$. Let $\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}} \triangleq [\mathbf{y}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2dk}$ denote the vector of past output symbols, and $\mathbf{X}_{\text{past}} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}_k) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2dk \times 2d}$. Let $\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} = [\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}^T, \mathbf{y}_{k+1}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2d(k+1)}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}} \\ \mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d(k+1) \times 2d}$ for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{S}^2$. Thus, we have the problem of estimating \mathbf{x}_{k+1} using $\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} = \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})\mathbf{h}(\theta) + \mathbf{z}_{\text{full}}$, where $\mathbf{h}(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\text{full}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d(k+1)}$ is defined similar to \mathbf{y}_{full} . The optimal context-unaware estimator is given by

$$\text{CME}[x] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}] = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}). \quad (8)$$

Now, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) &\propto \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{past}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}) \\ &\propto \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x})). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we compute the overall likelihood density as

$$p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x})) = \int_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \theta \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x})) d\theta = \int_{\theta \in \Theta} p_{\Theta}(\theta) p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta) d\theta,$$

where the second equality follows from θ being independent of $\mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x})$. Thus, it suffices to compute the likelihood density $p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta)$ for each of the latent context $\theta \in \Theta$.

For scenario 1, the latent space $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$ is finite. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_0(\mathbf{x}) &\triangleq p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta = 0) = \int_{\alpha \in (0, \pi]} p(\alpha, \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta = 0) d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\alpha \in (0, \pi]} p(\alpha) p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \alpha, \theta = 0) d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\alpha \in (0, \pi]} p(\alpha) p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0), \theta = 0) d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\alpha \in (0, \pi]} p(\alpha) p(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} \mid \tilde{x}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0)) \prod_{i=1}^k p(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i \mid \tilde{x}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0)) d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\alpha \in (0, \pi]} p(\alpha) p_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} - \tilde{x} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0)) \prod_{i=1}^k p_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i - \tilde{x}_i \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0)) d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\alpha \in (0, \pi]} p(\alpha) \exp\left(-\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_{k+1} - \tilde{x} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0)\|_2^2 / \sigma^2\right) \prod_{i=1}^k \exp\left(-\|\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i - \tilde{x}_i \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0)\|_2^2 / (2\sigma^2)\right) d\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where $p(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_{\alpha}(0)$ denotes the dependence of the hidden parameter on α . The above one-dimensional integral can be computed numerically.

Conditioned on $\mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta = 1$, since $\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} = \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{h}(1) + \mathbf{z}_{\text{full}}$ is Gaussian random variable with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq 1/2 \cdot \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}^T(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{2d(k+1)}$, we have

$$\ell_1(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta = 1) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\det(\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{x}))|}} \exp(-1/2 \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}^T \mathbf{C}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}).$$

Thus $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) \propto \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x})(\mathbb{P}_{\Theta}(0)\ell_0(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbb{P}_{\Theta}(1)\ell_1(\mathbf{x}))$ and so we can compute (8). If the context is known, then the context-aware estimator is given by

$$\text{CME}[x \mid \theta] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta] = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta), \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta) \propto \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x})\ell_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$.

B. Scenario 2

The real equations are given by $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{h}_i(\theta) + \mathbf{z}_i$ for $i \in [k+1]$. Let $\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}} \triangleq [\mathbf{y}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2dk}$ to be the vector of past output symbols, and $\mathbf{X}_{\text{past}} \triangleq \text{diag}(\mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}_1), \dots, \mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}_k)) \in \mathbb{R}^{2dk \times 2dk}$ to be the block diagonal matrix from past examples. Let $\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \triangleq [\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}^T, \mathbf{y}_{k+1}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2d(k+1)}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \triangleq \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{M}^d(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d(k+1) \times 2d(k+1)}$. Then, the equations are given by $\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} = \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})\mathbf{h}_{\text{full}}(\theta) + \mathbf{z}_{\text{full}}$, where $\mathbf{h}_{\text{full}}(\theta), \mathbf{z}_{\text{full}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d(k+1)}$ are defined similar to \mathbf{y}_{full} . Again, we can write the context-unaware conditional mean estimate is given by

$$\text{CME}[x] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}] = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}),$$

and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) \propto \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}))$ as in the previous section. Hence, it suffices to compute $p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta)$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$. In scenario 2, note that $\mathbf{h}_{\text{full}}(\theta)$ given θ is a Gaussian random vector with correlation $\mathbf{R}_{\text{full}}(\theta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}_{\text{full}}(\theta)\mathbf{h}_{\text{full}}^T(\theta)] = \mathbf{R}_{\theta} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{2d}$, where $(\mathbf{R}_{\theta})_{i,j} = R_{\theta}(|i-j|)$ for $i, j \in [k+1]$, where $R_{\theta}(\cdot)$ is defined in (7). Given $\mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta$, the vector \mathbf{y}_{full} can be seen to be a Gaussian random vector with zero mean and covariance $\mathbf{C}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{R}_{\text{full}}(\theta)\mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}^T(\mathbf{x}) + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_{2d(k+1)}$. Therefore, we get that

$$\ell_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{full}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{full}}(\mathbf{x}), \theta) \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\det(\mathbf{C}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}))|}} \exp(-1/2 \cdot \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}^T \mathbf{C}_{\theta}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}).$$

If Θ is finite, we can compute the posterior distribution as $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) \propto \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{P}_{\Theta}(\theta)\ell_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$. Similar to previous section the context-aware conditional mean estimate $\text{CME}[x \mid \theta]$ can be computed using $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{full}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta) \propto \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x})\ell_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ with the above expression for $\ell_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$.

C. Typical baselines

Typically one computes the estimate $\hat{\mathbf{h}}^{\text{EST}}$ for EST = MMSE, LMMSE of \mathbf{h}_{k+1} from \mathbf{y}_{past} and then compute the estimate for \mathbf{x}_{k+1} as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CME}[x \mid \text{EST}[h]] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{y}_{k+1}, \mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}}] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{x} \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{k+1}, \mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{y}_{k+1}, \mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}}) \propto \mathbb{P}_x(\mathbf{x})\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{y}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}})$ and we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{y}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}}) = p_{\mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{y}_{k+1} - \mathbf{H}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}}\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp(-\|\mathbf{y}_{k+1} - \mathbf{H}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}}\mathbf{x}\|_2^2 / (2\sigma^2)).$$

Now we show how to compute $\mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{EST}}$. The MMSE estimate can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{MMSE}} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}] \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{h} p(\mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) d\mathbf{h} = \int_{\theta \in \Theta} \int_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{h} p(\mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h}, \theta \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) d\mathbf{h} d\theta \\ &= \int_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) \int_{\mathbf{h}} \mathbf{h} p(\mathbf{h}_{k+1} = \mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta) d\mathbf{h} d\theta \\ &= \int_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}_{k+1} \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta] d\theta \\ &= \int_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta \mid \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}, \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}) \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{MMSE}, \theta} d\theta = \frac{\int_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta) \mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{MMSE}, \theta} d\theta}{\int_{\theta \in \Theta} p(\theta) p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta) d\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Since given $\theta, \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}$ and \mathbf{h}_{k+1} are jointly Gaussian MMSE of \mathbf{h}_{k+1} can be computed using LMMSE of \mathbf{h}_{k+1} from \mathbf{y}_{past} . First, we have $\mathbf{R}_{h,y}(\theta) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}_{k+1}(\theta)\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}^T] \in \mathbb{R}^{2d \times 2dk}$, where $\mathbf{R}_{h,y}(\theta) = (\mathbf{R}_{\theta}[k+1, 1:k] \otimes \mathbf{I}_{2d})\mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}^T$, where $(\mathbf{R}_{\theta})_{i,j} = R_{\theta}(|i-j|)$; we used the Python notation. Also, $\mathbf{R}_{y,y}(\theta) \triangleq \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}(\mathbf{R}_{\theta}[1:k, 1:k] \otimes \mathbf{I}_{2d})\mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}^T + \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_{2dk}$. Thus, can compute $\mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{MMSE}, \theta} = \mathbf{R}_{h,y}(\theta)\mathbf{R}_{y,y}^{-1}(\theta)\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}$. When Θ is finite, overall $\mathbf{h}_{k+1}^{\text{MMSE}}$ can be computed from the last equation. Finally, $p(\mathbf{y}_{\text{past}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{\text{past}}, \theta)$ is the Gaussian density with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance $\mathbf{R}_{y,y}(\theta)$.

Finally, one can compute the LMMSE estimate of the channel from \mathbf{y}_{past} which is a very common practical algorithm. Let $\mathbf{R} = \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \Theta}[\mathbf{R}_\theta]$ denote the average correlation of the hidden process $\{\mathbf{h}_\ell\}_{\ell \geq 1}$, which can be used in the previous computations to arrive at $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{k+1}^{\text{LMMSE}} = \mathbf{R}_{h,y} \mathbf{R}_{y,y}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{\text{past}}$ where the matrices $\mathbf{R}_{h,y}$, $\mathbf{R}_{y,y}$ are defined from the matrix \mathbf{R} .

One can define the context-aware estimator as done in the previous sections to be $\text{CME}[x | \text{EST}[h], \theta]$, as in this case LMMSE and MMSE estimates $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{k+1}^{\text{MMSE}, \theta}$ for \mathbf{h}_{k+1} coincide.

D. Model Parameters

We extend the codebase from Panwar et al. (2024) for our models and experiments. We use the same GPT-2 model size as in this paper, as well as the same optimizer (Adam, Kingma and Ba (2014)), the same learning rate (0.0001), and the same training length (500,000 steps).

| Embedding Size | # Layers | # Attention Heads |
|----------------|----------|-------------------|
| 256 | 12 | 8 |

TABLE I: Model Parameters

| Scenario | Curriculum Start Length | Curr. End Length | Batch Size | Learning Rate |
|----------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|---------------|
| C1 | 5 | 11 | 64 | 0.0001 |
| C2 | 5 | 15 | 64 | 0.0001 |

TABLE II: Training Parameters

Curriculum: Garg et al. (2022) observed that curriculum learning is useful in training models to perform in-context learning consistently and effectively. In Garg et al. (2022) and Panwar et al. (2024), the curriculum is to initiate training with small sequence lengths and vector dimensions and to increase these gradually over training until they reach the desired sizes. In our tasks, the vector dimension is fixed to twice the number of antennae, and we modify only the sequence lengths in our curriculum. For scenario C1, we vary the sequence length from 5 to a maximum of 11. For scenario C2, we vary the sequence length from 5 to a maximum of 15. We choose to use a larger sequence length for scenario C2 in order to better demonstrate the impact of using a time-varying channel.

The training has been done using a single NVIDIA A100 GPU on an internal cluster. Training of a single transformer takes about 8 hours.

We present the relevant architecture details and training parameters in Tables I and II.