

# Learned codes for broadcast channels with feedback

Yingyao Zhou<sup>1</sup>, Natasha Devroye<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Illinois Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA  
{yzhou238, devroye}@uic.edu

**Abstract**—We focus on designing error-correcting codes for the symmetric Gaussian broadcast channel with feedback. Feedback not only expands the capacity region of the broadcast channel but also enhances transmission reliability. In this work, we study the construction of learned finite blocklength codes for broadcast channels with feedback. Learned error-correcting codes, in which both the encoder and decoder are jointly trained, have shown impressive performance in point-to-point channels, particularly with noisy feedback. However, few learned schemes exist for multi-user channels. Here, we develop a lightweight code for the broadcast channel with feedback that outperforms existing schemes and operates effectively at short blocklengths.

**Index Terms**—Gaussian broadcast channel with feedback, deep-learned error correcting codes

## I. INTRODUCTION

We study the transmission of independent messages over a two-user static Gaussian broadcast channel with either noiseless or noisy feedback, where both the forward and feedback links are corrupted by independent Gaussian noises. While feedback does not increase the capacity of a memoryless point-to-point (P2P) channel [1], it can expand the capacity region of a broadcast channel even when the receiver noises are independent [2], or with only one user’s feedback [3].

For the point-to-point additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel with feedback, several well-known schemes exist: Schalkwijk-Kailath [4] introduced the “SK” scheme, a capacity-achieving linear coding scheme for noiseless feedback that achieves doubly exponential probability of error decay. For noisy feedback, Chance and Love proposed the CL scheme, a concatenated coding approach that uses passive feedback [5], while the Modulo-SK scheme introduced in [6] uses active feedback, achieving superior performance.

For the two-user Gaussian broadcast channel with feedback (GBCF), Ozarow extended the SK scheme to the “OL” scheme, which also achieves doubly exponential error decay [2]. Additionally, the work in [7] enhanced the OL scheme by adopting estimators with memory, i.e. that use the last two channel outputs  $y_{i-1}, y_i$  rather than simply the current channel output  $y_i$ , resulting in the “EOL” scheme. This enhancement not only improves the achievable rates of the OL scheme but also increases transmission reliability. In addition to these SK-type coding schemes, control-theory-based codes have been developed in for example [8], where LQG codes for the K-user GBCF, generalizing the schemes in [9] were proposed. For

the GBCF with noisy feedback, a linear concatenated coding scheme, referred to as the “GBCF-CL” scheme, for the K-user GBCF is proposed in [10].

The focus of this paper is not on achievable rates or error exponents, but rather on constructing practical codes at *finite* blocklength, evaluating them based on their *probability of error* for a fixed rate. To achieve low bit or block error rates for finite block lengths, deep learning has successfully been used to design encoder/decoder for P2P error-correcting codes with feedback (DL-ECFCs). These DL-ECFCs [11]–[17] outperform traditional analytically constructed codes in most cases, especially in noisy feedback. DL-ECFCs can be categorized into two types: *bit-by-bit*, where one bit of information is transmitted at a time, and *symbol-by-symbol*, where message bits of length  $K$  are mapped to a symbol for transmission, similar to SK-type codes. Bit-by-bit schemes [11]–[14] use a two-phase encoding process with a fixed rate of  $\frac{1}{3}$ , as first introduced in Deepcode [11]. Symbol-by-symbol schemes [15]–[17] achieve variable rates by adjusting the number of channel uses. The lightweight symbol-by-symbol code in [17] achieves state-of-the-art performance for AWGN channels with feedback. However, few deep learning strategies have been applied to multi-user channels; [18] extends Deepcode to fading Gaussian broadcast channels with feedback, while [19] focuses on the multiple-access channel (MAC) with feedback.

**Contribution:** We generalize Lightcode [17] to the symmetric GBCF with independent feedback links<sup>1</sup>, achieving superior performance over existing coding schemes in the short blocklength regime, even with noisy feedback. Additionally, we provide an initial interpretation of our learned codes, revealing an approximately linear relationship between the encoder output and the received feedback.

**Notation:** Random variables are denoted by capital letters and specific instances by lowercase letters. Vectors are represented in bold, with superscripts indicating their length. Subscripts  $u$  distinguish between users, and  $i$  denotes time indices.  $\text{SNR}_{u,f}$  and  $\text{SNR}_{u,fb}$  represent the Signal-to-Noise Ratios for the forward and feedback channels for user  $u$ , respectively. Probability is denoted by  $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$  and expectation by  $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ . Real values are represented by  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathbb{F}_2$  denotes the finite field with elements 0 and 1. Additionally,  $\text{sgn}(x) = 1$  if  $x \geq 0$ , and 0 otherwise. Moreover,  $x$  dB =  $10 \log 10(x)$ .

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider the real-valued Gaussian Broadcast Channel with feedback for two users (GBCF), as illustrated in

<sup>1</sup>Our code is available at <https://github.com/zyy-cc/GBCF.git>

The work of N. Devroye and Y. Zhou was partially supported by NSF under awards 2217023, 2240532, and 1900911. The contents of this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NSF.

Fig. 1. The transmitter sends independent messages  $\mathbf{M}_u = (M_{u,1}, \dots, M_{u,K_u}) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{K_u}$  to each user  $u \in \{1, 2\}$ . A total of  $K_1 + K_2$  message bits are sent over  $N$  channel uses, at the code rate for each user  $R_u = \frac{K_u}{N}$ . At time  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , the received symbols for user  $u \in \{1, 2\}$  are given by:

$$Y_{u,i} = X_i + Z_{u,i}$$

where  $X_i \in \mathbb{R}$  are the transmitted symbols of the codewords  $\mathbf{X}$  subject to the average power constraint  $\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{X}\|_2^2] \leq P$ , and  $Z_{u,i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{u,f}^2)$  are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian noises across different users and time. Each receiver sends the received symbols back to the transmitter through the feedback links with one unit delay. For noiseless feedback, the received feedback equals the channel outputs,  $\tilde{Y}_{u,i-1} = Y_{u,i-1}$ . However, for noisy feedback, the received feedback is expressed as  $\tilde{Y}_{u,i-1} = Y_{u,i-1} + \tilde{Z}_{u,i-1}$  where  $\tilde{Z}_{u,i-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{u,fb}^2)$  are also i.i.d. Gaussian noises.




Fig. 1: Gaussian broadcast channel with noisy feedback

In this work, we focus on the symbol-by-symbol coding, similar to the OL scheme, which maps message bits of length  $K$  to a symbol and iteratively refines the transmitted symbols. At the  $i$ -th transmission, the encoding function  $f_\theta$  generates the transmitted symbol  $X_i$  using the message bits  $\mathbf{M}_1$  and  $\mathbf{M}_2$ , along with the past feedback from both users  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_u^{i-1} = [\tilde{Y}_{u,1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{u,i-1}]$ , defined as

$$X_i = c_i f_\theta(\mathbf{M}_1, \mathbf{M}_2, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_1^{i-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_2^{i-1})$$

where  $c_i$  are scaling factors that ensure the power constraint is satisfied. After  $N$  transmissions, the decoder for each user estimates the message bits from their own received noisy codewords, expressed as  $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_u = g_{u,\phi}(\mathbf{Y}_u^N) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{K_u}$ , where  $\mathbf{Y}_u^N = [Y_{u,1}, \dots, Y_{u,N}]$ . The performance metric is the average block error rate (BLER), defined as  $\text{BLER}_u = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M}_u \neq \hat{\mathbf{M}}_u)$  for user  $u$ . The joint BLER is taken as the average BLER between the two users, given by  $\text{BLER} = \frac{1}{2}(\text{BLER}_1 + \text{BLER}_2)$ . For simplicity, we set  $K_1 = K_2$  and focus on the symmetric case where  $\sigma_{1,f}^2 = \sigma_{2,f}^2$  and  $\sigma_{1,fb}^2 = \sigma_{2,fb}^2$ .

Most previous work has focused on analytical linear code design for the encoder  $f_\theta$  and the decoders  $g_{1,\phi}$  and  $g_{2,\phi}$ . In this work, we aim to replace them with neural networks parameterized by  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  to minimize the BLER.

### III. PAST WORK

In this section, we provide a brief overview of deep-learned error-correcting feedback codes (DL-ECFCs) for P2P

AWGN channels with feedback and the analytical linear coding schemes for the GBCF.

#### A. DL-ECFCs

**Deepcode:** Deepcode [11] is the first DL-ECFC for the P2P AWGN channel with passive feedback, achieving a code rate of  $\frac{1}{3}$ . The encoder uses a recurrent neural network (RNN) to sequentially generate **two** parity bits for each message bit. The decoding process employs a two-layer bi-directional gated recurrent unit (bi-GRU) to estimate the message bits. The encoder and decoder are jointly trained by minimizing the binary cross-entropy (BCE). Our previous work [20], [21] explains how the Deepcode encoder utilizes past feedback for error correction and develops an analytical encoder and decoder with significantly fewer learned parameters that achieves comparable performance.

The study in [18] extends Deepcode to the symmetric two-user fading GBCF; here we consider static channels. Similar to Deepcode, GBCF-Deepcode [18] encoding has two phases: in the first, the BPSK-modulated message bits for both users are transmitted uncoded; in the second, the encoder generates a **single** parity bit based on feedback from the two receivers.

Deepcode achieves excellent performance in terms of bit error rate (BER), particularly with noisy feedback. However, it has a few drawbacks. It is limited to a code rate of  $\frac{1}{3}$ , making it difficult to adapt to a wider range of rates. Additionally, for message bits of length  $K$ , the total number of transmissions—including both forward and backward passes—grows linearly with  $K$ , potentially causing significant delays. Furthermore, the recurrent structure requires substantial memory to store hidden states.

**Lightcode:** To address these limitations, the authors in [15] proposed a block coding method for point-to-point (P2P) AWGN channels using a transformer structure called GBAF, which we consider a symbol-by-symbol scheme. GBAF achieves remarkably low block error rate (BLER). However, the transformer structure with self-attention is highly complex and has a large number of parameters. Lightcode [17], a much lighter symbol-by-symbol code, eliminates the transformer structure while maintaining strong performance, achieving a BLER as low as  $10^{-10}$  at a forward SNR  $-0.5$  dB. We expand on the structure of Lightcode in Section IV.

#### B. Analytical Linear Coding Schemes

In this subsection, we review the OL and EOL schemes developed for GBCF with **noiseless** feedback.

1) *OL scheme:* The OL scheme is an adaptation of the SK scheme [2]. Initially, the two message bits,  $\mathbf{M}_1$  and  $\mathbf{M}_2$ , are mapped to real numbers and transmitted separately over the forward channel. The receivers estimate the messages based on the received noisy symbols and send these estimates back to the transmitter via the noiseless feedback link. In subsequent rounds, the transmitter sends a linear combination of the estimation errors made by the two receivers. Each receiver updates its estimate, progressively reducing the errors.

**Initialization:** The message bits  $\mathbf{M}_u$ , where  $u \in \{1, 2\}$ , are mapped to a PAM modulation symbol  $\Theta_u$  from the constellation  $\{\pm 1\eta, \pm 3\eta, \dots, \pm(2^{K_u} - 1)\eta\}$ , with  $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2^{2K_u} - 1}}$  to satisfy the unity power constraint<sup>2</sup>. The estimated message at receiver  $u$  at time  $i$  is denoted by  $\hat{\Theta}_{u,i}$ , with the estimation error  $\epsilon_{u,i} = \hat{\Theta}_{u,i} - \Theta_u$ . The mean square error is represented by  $\alpha_{u,i} = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{u,i}^2]$ , and the correlation coefficient between the estimation errors of the two receivers is defined as  $\rho_i = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{1,i}\epsilon_{2,i}]}{\sqrt{\alpha_{1,i}\alpha_{2,i}}}$ . In the first two rounds, the transmitter sends with power  $P$  as

$$X_i = \sqrt{P}\Theta_i, \quad i = 1, 2$$

After the first transmission, receiver 1 estimates  $\hat{\Theta}_{1,1} = \hat{\Theta}_{1,2} = \frac{Y_{1,1}}{\sqrt{P}}$  and ignores the second transmission. Similarly, receiver 2 ignores the first transmission and estimates  $\hat{\Theta}_{2,1} = \hat{\Theta}_{2,2} = \frac{Y_{2,2}}{\sqrt{P}}$ . In this case,  $\alpha_{u,2} = \frac{\sigma_{u,f}^2}{P}$  and  $\rho_2 = 0$ . In this work, we focus on finite channel uses and apply LMMSE estimation in the first two rounds to improve BLER performance [6]. The estimate is given by

$$\hat{\Theta}_{u,i} = \frac{\sqrt{P}}{P + \sigma_{u,f}^2} Y_{u,i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad u = 1, 2$$

**Encoding:** For the  $i$ -th transmission, where  $i \geq 3$ , the transmitter sends:

$$X_i = \sqrt{\frac{P}{D_{i-1}}} \left[ \frac{\epsilon_{1,i-1}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{1,i-1}}} + \frac{\epsilon_{2,i-1}}{\sqrt{\alpha_{2,i-1}}} g \operatorname{sgn}(\rho_{i-1}) \right]$$

where  $D_{i-1} = 1 + g^2 + 2g|\rho_{i-1}|$ , and  $g$  is a nonnegative constant that balances the trade-off between the two users. To achieve similar BLER for both users, we assume  $g = 1$ .

**Decoding:** At the receiver  $u$ , a memoryless MMSE estimator is used to estimate  $\epsilon_{u,i-1}$  based **only** on  $Y_{u,i}$ , denoted by  $\hat{\epsilon}_{u,i-1} = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{u,i-1}|Y_{u,i}]$ . The receiver  $u$  then updates its estimate as follows:

$$\hat{\Theta}_{u,i} = \hat{\Theta}_{u,i-1} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{u,i-1}Y_{u,i}]}{\mathbb{E}[Y_{u,i}^2]} Y_{u,i}, \quad u = 1, 2$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[Y_{u,i}^2] = P + \sigma_{u,f}^2$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{1,i-1}Y_{1,i}] = \sqrt{\frac{P}{D_{i-1}}}\sqrt{\alpha_{1,i-1}}(1 + g|\rho_{i-1}|)$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{2,i-1}Y_{2,i}] = \sqrt{\frac{P}{D_{i-1}}}\sqrt{\alpha_{2,i-1}}(g + |\rho_{i-1}|)\operatorname{sgn}(\rho_{i-1})$ .

We experimentally observed that for the same code rate of  $\frac{1}{3}$ , different message bit lengths  $K = K_1 = K_2$  result in varying BLER performance, as shown in Fig. 2. At low SNR<sub>f</sub>, where noises significantly affect the signal, shorter message bit lengths perform better due to the increased distance between constellation points. Conversely, at high SNR<sub>f</sub>, longer message bit lengths  $K$ —and thus more channel uses  $N = 3K$ —lead to better performance, as the decoding error of the OL schemes decays doubly exponentially in  $N$ .

<sup>2</sup>In [2], message bits are mapped to  $\Theta_u$ , which ranges from  $-\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$ , then scaled by  $\sqrt{12P}$ . When  $2^{K_u}$  is large,  $\mathbb{E}[\Theta^2] \approx \frac{1}{12}$ . Since our  $K_u$  is small, we use the method described in our work.




Fig. 2: BLER performance for code rate  $\frac{1}{3}$  with varying message bit lengths  $K$ .

However,  $K$  cannot be too large due to precision issues and quantization errors associated with  $2^K$  PAM modulation. The advanced analog-to-digital converters, such as the Texas Instruments ADS1263 and Analog Devices AD4134, support up to 32-bit quantization [14]. In our experiments, when  $K \geq 25$ , the BLER starts to increase rather than decrease. To accommodate longer lengths  $L$ , we recommend selecting an appropriate value for  $K$  to avoid precision issues—using a small  $K$  at low SNR and a large  $K$  at high SNR—and then dividing it into  $l = \frac{L}{K}$  chunks of bits. Each chunk, with a message bit length of  $K$ , is processed using the desired coding scheme. The deep-learned codes also adhere to this rule; however, with more rounds, the input space increases, which raises training difficulty.

2) *EOL scheme:* The EOL scheme [7] extends the previous OL scheme by incorporating an MMSE estimator based on the current and previous channel outputs rather than just the current output. The transmission process remains nearly the same as before, except that the receiver now estimates  $\hat{\epsilon}_{u,i-1} = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_{u,i-1}|Y_{u,i-1}, Y_{u,i}]$ . For further details, we refer readers to [7].

#### IV. GBCF-LIGHTCODE

We now extend Lightcode to GBCF-Lightcode, which supports a wider range of code rates. Instead of bit-by-bit coding, we adopt a symbol-by-symbol design that reduces the number of forward and backward passes compared to GBCF-Deepcode, making it more practical. It offers superior BLER performance, particularly when the forward SNR is high. It also remains effective in noisy feedback environments, especially when the noise variance in the feedback link is low.

##### A. Structure

The structure is inspired by the block coding approach in [15], [17], with the design consisting of a feature extractor (FE) and a multilayer perceptron (MLP) module.

**Feature extractor:** This structure follows the design in [17], with the hidden dimension set to 64 to balance complexity and




Fig. 3: Design of the GBCF-Lightcode (left) and its detailed structure (right).

BLER performance. As shown in Fig. 3, a layer normalization is added to stabilize training, and a skip connection aggregates the outputs from the first and third linear layers. For activation functions, we experimented with Gaussian Error Linear Unit (GELU) and Exponential Linear Unit (ELU), but found that the original Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU) performed best.

**Multilayer perceptron:** The output of the feature extractor is passed to the MLP layers. The encoder uses a two-layer MLP to generate a symbol for each channel use, while the decoder employs a one-layer MLP. For the decoder on the receiver side,  $u \in \{1, 2\}$ , the index for each message bit  $M_u$  ranges from 0 to  $2^{K_u} - 1$ . Thus, the output of the linear layer is projected to a vector of dimension  $C_u = 2^{K_u}$ , with a softmax function applied to denote the probability for each index. For a vector  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{C_u}$ , the  $i$ -th element after applying softmax is given by  $\text{softmax}(v_i) = \frac{e^{v_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^{C_u} e^{v_j}}$ .

## B. Transmission

The entire transmission design is inspired by the OL scheme [2]. The learned parameters are highlighted in red.

**Initialization:** Similar to the OL scheme, during the first two rounds, the message bits for each user  $M_u$  are mapped to the PAM modulation symbol  $\Theta_u$  and transmitted separately.

$$X_i = \beta_i \Theta_i, \quad i = 1, 2$$

where  $\beta_i$  are the learned parameters.

**Encoding:** In the subsequent rounds, the learned encoder generates the transmitted symbols based on the previously generated symbols and the feedback from the two receivers from the last  $i - 1$  rounds. The generated symbol is given by

$$X_i = \beta_i f_\theta(\mathbf{X}^{i-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_1^{i-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_2^{i-1}), \quad i = 3, \dots, N$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_u^{i-1} = [\tilde{Y}_{u,1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{u,i-1}]$  represents the feedback from receiver  $u$ , with each element given by  $\tilde{Y}_{u,i-1} = X_{i-1} + Z_{u,i-1} + \tilde{Z}_{u,i-1}$ . The whole transmission is subject to an average power constraint, meaning  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_i^2 = P$ .

**Decoding:** Decoder 1 uses the received noisy codewords except the second transmission for decoding. Similarly, decoder 2 uses all the received codewords except the first transmission.

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}}_u = g_{u,\phi}(\mathbf{Y}_u^{N-1})$$

The encoder  $f_\theta$  and the two decoders  $g_{u,\phi}$  consist of FE and MLP modules, as shown in Fig. 3. The entire process is

outlined in Algorithm 1. The input dimension to the neural networks is fixed, so the  $*$  parts will be padded with zeros to maintain the required dimension. The function  $H_{ps}$  represents the power constraint block, while  $H_{d2b}$  converts the PAM index to its binary representation. In this work, we use the negative log-likelihood (NLL) loss as the objective function:

$$\ell_u(\mathbf{p}_u, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_u) = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \left( \sum_{j=0}^{C_u-1} p_{u,ij} \log(\hat{p}_{u,ij}) \right)$$

Here,  $B$  is the batch size, and  $C_u = 2^{K_u}$  represents the number of classes (PAM indices) for receiver  $u$ , and  $p_{u,ij}$  is 1 if class  $j$  is the correct class for the  $i$ -th sample, and 0 otherwise.  $\hat{p}_{u,ij} \in \mathbb{R}$  denotes the predicted probability for class  $j$  of the  $i$ -th sample. Additionally, during training, to prevent one receiver from significantly outperforming the other, we add a regularization term  $\lambda(\ell_1 - \ell_2)^2$  to ensure that the performance of both receivers remains comparable.

---

**Algorithm 1** GBCF-Lightcode (Encoder  $f_\theta$ , Decoder 1  $g_{1,\phi}$ , Decoder 2  $g_{2,\phi}$ , Channel Uses  $N$ , Message Bits  $M_1, M_2$ )

---

- 1: **Initialization:** Map  $M_1, M_2$  to PAM symbols  $\Theta_1, \Theta_2$ ; set  $X_1 = \beta_1 \Theta_1, X_2 = \beta_2 \Theta_2$
  - 2: **for** each  $i \in [3, N]$  **do**
  - 3:   Update encoder input vector;
  - 4:    $\mathbf{q}_i = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1}, *, \tilde{Y}_{1,1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{1,i-1}, *, \tilde{Y}_{2,1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{2,i-1}, *]$
  - 5:   Generate transmitted symbol:  $X_i = \beta_i H_{ps}[f_\theta(\mathbf{q}_i)]$
  - 6:   Transmit  $X_i$  to both receivers
  - 7: **end for**
  - 8: Receiver 1:  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_1 = g_{1,\phi}(Y_{1,1}, Y_{1,3}, \dots, Y_{1,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^{C_1}$
  - 9: Receiver 2:  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_2 = g_{2,\phi}(Y_{2,2}, Y_{2,3}, \dots, Y_{2,N}) \in \mathbb{R}^{C_2}$
  - 10: Compute NLL loss:  $\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \lambda(\ell_1 - \ell_2)^2$
  - 11: Classification:  $I_u = \text{argmax}(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_u)$ , where  $u \in \{1, 2\}$
  - 12: Get bit representation:  $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_u = H_{d2b}(I_u)$ , where  $u \in \{1, 2\}$
- 

The training parameters are listed in Table I. We optimize all parameters for the corresponding forward and feedback SNRs by minimizing the negative log-likelihood (NLL) loss. We also employ a curriculum training method, starting with high SNR and gradually decreasing it to the target SNRs.

TABLE I: Training parameters for rate  $\frac{3}{9}$  GBCF-Lightcode

Parameters	Values
Batch size $B$	100,000
Optimizer	AdamW
Weight decay	0.01
Epochs	4000
Initial learning rate	0.005
Clipping threshold	0.5
Power $P$	1
Regularization coefficient $\lambda$	1

## V. SIMULATIONS

In this section, we evaluate the performance of GBCF-Lightcode and compare it with other existing codes.

### A. Noiseless Feedback

In Fig. 4 we compare the BLER of codes with a code rate of  $\frac{3}{9}$  (where  $K_1 = K_2 = 3$  and  $N = 9$ ) under noiseless feedback. Although LQG codes outperform OL and EOL asymptotically in terms of achievable rates, LQG demonstrates poorer block error rate (BLER) performance in the finite-length regime. At low SNR<sup>3</sup>, all SK-type schemes, exhibit similar BLER when the feedback is unreliable. As forward SNR increases, GBCF-Deepcode shows improvement but is inferior to the analytical OL and EOL schemes. In contrast, GBCF-Lightcode outperforms other schemes in this finite region, particularly at high forward SNR.




Fig. 4: BLER performance for code rate  $\frac{3}{9}$  across different schemes with noiseless feedback

We also consider the Time-Division Lightcode (TD-Lightcode) scheme as a benchmark, in which each user transmits their message during an assigned time slot. To ensure fairness between the users, we assume an even number of

<sup>3</sup>For a fair comparison, we set the block length to 3 for GBCF-Deepcode. At SNR  $-1$  dB, GBCF-Deepcode slightly outperforms GBCF-Lightcode in BER, as BPSK modulation has an advantage over PAM modulation at low SNR.




Fig. 5: BLER comparison for code rates  $\frac{3}{8}$  and  $\frac{3}{10}$  with noiseless feedback

channel uses,  $N$ , with  $\frac{N}{2}$  time slots allocated for transmitting  $M_1$  and the other  $\frac{N}{2}$  slots for transmitting  $M_2$ . As shown in Fig. 5, the BLER performance is illustrated for code rates  $\frac{3}{8}$  and  $\frac{3}{10}$  with noiseless feedback. The results show that, at the same code rate, GBCF codes (including EOL schemes and GBCF-Lightcode) outperform TD-Lightcode, demonstrating that cooperation between the encoder and decoders effectively leverages feedback from both users. Notably, GBCF-Lightcode achieves the best performance among all tested codes. Additionally, the number of channel uses,  $N$ , is crucial for enhancing BLER performance; even a single additional channel use can lead to a significant improvement.

### B. Noisy Feedback

We also investigate the performance of GBCF-Lightcode under noisy feedback. Fig. 6 compares the performance of various schemes<sup>4</sup>, assuming a fixed forward SNR<sub>f</sub> = 3 dB. Results indicate that when feedback noise variance is low, symbol-by-symbol coding<sup>5</sup> with a longer block length ( $N = 9$ ) performs well, as additional channel uses allow for better message refinement when feedback is reliable. However, at low feedback SNR, where feedback is less reliable, a shorter block length ( $N = 3$ ) performs better due to the increased spacing between constellation points. Notably, GBCF-Lightcode outperforms other codes by adjusting the block length according to feedback noise levels. GBCF-Lightcode, with a code rate of  $\frac{1}{3}$  that transmits over three channel uses, shares the same configuration, transmitting a single bit at a time like GBCF-Deepcode, but consistently outperforms it.

### C. Interpretation

In this subsection, we present an initial interpretation of the learned GBCF-Lightcode encoder, examining the relationship

<sup>4</sup>We omit the GBCF-CL scheme here, as it appears to provide very poor BLER performance in this short blocklength regime.

<sup>5</sup>Although the OL and EOL schemes are designed for the noiseless feedback case, here we update the estimation error at the encoder with feedback noise, and apply normalization to ensure the transmitted symbol meets the power constraint.




Fig. 6: BLER performance with noisy feedback and fixed forward SNR 3 dB

between the encoder output at round 3,  $X_3$ , and past noisy feedback from two receivers, as in [17]. Here,  $I(\Theta_u)$ , which ranges from 0 to  $2^{K_u}$ , represents the PAM index for the message bits of user  $u$ . For feedback from receiver 1 ( $\tilde{Y}_{1,1}$ ) and receiver 2 ( $\tilde{Y}_{2,2}$ ), we analyze the relationship between  $X_3$  and the noisy feedback by setting the message bits and forward noises of the opposite user to  $I(\Theta_2) = 0$  and 0 for user 2 (left side of Fig. 7) and  $I(\Theta_1) = 0$  and 0 for user 1 (right side of Fig. 7). From Fig. 7, we observe that  $X_3$  is approximately a linear function of the feedback channel output, being negatively proportional to  $\tilde{Y}_{1,1}$  and positively proportional to  $\tilde{Y}_{2,2}$ .




Fig. 7: Encoder output at round 3  $X_3$  with respect to the noisy feedback  $\tilde{Y}_{1,1}$  (left) and  $\tilde{Y}_{2,2}$  (right) at code rate  $\frac{3}{8}$ , forward SNR 3 dB and noiseless feedback.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a symbol-by-symbol, learned coding scheme for the static Gaussian broadcast channel with feedback. This scheme easily applies to different coding rates and performs especially well at high forward SNR, while remaining robust to noisy feedback. At the same code rate, shorter message lengths (e.g., sending  $2^K$  PAM signals with smaller  $K$ ) are preferred at low forward or feedback SNR. Conversely, at high SNR, longer messages (with larger  $K$  and correspondingly more channel uses  $N$ ) are more suitable. We also provide an initial interpretation of our scheme, showing

that the learned encoder output at round 3 is a linear function of the channel outputs. This approach achieves the best-known finite blocklength performance (for short blocklengths  $N \leq 10$ ) for broadcast channels with feedback known to date.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Shannon, "The zero error capacity of a noisy channel," *IRE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 8–19, 1956.
- [2] L. Ozarow and S. Leung-Yan-Cheong, "An achievable region and outer bound for the gaussian broadcast channel with feedback (corresp.)," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 667–671, 1984.
- [3] S. R. Bhaskaran, "Gaussian broadcast channel with feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 5252–5257, 2008.
- [4] J. Schalkwijk and T. Kailath, "A coding scheme for additive noise channels with feedback-i: No bandwidth constraint," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 172–182, 1966.
- [5] Z. Chance and D. J. Love, "Concatenated coding for the awgn channel with noisy feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6633–6649, 2011.
- [6] A. Ben-Yishai and O. Shayevitz, "Interactive schemes for the awgn channel with noisy feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 2409–2427, 2017.
- [7] Y. Murin, Y. Kaspi, and R. Dabora, "On the ozarow-leung scheme for the gaussian broadcast channel with feedback," *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 948–952, 2014.
- [8] E. Ardestanizadeh, P. Minero, and M. Franceschetti, "Lqg control approach to gaussian broadcast channels with feedback," *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 5267–5278, 2012.
- [9] N. Elia, "When bode meets shannon: Control-oriented feedback communication schemes," *IEEE transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1477–1488, 2004.
- [10] Z. Ahmad, Z. Chance, D. J. Love, and C.-C. Wang, "Concatenated coding using linear schemes for gaussian broadcast channels with noisy channel output feedback," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 4576–4590, 2015.
- [11] H. Kim, Y. Jiang, S. Kannan, S. Oh, and P. Viswanath, "Deepcode: Feedback codes via deep learning," *NeurIPS*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [12] A. R. Safavi, A. G. Perotti, B. M. Popovic, M. B. Mashhadi, and D. Gunduz, "Deep extended feedback codes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01365*, 2021.
- [13] M. B. Mashhadi, D. Gunduz, A. Perotti, and B. Popovic, "Drf codes: Deep snr-robust feedback codes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11789*, 2021.
- [14] Y. Shao, E. Ozfatura, A. Perotti, B. Popovic, and D. Gündüz, "Attention-code: Ultra-reliable feedback codes for short-packet communications," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 2023.
- [15] E. Ozfatura, Y. Shao, A. G. Perotti, B. M. Popović, and D. Gündüz, "All you need is feedback: Communication with block attention feedback codes," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 587–602, 2022.
- [16] J. Kim, T. Kim, D. Love, and C. Brinton, "Robust non-linear feedback coding via power-constrained deep learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13178*, 2023.
- [17] S. K. Ankireddy, K. Narayanan, and H. Kim, "Lightcode: Light analytical and neural codes for channels with feedback," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10751*, 2024.
- [18] S. Li, D. Tuninetti, and N. Devroye, "Deep learning-aided coding for the fading broadcast channel with feedback," in *ICC 2022-IEEE International Conference on Communications*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 3874–3879.
- [19] E. Ozfatura, C. Bian, and D. Gündüz, "Do not interfere but cooperate: A fully learnable code design for multi-access channels with feedback," in *2023 12th International Symposium on Topics in Coding (ISTC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [20] Y. Zhou, N. Devroye, G. Turán, and M. Žefran, "Interpreting deepcode, a learned feedback code," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2024, pp. 1403–1408.
- [21] Y. Zhou, N. Devroye, G. Turán, and M. Zefran, "Higher-order interpretations of deepcode, a learned feedback code," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11907*, 2024.