

A MIMO ISAC System for Ultra-Reliable and Low-Latency Communications

Homa Nikbakht^{1,2}, Yonina C. Eldar², and H. Vincent Poor¹

¹Princeton University, ²Weizmann Institute of Science

{homa, poor}@princeton.edu, yonina.eldar@weizmann.ac.il

Abstract—In this paper, we propose a bi-static multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) integrated sensing and communication (ISAC) system to detect the arrival of ultra-reliable and low-latency communication (URLLC) messages and prioritize their delivery. In this system, a dual-function base station (BS) communicates with a user equipment (UE) and a sensing receiver (SR) is deployed to collect echo signals reflected from a target of interest. The BS regularly transmits messages of enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB) services to the UE. During each eMBB transmission, if the SR senses the presence of a target of interest, it immediately triggers the transmission of an additional URLLC message. To reinforce URLLC transmissions, we propose a dirty-paper coding (DPC)-based technique that mitigates the interference of both eMBB and sensing signals. For this system, we formulate the rate-reliability-detection trade-off in the finite blocklength regime by evaluating the communication rate of the eMBB transmissions, the reliability of the URLLC transmissions and the probability of the target detection. Our numerical analysis show that our proposed DPC-based ISAC scheme significantly outperforms power-sharing based ISAC and traditional time-sharing schemes. In particular, it achieves higher eMBB transmission rate while satisfying both URLLC and sensing constraints.

I. INTRODUCTION

Integrated sensing and communication (ISAC) is enabled by higher frequency bands, wider bandwidths and denser distributions of massive antenna arrays. Such integration is mutually beneficial to sensing and communication tasks thus offering various use cases for autonomous driving, smart factories, and other environmental-aware scenarios in 6G [1]–[5]. Many of these use cases also require ultra-reliable and low-latency communication (URLLC), a feature introduced in 5G and expected to be further advanced in 6G [6]–[9].

Despite great progress to achieve the required latency and reliability, 5G URLLC still does not meet all key performance metrics needed for diverse mission-critical applications. One of the main challenges arises from the random generation nature of URLLC services, as their generation is often linked to the occurrence of critical, time-sensitive events in the environment. Another challenge is the coexistence of URLLC services with other 5G/6G services such as enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB) type services that depend largely on high transmission rate and are less sensitive to delay. Different coexistence strategies have been studied in the literature [10]–[14]. For example, the work in [11] proposes a puncturing strategy in which the on-going eMBB transmission stops upon the arrival of URLLC messages. The work in [12] shows that a superposition coding strategy in which the transmitter simply sends a linear combination of eMBB and URLLC signals outperforms the

puncturing strategy. A dirty-paper coding (DPC) [15], [16] based joint transmission strategy is proposed in [13] which also outperforms the puncturing technique. These studies either assume a deterministic model or a random model with Bernoulli distribution for the arrival of URLLC messages, which have shortcomings in offering a practical model for the stochastic nature of this type of services.

In this work, we propose a bi-static MIMO ISAC-enabled URLLC system that supports the joint transmission of eMBB and URLLC services. This system uses its own sensory data to trigger URLLC transmissions with no assumption on their arrival distribution. The setup consists of one base station (BS), one user equipment (UE), one target and one sensing receiver (SR). The BS accommodates the transmission of both eMBB and URLLC type services. The eMBB message arrives at the beginning of the transmission slot and its transmission lasts over the entire slot. We divide the eMBB slot into smaller blocks. In each block, the BS transmits dual-function signals enabling simultaneous communication and sensing tasks. In each block, if the SR senses the presence of the target, it triggers the transmission of an additional URLLC message over the next immediate block. In blocks with no URLLC transmission, the dual function signal is generated using DPC to precancel the interference of sensing signal from the eMBB transmission [17]. In blocks with joint URLLC and eMBB transmissions, to increase the reliability of the URLLC transmission, we also propose a DPC based method to generate the dual function signal. In this method, we first precancel the interference of the sensing signal from the eMBB transmission, and then precancel the interference of both eMBB and sensing signals from the URLLC transmission. After each block, the UE attempts to decode a URLLC message, and after the entire transmission slot it decodes the eMBB message.

For this system, we formulate the rate-reliability-detection trade-off in the finite blocklength regime [18]. Specifically, we upper bound the eMBB rate while treating the interference of URLLC as noise. We measure the reliability of the almost interference-free URLLC transmissions by evaluating the corresponding decoding error probability. Finally, we calculate the target detection probability under the interference of both URLLC and eMBB. Through numerical analyses we show that our proposed DPC-based ISAC scheme outperforms the power-sharing and the time-sharing schemes by achieving higher eMBB rate while accommodating the URLLC constraints and the sensing constraints of the target detection.




Fig. 1: An illustration of the system model: (a) no target is detected, (b) detection of a target, (c) example of transmission blocks with $\eta = 4$.

II. PROBLEM SETUP

Consider a bi-static MIMO ISAC system where a BS is communicating with a UE and simultaneously wishes to sense a target of interest. A SR is deployed to collect echo signals reflected from the target¹. The BS is equipped with t transmit antennas, the UE and the SR each are equipped with r receive antennas. The BS communicates both eMBB and URLLC type messages to the UE. Assume n is the total communication frame length. The eMBB message m_e is uniformly distributed over a given set $\mathcal{M}_e := \{1, \dots, M_e\}$ and is sent over the entire transmission interval n . We divide n into η blocks each of length ℓ (i.e., $n = \eta \cdot \ell$), as in Fig. 1. Denote by $P_{b,D}$ as the target detection probability in block b . In each block $b \in [\eta]$, with $[\eta] := \{1, \dots, \eta\}$, the BS transmits an additional URLLC message $m_{b,U}$ to the UE with probability $P_{b-1,D}$ which is the target detection probability in the previous block $b-1$. With probability $1 - P_{b-1,D}$ no URLLC message is generated. The message $m_{b,U}$ is uniformly distributed over a given set $\mathcal{M}_U := \{1, \dots, M_U\}$. For each $b \in [\eta]$, if a URLLC message is generated, then we set $A_b = 1$, and otherwise we set $A_b = 0$. Note that $A_1 = 0$ with probability 1. Define

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} := \{b \in [\eta] : A_b = 1\}, \quad (1)$$

as the set of blocks in which an additional URLLC message is generated.

A. Communication Received Signal at the UE

At the end of each block $b \in [\eta]$, the UE receives the signal $\mathbf{Y}_{b,c} = [\mathbf{Y}_{b,c,1} \dots \mathbf{Y}_{b,c,r}] \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times r}$ from the BS. Assume a MIMO memoryless Gaussian quasi-static fading channel. The channel input-output relation in each block $b \in [\eta]$ is given by

$$\mathbf{Y}_{b,c} = (\mathbf{X}_{b,c} + \mathbf{X}_{b,s})\mathbf{H}_{b,c} + \mathbf{N}_{b,c}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{b,c} \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times t}$ is the communication signal, $\mathbf{X}_{b,s} \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times t}$ is the sensing signal, $\mathbf{Y}_{b,c} \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times r}$ is the communication channel

¹We assume that the UE is not within the SR sensing range. Hence, the SR does not receive echo signals from the UE. We also assume that the SR and the BS can communicate over an interference-free backhaul link.

output, $\mathbf{H}_{b,c} \in \mathbb{C}^{t \times r}$ is the communication channel matrix, and $\mathbf{N}_{b,c} \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times r}$ is additive noise at the UE whose entries are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and is independent of $\mathbf{H}_{b,c}$. Let $\mathbf{X}_b = \mathbf{X}_{b,c} + \mathbf{X}_{b,s}$, and denote $\mathbf{X} := [\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_\eta]$. The input matrix \mathbf{X} is admissible if it belongs to the following set:

$$\mathcal{P}_X(P) := \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times t} : \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H) \leq nP\}, \quad (3)$$

that implies a power constraint on the input matrix \mathbf{X} by upper bounding the trace of $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^H$ with nP . Assume that the channel state information is known at both the BS and the UE. We next introduce a communication channel code notation for this setting.

Definition 1: A communication channel code $(n, M_e, M_U, \epsilon_e^{(n)}, \{\epsilon_{b,U}\}_{b=1}^\eta)$ consists of:

- An encoder $f_e : \mathcal{M}_e \times \mathbb{C}^{t \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{t \times r}$ that at each block $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$ maps the message $m_e \in \mathcal{M}_e$ and the channel $\mathbf{H}_{b,c}$ to a codeword $\mathbf{X}_{b,c} = f_e(m_e, \mathbf{H}_{b,c})$ for each $m_e \in \mathcal{M}_e$ and $\mathbf{H}_{b,c} \in \mathbb{C}^{t \times r}$.
- An encoder $f_b : \mathcal{M}_e \times \mathcal{M}_U \times \mathbb{C}^{t \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{t \times r}$ that at each block $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$ maps the message pair $(m_e, m_{b,U})$ and the channel $\mathbf{H}_{b,c}$ to a codeword $\mathbf{X}_{b,c} = f_b(m_e, m_{b,U}, \mathbf{H}_{b,c})$ for each $m_e \in \mathcal{M}_e$, $m_{b,U} \in \mathcal{M}_U$ and $\mathbf{H}_{b,c} \in \mathbb{C}^{t \times r}$.
- A decoder $g_{b,u} : \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times r} \times \mathbb{C}^{t \times r} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_U$ that in each block $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$ produces

$$\hat{m}_{b,U} = g_{b,u}(\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}, \mathbf{H}_{b,c}), \quad (4)$$

and produces $\hat{m}_{b,U} = 0$ if $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$. For each message $m_{b,U}$, the average error probability is defined as

$$\epsilon_{b,U} := P_{b-1,D} \mathbb{P}[\hat{m}_{b,U} \neq m_{b,U} | b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}] + (1 - P_{b-1,D}) \mathbb{P}[\hat{m}_{b,U} \neq 0 | b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}]. \quad (5)$$

- A decoder $g_e : \mathbb{C}^{n \times r} \times \mathbb{C}^{t \times r} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_e$ that at the end of the entire n channel uses produces

$$\hat{m}_e = g_e(\mathbf{Y}_{1,c}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{\eta,c}, \mathbf{H}_{1,c}, \dots, \mathbf{H}_{\eta,c}). \quad (6)$$

The average error probability of the eMBB message m_e is defined as

$$\epsilon_e^{(n)} := \mathbb{P}[\hat{m}_e \neq m_e]. \quad (7)$$

B. Target Echo Signal Model

In block $b \in [\eta]$, after transmitting \mathbf{X}_b , the SR receives the reflected echo matrix $\mathbf{Y}_{b,s} = [\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,1} \dots \mathbf{Y}_{b,s,r}] \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times r}$. The target detection problem in each block is formulated by defining the following two hypotheses:

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{Y}_{b,s} = \mathbf{N}_{b,s}, \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_1 : \mathbf{Y}_{b,s} = (\mathbf{X}_{b,c} + \mathbf{X}_{b,s})\mathbf{H}_{b,s} + \mathbf{N}_{b,s}, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{b,s} \in \mathbb{C}^{t \times r}$ is the target channel response matrix and $\mathbf{N}_{b,s} \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell \times r}$ is additive noise matrix with each entry having zero mean and unit variance. The optimal detector for this problem is the likelihood ratio test (LRT) [19] and is given by

$$T_b = \log \left(\prod_{j=1}^q \frac{f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_1)}{f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_0)} \right) \underset{\mathcal{H}_0}{\overset{\mathcal{H}_1}{\gtrless}} \delta \quad (10)$$

where $f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j}|\mathcal{H}_0)$ and $f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j}|\mathcal{H}_1)$ are the probability density functions (pdf) of the observation vector under the null and alternative hypotheses, respectively, and $q := \min\{r, t\}$. Denote by $P_{b,D}$ and $P_{b,FA}$ the target detection and false alarm probabilities of block b , respectively. These probabilities are given by

$$P_{b,D} = \mathbb{P}[T_b > \delta | \mathcal{H}_1], \quad (11a)$$

$$P_{b,FA} = \mathbb{P}[T_b > \delta | \mathcal{H}_0]. \quad (11b)$$

In our analysis, the threshold δ is set to ensure the desired probability of false alarm. In each block b , we assume that the SR has the full knowledge of the sensing channel state information and the sensing signal $\mathbf{X}_{b,s}$ but the communication signal $\mathbf{X}_{b,c}$ is unknown to the SR.

Proposition 1: Given n, η and P , let $R_e := \frac{\log M_e}{n}$ be the eMBB transmission rate. The rate-reliability-detection trade-off is

$$\max_{f_{\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{P}_X(P)}} R_e \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \epsilon_e^{(n)} \leq \epsilon_e, \quad (12b)$$

$$\epsilon_{b,U} \leq \epsilon_U, \quad \forall b \in [\eta], \quad (12c)$$

$$P_{b,D} \geq P_D, \quad \forall b \in [\eta], \quad (12d)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_X(P)$ is defined in (3).

III. CODING SCHEME

In each block $b \in [\eta]$, codewords are generated such that the total transmit power is upper bounded by ℓP thus satisfying the power constraint (3) over the η blocks. In each block $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$, we employ a DPC technique with parameter $\alpha_{s,1} \in [0, 1]$ to precancel the interference of the sensing signal from the eMBB transmission. In each block $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$ where the BS has both eMBB and URLLC messages to send, we employ a DPC technique to improve the reliability of the URLLC transmission. In this technique, we first precancel the interference of the sensing signal from the eMBB transmission using a DPC with parameter $\alpha_{s,2} \in [0, 1]$, and then precancel the interference of both eMBB and sensing signals from the URLLC transmission using a DPC technique with parameter $\alpha_u \in [0, 1]$.

A. Codebook construction

Choose $\beta_u, \beta_{s,1}, \beta_{s,2} \in [0, 1]$. To improve the finite block-length performance, all codewords are uniformly distributed on the power shell. Denote a centered ℓ -dimensional sphere of radius r by $S_\ell(r)$. For each block $b \in [\eta]$ and for each $j \in [t]$, generate the following codewords.

- For each $v \in [M_v]$ and each realization $m \in [M_U]$, generate codewords $\mathbf{V}_{b,j}(m, v)$ by picking them uniformly over $S_\ell\left(\sqrt{\ell(\beta_u + \alpha_u^2(1 - \beta_u))}P\right)$.
- For each $s \in [M_s]$ and each realization $m' \in [M_e]$, randomly draw two codewords: a codeword $\mathbf{S}_{b,j}^{(1)}(m', s)$ uniformly distributed on $S_\ell\left(\sqrt{\ell(\beta_{s,1} + \alpha_{s,1}^2(1 - \beta_{s,1}))}P\right)$; and a codeword $\mathbf{S}_{b,j}^{(2)}(m', s)$ uniformly distributed on $S_\ell\left(\sqrt{\ell(1 - \beta_u)(\beta_{s,2} + \alpha_{s,2}^2(1 - \beta_{s,2}))}P\right)$.

- For each $s \in [M_s]$, randomly draw two codewords: a codeword $\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,1)}(s)$ uniformly distributed on $S_\ell\left(\sqrt{\ell(1 - \beta_{s,1})}P\right)$; and a codeword $\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,2)}(s)$ uniformly distributed on $S_\ell\left(\sqrt{\ell(1 - \beta_u)(1 - \beta_{s,2})}P\right)$.

All codewords are chosen independently of each other.

B. Encoding

1) *Encoding at each block $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$:* In each block $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$ and each $j \in [t]$, the BS first picks its sensing signal $\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,1)}(s)$ and then uses DPC to encode its eMBB message m_e while precanceling the interference of its own sensing signal. Specifically, it chooses an index s such that the

$$\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(e,1)} := \mathbf{S}_{b,j}^{(1)}(m_e, s) - \alpha_{s,1} \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,1)} \quad (13)$$

lies in the set $\mathcal{D}(\ell\beta_{s,1}P, \zeta_{s,1})$ for a given $\zeta_{s,1} > 0$ where

$$\mathcal{D}(a, \zeta) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} : a - \zeta \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \leq a \right\}. \quad (14)$$

For simplicity, we assume that at least one such a codeword exists. If multiple such codewords exist, the index s^* is chosen at random from this set, and the BS sends $\mathbf{X}_b = [\mathbf{X}_{b,1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{b,t}]$ with

$$\mathbf{X}_{b,j} = \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(e,1)} + \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,1)}, \quad j \in [t]. \quad (15)$$

2) *Encoding at each block $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$:* In each block $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$, the BS has both eMBB and URLLC messages to send. For each $j \in [t]$, it first picks its sensing signal $\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,2)}(s)$. It then uses DPC to encode its eMBB message m_e while precanceling the interference of its own sensing signal. More specifically it chooses an index s such that

$$\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(e,2)} := \mathbf{S}_{b,j}^{(2)}(m_e, s) - \alpha_{s,2} \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,2)} \quad (16)$$

lies in the set $\mathcal{D}(\ell\beta_{s,2}(1 - \beta_u)P, \zeta_{s,2})$ for a given $\zeta_{s,2} > 0$. Then it employs DPC to encode $m_{b,U}$ while precanceling the interference of its own sensing and eMBB signals $\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(e,2)} + \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,2)}$. Specifically, it chooses an index v such that the sequence

$$\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(U)} := \mathbf{V}_{b,j}(m_{b,U}, v) - \alpha_u \left(\mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(e,2)} + \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,2)} \right) \quad (17)$$

lies in the set $\mathcal{D}(\ell\beta_u P, \zeta_u)$ for a given $\zeta_u > 0$. If multiple such codewords exist, indices s^* and v^* are chosen at random from these sets, and the BS sends $\mathbf{X}_b = [\mathbf{X}_{b,1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{b,t}]$ with

$$\mathbf{X}_{b,j} = \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(U)} + \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(e,2)} + \mathbf{X}_{b,j}^{(s,2)}, \quad j \in [t]. \quad (18)$$

C. Decoding

1) *Decoding of URLLC Messages:* At the end of each block $b \in [\eta]$, the UE observes the channel outputs $\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}$:

$$\mathbf{Y}_{b,c} = \begin{cases} (\mathbf{X}_b^{(e,1)} + \mathbf{X}_b^{(s,1)})\mathbf{H}_{b,c} + \mathbf{N}_{b,c} & \text{if } b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} \\ (\mathbf{X}_b^{(U)} + \mathbf{X}_b^{(e,2)} + \mathbf{X}_b^{(s,2)})\mathbf{H}_{b,c} + \mathbf{N}_{b,c} & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Define the information density metric between $\mathbf{y}_{b,c}$ and $\mathbf{v}_b := [\mathbf{v}_{b,1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{b,q}]$ by:

$$i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{v}_b; \mathbf{y}_{b,c}) := \log \frac{f_{\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{v}_b)}{f_{\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c})}. \quad (20)$$

The UE then chooses the pair

$$(m^*, v^*) = \arg \max_{m, v} i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{v}_b; \mathbf{y}_{b,c}). \quad (21)$$

Given a threshold δ_U , if for this pair

$$i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{v}_b; \mathbf{y}_{b,c}) > \delta_U \quad (22)$$

the UE chooses $(\hat{m}_{b,U}, \hat{v}) = (m^*, v^*)$. Otherwise the UE declares that no URLLC message has been received and indicates it by setting $\hat{m}_{b,U} = 0$. Define

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} := \{b \in [\eta] : \hat{m}_{b,U} \neq 0\}, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{decode}} := \{b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} : \hat{m}_{b,U} = m_{b,U}\}, \quad (24)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}}$ denotes the set of blocks in which a URLLC message is detected and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{decode}}$ denotes the set of blocks in which a URLLC message is decoded correctly.

2) *Decoding the eMBB Message:* The UE decodes its eMBB message based on the output of the entire η blocks. Let $\mathbf{Y}_c := [\mathbf{Y}_{1,c}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{\eta,c}]$. Given that the URLLC messages interfere on the eMBB transmissions, the UE treats URLLC transmissions as noise. Therefore, the decoding of the eMBB message depends on the detection of URLLC messages sent over the η blocks. Let B_{dt} be the realization of the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}}$ defined in (23). Also, let $\mathbf{s}_{e,1} := \{\mathbf{s}_b^{(1)}\}_{b \notin B_{\text{dt}}}$, and $\mathbf{s}_{e,2} := \{\mathbf{s}_b^{(2)}\}_{b \in B_{\text{dt}}}$. Given B_{dt} , the UE decodes its eMBB message based on the outputs of the entire n channel uses by looking for an index pair (m', s) such that its corresponding codewords $\{\mathbf{s}_{e,2}(m', s), \mathbf{s}_{e,1}(m', s)\}$ maximize

$$i^{(e)}(\mathbf{s}_{e,2}, \mathbf{s}_{e,1}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) := \log \prod_{b \notin B_{\text{dt}}} \frac{f_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(1)}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(1)})}{f_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c})} + \log \prod_{b \in B_{\text{dt}}} \frac{f_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(2)}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(2)})}{f_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c})} \quad (25)$$

among all codewords $\{\mathbf{s}_{e,2}(m', s), \mathbf{s}_{e,1}(m', s)\}$.

IV. MAIN RESULTS

For each $b \in [\eta]$, let $\gamma_{b,1} \geq \gamma_{b,2} \geq \dots \geq \gamma_{b,q}$ be the q largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{H}_{b,s}^H \mathbf{H}_{b,s}$. We have the following lemma on the target detection probability.

Lemma 1: The target detection probability is given by

$$P_{b,D} = 1 - F_{\tilde{\chi}_2} \left(F_{\tilde{\chi}_1}^{-1}(1 - P_{\text{FA}}) \right), \quad (26)$$

where P_{FA} is the desired false alarm probability, $\tilde{\chi}_1(\{w_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q, \ell, \{\nu_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q)$ and $\tilde{\chi}_2(\{w_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q, \ell, \{\tilde{\nu}_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q)$ are generalized chi-square distributions with

$$w_{b,j} := \frac{\gamma_{b,j}(1 - \kappa_1)\mathbf{P}}{1 + \gamma_{b,j}(1 - \kappa_1)\mathbf{P}}, \quad (27a)$$

$$\nu_{b,j} := \kappa_2 \ell \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{1 - w_{b,j}}{w_{b,j}} \right)^2, \quad (27b)$$

$$\tilde{\nu}_{b,j} := \begin{cases} \gamma_{b,j} \ell \mathbf{P} \left(\beta_{s,1} + \frac{\kappa_2}{w_{b,j}} \right) & b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}, \\ \gamma_{b,j} \ell \mathbf{P} \left(\beta_u + \frac{\kappa_2}{w_{b,j}} \right) & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (27c)$$

where

$$\kappa_1 := \begin{cases} \kappa_2(1 - \alpha_{s,1})^2, & b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} \\ \kappa_2(1 - \alpha_u)^2(1 - \alpha_{s,2})^2, & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

$$\kappa_2 := \begin{cases} (1 - \beta_{s,1}), & b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} \\ (1 - \beta_u)(1 - \beta_{s,2}), & \text{o.w.} \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

and $F_{\tilde{\chi}_1}(\cdot)$ and $F_{\tilde{\chi}_2}(\cdot)$ are the corresponding CDFs.

Proof: See Appendix A. \blacksquare

For each $b \in [\eta]$, let $\lambda_{b,1} \geq \lambda_{b,2} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{b,q}$ be the q largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{H}_{b,c}^H \mathbf{H}_{b,c}$. We have the following lemma on the URLLC decoding error probability.

Lemma 2: The average URLLC decoding error probability is upper bounded by

$$\epsilon_{b,U} \leq P_{b-1,D} P_{U,1} + (1 - P_{b-1,D}) P_{U,2} \quad (30)$$

where

$$P_{U,1} := (\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1} + (\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1})^{M_U M_v} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2}), \quad (31)$$

$$P_{U,2} := \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2}}{M_U M_v} \right)^{M_U M_v} \right), \quad (32)$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1} := Q \left(\frac{-\log(M_U M_v) + \ell C_U - K_U \log(\ell)}{\sqrt{\ell N_U}} \right) + \frac{B}{\sqrt{\ell}}, \quad (33)$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2} := \frac{2}{\ell K_U} \left(\frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell}} + \frac{2B}{\sqrt{\ell}} \right), \quad (34)$$

for some $K_U > 0$ and $B > 0$ and where $Q(\cdot)$ is the Q -function and

$$C_U := \sum_{j=1}^q C(\Omega_{b,j}), \quad V_U := \sum_{j=1}^q V(\Omega_{b,j}), \quad (35)$$

with $C(x) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1+x)$, $V(x) := \frac{x(2+x)}{2(1+x)^2}$ and

$$\Omega_{b,j} := \frac{\lambda_{b,j}(1 - (1 - \beta_u)(1 - \alpha_u)^2)\mathbf{P}}{1 + \lambda_{b,j}(1 - \alpha_u)^2(1 - \beta_u)\mathbf{P}}. \quad (36)$$

Proof: See Appendix B. The proof follows by analyzing the following three error events:

$$\mathcal{E}_{U,1} := \{b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} | b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\}, \quad (37)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{U,2} := \{b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{decode}} | b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}}, b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\}, \quad (38)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{U,3} := \{b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} | b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\}, \quad (39)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{U,1}$ happens when the transmitted URLLC message is not detected, $\mathcal{E}_{U,2}$ happens when the transmitted URLLC message is detected by the UE but the decoded message does not match the transmitted one, and $\mathcal{E}_{U,3}$ happens if no URLLC message has been transmitted but the UE incorrectly declares the detection of a URLLC message. \blacksquare

The following lemma is on the eMBB transmission rate.

Lemma 3: The eMBB transmission rate $R_e := \frac{\log M_e}{n}$ is upper bounded by

$$R_e \leq C_e - \sqrt{\frac{V_e}{n}} Q^{-1}(\epsilon_e - \Delta_e) - K_e \frac{\log(n)}{n} - \frac{\log(M_s)}{n} \quad (40)$$

for some $K_e > 0$ and where

$$C_e := \sum_{B_{\text{dt}}} \mathbf{P}_{\text{det}}^{|B_{\text{dt}}|} (1 - \mathbf{P}_{\text{det}})^{\eta - |B_{\text{dt}}|} \tilde{C}_e, \quad (41)$$

$$V_e := \sum_{B_{\text{dt}}} \mathbf{P}_{\text{det}}^{|B_{\text{dt}}|} (1 - \mathbf{P}_{\text{det}})^{\eta - |B_{\text{dt}}|} \tilde{V}_e, \quad (42)$$




Fig. 2: Comparing our DPC-based scheme with power-sharing and time-sharing schemes for $P = 0.5$, $\ell = 150$, $\eta = 10$, $P_{FA} = 10^{-6}$, $\epsilon_e = 10^{-3}$.

$$\tilde{C}_e := \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\sum_{b \notin B_{dt}} C(\Omega_{b,j}^{(1)}) + \sum_{b \in B_{dt}} C(\Omega_{b,j}^{(2)}) \right), \quad (43)$$

$$\tilde{V}_e := \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\sum_{b \notin B_{dt}} V(\Omega_{b,j}^{(1)}) + \sum_{b \in B_{dt}} V(\Omega_{b,j}^{(2)}) \right), \quad (44)$$

where $C(x) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1+x)$, $V(x) := \frac{x(2+x)}{2(1+x)^2}$,

$$\Omega_{b,j}^{(1)} := \frac{\lambda_{b,j}(1 - (1 - \alpha_{s,1})^2(1 - \beta_{s,1}))P}{1 + \lambda_{b,j}(1 - \alpha_{s,1})^2(1 - \beta_{s,1})P}, \quad (45)$$

$$\Omega_{b,j}^{(2)} := \frac{\lambda_{b,j}(1 - \alpha_u)^2(1 - \beta_u)(1 - (1 - \alpha_{s,2})^2(1 - \beta_{s,2}))P}{1 + \lambda_{b,j}(1 - (1 - \alpha_u)^2(1 - \beta_u))P}, \quad (46)$$

$$P_{det} := P_{b-1,D}(1 - (\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1})^{M_U M_v}) + (1 - P_{b-1,D})P_{U,2}, \quad (47)$$

$$\Delta_e := \left[1 + \frac{\tilde{B}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \frac{4}{n_e^K} \right) + \frac{2 \log 2}{n^{\kappa_e} \sqrt{2n\pi}} - \frac{(P_{b-1,D} - \kappa_e)^{|B_{dt}|} ((\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1})^{M_U M_v} - \kappa_e)^{\eta - |B_{dt}|}}{P_{det}^{|B_{dt}|} (1 - P_{det})^{\eta - |B_{dt}|}} \right], \quad (48)$$

with $\kappa_e := P_{b-1,D}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1})^{M_U M_v}$, and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2}$ are defined in (33) and (34), respectively.

Proof: See Appendix C. ■

By combining Lemmas 1–3 with Proposition 1, we have the following theorem on the rate-reliability-detection trade-off.

Theorem 1: Given n and P , the rate-reliability-detection trade-off is given by

$$\max_{\beta, \alpha} C_e - \sqrt{\frac{V_e}{n}} Q^{-1}(\epsilon_e - \Delta_e) - K_e \frac{\log(n)}{n} - \frac{\log(M_s)}{n} \quad (49a)$$

$$\text{s.t.}: P_{b-1,D}P_{U,1} + (1 - P_{b-1,D})P_{U,2} \leq \epsilon_U, \quad \forall b \in [\eta], \quad (49b)$$

$$1 - F_{\tilde{\chi}_2}(F_{\tilde{\chi}_1}^{-1}(1 - P_{FA})) \geq P_D, \quad \forall b \in [\eta], \quad (49c)$$

where $\beta := \{\beta_u, \beta_{s,1}, \beta_{s,2}\}$ and $\alpha := \{\alpha_u, \alpha_{s,1}, \alpha_{s,2}\}$.




Fig. 3: Our proposed scheme with different values of the URLLC decoding error probability threshold for $P = 0.5$, $\ell = 150$, $\eta = 10$, $P_{FA} = 10^{-6}$, $\epsilon_e = 10^{-3}$.

V. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

In this section, we numerically evaluate the rate-reliability-detection trade-off of Theorem 1. Given P , n and η and ϵ_U , we first find values of α_u and β_u such that $\epsilon_{b,U}$ is below ϵ_U in all blocks. Meaning that the constraint (49b) is satisfied for all blocks. Next, we maximize the upper bound on the eMBB rate in (49a) over $\beta_{s,1}, \beta_{s,2}, \alpha_{s,1}, \alpha_{s,2}$ while satisfying the minimum required target detection probability (i.e., P_D) over all blocks.

Fig. 2 illustrates the upper bound on the eMBB transmission rate as a function of P_D for our DPC-based scheme, power-sharing and time-sharing schemes when ϵ_U is fixed at 10^{-2} . In the power-sharing scheme the BS sends a linear combination of the sensing and communication signals and shares the transmit power P between the two tasks. In the time-sharing scheme sensing and communication tasks are performed independently each using a portion of the blocklength n . As can be seen from this figure, our scheme significantly outperforms the other two schemes. Fig. 3 illustrates the upper bound on the eMBB transmission rate as a function of P_D for our proposed scheme under different levels of URLLC reliability. It can be seen that as we decrease the required threshold on the URLLC decoding error probability (i.e., ϵ_U) the eMBB rate decreases.

VI. CONCLUSION

We proposed a MIMO ISAC-enabled URLLC system where a BS communicates with a UE and a SR collects echo signals reflected from a target of interest. The BS simultaneously transmit messages from eMBB and URLLC services. During each eMBB transmission, the transmission of an additional URLLC message is triggered when the SR sensed the presence of the target. To reinforce URLLC transmissions, the interference of both eMBB and sensing signals were mitigated using DPC. For this system, we formulated the rate-reliability-detection trade-off in the finite blocklength regime. Our numerical analysis shows a significant outperformance of our scheme over the power-sharing and the time-sharing methods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported in part by NextG Innovation Award from Princeton University.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF LEMMA 1

The SR treats the interference of the communication signal as noise. At each block $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$, the communication signal only carries eMBB traffic, i.e., $\mathbf{X}_{b,c} = \mathbf{X}_b^{(e,1)}$, whereas, at each block $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$, the communication signal carries both eMBB and URLLC traffic, i.e., $\mathbf{X}_{b,c} = \mathbf{X}_b^{(U)} + \mathbf{X}_b^{(e,2)}$. Denote by $q := \min\{t, r\}$ and let $\gamma_{b,1} \geq \gamma_{b,2} \geq \dots \geq \gamma_{b,q}$ be the q largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{H}_{b,s}^H \mathbf{H}_{b,s}$. The LRT test in each block $b \in [\eta]$ is given by

$$T_b = \log \left(\prod_{j=1}^q \frac{f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_1)}{f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_0)} \right) \underset{\mathcal{H}_0}{\overset{\mathcal{H}_1}{\geq}} \delta. \quad (50)$$

Given that $N_{b,s,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_\ell)$, thus $f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_0)$ is an i.i.d Gaussian distribution. However, due to our power-shell code construction, $f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_1)$ is non i.i.d. Hence, we take a change of metric measurement approach by introducing the following new LRT test:

$$\tilde{T}_b := \log \left(\prod_{j=1}^q \frac{Q(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_1)}{f(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_0)} \right) \underset{\mathcal{H}_0}{\overset{\mathcal{H}_1}{\geq}} \delta, \quad (51)$$

where $Q(\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} | \mathcal{H}_1)$ is i.i.d Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}, \sigma_{b,j}^2 \mathbf{I}_\ell)$. If $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j} = \sqrt{\gamma_{b,j}} \mathbf{x}_{b,j}^{(s,1)}$ and $\sigma_{b,j}^2 = 1 + \gamma_{b,j}(1 - (1 - \beta_{s,1})(1 - \alpha_{s,1})^2)P$. Otherwise, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j} = \sqrt{\gamma_{b,j}} \mathbf{x}_{b,j}^{(s,2)}$ and $\sigma_{b,j}^2 = 1 + \gamma_{b,j}(1 - (1 - \beta_u)(1 - \alpha_u)^2(1 - \beta_{s,2})(1 - \alpha_{s,2})^2)P$. The test thus can be written as

$$\tilde{T}_b = \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\|\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j}\|^2 - \frac{\|\mathbf{Y}_{b,s,j} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2}{\sigma_{b,j}^2} \right) \underset{\mathcal{H}_0}{\overset{\mathcal{H}_1}{\geq}} \delta. \quad (52)$$

The probability of false alarm is given by

$$P_{b,\text{FA}} = \mathbb{P}[T_b > \delta | \mathcal{H}_0] \quad (53)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{j=1}^q \left(\|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j}\|^2 - \frac{\|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2}{\sigma_{b,j}^2} \right) > \delta \right] \quad (54)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{j=1}^q \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2} \right) \|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2 > \delta + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2 \right] \quad (55)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left[u_b > \delta + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2 \right], \quad (56)$$

where

$$u_b := \sum_{j=1}^q \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2} \right) \|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2. \quad (57)$$

Given that $N_{b,s,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_\ell)$, then $N_{b,s,j} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}, \mathbf{I}_\ell)$ and consequently $\|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2$ follows a non-central chi-square distribution with degree of ℓ and parameter $\frac{1}{(\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1)^2} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2$. Hence, u_b is the weighted sum

of independent non-central chi-square random variables. It thus follows a generalized chi-square distribution. More specifically,

$$u_b \sim \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1(\{w_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q, \ell, \{\nu_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q), \quad (58)$$

where the parameters $\{w_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q$ and $\{\nu_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q$ are defined in (27). Let $F_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}(\cdot)$ denote the CDF of the corresponding generalized chi-square distribution. The probability of false alarm thus is given by

$$P_{b,\text{FA}} = 1 - F_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1} \left(\delta + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2 \right). \quad (59)$$

For each block b , we fix the false alarm probability at P_{FA} . The threshold δ then is equal to

$$\delta = F_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}^{-1}(1 - P_{\text{FA}}) - \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2. \quad (60)$$

The target detection probability is given by

$$P_{b,\text{D}} = \mathbb{P}[T_b > \delta | \mathcal{H}_1] \quad (61)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{j=1}^q \left(\|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} + \mathbf{X}_{b,j} \sqrt{\gamma_{b,j}}\|^2 - \frac{\|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} + \mathbf{X}_{b,c,j} \sqrt{\gamma_{b,j}}\|^2}{\sigma_{b,j}^2} \right) > \delta \right] \quad (62)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{j=1}^q \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2} \right) \|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} + \mathbf{X}_{b,c,j} \sqrt{\gamma_{b,j}} + \frac{\sigma_{b,j}^2}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2 \right) > \delta + \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2 \right] \quad (63)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left[\tilde{u}_b > F_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}^{-1}(1 - P_{\text{FA}}) \right], \quad (64)$$

where

$$\tilde{u}_b := \sum_{j=1}^q \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma_{b,j}^2} \right) \|\mathbf{N}_{b,s,j} + \sqrt{\gamma_{b,j}} \mathbf{X}_{b,c,j} + \frac{\sigma_{b,j}^2}{\sigma_{b,j}^2 - 1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{b,j}\|^2 \quad (65)$$

Following the same argument provided for the false alarm probability, one can obtain that \tilde{u}_b is the weighted sum of independent non-central chi-square random variables and thus follows a generalized chi-square distribution as

$$\tilde{u}_b \sim \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2(\{w_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q, \ell, \{\tilde{\nu}_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q), \quad (66)$$

where the parameters $\{w_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q$ and $\{\tilde{\nu}_{b,j}\}_{j=1}^q$ are defined in (27). Let $F_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2}(\cdot)$ denote the CDF of the corresponding generalized chi-square distribution.

Subsequently, the target detection probability is given by

$$P_{b,\text{D}} = 1 - F_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_2} \left(F_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_1}^{-1}(1 - P_{\text{FA}}) \right). \quad (67)$$

This concludes the proof.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF LEMMA 2

When channel state is known at both the BS and the UE, then by performing a singular value decomposition, the MIMO channel in (2) is transferred into the following set of $q := \min\{t, r\}$ parallel channels

$$\mathbf{Y}_{b,c,j} = \mathbf{X}_{b,j} \sqrt{\lambda_{b,j}} + \mathbf{N}_{b,c,j}, \quad (68)$$

for each $j \in [q]$ and each $b \in [\eta]$. Here, $\lambda_{b,1} \geq \lambda_{b,2} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{b,q}$ are the largest q eigenvalues of $\mathbf{H}_{b,c} \mathbf{H}_{b,c}^H$ and $\mathbf{N}_{b,c,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_\ell)$ are independent noise vectors. Let $\lambda_b = [\lambda_{b,1}, \dots, \lambda_{b,q}]$. We further assume that the encoders f_e and f_b in Definition 1 act on λ_b instead of $\mathbf{H}_{b,c}$. Also, let $\mathbf{X}_b := [\mathbf{X}_{b,1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{b,q}]$. The power constraint (3) applies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \|\mathbf{X}_{b,j}\|^2 \leq \ell P. \quad (69)$$

Note that, to improve the finite blocklength performance, all the codewords are uniformly distributed on the power shell. According to Shannon's observation, the optimal decay of the probability of error near capacity of the point-to-point Gaussian channel is achieved by codewords on the power-shell [20]. As a result of this code construction, the induced output distributions $f_{\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}|\mathbf{V}_b}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c}|\mathbf{v}_b)$ and $f_{\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c})$ are non i.i.d. We thus take a change of metric approach and instead of the information density metric $i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c})$ defined in (20), we use the following metric:

$$\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) := \log \frac{Q_{\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}|\mathbf{V}_b}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c}|\mathbf{v}_b)}{Q_{\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c})}. \quad (70)$$

where Q 's are i.i.d Gaussian distributions.

Given that the channel state information is known at both BS and UE, the information density metric can be written as

$$\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) = \sum_{j=1}^q \tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_{b,j}; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c,j}). \quad (71)$$

The following lemma shows that the random variable $\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c})$ converges in distribution to a Gaussian distribution.

Lemma 4: The following holds:

$$\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\ell C_U, \ell V_U), \quad (72)$$

where

$$C_U := \sum_{j=1}^q C(\Omega_{b,j}), \quad V_U := \sum_{j=1}^q V(\Omega_{b,j}) \quad (73)$$

with $C(x) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1+x)$, $V(x) := \frac{x(2+x)}{2(1+x)^2}$ and $\Omega_{b,j}$ is defined in (36).

Proof: The proof follows the same argument as the proof of [21, Proposition 1]. ■

We are now ready to analyze the URLLC decoding error probability. Recall the definition of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$, $\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{decode}}$

from (1), (23) and (24), respectively. In each block $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$, we have the following URLLC decoding error events:

$$\mathcal{E}_{U,1} := \{b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} | b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\}, \quad (74)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{U,2} := \{b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{decode}} | b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}}, b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\}. \quad (75)$$

In each block $b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}$ we have the following error event:

$$\mathcal{E}_{U,3} := \{b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} | b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\}. \quad (76)$$

The URLLC decoding error probability thus can be bounded by

$$\epsilon_{b,U} \leq P_{b-1,D} (\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,1}] + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,2}]) + (1 - P_{b-1,D}) \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,3}]. \quad (77)$$

In the following sections, we evaluate the occurrence probability of each event individually.

1) *Analyzing $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,1}]$:* This error event is equivalent to the probability that for all $v \in [M_v]$ and for all $m \in [\dots, M_U]$ there is no codeword $\mathbf{V}_b(m, v)$ such that $\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) > \delta_U$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,1}] = \left(\mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \leq \delta_U] \right)^{M_U M_v}. \quad (78)$$

2) *Analyzing $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,2}]$:* This error event is equivalent to the missed detection of the transmitted URLLC message. To evaluate this probability, we use the threshold bound for maximum-metric decoding. For any given threshold δ_U :

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_1^{(U)}] \leq \mathbb{P}[i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b(m_{b,U}, v); \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \leq \delta_U] + (M_U M_v - 1) \mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b(m', v'); \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) > \delta_U] \quad (79)$$

where $m' \in [M_U]$, $v' \in [M_v]$ and $(m_{b,U}, v) \neq (m', v')$ and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b \sim f_{\mathbf{V}_b}$ and is independent of \mathbf{V}_b and $\mathbf{Y}_{b,c}$.

3) *Analyzing $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,3}]$:* This error event is equivalent to the probability that no URLLC has been sent over block b but there is at least one codeword $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) > \delta_U]$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,3}] = 1 - \left(\mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \leq \delta_U] \right)^{M_U M_v} \quad (80)$$

Combining (77), (78), (79) and (80), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{b,U} \leq P_{b-1,D} & \left(\mathbb{P}[i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \leq \delta_U]^{M_U M_v} \right. \\ & \left. + \mathbb{P}[i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \leq \delta_U] \right. \\ & \left. + (M_U M_v - 1) \mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) > \delta_U] \right) \\ & + (1 - P_{b-1,D}) \left(1 - \left(\mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \leq \delta_U] \right)^{M_U M_v} \right). \quad (81) \end{aligned}$$

set

$$\delta_U := \log(M_U M_v) + K_U \log(\ell) \quad (82)$$

for some $K_U > 0$. To evaluate $\mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}_b^{(U)}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) > \delta_U]$ we follow [22, Lemma 47] which results in

$$\mathbb{P}[i_b^{(U)}(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) > \delta_U] \leq \frac{2}{M_U M_v \ell^{K_U}} \left(\frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell}} + \frac{2B}{\sqrt{\ell}} \right). \quad (83)$$

To evaluate $\mathbb{P}[i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b(m_{b,U}, v); \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) < \delta_U]$ we employ the Berry-Esseen central limit theorem (CLT) for functions [21, Proposition 1] which results in

$$\mathbb{P}[i_b^{(U)}(\mathbf{V}_b; \mathbf{Y}_{b,c}) \leq \delta_U]$$

$$\leq Q\left(\frac{-\log(M_U M_v) + \ell C_U - K_U \log(\ell)}{\sqrt{\ell N_U}}\right) + \frac{B}{\sqrt{\ell}}, \quad (84)$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ is the Q-function. Denote by

$$P_{U,1} := (\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1} + (\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1})^{M_U M_v} + \tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2}), \quad (85)$$

$$P_{U,2} := \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2}}{M_U M_v}\right)^{M_U M_v}\right), \quad (86)$$

with

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1} := Q\left(\frac{-\log(M_U M_v) + \ell C_U - K_U \log(\ell)}{\sqrt{\ell N_U}}\right) + \frac{B}{\sqrt{\ell}}, \quad (87)$$

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2} := \frac{2}{\ell^{K_U}} \left(\frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell}} + \frac{2B}{\sqrt{\ell}}\right). \quad (88)$$

Combining (85)–(88) with (81) concludes the proof.

APPENDIX C PROOF OF LEMMA 3

The eMBB message is decoded at the end of the entire n channel uses. We have the following two eMBB decoding error events:

$$\mathcal{E}_{e,1} := \{\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} \neq \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\} \quad (89)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{e,2} := \{\hat{m}_e \neq m_e | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}\} \quad (90)$$

Recall the definition of B_{dt} as the realization of the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}}$. The average eMBB decoding error probability is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_e^{(n)} &\leq \sum_{B_{\text{dt}}} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] \\ &\quad \left(\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{e,1} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] + \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{e,2} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}]\right). \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

1) *Analyzing $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}]$:* Define

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{det}} &:= \mathbb{P}[b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}] \mathbb{P}[b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} | b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}[b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}] \mathbb{P}[b \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} | b \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}}] \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

$$= P_{b-1,D}(1 - \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,1}]) + (1 - P_{b-1,D}) \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,3}] \quad (93)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= P_{b-1,D}(1 - (\tilde{\epsilon}_{U,1})^{M_U M_v}) \\ &\quad + (1 - P_{b-1,D})(1 - (1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_{U,2})^{M_U M_v}) \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

We thus have

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] = P_{\text{det}}^{|B_{\text{dt}}|} (1 - P_{\text{det}})^{\eta - |B_{\text{dt}}|}. \quad (95)$$

2) *Analyzing $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{e,1} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}]$:* This error event is equivalent to the probability that the set of blocks in which a URLLC message is detected by the UE differs from the set of blocks in which URLLC messages have been transmitted by the BS.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{e,1} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] &= \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} \neq \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} \neq B_{\text{dt}} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] \quad (97)$$

$$= 1 - \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} = B_{\text{dt}} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] \quad (98)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} = B_{\text{dt}}] \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{arrival}} = B_{\text{dt}}]}{\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}]} \quad (99)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{(P_{b-1,D}(1 - \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,1}]))^{|B_{\text{dt}}|} (\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{U,1}](1 - P_{b-1,D}))^{\eta - |B_{\text{dt}}|}}{P_{\text{det}}^{|B_{\text{dt}}|} (1 - P_{\text{det}})^{\eta - |B_{\text{dt}}|}}. \quad (100)$$

3) *Analyzing $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{e,2} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}]$:* To evaluate this probability, we first follow the argument provided in Appendix B, and introduce a new metric:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{i}^{(e)}(\mathbf{s}_{e,2}, \mathbf{s}_{e,1}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) &:= \\ \log \prod_{b \notin B_{\text{dt}}} \frac{f_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(1)}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(1)})}{Q_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c})} &+ \log \prod_{b \in B_{\text{dt}}} \frac{Q_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(2)}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c} | \mathbf{s}_b^{(2)})}{Q_{\mathbf{y}_{b,c}}(\mathbf{y}_{b,c})} \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where Q s are i.i.d Gaussian distributions. Following the same argument as Lemma 4, we have the following lemma showing $\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\mathbf{s}_{e,2}, \mathbf{s}_{e,1}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}})$ converges in distribution to a Gaussian distribution.

Lemma 5: The following holds:

$$\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\mathbf{s}_{e,2}, \mathbf{s}_{e,1}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) \sim \mathcal{N}(n\tilde{C}_e, n\tilde{V}_e) \quad (102)$$

where \tilde{C}_e and \tilde{V}_e are defined in (43) and (44), respectively. We now use the threshold bound for maximum-metric decoding to evaluate $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{e,2} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}]$. For any given threshold δ_e :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_{e,2} | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}] &\leq \mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\mathbf{s}_{e,1}, \mathbf{s}_{e,2}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) \leq \delta_e] \\ &\quad + (M_e M_s - 1) \mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,1}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,2}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) > \delta_e], \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,1} \sim f_{\mathbf{s}_{e,1}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,2} \sim f_{\mathbf{s}_{e,2}}$ and are independent of $\mathbf{s}_{e,1}$, $\mathbf{s}_{e,2}$ and \mathbf{y}_c .

Set

$$\delta_e := \log M_e + \log M_s + K_e \log(n) \quad (104)$$

for some $K_e > 0$.

To evaluate $\mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\mathbf{s}_{e,1}, \mathbf{s}_{e,2}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) \leq \delta_e]$ we employ the Berry-Esseen central limit theorem (CLT) for functions [21, Proposition 1] which results in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\mathbf{s}_{e,1}, \mathbf{s}_{e,2}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) \leq \delta_e] &\leq Q\left(\frac{-\log(M_e) - \log(M_s) + n\tilde{C}_e - K_e \log(n)}{\sqrt{n\tilde{V}_e}}\right) + \frac{\tilde{B}}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

for some $\tilde{B} > 0$ and where $Q(\cdot)$ is the Q-function. To evaluate $\mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,1}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,2}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) > \delta_e]$ we follow [22, Lemma 47] which results in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\tilde{i}^{(e)}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,1}, \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{e,2}; \mathbf{y}_c | \mathcal{B}_{\text{detect}} = B_{\text{dt}}) > \delta_e] &\leq \frac{2}{M_e M_s n^{K_e}} \left(\frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} + \frac{2\tilde{B}}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

By combining (91), (95), (100), (103), (105) and (106) we have the following bound on the eMBB decoding error probability:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_e^{(n)} &\leq \sum_{B_{\text{dt}}} P_{\text{det}}^{|B_{\text{dt}}|} (1 - P_{\text{det}})^{\eta - |B_{\text{dt}}|} \\ &\quad \left[\Delta_e + Q\left(\frac{-\log(M_e M_s) + n\tilde{C}_e - K_e \log(n)}{\sqrt{n\tilde{V}_e}}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

where Δ_e is defined in (48). According to Proposition 1, it is required that $\epsilon_e^{(n)}$ to be bounded above by ϵ_e , i.e., $\epsilon_e^{(n)} \leq \epsilon_e$. Thus

$$\epsilon_e \geq \sum_{B_{\text{dt}}} P_{\text{det}}^{|B_{\text{dt}}|} (1 - P_{\text{det}})^{\eta - |B_{\text{dt}}|} \left[\Delta_e + Q \left(\frac{-\log(M_e M_s) + n\tilde{C}_e - K_e \log(n)}{\sqrt{n\tilde{V}_e}} \right) \right]. \quad (108)$$

By taking the inverse of the Q -function, we have

$$\log M_e \leq n\tilde{C}_e - \sqrt{n\tilde{V}_e} Q^{-1}(\epsilon_e - \Delta_e) - K_e \log(n) - \log M_s. \quad (109)$$

Dividing both sides of (109) by n concludes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Koivunen, M. F. Keskin, H. Wymeersch, M. Valkama, and N. González-Prelcic, "Multicarrier ISAC: Advances in waveform design, signal processing, and learning under nonidealities," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 17–30, Sept. 2024.
- [2] H. Luo, F. Gao, H. Lin, S. Ma, and H. V. Poor, "YOLO: An efficient terahertz band integrated sensing and communications scheme with beam squint," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 9389–9403, Aug. 2024.
- [3] F. Liu et al., "Integrated sensing and communications: Toward dual-functional wireless networks for 6G and beyond," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1728–1767, June 2022.
- [4] H. Li, Z. Han and H. V. Poor, "Waveform shaping in integrated sensing and communications," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Military Communications Conference*, Washington, DC, USA, pp. 670–671, 2024.
- [5] Y. Liu, T. Huang, F. Liu, D. Ma, W. Huangfu, and Y. C. Eldar, "Next-generation multiple access for integrated sensing and communications," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 112, no. 9, pp. 1467–1496, Sept. 2024.
- [6] N. H. Mahmood, I. Atzeni, E. A. Jorswieck, and O. L. A. López, "Ultra-reliable low-latency communications: Foundations, enablers, system design, and evolution towards 6G", *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 20, no. 5-6, pp. 512–747, 2023.
- [7] Z. Behdad, Ö. T. Demir, K. W. Sung, and C. Cavdar, "Joint processing and transmission energy optimization for ISAC in cell-free massive MIMO with URLLC," arXiv:2401.10315, 2024.
- [8] P. Qin, Y. Fu, Z. Yu, J. Zhang, and X. Zhao, "URLLC-aware trajectory plan and beamforming design for NOMA-aided UAV integrated sensing, communication, and computation networks," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 1610–1625, Jan. 2025.
- [9] X. Zhao and Y. -J. Angela Zhang, "Joint beamforming and scheduling for integrated sensing and communication systems in URLLC: A POMDP approach," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 72, no. 10, pp. 6145–6161, Oct. 2024.
- [10] H. Nikbakht, M. Wigger, M. Egan, S. Shamai (Shitz), J-M. Gorce, and H. V. Poor, "An information-theoretic view of mixed-delay traffic in 5G and 6G," *Entropy*, vol. 24, no. 5, article 637, 2022.
- [11] X. Song and M. Yuan, "Performance analysis of one-way highway vehicular networks with dynamic multiplexing of eMBB and URLLC traffics," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 118020–118029, 2019.
- [12] G. Interdonato, S. Buzzi, C. D'Andrea, L. Venturino, C. D'Elia, and P. Vendittelli, "On the coexistence of eMBB and URLLC in multi-cell massive MIMO," *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 4, pp. 1040–1059, 2023.
- [13] H. Nikbakht, E. Ruzomberka, M. Wigger, S. Shamai, and H. V. Poor, "Joint coding of eMBB and URLLC in vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communications," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Global Communications Conference*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 1–6, 4–8 Dec. 2023..
- [14] J. Wang, G. Xie, D. Xia, and B. Dai, "Feedback coding of URLLC in vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communications and its secrecy analysis," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference*, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, pp. 01-06, 21–24 April, 2024.
- [15] H. Nikbakht, M. Egan, and J.-M. Gorce, "Dirty paper coding for consecutive messages with heterogeneous decoding deadlines in the finite blocklength regime," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 2100–2105, Espoo, Finland, 26 June – 01 July, 2022.
- [16] M. H. M. Costa, "Writing on dirty paper (Corresp.)," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 439–441, May 1983.
- [17] H. Li, Z. Han, and H. V. Poor, "A broadcast channel framework for joint communications and sensing-part II: Superposition coding," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Global Communications Conference*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 7381–7386, 4–8 Dec. 2023.
- [18] H. Nikbakht, M. Wigger, S. Shamai, and H. V. Poor, "Integrated sensing and communication in the finite blocklength regime," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 2790–2795, Athens, Greece, 07–12 July, 2024.
- [19] H. V. Poor, *An introduction to signal detection and estimation*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [20] C. E. Shannon, "Probability of error for optimal codes in a Gaussian channel," *The Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 611–656, 1959.
- [21] E. MolavianJazi and J. N. Laneman, "A finite-blocklength perspective on Gaussian multi-access channels", arXiv:1309.2343, sep. 2013.
- [22] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor and S. Verdú, "Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2307–2359, May, 2010.