

Zero Estimation Cost Strategy for Witsenhausen Counterexample with Causal Encoder

Mengyuan Zhao and Tobias J. Oechtering
 Division of Information Science and Engineering
 KTH Royal Institute of Technology
 10044 Stockholm, Sweden

Maël Le Treust
 Univ. Rennes, CNRS, Inria, IRISA UMR 6074
 35000 Rennes, France

Abstract—We propose a zero estimation cost (ZEC) scheme for causal-encoding noncausal-decoding vector-valued Witsenhausen counterexample based on the coordination coding result. In contrast to source coding, our goal is to communicate a controlled system state. The introduced ZEC scheme is a joint control-communication approach that transforms the system state into a sequence that can be efficiently communicated using block coding. Numerical results show that our approach significantly reduces the power required for achieving zero-estimation-cost state reconstruction at the decoder. In the second part, we introduce a more general non-zero estimation cost (Non-ZEC) scheme. We observe numerically that the Non-ZEC scheme operates as a time-sharing mechanism between the two-point strategy and the ZEC scheme. Overall, by leveraging block-coding gain, our proposed methods substantially improve the power-estimation trade-off for Witsenhausen counterexample.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1968, Witsenhausen proposed his renowned counterexample, highlighting the suboptimality of affine strategies in the Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) settings with non-classical information pattern [1]. This counterexample has since become a prominent toy example in the study of distributed decision-making [2]–[5] and information-theoretic control [6]–[13].

The vector-valued extension of Witsenhausen counterexample [14] facilitates the application of many information-theoretic approaches [15]–[18] to analyze this open problem. Among these, the coordination coding method [19]–[21] has proven powerful in building cooperative behavior among different decision-makers, yielding novel bounds and insights into the distributed decision-making field.

Recent advances in this direction for Witsenhausen counterexample are the single-letter characterizations for the optimal trade-off region of the power cost and estimation cost in various causal decision-making frameworks, including causal decoding [22], causal coding with feedback [23], and in particular, causal encoding [24]. The auxiliary random variables (aux. RVs) involved in the single-letter expressions, not only capture the asymptotic behavior of the costs, but also explicitly carry the dual role of control in Witsenhausen counterexample: joint state control and information communication.

Building upon this idea, the design of aux. RVs that can be efficiently communicated becomes a key question. In [25], we




Fig. 1. Causal-encoding noncausal-decoding vector-valued Witsenhausen counterexample.

explored control designs within the class of jointly Gaussian aux. RVs and determined the optimal estimation cost for a given power. This optimal Gaussian scheme is shown to operate as a time-sharing mechanism between two affine strategies. However, it is outperformed by Witsenhausen’s two-point strategy, which communicates the controlled system state more efficiently by designing it to be a binary sign symbol.

Inspired by the two-point strategy, we propose a zero estimation cost (ZEC) block-coding approach where one aux. RV is Gaussian and the other one is discrete representing the sign of the source state for the causal-encoding setup. The ZEC scheme requests the two aux. RVs to deterministically describe the controlled system state X_1 . Simulation results show that the ZEC strategy significantly reduces the power required for zero-estimation-cost system state reconstruction at the decoder, offering a substantial improvement over existing causal methods. Next, we introduce a more general non-zero estimation cost (Non-ZEC) scheme by incorporating a test channel on top of the discrete aux. RV. This extended scheme reduces the necessary power cost by allowing a trade-off with estimation accuracy, which is shown numerically, to be a time-sharing operation between the two-point scheme and our proposed ZEC strategy. By exploiting block-coding gain, our proposed approach strictly outperforms the two-point strategy and greatly enhances the power-estimation trade-off for Witsenhausen counterexample.

This paper is organized as follows: Section II formulates the problem and recapitulates some foundational results. Section III introduces the ZEC scheme and its performance analysis. Section IV extends this to the Non-ZEC scheme with numerical simulations. Lastly, a conclusion follows in Section V.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

Let us consider the vector-valued Witsenhausen counterexample setup with causal source states and channel noises

This work is supported by Swedish Research Council (VR) under grant 2020-03884. The work of Maël Le Treust is supported in part by PEPR NF FOUNDS ANR-22-PEFT-0010.

that are drawn independently according to the i.i.d. Gaussian distributions $X_0^n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, Q\mathbb{I})$ and $Z_1^n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N\mathbb{I})$, for some $Q, N \in \mathbb{R}^+$, where \mathbb{I} is the identity matrix, see Figure 1. We denote by X_1 the memoryless interim system state and Y_1 the output of the memoryless additive channel, generated by

$$X_1 = X_0 + U_1 \quad \text{with } X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, Q), \quad (1)$$

$$Y_1 = X_1 + Z_1 = X_0 + U_1 + Z_1 \quad \text{with } Z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N). \quad (2)$$

We denote by $\mathcal{P}_{X_0} = \mathcal{N}(0, Q)$ the generative Gaussian probability distribution of the source, and by $\mathcal{P}_{X_1, Y_1 | X_0, U_1}$ the channel probability distribution according to (1) and (2).

We define the control design for this setup, its induced cost functions, and the achievable cost pairs as follows:

Definition II.1. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a ‘‘control design’’ with causal encoder and noncausal decoder is a tuple of stochastic functions $c = (\{f_{U_{1,t}|X_0^t}^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^n, g_{U_2^n|Y_1^n})$ defined by

$$f_{U_{1,t}|X_0^t}^{(t)} : \mathcal{X}_0^t \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_1, \quad g_{U_2^n|Y_1^n} : \mathcal{Y}_1^n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_2^n, \quad (3)$$

which induces a distribution over sequences of symbols:

$$\prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{X_0, t} \prod_{t=1}^n f_{U_{1,t}|X_0^t}^{(t)} \prod_{t=1}^n \mathcal{P}_{X_1, t, Y_1, t | X_0, t, U_1, t} g_{U_2^n | Y_1^n}.$$

Definition II.2. We define the two long-run cost functions $c_P(u_1^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (u_{1,t})^2$ and $c_S(x_1^n, u_2^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n (x_{1,t} - u_{2,t})^2$. The pair of costs $(P, S) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is said to be achievable if for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq \bar{n}$, there exists a control design c as in (3) such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|P - c_P(U_1^n)| + |S - c_S(X_1^n, U_2^n)| \right] \leq \varepsilon.$$

The following theorem is the single-letter characterization for the optimal cost region formed by all achievable cost pairs.

Theorem II.3 ([24, Theorem I]). *The pair of Witsenhausen costs (P, S) is achievable if and only if there exists a joint distribution over the random variables $(X_0, W_1, W_2, U_1, X_1, Y_1, U_2)$ that decomposes according to*

$$\mathcal{P}_{X_0} \mathcal{P}_{W_1} \mathcal{P}_{W_2 | X_0, W_1} \mathcal{P}_{U_1 | X_0, W_1} \mathcal{P}_{X_1, Y_1 | X_0, U_1} \mathcal{P}_{U_2 | W_1, W_2, Y_1}, \quad (4)$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} I(W_1, W_2; Y_1) - I(W_2; X_0 | W_1) &\geq 0, \\ P = \mathbb{E}[U_1^2], \quad S = \mathbb{E}[(X_1 - U_2)^2], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{P}_{X_0} and $\mathcal{P}_{X_1, Y_1 | X_0, U_1}$ are two given Gaussian distributions, and W_1, W_2 are two aux. RVs.

The two aux. RVs can be interpreted as follows: W_1 represents the independent codeword designed for the state-dependent channel with state X_0 , consistent with the Shannon strategy [26]. W_2 is correlated with both X_0 and W_1 , acting as a description of these two symbols. Both W_1 and W_2 are made available to the noncausal decoder. This formulation explicitly captures the dual role of control in Witsenhausen counterexample.

Remark 1. *The following Markov chains follow from the joint probability distribution (4):*

$$\begin{cases} X_0 \text{ is independent of } W_1, \\ U_1 \text{ } \ominus \text{ } (X_0, W_1) \text{ } \ominus \text{ } W_2, \\ (X_1, Y_1) \text{ } \ominus \text{ } (X_0, U_1) \text{ } \ominus \text{ } (W_1, W_2), \\ U_2 \text{ } \ominus \text{ } (W_1, W_2, Y_1) \text{ } \ominus \text{ } (X_0, U_1, X_1). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The first two Markov chains are consequences of causal encoding. The third Markov chain is related to the processing order of the Gaussian channel. The last Markov chain comes from non-causal decoding and symbol-wise reconstruction.

In order to investigate the optimal achievable cost pairs, we focus on the lower boundary of the 2-dimensional cost region characterized in Theorem II.3: For a given power cost $P \geq 0$, we aim to determine the minimum estimation cost at the decoder. Since the minimum mean square error (MMSE) estimation provides the optimal decoding policy and is given by the conditional expectation, we have the following lemma:

Lemma II.4. *Given a power cost parameter $P \geq 0$, the optimal estimation cost $S^*(P)$ is given by*

$$S^*(P) = \inf_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{P}(P)} \mathbb{E} \left[(X_1 - \mathbb{E}[X_1 | W_1, W_2, Y_1])^2 \right], \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(P) = \left\{ (\mathcal{P}_{W_1}, \mathcal{P}_{W_2 | X_0, W_1}, \mathcal{P}_{U_1 | X_0, W_1}) \text{ s.t. } P = \mathbb{E}[U_1^2] \right. \\ \left. I(W_1, W_2; Y_1) - I(W_2; X_0 | W_1) \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Next, we revisit Witsenhausen’s two-point strategy. Our findings in [25] show it outperforms both the best affine [25, Lemma III.3] and optimal joint Gaussian strategies [25, Theorem III.4] for some values of Q, N .

Theorem II.5 ([1, Sec. 6]). *For parameter $a \geq 0$, Witsenhausen’s two-point strategy is given by*

$$U_1 = a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0) - X_0.$$

The power and estimation costs are given by

$$P_2(a) = Q + a \left(a - 2\sqrt{\frac{2Q}{\pi}} \right), \quad (8)$$

$$S_2(a) = a^2 \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{N}} \phi \left(\frac{a}{\sqrt{N}} \right) \int \frac{\phi \left(\frac{y_1}{\sqrt{N}} \right)}{\cosh \left(\frac{ay_1}{N} \right)} dy_1, \quad (9)$$

where $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$ and the optimal receiver’s strategy is given by $\mathbb{E}[X_1 | Y_1 = y_1] = a \tanh \left(\frac{ay_1}{N} \right)$.

The core idea of the two-point strategy is that the encoder designates the system state $X_1 = U_1 + X_0 = a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0)$ to be binary, making it easier for the decoder to estimate. Inspired by this approach, in the next section, we introduce the ZEC scheme based on our coordination coding result in Theorem II.3. The ZEC method leverages the block-coding gain to reconstruct X_1 with no estimation cost while significantly reducing the required power cost.

III. THE ZERO ESTIMATION COST SCHEME

We propose the following design of aux. RVs involved in Theorem II.3, where W_1 is continuous Gaussian and W_2 is discrete binary¹. For given parameters $V_1, a \geq 0$,

$$\begin{cases} X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, Q), \\ W_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, V_1), \\ W_2 = a \cdot S, \text{ where } S = \text{sign}(X_0), \\ U_1 = W_1 + a \cdot S - X_0, \\ X_1 = U_1 + X_0 = W_1 + a \cdot S = W_1 + W_2, \\ Y_1 = X_1 + Z_1 = W_1 + W_2 + Z_1, \quad Z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N). \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

In this joint control-communication scheme, the system state X_1 is effectively communicated through the control action U_1 which encodes the two aux. RVs (W_1, W_2). Additionally, X_1 is deterministically represented by (W_1, W_2) , which are subsequently revealed to the noncausal decoder. Hence, the MMSE estimator $\mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1, W_2, Y_1]$ is of zero variance, resulting in a zero estimation cost (7).

Moreover, the power cost needed for this system is

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \mathbb{E}[U_1^2] = \mathbb{E}[(W_1 + a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0) - X_0)^2] \\ &= V_1 + \left(Q + a^2 - 2a\sqrt{\frac{2Q}{\pi}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, V_1 is uniquely determined by the parameter a which needs to satisfy the following power condition

$$V_1 = P - \left(Q + a^2 - 2a\sqrt{\frac{2Q}{\pi}} \right) \geq 0. \quad (11)$$

The information constraint (5) in bits becomes

$$\begin{aligned} I(W_1, W_2; Y_1) - I(W_2; X_0|W_1) \\ &= h(Y_1) - h(Y_1|W_1, W_2) - h(W_2|W_1) + h(W_2|X_0, W_1) \\ &= h(Y_1) - \frac{1}{2} \log_2(2\pi eN) - 1 \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $h(Y_1)$ is calculated with regard to the Gaussian mixture distribution of the following form

$$f_{Y_1}(y) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{(V_1+N)}} \left[\phi\left(\frac{y-a}{\sqrt{V_1+N}}\right) + \phi\left(\frac{y+a}{\sqrt{V_1+N}}\right) \right], \quad (13)$$

where $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right)$ is the standard Gaussian p.d.f.. Since there is no closed form for the entropy of Gaussian mixture distributions, methods discussed in [28, 29] can be employed for simulation.

We denote the set of parameters $a \geq 0$ that satisfy the power cost constraint (11) and the information constraint (12) by

$$\mathcal{A}^0(P) = \{a \geq 0 : h(Y_1) - \frac{1}{2} \log_2(2\pi eN) \geq 1, \quad (14)$$

$$\text{and } V_1 = P - \left(Q + a^2 - 2a\sqrt{\frac{2Q}{\pi}} \right) \geq 0\}.$$

¹This approach is similar to the hybrid coding scheme [27], which also combines digital and analog coding.

Based on the above derivation, the optimal cost function for the system is described in the following theorem:

Theorem III.1. *Given the power cost $P \geq 0$, the MMSE estimation cost for the ZEC coding scheme (10) is given by*

$$S_{\text{ZEC}}(P) = 0, \text{ for } P \geq P^*, \quad (15)$$

where the value

$$P^* = \min\{P : \mathcal{A}^0(P) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (16)$$

To satisfy the second constraint of the admissible condition in (14), the minimum power cost P^* for ZEC must satisfy

$$P^* \geq \min_a \left(Q + a^2 - 2a\sqrt{\frac{2Q}{\pi}} \right) = Q \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \right) = P_2^{\min},$$

where P_2^{\min} represents the minimum power cost required for the two-point strategy (8). This indicates that the ZEC scheme achieves improved estimation performance, at the expense of a higher power consumption than the original two-point strategy.

To illustrate the performance of the ZEC scheme, we compare its cost function $S_{\text{ZEC}}(P)$, with that of the original two-point strategy $S_2(P)$ given in (8)-(9), the best affine strategy $S_\ell(P)$ [25, Lemma III.3], and the optimal joint Gaussian strategy $S_G(P)$ [25, Theorem III.4] at $Q = 1, N = 0.15$ in Figure 2. As we can see, using only a slightly higher power cost than $P_2^{\min} = 0.363$, the ZEC scheme can already achieve a zero-estimation-cost system state reconstruction at $P^* = 0.383$. In contrast, all the other strategies, $S_2(P)$, $S_\ell(P)$, and $S_G(P)$, only achieve zero-estimation-cost reconstruction at a significantly bigger power cost of $P = Q = 1$.




Fig. 2. Comparison of the four cost functions $S_{\text{ZEC}}(P)$, $S_2(P)$, $S_\ell(P)$, and $S_G(P)$ at $Q = 1, N = 0.15$. Our proposed scheme strictly outperforms the other strategies and achieves a zero-estimation-cost state reconstruction when $P \geq P^* = 0.383$.

Figure 3 illustrates how P^* given in (16) varies with N when $Q = 1$. Notably, for small values of N , e.g. $N \leq 0.07$, $P^* = P_2^{\min} = 0.363$, indicating that zero-cost estimation can be achieved without any additional power expenditure compared to the original two-point strategy. However, when




Fig. 3. Variation of $P^*(N)$ with the noise N for $Q = 1$. $P^*(N)$ starts with $P_2^{\min} = 0.363$ at small N and increases to $P^*(N) = Q = 1$ for $N \geq 0.65$.

$N \geq 0.65$, $P^* \geq Q = 1$, meaning that the ZEC scheme can no longer provide a zero-estimation-cost block-coding gain.

Next, we extend the ZEC strategy to the Non-ZEC scheme. This extension introduces a trade-off between estimation accuracy and power cost, enabling a power cost reduction.

IV. THE NON-ZERO ESTIMATION COST SCHEME

In this section, we apply a test channel between the aux. RV W_2 and the source state X_0 with a cross-over probability γ . Given $V_1, a, \gamma \geq 0$, we consider

$$\begin{cases}
 X_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, Q), \\
 W_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, V_1), \\
 W_2 = \begin{cases} a \cdot S & \text{with probability } 1 - \gamma, \\ -a \cdot S & \text{with probability } \gamma, \end{cases} \\
 \text{where } S = \text{sign}(X_0), \\
 U_1 = W_1 + a \cdot S - X_0, \\
 X_1 = U_1 + X_0 = W_1 + a \cdot S \\
 Y_1 = X_1 + Z_1 = W_1 + a \cdot S + Z_1, \quad Z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N).
 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

The design of W_2 as a binary RV dependent on X_0 rather than a deterministic variable introduces additional randomness, which affects the estimation precision of X_1 from (W_1, W_2, Y_1) . Note that, if $\gamma = 0$ or 1 , the above system degrades to a deterministic relation, where $X_1 = W_1 + W_2$ or $X_1 = W_1 - W_2$, respectively. In either case, the estimation cost is zero, hence we recover the ZEC scheme. Furthermore, it can be shown that the MMSE remains the same for γ and $1 - \gamma$. Therefore, we can restrict our analysis to the case where $\gamma \in [0, 0.5]$, without loss of generality.

To simplify the presentation of the estimation cost result presented in Theorem IV.1, we define the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_0(w_1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_1}} \phi\left(\frac{w_1}{\sqrt{V_1}}\right), \\
 G_1(w_1, y_1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y_1 - (w_1 + a)}{\sqrt{N}}\right),
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_2(w_1, y_1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y_1 - (w_1 - a)}{\sqrt{N}}\right), \\
 I(w_1, y_1) &= G_0 \left[\frac{[(1 - \gamma)G_1 - \gamma G_2]^2}{(1 - \gamma)G_1 + \gamma G_2} + \frac{[\gamma G_1 - (1 - \gamma)G_2]^2}{\gamma G_1 + (1 - \gamma)G_2} \right],
 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, the admissible set of parameters

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{A}^\gamma(P) &= \{a \geq 0 : h(Y_1) + H_2(\gamma) - h(Y_1|W_1, W_2) \geq 1, \\
 &\text{and } V_1 = P - \left(Q + a^2 - 2a\sqrt{\frac{2Q}{\pi}}\right) \geq 0\}, \quad (18)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $h(Y_1)$ is the entropy calculated from the distribution defined in (13), $H_2(\gamma) = -\gamma \log_2(\gamma) - (1 - \gamma) \log_2(1 - \gamma)$ is a binary entropy function, and $h(Y_1|W_1, W_2)$ is the following Gaussian mixture entropy

$$h\left((1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y - a}{\sqrt{N}}\right) + \gamma \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y + a}{\sqrt{N}}\right)\right).$$

By setting $\gamma = 0$ or $\gamma = 1$, (18) recovers the admissible set $\mathcal{A}^0(P)$ of the ZEC scheme. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{A}^0(P) \subseteq \mathcal{A}^\gamma(P), \quad (19)$$

indicating that the Non-ZEC scheme permits lower power costs compared to the ZEC scheme.

A proof sketch for Theorem IV.1 using the above quantities is provided in the Appendix. The complete proof is available on arXiv.

Theorem IV.1. Given $P \geq P_2^{\min}$, the optimal estimation cost induced by the Non-ZEC scheme (17) is given by

$$S_{\text{Non-ZEC}}(P) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(P), \gamma \in [0, 0.5]} \{F(a, \gamma, P)\}, \quad (20)$$

$$F(a, \gamma, P) = a^2 - \frac{a^2}{2} \iint I(w_1, y_1) dw_1 dy_1. \quad (21)$$

In this theorem, $F(a, \gamma, P)$ represents the achievable estimation cost for given (a, γ) at power cost P , and we can minimize F over all admissible parameters $a \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(P)$, $\gamma \in [0, 0.5]$ to get the optimal result (20). Moreover, by plugging in $\gamma = 0$, we obtain $S_{\text{Non-ZEC}}(P) = S_{\text{ZEC}}(P)$, where $P \geq P^*$ in (16).

To analyze the performance of the Non-ZEC scheme, we examine how different values of $\gamma \in [0, 0.5]$ affect its achievable cost region. Figure 4 illustrates the function $F(a, \gamma, P)$ in (21) by plotting all the admissible points $a \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(P)$ at each $P \geq P_2^{\min}$, resulting in a 2-dimensional region, for fixed parameters of $\gamma \in \{0, 0.01, 0.1, 0.5\}$ compared to the original two-point strategy at $Q = 1$, $N = 0.15$.

As shown in Figure 4, $F(a, 0, P)$ aligns with the ZEC cost function $S_{\text{ZEC}}(P)$ in (15), as expected. Gradually increasing γ , which introduces more randomness in W_2 , allows for a reduction in power at the expense of estimation accuracy. Ultimately, when $\gamma = 0.5$, which means W_2 provides no information about the source X_0 at all, the power cost reaches its minimum, and the boundary of the cost function $F(a, 0.5, P)$ converges to that of the original two-point strategy.

In Figure 5, We plot the optimized achievable estimation cost function $S_{\text{Non-ZEC}}(P)$ in (20) and compare it with the




Fig. 4. Evolution of $F(a, \gamma, P)$ with different values of $\gamma = 0, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5$. When $\gamma = 0$, $F(a, 0, P) = S_{\text{ZEC}}(P)$ in (15), and when $\gamma = 0.5$, $F(a, 0.5, P)$ recovers the cost region boundary of two-point strategy.

other three costs $S_2(P)$, $S_\ell(P)$ and $S_G(P)$. The numerical results indicate that the Non-ZEC scheme functions effectively as a time-sharing mechanism between the ZEC scheme and the original two-point strategy. Moreover, $S_{\text{t-s}}(P)$ represents the cost function resulting from the time-sharing operation between the optimal Gaussian strategy $S_G(P)$ and the ZEC strategy $S_{\text{ZEC}}(P)$, which in this scenario, demonstrates to be superior to the Non-ZEC scheme.




Fig. 5. Comparison of the four closed-form cost functions $S_{\text{Non-ZEC}}(P)$, $S_2(P)$, $S_\ell(P)$, $S_G(P)$, and the induced time-sharing cost $S_{\text{t-s}}(P)$ at $Q = 1$, $N = 0.15$.

V. CONCLUSION

Our proposed joint control-communication schemes improve the overall power-estimation performance of Witsenhausen counterexample. In particular, the ZEC scheme significantly reduces the minimum power required for zero-estimation-cost system state reconstruction at the decoder from

$P = Q$ to P^* . However, it remains unknown whether P^* is the universal minimum power to achieve zero-cost estimation. Furthermore, the current numerical results show that the Non-ZEC scheme is outperformed by the time-sharing mechanism between the optimal Gaussian strategy and the ZEC scheme. Whether there exist scenarios where the Non-ZEC scheme can outperform this time-sharing mechanism remains unknown.

APPENDIX

Proof Sketch for Theorem IV.1. Using the properties of mutual information, the chain rule of differential entropy, and the Markov chain (6), the constraint (5) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} I(W_1, W_2; Y_1) - I(W_2; X_0|W_1) \\ = h(Y_1) + h(W_2|X_0, W_1) - h(Y_1|W_1, W_2) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $h(Y_1)$ and $h(Y_1|W_1, W_2)$ are Gaussian mixture entropies and $h(W_2|X_0, W_1)$ is the binary entropy, as we defined above. Combined with the power constraint, same as in (11), the admissible set is given by (18).

Next, in order to obtain the MMSE, we need the following conditional distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(x_1|w_1, w_2, y_1) = \mathbb{P}(s|w_1, w_2, y_1), \text{ where } s = \text{sign}(x_0).$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(s = 1|w_1, w_2, y_1) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1}{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}, \\ \mathbb{P}(s = -1|w_1, w_2, y_1) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, W_2 = a, y_1] &= w_1 + a \frac{(1-\gamma)G_1 - \gamma G_2}{(1-\gamma)G_1 + \gamma G_2}, \\ \mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, W_2 = -a, y_1] &= w_1 + a \frac{\gamma G_1 - (1-\gamma)G_2}{(1-\gamma)G_1 + \gamma G_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the hybrid joint distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = a, y_1) &= \frac{G_0}{2} [(1-\gamma)G_1 + \gamma G_2], \\ \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = -a, y_1) &= \frac{G_0}{2} [\gamma G_1 + (1-\gamma)G_2]. \end{aligned}$$

The MMSE for given $a \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(P)$, $\gamma \in [0, 0.5]$ is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(X_1 - \mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1, W_2, Y_1])^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] - \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1, W_2, Y_1])^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(W_1 + a \cdot S)^2] \\ &\quad - \sum_{w_2 \in \{a, -a\}} \iint (\mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, w_2, y_1])^2 \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2, y_1) dw_1 dy_1 \\ &= a^2 - \frac{a^2}{2} \iint I(w_1, y_1) dw_1 dy_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] H. S. Witsenhausen, "A counterexample in stochastic optimum control," *SIAM Journal on Control*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 131–147, 1968.
- [2] R. Bansal and T. Başar, "Stochastic teams with nonclassical information revisited: When is an affine law optimal?," in *1986 American Control Conference*, pp. 45–50, IEEE, 1986.
- [3] E. I. Silva, G. C. Goodwin, and D. E. Quevedo, "Control system design subject to SNR constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 428–436, 2010.
- [4] S. Yüksel and T. Başar, *Stochastic networked control systems: Stabilization and optimization under information constraints*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [5] A. Gupta, S. Yüksel, T. Başar, and C. Langbort, "On the existence of optimal policies for a class of static and sequential dynamic teams," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 1681–1712, 2015.
- [6] N. C. Martins and M. A. Dahleh, "Fundamental limitations of performance in the presence of finite capacity feedback," in *Proceedings of the 2005, American Control Conference, 2005.*, pp. 79–86, IEEE, 2005.
- [7] J. S. Freudenberg and R. H. Middleton, "Feedback control performance over a noisy communication channel," in *2008 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, pp. 232–236, IEEE, 2008.
- [8] M. S. Derpich and J. Ostergaard, "Improved upper bounds to the causal quadratic rate-distortion function for gaussian stationary sources," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 3131–3152, 2012.
- [9] A. Agrawal, F. Danard, B. Larrousse, and S. Lasaulce, "Implicit coordination in two-agent team problems with continuous action sets. application to the Witsenhausen cost function," in *European Control Conference, ECC 2015, Linz, Austria, July 15-17, 2015*, pp. 1854–1859, IEEE, 2015.
- [10] E. Akyol, C. Langbort, and T. Başar, "Information-theoretic approach to strategic communication as a hierarchical game," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 105, no. 2, pp. 205–218, 2017.
- [11] C. D. Charalambous, C. Kourtellis, and I. Tzortzis, "Hierarchical optimality of linear controllers-encoders-decoders operating at control-coding capacity of LQG control systems," in *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 3682–3687, IEEE, 2017.
- [12] M. Wiese, T. J. Oechtering, K. H. Johansson, P. Papadimitratos, H. Sandberg, and M. Skoglund, "Secure estimation and zero-error secrecy capacity," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1047–1062, 2018.
- [13] P. A. Stavrou, M. Skoglund, and T. Tanaka, "Sequential source coding for stochastic systems subject to finite rate constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 8, pp. 3822–3835, 2022.
- [14] P. Grover and A. Sahai, "Witsenhausen's counterexample as assisted interference suppression," *International Journal of Systems, Control and Communications*, vol. 2, pp. 197–237, 2010.
- [15] A. El Gamal and Y. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [16] Y.-H. Kim, A. Sutivong, and T. M. Cover, "State amplification," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 1850–1859, 2008.
- [17] O. Sumszyk and Y. Steinberg, "Information embedding with reversible stegotext," in *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 2728–2732, IEEE, 2009.
- [18] C. Choudhuri, Y.-H. Kim, and U. Mitra, "Causal state communication," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 3709–3719, 2013.
- [19] P. W. Cuff, H. H. Permuter, and T. M. Cover, "Coordination capacity," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4181–4206, 2010.
- [20] P. Cuff and C. Schieler, "Hybrid codes needed for coordination over the point-to-point channel," in *2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pp. 235–239, IEEE, 2011.
- [21] P. Cuff and L. Zhao, "Coordination using implicit communication," in *2011 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, pp. 467–471, IEEE, 2011.
- [22] M. Le Treust and T. J. Oechtering, "Power-estimation trade-off of vector-valued Witsenhausen counterexample with causal decoder," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 1588–1609, 2024.
- [23] M. Zhao, M. Le Treust, and T. J. Oechtering, "Causal vector-valued Witsenhausen counterexamples with feedback," in *2024 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pp. 687–692, IEEE, 2024.
- [24] M. Zhao, M. Le Treust, and T. J. Oechtering, "Coordination coding with causal encoder for vector-valued Witsenhausen counterexample," in *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 3255–3260, IEEE, 2024.
- [25] M. Zhao, T. J. Oechtering, and M. L. Treust, "Optimal gaussian strategies for vector-valued Witsenhausen counterexample with non-causal state estimator," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02807*, 2024.
- [26] C. E. Shannon, "Channels with side information at the transmitter," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 289–293, 1958.
- [27] M. Skoglund, N. Phamdo, and F. Alajaji, "Hybrid digital-analog source-channel coding for bandwidth compression/expansion," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 3757–3763, 2006.
- [28] M. F. Huber, T. Bailey, H. Durrant-Whyte, and U. D. Hanebeck, "On entropy approximation for gaussian mixture random vectors," in *2008 IEEE International Conference on Multisensor Fusion and Integration for Intelligent Systems*, pp. 181–188, IEEE, 2008.
- [29] S. M. Kim, T. T. Do, T. J. Oechtering, and G. Peters, "On the entropy computation of large complex gaussian mixture distributions," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 17, pp. 4710–4723, 2015.
- [30] M. S. Pinsker, "Information and information stability of random variables and processes," *Holden-Day*, 1964.

APPENDIX

Full Derivation for Theorem IV.1. Since the Non-ZEC coordination-coding scheme (17) incorporates both a continuous RV W_1 , and a discrete RV W_2 , we must account for both the counting measure μ and the Lebesgue measure λ in our analysis. The information-theoretic expressions follow the Radon-Nikodym derivative, see more in [30]. Using the Radon-Nikodym derivative allows us to define the entropy for mixed discrete and continuous RVs with a behavior similar to the discrete or differential entropy. Consequently, we can reformulate the information constraint as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & I(W_1, W_2; Y_1) - I(W_2; X_0|W_1) \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} h(Y_1) + h(W_2|X_0, W_1) - h(Y_1|W_1, W_2) - h(W_2). \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{=} h(Y_1) + h(W|X_0, W_1) - h(Y_1|W_1, W_2) - h(W) \end{aligned}$$

where (a) comes from the chain rule of mutual information, (b) comes from denoting

$$W = W_2/a \sim \begin{cases} S & \text{with probability } 1 - \gamma, \\ -S & \text{with probability } \gamma, \end{cases}$$

where $S = \text{sign}(X_0)$. Moreover, because of the basic property of differential entropy that $h(cX) = h(X) + \log|c|$ and we can cancel the constant $\log|a|$ appeared in both the second and fourth terms.

Next, we examine each entropy term respectively

- $h(Y_1)$: Since $Y_1 = W_1 + a \cdot S + Z_1$ and $W_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp Z_1$ are both Gaussian distributed, the conditional distribution is

$$f_{Y_1|S}(y|s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(V_1 + N)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - a \cdot s)^2}{2(V_1 + N)}\right).$$

Moreover, since $f_S(s = -1) = f_S(s = +1) = \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Y_1}(y) &= \sum_{s \in \{-1, +1\}} f_{Y_1|S}(y|s) f_S(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{(V_1 + N)}} \left(\phi\left(\frac{y - a}{\sqrt{V_1 + N}}\right) + \phi\left(\frac{y + a}{\sqrt{V_1 + N}}\right) \right), \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

according to which we can calculate $h(Y_1)$.

- $h(W|X_0, W_1)$: Since W is independent of $W_1 = w_1$ once $X_0 = x_0$ is given, we have

$$W|X_0 = x_0, W_1 = w_1 \sim \begin{cases} s & \text{with probability } 1 - \gamma, \\ -s & \text{with probability } \gamma, \end{cases}$$

is a binary discrete probability distribution. Thus.

$$h(W|X_0, W_1) = H_2(\gamma) = -[(1 - \gamma) \log_2(1 - \gamma) + \gamma \log_2 \gamma]. \tag{23}$$

- $h(Y_1|W_1, W_2)$: Because

$$\begin{aligned} h(Y_1|W_1, W_2) &= h(W_1 + a \cdot S + Z_1|W_1, W_2) \\ &= h(a \cdot S + Z_1|W_2). \end{aligned}$$

The conditional distribution takes the following form

$$a \cdot S + Z_1|W_2 = a \sim \begin{cases} a + Z_1 & \text{with probability } 1 - \gamma, \\ -a + Z_1 & \text{with probability } \gamma. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, since $Z_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N)$ is an independent RV,

$$f(a \cdot S + Z_1|W_2 = a) = (1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y - a}{\sqrt{N}}\right) + \gamma \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y + a}{\sqrt{N}}\right),$$

is also a Gaussian mixture distribution.

And on the other hand,

$$f(a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0) + Z_1|W_2 = -a) = \gamma \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y - a}{\sqrt{N}}\right) + (1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y + a}{\sqrt{N}}\right).$$

We can see that the above two Gaussian mixture distributions are just swapped mixture weights and the shape of one is just “mirrored” left-to-right of the other one. Hence, the differential entropy (which is shift-invariant in the sense of mixing) remains the same. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& h(a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0) + Z_1|W_2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}h(a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0) + Z_1|W_2 = a) + \frac{1}{2}h(a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0) + Z_1|W_2 = -a) \\
&= h(a \cdot \text{sign}(X_0) + Z_1|W_2 = a) \\
&= h\left(\left(1 - \gamma\right)\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\phi\left(\frac{y - a}{\sqrt{N}}\right) + \gamma\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\phi\left(\frac{y + a}{\sqrt{N}}\right)\right). \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

- $h(W)$: Since the marginal $P(W = 1) = P(W = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain $h(W) = 1$.

Given the above results (22) - (24) for calculating the information constraint, together with the power constraint, same as in (11), the admissible set is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^\gamma(P) &= \{a \geq 0 : h(Y_1) + H_2(\gamma) - h(Y_1|W_1, W_2) \geq 1, \\
&\text{and } V_1 = P - \left(Q + a^2 - 2a\sqrt{\frac{2Q}{\pi}}\right) \geq 0\},
\end{aligned}$$

as in (18).

Next, given $\gamma \in [0, 0.5]$, $P \geq 0$, and for a feasible parameter $a \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(P)$, we are interested in deriving the MMSE estimator of X_1 given $W_1 = w_1, W_2 = w_2, Y_1 = y_1$, namely,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, w_2, y_1] = \int x_1 f(x_1|w_1, w_2, y_1) dx_1.$$

Hence, we need the closed-form expression of the following conditional probability distribution:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(x_1|w_1, w_2, y_1) &= \mathbb{P}(w_1 + a \cdot s|w_1, w_2, y_1) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(s|w_1, w_2, y_1),
\end{aligned}$$

which reduces to a two-point distribution. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(s = 1|w_1, w_2, y_1) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(s = 1, w_2, y_1|w_1)}{\mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1)} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s = 1)\mathbb{P}(s = 1|w_1)}{\sum_{s' \in \{-1, 1\}} \mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s')\mathbb{P}(s'|w_1)} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s = 1)\mathbb{P}(s = 1)}{\sum_{s' \in \{-1, 1\}} \mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s')\mathbb{P}(s')} \\
&= \frac{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s = 1)}{\sum_{s' \in \{-1, 1\}} \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s')} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s = 1)}{\sum_{s' \in \{-1, 1\}} \mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s')} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(y_1|w_1, s = 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1, w_1, y_1)}{\sum_{s' \in \{-1, 1\}} \mathbb{P}(w_2, y_1|w_1, s')} \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Y_1 = W_1 + a \cdot S + Z_1$, the term $\mathbb{P}(y_1|w_1, s = 1)$ above becomes a Gaussian distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(y_1|w_1, s = 1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\phi\left(\frac{y_1 - (w_1 + a)}{\sqrt{N}}\right) = G_1.$$

Moreover, because of the Markov chain $W_2 \text{---} S \text{---} (W_1, Y_1)$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1, w_1, y_1) = \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1).$$

Therefore, (25) becomes

$$\mathbb{P}(s = 1|w_1, w_2, y_1) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1}{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}.$$

where $G_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\phi\left(\frac{y_1 - (w_1 - a)}{\sqrt{N}}\right)$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(s = -1|w_1, w_2, y_1) &= 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1}{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}.\end{aligned}$$

This means,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(x_1 = w_1 + a|w_1, w_2, y_1) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1}{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}, \\ \mathbb{P}(x_1 = w_1 - a|w_1, w_2, y_1) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}{\mathbb{P}(w_2|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2|s = -1)G_2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, when $w_2 = a$, the MMSE estimator is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1 = w_1, W_2 = a, Y_1 = y_1] &= w_1 + \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2 = a|s = 1)G_1 - \mathbb{P}(w_2 = a|s = -1)G_2}{\mathbb{P}(w_2 = a|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2 = a|s = -1)G_2} \cdot a \\ &= w_1 + \frac{(1 - \gamma)G_1 - \gamma G_2}{(1 - \gamma)G_1 + \gamma G_2} \cdot a.\end{aligned}$$

And on the other hand, when $w_2 = -a$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1 = w_1, W_2 = -a, Y_1 = y_1] &= w_1 + \frac{\mathbb{P}(w_2 = -a|s = 1)G_1 - \mathbb{P}(w_2 = -a|s = -1)G_2}{\mathbb{P}(w_2 = -a|s = 1)G_1 + \mathbb{P}(w_2 = -a|s = -1)G_2} \cdot a \\ &= w_1 + \frac{\gamma G_1 - (1 - \gamma)G_2}{\gamma G_1 + (1 - \gamma)G_2} \cdot a.\end{aligned}$$

And the joint distribution of (w_1, w_2, y_1) when $w_2 = a$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = a, y_1) &= f(w_1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(a, y_1|w_1) \\ &= f(w_1) \left(\sum_{s' \in \{-1, 1\}} \mathbb{P}(a, y_1|w_1, s')\mathbb{P}(s') \right) \\ &= \frac{f(w_1)}{2} \left(\sum_{s' \in \{-1, 1\}} \mathbb{P}(y_1|w_1, s') \cdot \mathbb{P}(a|s') \right) \\ &= \frac{G_0}{2} [(1 - \gamma)G_1 + \gamma G_2],\end{aligned}$$

where $G_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_1}}\phi\left(\frac{w_1}{\sqrt{V_1}}\right)$. Similarly, if we plug in $w_2 = -a$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = -a, y_1) = \frac{G_0}{2} [\gamma G_1 + (1 - \gamma)G_2].$$

Next, we calculate the expected squared MMSE estimation in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1, W_2, Y_1])^2 \right] & \tag{26} \\ &= \iiint (\mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, w_2, y_1])^2 \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2, y_1) dw_1 dw_2 dy_1 \\ &= \sum_{w_2 \in \{a, -a\}} \iint (\mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, w_2, y_1])^2 \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2, y_1) dw_1 dy_1 \\ &= \iint (\mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, w_2 = a, y_1])^2 \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = a, y_1) dw_1 dy_1 + \iint (\mathbb{E}[X_1|w_1, w_2 = -a, y_1])^2 \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = -a, y_1) dw_1 dy_1 \\ &= \iint w_1^2 \cdot [\mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = a, y_1) + \mathbb{P}(w_1, w_2 = -a, y_1)] dw_1 dy_1 + a \iint G_0 [(1 - \gamma)G_1 - \gamma G_2] w_1 dw_1 dy_1\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + a \iint G_0 [\gamma G_1 - (1 - \gamma)G_2] w_1 dw_1 dy_1 + \frac{a^2}{2} \iint G_0 \frac{[(1 - \gamma)G_1 - \gamma G_2]^2}{(1 - \gamma)G_1 + \gamma G_2} dw_1 dy_1 + \frac{a^2}{2} \iint G_0 \frac{[\gamma G_1 - (1 - \gamma)G_2]^2}{\gamma G_1 + (1 - \gamma)G_2} dw_1 dy_1 \\
& = \mathbb{E}[W_1^2] + a \iint G_0 [G_1 - G_2] w_1 dw_1 dy_1 + \frac{a^2}{2} \iint I(w_1, y_1) dw_1 dy_1.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term above is $\mathbb{E}[W_1^2] = V_1$. Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iint G_0 G_1 w_1 dw_1 dy_1 \\
& = \iint \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_1}} \phi\left(\frac{w_1}{\sqrt{V_1}}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y_1 - (w_1 + a)}{\sqrt{N}}\right) w_1 dw_1 dy_1 \\
& = \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_1}} \phi\left(\frac{w_1}{\sqrt{V_1}}\right) w_1 \left[\int \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y_1 - (w_1 + a)}{\sqrt{N}}\right) dy_1 \right] dw_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inner integral is with regard to the distribution of $Y_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(w_1 + a, N)$ conditioned on $W_1 = w_1$, therefore the integral value is actually a cumulative distribution with

$$\int \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \phi\left(\frac{y_1 - (w_1 + a)}{\sqrt{N}}\right) dy_1 = 1,$$

and in this way, the outer integral becomes

$$\int \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_1}} \phi\left(\frac{w_1}{\sqrt{V_1}}\right) w_1 dw_1 = a \cdot \mathbb{E}[W_1] = 0.$$

Similarly, we can obtain

$$\iint G_0 G_2 w_1 dw_1 dy_1 = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$a \iint G_0 [G_1 - G_2] w_1 dw_1 dy_1 = 0.$$

Therefore, the MMSE of estimating $X_1 = W_1 + a \cdot S$ given W_1, W_2, Y_1 is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(X_1 - \mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1, W_2, Y_1])^2] & = \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] - \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1, W_2, Y_1])^2] \\
& = \mathbb{E}[(W_1 + a \cdot S)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[X_1|W_1, W_2, Y_1])^2] \\
& = V_1 + a^2 - V_1 - \frac{a^2}{2} \iint I(w_1, y_1) dw_1 dy_1 \\
& = a^2 - \frac{a^2}{2} \iint I(w_1, y_1) dw_1 dy_1.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem IV.1

□