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Abstract—We provide a single letter characterization of the capacity region for independent, identically distributed, finite-state channels, with partial (quantized) state information, when the channel state information is available at the receiver. The partial state information is asymmetric at the encoders. The problem is practically relevant, and provides a tractable optimization problem. We also consider the case where the channel has memory.

I. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Wireless communication channels and Internet are examples of channels where the channel characteristics are variable. Channel fading models for wireless communications include fast fading and slow fading; in fast fading the channel state is assumed to be changing for each use of the channel, whereas in slow fading, the channel is assumed to be constant for each finite block length. In fading channels, the channel fade might not be transmitted to the transmitter over a perfect channel, but via reducing the data rate, the error in feedback transmission can be improved.

Capacity with partial channel state information at the transmitter is related to the problem of coding with unequal side information at the encoder and the decoder. The capacity of memoryless channels with various cases of side information being available at either, either or both the transmitter and receiver have been studied in [12] and [5]. [1] studied the capacity of channels with memory and complete noiseless output feedback and introduced a stochastic control formulation for the computation via the properties of the directed mutual information. Reference [6] considered fading channels with perfect channel state information at the transmitter, and showed that with instantaneous and perfect state feedback, the transmitter can adjust the data rates for each channel state to maximize the average transmission rate. Viswanathan [15] relaxed this assumption of perfect instantaneous feedback, and studied the capacity of Markovian channels with delayed feedback. Reference [16] studied the capacity of Markov channels with perfect causal state feedback. Capacity of Markovian, finite state channels with quantized state feedback available at the transmitter was studied in [2].

A related work [9] has studied MAC channels where the encoders have degraded information on the channel state, which is coded to the encoders. In this paper, we consider a setting where the encoders have asymmetric partial state information, where the partial information is obtained through a quantizer.

Another recent related work is [20] which provided an infinite-dimensional characterization for the capacity region for Multiple Access Channels with feedback.

We use tools from team decision theory to develop our result [17], [18]. We also discuss the case where the channel state has Markovian dynamics.

II. CAPACITY OF 1.1.D FINITE-STATE MAC CHANNEL WITH ASYMMETRIC PARTIAL STATE FEEDBACK

In the following, we shall present some notation, before formally stating the problem. For a vector v, and
a positive integer \(i, v_i\) will denote the \(i\)-th entry of \(v\), while \(v_{[i]} = (v_1, \ldots, v_i)\) denotes the vector of the first \(i\) entries of \(v\). Following the usual convention, capital letters will be used to denote random variables (r.v.s), and small letters denote particular realizations. We shall use the standard notation \(H(\cdot)\), and \(I(\cdot; \cdot)\) (respectively \(H(\cdot|\cdot)\), and \(I(\cdot; \cdot|\cdot)\)) for the (conditional) binary entropy and mutual information of r.v.s. For \(0 \leq x \leq 1\), \(H(x)\) will also denote the binary entropy of \(x\). Finally, the decoder is assumed to have access to perfect causal state information; the estimated message pair will be denoted by \(\hat{W}\).

We shall consider a finite state, multiple access channel with two transmitters, indexed by \(i = a, b\), and one receiver. Transmitter \(i\) aims at reliably communicating a message \(W_i\), uniformly distributed over some finite message set \(W_i\), to the receiver. The two messages \(W_a\) and \(W_b\) are assumed to be mutually independent. We shall use the notation \(W := (W_a, W_b)\) for the vector of the two messages.

The channel state process is modeled by a sequence \(S = (S_t)\) of independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) r.v.s, taking values in some finite state space \(S\), and independent from \(W\). The two encoders have access to causal, partial state information: at each time \(t \geq 1\), encoder \(i\) observes \(V_i^t = q_i(S_t)\), where \(q_i: S \rightarrow V_i\) is a quantizer modeling the imperfection in the state information. We shall denote by \(V_i := (V_i^n, V_i^t)\) the vector of quantized state observations, taking values in \(V := V_a \times V_b\). The channel input of encoder \(i\) at time \(t\), \(X_i^t\), takes values in a finite set \(X_i\), and is assumed a function of the locally available information \((W_i, V_i^t)\).

The symbol \(X_i = (X_i^n, X_i^t)\) will be used for the vector of the two channel inputs at time \(t\), taking values in \(V := V_a \times V_b\). The channel output at time \(t\), \(Y_t\), takes values in a finite set \(Y\); its conditional distribution satisfies

\[
P(Y_t|W, X_{[t]}, S_{[t]}) = P(Y_t|X_t, S_t).
\]

(1)

Finally, the decoder is assumed to have access to perfect causal state information; the estimated message pair will be denoted by \(\hat{W} = (W_a, W_b)\).

We now present the class of transmission systems.

**Definition 1:** For a rate pair \(R = (R_a, R_b) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2\), a block-length \(n \geq 1\), and a target error probability \(\varepsilon \geq 0\), an \((R, n, \varepsilon)\)-coding scheme consists of two sequences of functions

\[
\{\phi_i^t : W_i \times V_i^t \rightarrow X_i\}_{1 \leq t \leq n},
\]

and a decoding function

\[
\psi : S^n \times Y^n \rightarrow W_a \times W_b,
\]

such that, for \(i = a, b, 1 \leq t \leq n:\)

- \(|W_i| \geq 2^{nR_i}\);
- \(X_i^t = \phi_i^t(W_i, V_i^t)\);
- \(\hat{W} := \psi(S_{[t]}, Y_{[t]})\);
- \(\mathbb{P}(\hat{W} \neq W) \leq \varepsilon\).

Upon the description of the channel and transmission systems, we now proceed with the computation of the capacity region.

**Definition 2:** A rate pair \(R \in \mathbb{R}_+^2\) is achievable if, for all \(\varepsilon > 0\), there exists, for some \(n \geq 1\), an \((R, n, \varepsilon)\)-coding scheme. The capacity region of the finite state MAC is the closure of the set of all achievable rate pairs.

We now introduce static team policies and their associated rate regions.

**Definition 3:** A static team policy is a family

\[
\pi = \{\pi_i(\cdot|x_i) \in P(X_i)| i = a, b, x_i \in V_i\}
\]

(2)

of probability distributions on the two channel input sets conditioned on the quantized observation of each transmitter. For every static team policy \(\pi, \mathcal{R}(\pi)\) will denote the region of all rate pairs \(R = (R_a, R_b) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2\) satisfying

\[
R_a < I(X_a; Y|X_b, S) \leq I(X_a; Y|S),
\]

(3)

where \(S, X = (X_a, X_b)\), and \(Y\), are r.v.s whose joint distribution factorizes as

\[
P(S, X_a, X_b, Y) = P(S)\pi_a(X_a|q_a(S))\pi_b(X_b|q_b(S))P(Y|S, X_a, X_b).
\]

(4)

We can now state the main result of the paper.

**Theorem 4:** The achievable rate region is given by

\[
\mathcal{R}(\cup_\mu \mathcal{R}(\mu))
\]

the closure of the convex hull of the rate regions associated to all possible static team policies \(\pi\) as in (2). In the sequel, we shall prove this theorem.

### III. converse to the channel theorem

For \(R \in \mathbb{R}_+^2\), and \(0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/2\), let us consider a \((R, n, \varepsilon)\)-code. Fano’s inequality implies that

\[
H(W|Y_{[n]}; S_{[n]}) \leq H(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \log(|W_a||W_b|).
\]

(5)

For \(t \geq 1\), define

\[
\Delta_t := I(W_t; Y_{[t]}, S_{t+1}|Y_{[t-1]}, S_{[t]}),
\]

and observe that

\[
\sum_{1 \leq t \leq N} \Delta_t = H(W_{[N]}) - H(W|S_{[N+1]}, Y_{[N]})
\]

\[
= \log(|W_a||W_b|) - H(W|S_{[n]}, Y_{[n]}),
\]

(6)
since $S_1$ is independent of $W$, and $S_{t+1}$ is conditionally independent of $W$ given $(S_n, Y_n)$. On the other hand, using the conditional independence of $W$ from $S_{t+1}$ given $(S_t, Y_t)$, one gets

$$\Delta_t = I(W; Y_t, S_{t+1} | Y_{[t-1]}, S_t)$$

$$= I(W; Y_t | Y_{[t-1]}, S_t)$$

$$= H(Y_t | Y_{[t-1]}, S_t) - H(Y_t | W, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t)$$

$$\leq H(Y_t | S_t) - H(Y_t | W, S_t)$$

$$= I(W; Y_t | S_t),$$

(7)

where the above inequality follows from the fact that $H(Y_t | Y_{[t-1]}, S_t) \leq H(Y_t | S_t)$, since removing the conditioning does not decrease the entropy, while $H(Y_t | W, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t) = H(Y_t | W, S_t)$, as $Y_t$ is conditionally independent from $Y_{[t-1]}$ given $(W, S_t)$, due to the absence of output feedback. Since $(W, S_t) - X_t - Y_t$ forms a Markov chain, the data processing inequality implies that

$$I(W; Y_t | S_t) \leq I(X_t; Y_t | S_t).$$

(8)

By combining (5), (6), (7) and (8), we then get

$$R_a + R_b \leq \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{W}_a|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} I(X_t; Y_t | S_t) + \frac{H(\varepsilon)}{n(1 - \varepsilon)}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} I(X_t; Y_t | S_t) + \eta(\varepsilon)$$

$$\leq \sum_{s \in S^{(n)}} \alpha_s I(X_t; Y_t | S_t, S_{[t-1]} = s) + \eta(\varepsilon),$$

(9)

where

$$\eta(\varepsilon) := \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \log |\mathcal{Y}| + \frac{H(\varepsilon)}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

(10)

is such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \eta(\varepsilon) = 0,$$

(11)

and

$$\alpha_s := \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P}(S_{[t-1]} = s), \quad s \in S^{(n)},$$

(12)

are such that

$$\sum_{s \in S^{(n)}} \alpha_s = 1.$$

(13)

Analogously, let us focus on encoder $a$: by Fano’s inequality, we have that

$$H(W_a | Y_{[n]}; S_{[n]}) \leq H(\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \log (|W_a|).$$

(14)

For $t \geq 1$, define

$$\Delta_t^b := I(W_a; Y_t, S_{t+1} | W_b, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t),$$

and observe that

$$\sum_{1 \leq t \leq n} \Delta_t^b = H(W_1 | S_1, W_2) - H(W_a | W_b, S_{[n+1]}, Y_{[n]})$$

$$\geq \log |\mathcal{W}_a| - H(W_a | S_{[n]}, Y_{[n]}),$$

(15)

where the last inequality follows from the independence between $W_a, S_1$, and $W_b$, and the fact that removing the conditioning does not decrease the entropy. Now, we have

$$\Delta_t^b = I(W_a; Y_t, S_{t+1} | W_b, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t)$$

$$= I(W_a; Y_t | W_b, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t)$$

$$= H(Y_t | W_b, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t) - H(Y_t | W_b, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t)$$

$$\leq H(Y_t | W_b, S_t) - H(Y_t | W_b, S_t)$$

$$= I(W_a; Y_t | W_b, S_t),$$

(16)

where the inequality above follows from the fact that $H(Y_t | W_b, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t) \leq H(Y_t | W_b, S_t)$ since removing the conditioning does not decrease the entropy, and that $H(Y_t | W_b, Y_{[t-1]}, S_t) = H(Y_t | W, S_t)$ due to absence of output feedback. Observe that, since, conditioned on $W_b$ and $S_t$ (hence, on $X_t^b$), $W_a - X_a - Y_t$ forms a Markov chain, the data processing inequality implies that

$$I(W_a; Y_t | W_b, S_t) \leq I(X_t^a; Y_t | X_t^b, S_t).$$

(17)

By combining (14), (15), (16), and (17), one gets

$$R_a \leq \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{W}_a|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} I(X_t^a; Y_t | X_t^b, S_t) + \frac{H(\varepsilon)}{n - \varepsilon}$$

$$\leq \sum_{s \in S^{(n)}} \alpha_s I(X_t^a; Y_t | X_t^b, S_t, S_{[t-1]} = s) + \eta(\varepsilon).$$

(18)

In the same way, by reversing the roles of encoder $a$ and $b$, one obtains

$$R_b \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s \in S^{(n)}} I(X_t^b; Y_t | X_t^a, S_t, S_{[t-1]} = s) + \eta(\varepsilon).$$

(19)

Observe that, for all $s_t \in S^t, x = (x_a, x_b) \in \mathcal{X}$, and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_t = s_t, X_t = x, Y_t = y | S_{[t-1]} = s_{[t-1]})$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(S_t = s_t | S_{[t-1]} = s_{[t-1]}) \mathbb{P}(X_t = x | S_t = s_t) \mathbb{P}(y | x_t, s_t),$$

(20)

the former above equality following from (1), the latter being implied by the assumption that the channel state sequence is i.i.d.

Now, recall that $X_t^i = \phi_t^i(W_i, V_i)$, for $i = a, b$. For $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i, v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i$, and $s \in S^{t-1}$, let us consider the set $\mathcal{Y}_s^i(x_i, v_i)$, let us consider the set $\mathcal{Y}_s^i(x_i, v_i) := \{ w_i : \phi_t^i(w_i, q_i(s_t), \ldots, q(s_{t-1}), v_i) = x_i \}$, and the probability distribution $\pi_s^i(v_i | v_i) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}_i)$,

$$\pi_s^i(x_i | v_i) := \sum_{w_i \in \mathcal{Y}_s^i(x_i, v_i)} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{W}_i|^{-1}} \mathbb{P}(w_i) \prod_{s \in S^{t-1}} \mathbb{P}(s_t) \mathbb{P}(x_t) \mathbb{P}(y_t | x_t, s_t),$$

(21)
Then, we have

\[ P(X_t = x | S_{[t]} = s_{[t]}) = \sum_w P(X_t = x | S_{[t]} = s_{[t]}, W = w) P(W = w | S_{[t]}) \]
\[ = \sum_w P(X_t = x | S_{[t]} = s_{[t]}, W = w) |W_a|^{-1} |W_b|^{-1} \]
\[ = \sum_{w_a \in \mathcal{T}_a(x, q_a(s_i))} \sum_{w_b \in \mathcal{T}_b(x, q_b(s_i))} |w_a|^{-1} |w_b|^{-1} \]
\[ = \pi^a_w(x_a | q_a(s_i)) \pi^b_w(x_b | q_b(s_i)), \]

(21)

the second inequality above following from the mutual independence of \( S_{[t]}, W_a, \) and \( W_b. \)

It thus follows from (20) and (21) that the conditional joint distribution of \( S_t, X_t = (X^a_t, X^b_t), \) and \( Y_t, \) given \( S_{[t-1]} = s, \) factorizes as in (4). Hence, (9), (18), and (19), together with (11) and (13), imply that any achievable data rate \( R = (R_a, R_b) \) can be written as a convex combination of rate pairs satisfying (3). Hence, any achievable rate pair \( R \) belongs to \( \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{U}_R, \mathcal{R}(\mu)). \)

**Remark:** For the validity of the arguments above, a critical step is (20), where the hypothesis of i.i.d. channel state sequence has been used.

\[ \Diamond \]

**IV. Achievability**

In this section, we shall show that any rate pair \( R = (R_a, R_b) \) belonging to the region \( \mathcal{R}(\pi), \) for some static policy \( \pi, \) is achievable. Achievability of any rate pair \( R \in \text{co}(\mathcal{U}_R, \mathcal{R}(\pi)) \) will then follow by a standard time-sharing argument (see e.g. [19, Lemma 2.2, p.272]).

In order to prove achievability on the original finite state MAC, we shall consider an equivalent memoryless MAC having output space \( Z := X \times Y \) coinciding with the product of the state and output space of the original MAC, input spaces \( \mathcal{U}_i := \{ u_i : \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i \}, \) for \( i = a, b, \) and transition probabilities

\[ Q(z | u_a, u_b) := P(s) P(y | u_a(q_a(s)), u_b(q_b(s))), \]

where \( z = (s, y). \) A coding scheme for such a MAC consists of a pair of encoders

\[ f_i : \mathcal{W}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^n_i, \quad i = a, b, \]

and a decoder

\[ g : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{S}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_a \times \mathcal{W}_b. \]

To any such coding scheme it is natural to associate a coding scheme for the original finite state MAC, by defining the encoders

\[ \phi^a_i : \mathcal{W}_i \times \mathcal{Y}^n_i \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i, \quad \phi^b_i(w_i, s_i) = [f_i(w_i)](s_i) \]

for \( i = a, b, \) and letting the decoder \( \psi : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{S}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_a \times \mathcal{W}_b \) coincide with \( g. \) It is not hard to verify that the probability measure induced on the product space \( \mathcal{W}_a \times \mathcal{W}_b \times \mathcal{X}_a \times \mathcal{X}_b \) coincides with \( g. \)

To associate an \((R, n, \varepsilon)-\)coding scheme on the memoryless MAC \( Q, \) it is possible to associate an \((R, n, \varepsilon)-\)coding scheme \((\phi^a_i, \phi^b_i, \psi)\) on the original finite state MAC \( P. \)

Now, let \( \mu_a \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U}_a), \) and \( \mu_b \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U}_b), \) be probability distributions on the input spaces of the new memoryless MAC, and fix an arbitrary rate pair \( R = (R_a, R_b) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \) such that

\[ R_a < I(U_a; Z | U_b) \]
\[ R_b < I(U_b; Z | U_a) \]
\[ R_a + R_b < I(U; Z), \]

(22)

where \( U = (U_a, U_b) \) and \( Z \) are r.v.s whose joint distribution factorizes as

\[ P(U_a, U_b, Z) = \mu_a(U_a) \mu_b(U_b) Q(Z | U_a, U_b). \]

(23)

Consider a sequence of random codes

\[ \{ f^{(n)}_a : \mathcal{W}^{(n)}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^{(n)}_a, f^{(n)}_b : \mathcal{W}^{(n)}_b \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^{(n)}_b \}_n \]

where \( |W^{(n)}_a| = |\exp(R_a n)| \) and \( |W^{(n)}_b| = |\exp(R_b n)| \) and \( \{ f^{(n)}_a(w_a), f^{(n)}_b(w_b) : w_a \in W^{(n)}_a, w_b \in W^{(n)}_b \} \) is a collection of independent r.v.s, with \( f^{(n)}_i(w_i) \) taking values in \( U^{(n)}_i \) with product distribution \( \mu_i \otimes \ldots \otimes \mu_i, \) for \( i = a, b \) and \( w_i \in W_i. \) Then, it follows from the direct coding theorem for memoryless MACs [19, Th.3.2, p. 272] that the average error probability of such a code ensemble converges to zero in the limit of \( n \) going to infinity.

Now, we apply the arguments above to the special class of probability distributions \( \mu_i \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U}_i) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^{S_i}) \) with the product structure

\[ \mu_i(u_i) = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{Y}_i} \pi_i(u_i(v_i)) v_i, \quad u_i : \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_i, \quad i = a, b, \]

(24)

for some static team policy \( \pi \) as in (2). Observe that, for such \( \mu_a \) and \( \mu_b, \) to any triple of r.v.s \( U_a, U_b, Z, \) with joint distribution as in (23), one can naturally associate r.v.s \( S, \) \( X_a := U_a(q_a(S)), \) \( X_b := U_b(q_b(S)), \) and \( Y, \) whose joint probability distribution satisfies (4). Moreover, it can be readily verified that

\[ I(X_a; Y | S, X_b) = I(U_a; Z | U_b) \]
\[ I(X_b; Y | S, X_a) = I(U_b; Z | U_a) \]
\[ I(X; Y | S) = I(U; Z). \]

Hence, if a rate pair \( R = (R_a, R_b) \) belongs to the rate region \( \mathcal{R}(\pi) \) associated to some static team policy \( \pi \) (i.e. if it satisfies (3)), that \( R \) satisfies (22) for the product probability distributions \( \mu_a, \mu_b \) defined by (24).

As observed above, the direct coding theorem for memoryless MACs implies that such a rate pair is achievable on the MAC \( Q. \) As argued above in this section, this in turn implies that the rate pair is achievable on the
By the possible memory realizations, that is the policy is to map the variables \( W, V^a, V^b \) to \( (X^t_a, X^b) \) decentrally, and the memory cannot be truncated, as every additional bit is essential in the construction of an equivalent Markov chain to which the Markov Decision Dynamic Program can be applied; both for the prediction on the channel state as well as the belief of the belief of the coders on each other’s memory.

For the i.i.d. case, by first showing that the past information is irrelevant, we observed that we could limit the memory space on which the optimization is performed, and as such have a problem which is tractable.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper studied the problem of multi-access coding with asymmetric, imperfect channel state information. We observed that one can provide a single letter characterization when the channel state is i.i.d., but when the channel state is Markovian, the problem is more complicated.

One question of interest is the following: If the channel transitions form a Markov chain, which is mixing fast, is it sufficient to use a finite memory construction for practical purposes? This is currently being investigated.
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