

Strong Converse Exponent for State Dependent Channels With Full State Information at the Sender

Yasutada Oohama

University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo, Japan

Email: oohama@uec.ac.jp

Abstract—We consider the state dependent channels with full state information with at the sender. For this state dependent channel, the channel capacity was determined by Gel’fand and Pinsker. In this paper, we study the correct probability of decoding at rates above the capacity. We prove that when the transmission rate is above the capacity this probability goes to zero exponentially and derive an explicit lower bound of this exponent function.

Index Terms—State dependent channels, strong converse theorem, exponent of correct probability of decoding

I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the classical problem of channel coding with noncausal state information at the encoder. This problem was posed and investigated by the Gel’fand and Pinsker [1]. We hereafter call the above state dependent channel the Gel’fand and Pinsker channel (the GPC). The channel capacity of the GPC was determined by Gel’fand and Pinsker [1]. Tyagi and Narayan [2] proved the strong converse theorem for the GPC.

In this paper, we establish the exponential strong converse theorem for the GPC. We study the correct probability of decoding at rates above the capacity and prove that when the transmission rate is above the capacity this probability goes to zero exponentially and derive an explicit lower bound of this exponent function.

We derive the result by a combination of two methods. One is a method called the recursive method. This method includes a certain recursive algorithm for a single letterization of exponent functions. The recursive method is a general powerful tool to prove strong converse theorems for several coding problems in information theory. In fact, this method plays important roles in deriving exponential strong converse exponent for communication systems treated in [3], [4], [5], [6], [7]. The other is to use the information spectrum version of Csiszár’s sum identity found in [8]. For cooperation with the recursive method, some careful use of the identity is necessary. Similar combination of the two methods to prove the exponential strong converse theorem is found in [7].

The state dependent channel with full state information at the sender and partial state information at the receiver (the SDC) was posed and investigated by Heegard and El Gamal [9]. The SDC can be regarded an extension of the GPC. Steineberg [10] determined the capacity region for the SDC which indicates the trade off between the transmission rate and the compression rate on the partial state information.

The exponential strong converse theorem for the SDC was first investigated by the author [11]. However, we have a gap on the proof. In this paper we fix this gap in the special case that the state information is not available at the decoder.

II. CODING PROBLEM FOR STATE DEPENDENT CHANNELS

In the channel coding with noncausal state information at the encoder we would like to send a uniformly distributed message over a state-dependent channel $W^n : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{S}^n$, where \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , respectively, are the state, input and output alphabets.

We assume that $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{S}$ are finite sets. The state-dependent channel(SDC) we study in this paper is defined by a stationary discrete memoryless channel specified by the following stochastic matrix:

$$W := \{W(y|x, s)\}_{(s,x,y) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}. \quad (1)$$

Let X^n be a random variable taking values in \mathcal{X}^n . We write an element of \mathcal{X}^n as $x^n = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$. Suppose that X^n has a probability distribution on \mathcal{X}^n denoted by $p_{X^n} = \{p_{X^n}(x^n)\}_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n}$. Similar notations are adopted for other random variables. Let $Y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ be a random variable obtained as the channel output by connecting X^n to the input of channel under the random state S^n . We write a conditional distribution of Y^n on \mathcal{Y}^n given X^n and S^n as

$$W^n = \{W^n(y^n|x^n, s^n)\}_{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n}.$$

Since the channel is memoryless, we have

$$W^n(y^n|x^n, s^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n W(y_t|x_t, s_t). \quad (2)$$

We assume that the state information of S^n is an output of a stationary discrete memoryless source $\{S_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ specified with a probability distribution $p_S = \{p_S(s)\}_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$ on \mathcal{S} . Transmission of messages via the state dependent channel is shown in Fig. 1. The random variable K_n is a message sent to the receiver. The random variable S_n represent a random state. Under S^n , a sender transforms K_n into a transmitted sequence X^n using an encoder function $\varphi^{(n)}$ and sends it to the receiver. In this paper we assume that the encoder function $\varphi^{(n)}$ is a stochastic encoder. In this case, $\varphi^{(n)}$ is a stochastic matrix given by

$$\varphi^{(n)} = \{\varphi^{(n)}(x^n|k, s^n)\}_{(k, s^n, x^n) \in \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n},$$




Fig. 1. Coding for state dependent channels

where $\varphi^{(n)}(x^n|k, s^n)$ is a conditional probability of $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ given $k \in \mathcal{K}_n$ and non-causal random state $s^n \in \mathcal{S}^n$. The joint probability mass function on $\mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{(K_n, S^n, X^n, Y^n) = (k, s^n, x^n, y^n)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{K}_n|} \varphi^{(n)}(x^n|k, s^n) p_{S^n}(s^n) \prod_{t=1}^n W(y_t|x_t, s_t), \end{aligned}$$

where $|\mathcal{K}_n|$ is a cardinality of the set \mathcal{K}_n . The decoding function at the receiver is denoted by $\psi^{(n)}$. This function is formally defined by $\psi^{(n)}: \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_n$. The average error probability of decoding on the receiver is defined by

$$P_e^{(n)} = P_e^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) := \Pr\{\psi^{(n)}(Y^n) \neq K_n\}.$$

For $k \in \mathcal{K}_n$, set $\mathcal{D}(k) := \{y^n : \psi^{(n)}(y^n) = (k)\}$. A family of sets $\{\mathcal{D}(k)\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n}$ is called the decoding region. Using the decoding region, $P_e^{(n)}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P_e^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{K}_n|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n: \\ y^n \in \mathcal{D}^c(k)}} \\ &\quad \times \varphi^{(n)}(x^n|k, s^n) W^n(y^n|x^n, s^n) p_{S^n}(s^n). \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$P_c^{(n)} = P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) := 1 - P_e^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}).$$

The quantity $P_c^{(n)}$ is called the average correct probability of decoding. This quantity has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} P_c^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{K}_n|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n: \\ y^n \in \mathcal{D}(k)}} \\ &\quad \times \varphi^{(n)}(x^n|k, s^n) W^n(y^n|x^n, s^n) p_{S^n}(s^n). \end{aligned}$$

For fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, R is ε -achievable if there exists a sequence of pairs $\{(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that for any $\delta > 0$ and for any n with $n \geq n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$,

$$P_e^{(n)} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R - \delta.$$

The supremum of all ε -achievable rates is denoted by $C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|W)$, which is called the ε -capacity of the Gel'fand-Pinsker channel (GPC). We set

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W) := \inf_{\varepsilon \in (0, 1)} C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W),$$

which is called the capacity of the GPC. We can show that the capacity regions $C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and $C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W)$ satisfy the following property.

Property 1: $C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W)$ has another form using (n, ε) -capacity $C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$, the definition of which is as follows. We set

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W) &:= \sup\{R : \\ &\quad \text{There exists } (\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \text{ such that} \\ &\quad \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \leq R, P_e^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$, $C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W)$ can be expressed as

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W) = \sup_{m \geq 1} \inf_{n \geq m} C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W).$$

Proof of Property 1 is given in Appendix A. To describe previous works on $C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W)$ and $C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W)$, we introduce an auxiliary random variable U taking values in a finite set $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$. We assume that the joint distribution of (U, S, X, Y) is

$$\begin{aligned} & p_{USXY}(u, s, x, y) \\ &= p_U(u) p_{SX|UV}(s, x|u, v) W(y|x, s). \end{aligned}$$

The above condition is equivalent to $U \leftrightarrow (X, S) \leftrightarrow Y$. Define the set of probability distributions $q = q_{USXY}$ of $(U, S, X, Y) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(p_S, W) &:= \{q : |\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}|, q_S = p_S, q_{Y|XS} = W, \\ &\quad U \leftrightarrow (X, S) \leftrightarrow Y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$C(p_S, W) := \max_{q \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)} \{I_q(Y; U) - I_q(S; U)\}.$$

The GPC was posed and investigated by Gel'fand and Pinsker [1]. They determined $C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W)$. Their result is the following:

Theorem 1 (Gel'fand and Pinsker [1]): For any state dependent channel W , $C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W) = C(p_S, W)$.

The strong converse theorem for the GPC was proved by Tyagi and Narayan [2]. Their result is the following:

Theorem 2 (Tyagi and Narayan [2]): For each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and for any state dependent channel W , we have

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W) = C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W).$$

To prove Theorem 2, they used a method of image size characterization introduced by Csiszár and Körner [12]. Capacity theorems for the state dependent channel in the case of general noisy channels was obtained by Tan [13]. To derive those capacity results he used the information spectrum method introduced by Han [14].

To examine an asymptotic behavior of $P_c^{(n)}$ for rates outside the capacity region $C(p_S, W)$ we define the following quantity.

$$\begin{aligned} & G^{(n)}(R|p_S, W) \\ &:= \min_{\substack{(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}): \\ (1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R}} \left(-\frac{1}{n} \right) \log P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}). \end{aligned}$$

By time sharing we have that $\{G^{(n)}(R|p_S, W)\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies the following subadditivity property:

$$\begin{aligned} & G^{(n+m)}(R|p_S, W) \\ & \leq \frac{nG^{(n)}(R|p_S, W) + mG^{(m)}(R|p_S, W)}{n+m}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G^{(n)}(R|p_S, W) = \inf_{n \geq 1} G^{(n)}(R|p_S, W).$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned} G(R|p_S, W) & := \inf_{n \geq 1} G^{(n)}(R|p_S, W), \\ \mathcal{R}(p_S, W) & := \{(R, G) : G \geq G(R|p_S, W)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The exponent function $G(R|p_S, W)$ is a convex function of R . In fact, by time sharing we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & G^{(n+m)}\left(\frac{nR + mR'}{n+m} \middle| p_S, W\right) \\ & \leq \frac{nG^{(n)}(R|p_S, W) + mG^{(m)}(R'|p_S, W)}{n+m}, \end{aligned}$$

from which we have that for any $\kappa \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & G(\kappa R + \bar{\kappa}R'|p_S, W) \\ & \leq \kappa G(R|p_S, W) + \bar{\kappa}G(R'|p_S, W). \end{aligned}$$

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section we state our main results. We first define several quantities to describe our main results. Define the set of probability distributions $p = p_{USXY}$ of $(U, S, X, Y) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ by

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{q = q_{USXY} : |\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{Y}| - 1\}.$$

Furthermore define

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_q^{(\alpha)}(s, x, y|u) & := \log \frac{p_S(s)W(y|x, s)}{q_S(s)q_{Y|XSV}(y|x, s, u)} \\ & + \alpha \log \frac{q_{Y|U}(y|u)q_S(s)}{q_{S|U}(s|u)q_Y(y)}, \\ \Lambda^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W) & := \mathbb{E}_q \left[\exp \left\{ \beta \omega_q^{(\alpha)}(S, X, Y|U) \right\} \right], \\ \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W) & := \log \Lambda^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W), \\ \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W) & := \max_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W), \end{aligned}$$

$$F^{(\alpha, \beta)}(R|p_S, W) := \frac{\beta \alpha R - \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \beta[1 + 3\alpha]},$$

$$F(R|p_S, W) := \sup_{\alpha, \beta \geq 0} F^{(\alpha, \beta)}(R|p_S, W).$$

We next define a function serving as a lower bound of $F(R|p_S, W)$. For each $p = p_{UXYS} \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega}_p(s, x, y|u) & := \log \frac{p_{Y|U}(y|u)p_S(s)}{p_{S|U}(s|u)p_Y(y)}, \\ \tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(p) & := \mathbb{E}_p \left[\exp \left\{ \lambda \tilde{\omega}_p(S, X, Y|U) \right\} \right], \\ \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p) & := \log \tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(p). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, set

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W) & := \max_{p \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p), \\ \tilde{F}^{(\lambda)}(R|p_S, W) & := \frac{\lambda R - \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)}{2 + 7\lambda}, \\ \tilde{F}(R|p_S, W) & := \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \tilde{F}^{(\lambda)}(R|p_S, W). \end{aligned}$$

We can show that the above functions and sets satisfy the following property.

Property 2:

- The cardinality bound $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ appearing in the definition of \mathcal{Q} is sufficient to describe $\Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W)$. Furthermore, the cardinality bound $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}|$ appearing in the definition of $\mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$ is sufficient to describe $\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)$.
- For any $R > 0$, we have

$$F(R|p_S, W) \geq \tilde{F}(R|p_S, W).$$

- For any $\lambda \in [0, 1/2]$ and any $q \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$, we have

$$|\mathcal{S}|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(q) \leq |\mathcal{X}|^2 |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{Y}|.$$

- Fix any $q \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$. For $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we define a probability distribution $q^{(\lambda)} = q_{USXY}^{(\lambda)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & q^{(\lambda)}(u, s, x, y) \\ & := \frac{q(u, s, x, y) \exp \{ \lambda \tilde{\omega}_q(s, x, y|u) \}}{\mathbb{E}_q \left[\exp \{ \lambda \tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U) \} \right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for $\lambda \in [0, 1/4]$, $\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q)$ is twice differentiable. Furthermore, for $\lambda \in [0, 1/4]$, we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\lambda} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q) & = \mathbb{E}_{q^{(\lambda)}} [\tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U)], \\ \frac{d^2}{d\lambda^2} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q) & = \text{Var}_{q^{(\lambda)}} [\tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U)]. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3)$$

- For $\lambda \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1/4]$, define

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W) \\ & := \max_{\substack{(\gamma, q) \in [0, \lambda] \\ \times \mathcal{P}(p_S, W): \\ \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q) \\ = \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)}} \text{Var}_{q^{(\gamma)}} [\tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U)], \end{aligned}$$

and set

$$\rho = \rho(p_S, W) := \max_{\lambda \in [0, 1/4]} \rho^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W).$$

Then, we have $\rho(p_S, W) < \infty$. Furthermore, for any $\lambda \in [0, 1/4]$, we have

$$\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W) \leq \lambda C(p_S, W) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \rho(p_S, W).$$

- For every $\tau \in (0, (1/4)\rho(p_S, W)]$, $R > C(p_S, W) + \tau$ implies that

$$\tilde{F}(R|p_S, W) > \frac{\rho(p_S, W)}{4} \cdot g^2 \left(\frac{\tau}{\rho(p_S, W)} \right) > 0,$$

where g is the inverse function of $\vartheta(a) := a + (7/4)a^2, a \geq 0$.

Proof of Property 2 part a) is given in Appendix B. Proofs of Property 2 part b) is given in Appendix C. Proofs of Property 2 parts c), d), e) are given in Appendix D. Proof of Property 2 part f) are given in Appendix E. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 3: For any $R \geq 0$, any (p_S, W) , and for any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, we have

$$P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq 4 \exp \{-nF(R|p_S, W)\}.$$

It follows from Theorem 3 and Property 2 parts b) and f) that if R is above the capacity, then the error probability of decoding goes to one exponentially and its exponent is not below $F(R|p_S, W)$. It immediately follows from Theorem 3 that we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1: For any (p_S, W) , we have

$$G(R|p_S, W) \geq F(R|p_S, W), \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(p_S, W) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}}(p_S, W). \quad (5)$$

Proof of Theorem 3 will be given in the next section. The exponent function at rates outside the channel capacity was derived by Arimoto [15] and Dueck and Körner [16]. The techniques used by them are not useful to prove Theorem 3. Some novel techniques based on the information spectrum method introduced by Han [14] are necessary to prove this theorem.

From Theorem 3 and Property 2 parts b) and f), we can obtain an explicit upper bound of $C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$ with an asymptotically vanishing deviation from $C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W) = C(p_S, W)$. The strong converse theorem immediately follows from this corollary. We define $\nu_n = \nu_n(\varepsilon, \rho(p_S, W))$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n &:= \rho(p_S, W) \vartheta \left(\sqrt{\frac{4}{n\rho(p_S, W)} \log \left(\frac{4}{1-\varepsilon} \right)} \right) \quad (6) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sqrt{\frac{4\rho(p_S, W)}{n} \log \left(\frac{4}{1-\varepsilon} \right)} + \frac{7}{n} \log \left(\frac{4}{1-\varepsilon} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows from $\vartheta(a) = a + (7/4)a^2$. Since $\nu_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have the smallest positive integer $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, \rho(p_S, W))$ such that $\nu_n \leq (1/4)\rho(p_S, W)$ for $n \geq n_0$. From Theorem 3, Property 2 parts b), and f), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2: For each fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we choose the above positive integer $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, \rho(p_S, W))$. Then, for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W) \leq C(p_S, W) + \nu_n.$$

The above result together with

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W) = \sup_{m \geq 1} \inf_{n \geq m} C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$$

yields that for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W) = C(p_S, W) = C_{\text{GPC}}(p_S, W).$$

This recovers the strong converse theorem proved by Tyagi and Narayan [2].

Proof of this corollary will be given in the next section.

IV. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1: For any $\eta > 0$ and for any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) &\leq p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \left\{ \right. \\ &0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{p_S^n(S^n) W^n(Y^n|X^n, S^n)}{Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(S^n) Q_{Y^n|X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}(Y^n|X^n, S^n, K_n)} \quad (7) \\ &\quad \left. + \eta, \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{p_{S^n|K_n}(S^n|K_n)}{Q_{S^n|K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n|K_n)} + \eta, \quad (8)$$

$$R \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{p_{Y^n|K_n}(Y^n|K_n)}{Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}(Y^n)} + \eta \left. \right\} + 3e^{-n\eta}. \quad (9)$$

In (7), we can choose any distribution $Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(S^n)$ on \mathcal{S}^n and any conditional distribution $Q_{Y^n|X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}$ on \mathcal{Y}^n given (X^n, S^n, K_n) . In (8), we can choose any conditional distribution $Q_{S^n|K_n}^{(ii)}$ on \mathcal{S}^n given K_n . In (9), we can choose any conditional distribution $Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}$ on \mathcal{Y}^n .

Proof of this lemma is given in Appendix F. Since K_n is independent of S^n , we have

$$p_{S^n|K_n}(S^n|K_n) = p_S^n(S^n). \quad (10)$$

From (10) and Lemma 1, we immediately obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2: For any $\eta > 0$ and for any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) &\leq p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \left\{ \right. \\ &0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{p_S^n(S^n) W^n(Y^n|X^n, S^n)}{Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(S^n) Q_{Y^n|X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}(Y^n|X^n, S^n, K_n)} \quad (11) \\ &\quad \left. + \eta, \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$R \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{p_{Y^n|K_n}(Y^n|K_n) p_S^n(S^n)}{Q_{S^n|K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n|K_n) Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}(Y^n)} \quad (12)$$

$$\left. + 2\eta \right\} + 3e^{-n\eta}. \quad (13)$$

In (11), the choice of $Q_{Y^n|X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}$ is the same as (7) in Lemma 1. In (12), we can choose any $Q_{S^n|K_n}^{(ii)}$ and $Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}$.

For $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, set

$$\mathcal{U}_t := \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^{t-1} \times \mathcal{Y}_{t+1}^n, u_t := (k, s^{t-1}, y_{t+1}^n) \in \mathcal{U}_t,$$

$$\mathcal{V}_t := \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{Y}_{t+1}^n, v_t := (k, y_{t+1}^n) \in \mathcal{V}_t,$$

$$\mathcal{U}_t := (K_n, S^{t-1}, Y_{t+1}^n) \in \mathcal{U}_t, \mathcal{V}_t := (K_n, Y_{t+1}^n) \in \mathcal{V}_t.$$

From Lemma 2, we have the following.

Lemma 3: For any $\eta > 0$ and for any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \phi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) &\leq p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \left\{ \right. \\ 0 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log \frac{p_S(S_t) W(Y_t | X_t, S_t)}{Q_{S_t}^{(i)}(S_t) Q_{Y_t | X_t S_t U_t}^{(i)}(Y_t | X_t, S_t, U_t)} \\ &\quad + \eta, \\ R &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log \frac{\tilde{Q}_{Y_t | U_t}^{(ii)}(Y_t | U_t) p_S(S_t)}{Q_{S_t | U_t}^{(ii)}(S_t | U_t) Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)}(Y_t)} + 2\eta \\ &\left. \right\} + 3e^{-n\eta}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where for each $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, the following probability and conditional probability distributions:

$$Q_{S_t}^{(i)}, Q_{Y_t | X_t S_t U_t}^{(i)}, Q_{S_t | U_t}^{(ii)}, Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)} \quad (15)$$

appearing in the first term in the right members of (14) have a property that we can choose their values arbitrary. In (14), $\tilde{Q}_{Y_t | U_t}^{(ii)}$ can be computed from $\{(p_{Y_i | V_i}, Q_{S_i | U_i}^{(ii)})_{i=1}^{t-1}\}$ and $p_{Y_t | V_t}$, having the form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{Y_t | U_t}^{(ii)}(y_t | u_t) &= \frac{\sum_{\tilde{y}^{t-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \left\{ Q_{S_i | U_i}^{(ii)}(s_i | \tilde{u}_i) p_{Y_i | V_i}(\tilde{y}_i | \tilde{v}_i) \right\} \right) p_{Y_t | V_t}(y_t | v_t)}{\sum_{\tilde{y}^t} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \left\{ Q_{S_i | U_i}^{(ii)}(s_i | \tilde{u}_i) p_{Y_i | V_i}(\tilde{y}_i | \tilde{v}_i) \right\} \right) p_{Y_t | V_t}(\tilde{y}_t | v_t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$, \tilde{u}_i and \tilde{v}_i are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}_i &:= (s^{i-1}, \tilde{y}_{i+1}^t, y_{t+1}^n, k) \in S^{i-1} \times \mathcal{Y}_{i+1}^n \times \mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{U}_i, \\ \tilde{v}_i &:= (\tilde{y}_{i+1}^t, y_{t+1}^n, k) \in \mathcal{Y}_{i+1}^n \times \mathcal{K}_n = \mathcal{V}_i. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: On the probability distributions appearing in the right members of (13), we take the following choices. In (11), we choose $Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(S^n)$ so that

$$Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(S^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n Q_{S_t}^{(i)}(S_t) \quad (16)$$

and choose $Q_{Y^n | X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{Y^n | X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}(Y^n | X^n, S^n, K_n) &= \prod_{t=1}^n Q_{Y_t | X^t S^t Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(i)}(Y_t | X_t, S^t, Y_{t+1}^n, K_n) \\ &= \prod_{t=1}^n Q_{Y_t | X^t U_t}^{(i)}(Y_t | X_t, S_t, U_t). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We define joint conditional distribution $Q_{S^n Y^n | K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n, Y^n | K_n)$ on (S^n, Y^n) given K_n by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{S^n Y^n | K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n, Y^n | K_n) &= Q_{S^n | Y^n K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n | Y^n, K_n) p_{Y^n | K_n}(Y^n | K_n) \\ &= \left\{ \prod_{t=1}^n Q_{S_t | S^{t-1} Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(S_t | S^{t-1}, Y_{t+1}^n, K_n) \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \prod_{t=1}^n p_{Y_t | Y_{t+1}^n K_n}(Y_t | Y_{t+1}^n, K_n) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We assume that $Q_{S^n | K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n | K_n)$ is a marginal distribution of $Q_{S^n Y^n | K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n, Y^n | K_n)$. Then, in (12), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Q_{Y^n | K_n}^{(ii)}(Y^n | K_n)}{Q_{S^n | K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n | K_n)} &= \prod_{t=1}^n \frac{\tilde{Q}_{Y_t | S^{t-1} Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(Y_t | S^{t-1}, Y_{t+1}^n, K_n)}{Q_{S_t | S^{t-1} Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(S_t | S^{t-1}, Y_{t+1}^n, K_n)} \\ &= \prod_{t=1}^n \frac{\tilde{Q}_{Y_t | U_t}^{(ii)}(Y_t | U_t)}{Q_{S_t | U_t}^{(ii)}(S_t | U_t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Based on (18), we compute $\tilde{Q}_{S^{t-1} Y_t | Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(s^{t-1}, y_t | y_{t+1}^n, k)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{S^{t-1} Y_t | Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(s^{t-1}, y_t | y_{t+1}^n, k) &= \sum_{\tilde{y}^{t-1}} \tilde{Q}_{S^{t-1} Y_{t-1} Y_t | Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(s^{t-1}, \tilde{y}^{t-1}, y_t | y_{t+1}^n, k) \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{y}^{t-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \left\{ Q_{S_i | S^{i-1} Y_{i+1}^{t-1} Y_t^n K_n}^{(iii)}(s_i | s^{i-1}, \tilde{y}_{i+1}^{t-1}, y_t^n, k) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times p_{Y_i | Y_{i+1}^{t-1} Y_t^n K_n}(y_i | \tilde{y}_{i+1}^{t-1}, y_t^n, k) \right\} \right) p_{Y_t | Y_{t+1}^n K_n}(y_t | y_{t+1}^n, k) \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{y}^{t-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \left\{ Q_{S_i | U_i}^{(ii)}(s_i | \tilde{u}_i) p_{Y_i | V_i}(\tilde{y}_i | \tilde{v}_i) \right\} \right) p_{Y_t | V_t}(y_t | v_t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{Y_t | U_t}^{(ii)}(y_t | u_t) &= \tilde{Q}_{Y_t | S^{t-1} Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(y_t | s^{t-1}, y_{t+1}^n, k) \\ &= \frac{\tilde{Q}_{S^{t-1} Y_t | Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(s^{t-1}, y_t | y_{t+1}^n, k)}{\tilde{Q}_{S^{t-1} | Y_{t+1}^n K_n}^{(ii)}(s^{t-1} | y_{t+1}^n, k)} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{\tilde{y}^{t-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \left\{ Q_{S_i | U_i}^{(ii)}(s_i | \tilde{u}_i) p_{Y_i | V_i}(\tilde{y}_i | \tilde{v}_i) \right\} \right) p_{Y_t | V_t}(y_t | v_t)}{\sum_{\tilde{y}^t} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \left\{ Q_{S_i | U_i}^{(ii)}(s_i | \tilde{u}_i) p_{Y_i | V_i}(\tilde{y}_i | \tilde{v}_i) \right\} \right) p_{Y_t | V_t}(\tilde{y}_t | v_t)}. \end{aligned}$$

In (12), we choose $Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}$ so that

$$Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}(Y^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)}(Y_t). \quad (20)$$

From Lemma 2 and (17)-(20), we have the bound (14) in Lemma 3. \blacksquare

For each $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, let \underline{Q}_t be a set of all

$$\underline{Q}_t := (Q_{S_t}^{(i)}, Q_{Y_t|X_t S_t U_t}^{(i)}, Q_{S_t|U_t V_t}^{(ii)}, Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)}).$$

Set

$$\underline{Q}^n := \prod_{t=1}^n \underline{Q}_t, \underline{Q}^n := \left\{ \underline{Q}_t \right\}_{t=1}^n \in \underline{Q}^n.$$

To evaluate an upper bound of (14) in Lemma 3. We use the following lemma, which is well known as the Cramér's bound in the large deviation principle.

Lemma 4: For any real valued random variable A and any $\theta > 0$, we have

$$\Pr\{A \geq a\} \leq \exp[-(\theta a - \log E[\exp(\theta A)])].$$

Here we define a quantity which serves as an exponential upper bound of $P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi_1^{(n)}, \psi_2^{(n)})$. Let $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(p_S, W)$ be a set of all probability distributions $p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n}$ on $\mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ having the form:

$$p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n}(k, s^n, x^n, y^n) = p_{K_n}(k) p_{S^n}(s^n) \times \prod_{t=1}^n p_{X_t|K_n X^{t-1} S^n}(x_t|k, x^{t-1}, s^n) W(y_t|x_t, s_t).$$

For simplicity of notation we use the notation $p^{(n)}$ for $p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(p_S, W)$. We assume that $p_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t} = p_{K_n S_t^n X_t Y_t}$ is a marginal distribution induced by $p^{(n)}$. For $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we simply write $p_t = p_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t}$. For $p^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(p_S, W)$ and $\underline{Q}^n \in \underline{Q}^n$, we define

$$\Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) := \log E_{p^{(n)}} \left[\left(\prod_{t=1}^n \left\{ 1 \times \frac{p_S(S_t) W(Y_t|X_t, S_t)}{Q_{S_t}^{(i)}(S_t) Q_{Y_t|X_t S_t U_t}^{(i)}(Y_t|X_t, S_t, U_t)} \right\} \right)^{\theta} \times \left(\prod_{t=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\tilde{Q}_{Y_t|U_t}^{(ii)}(Y_t|U_t) p_S(S_t)}{Q_{S_t|U_t}^{(ii)}(S_t|U_t) Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)}(Y_t)} \right\} \right)^{\alpha \theta} \right].$$

Here we give a remark on an essential difference between $p^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(p_S, W)$ and $\underline{Q}^n \in \underline{Q}^n$. For the former the n probability distributions p_t , $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are consistent with $p^{(n)}$, since all of them are marginal distributions of $p^{(n)}$. On the other hand, for the latter, \underline{Q}^n is just a sequence of n probability distributions. Hence, we may not have the consistency between the n elements \underline{Q}_t , $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, of \underline{Q}^n . By Lemmas 3 and 4, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 1: For any $\alpha, \theta > 0$, any $\underline{Q}^n \in \underline{Q}^n$, and any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, we have

$$P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq 4 \exp \left\{ -n \frac{\theta R - (1/n) \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n)}{1 + \theta(1 + 2\alpha)} \right\}. \quad (21)$$

Proof: When $\theta R - (1/n) \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) \leq 0$, the bound (21) in Proposition 1 is obvious. In the following argument we assume that $\theta R - (1/n) \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) > 0$. We define three random variables $A_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ by

$$A_1 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log \frac{p_S(S_t) W(Y_t|X_t, S_t)}{Q_{S_t}^{(i)}(S_t) Q_{Y_t|X_t S_t U_t}^{(i)}(Y_t|X_t, S_t, U_t)},$$

$$A_2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log \frac{\tilde{Q}_{Y_t|U_t}^{(ii)}(Y_t|U_t) p_S(S_t)}{Q_{S_t|U_t}^{(ii)}(S_t|U_t) Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)}(Y_t)}.$$

Then by Lemma 3, for any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$ we have

$$P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \{A_1 \geq -\eta, A_2 \geq R - 2\eta\} + 3e^{-n\eta}$$

$$\leq p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \{A_1 + \alpha A_2 \geq \alpha R - \eta(1 + 2\alpha)\} + 3e^{-n\eta}$$

$$\leq p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \{A \geq a\} + 3e^{-n\eta}, \quad (22)$$

where we set $A := A_1 + \alpha A_2$, $a := \alpha R - \eta(1 + 2\alpha)$. Applying Lemma 4 to the first term in the right member of (22), we have

$$P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq \exp[-(n\theta a - \log E_{p^{(n)}}[\exp(n\theta A)])] + 3e^{-n\eta}$$

$$= \exp \left[n \left\{ \theta(1 + 2\alpha)\eta - \theta \alpha R + (1/n) \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) \right\} \right] + 3e^{-n\eta}. \quad (23)$$

We choose η so that

$$-\eta = \theta(1 + 2\alpha)\eta - \theta \alpha R + (1/n) \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n). \quad (24)$$

Solving (24) with respect to η , we have

$$\eta = \frac{\theta \alpha R - (1/n) \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n)}{1 + \theta(1 + 2\alpha)}.$$

For this choice of η and (23), we have

$$P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq 4e^{-n\eta}$$

$$= 4 \exp \left\{ -n \frac{\theta \alpha R - (1/n) \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n)}{1 + \theta(1 + 2\alpha)} \right\},$$

completing the proof. ■

Set

$$\bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p_S, W) := \sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{p^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(p_S, W)} \min_{\underline{Q}^n \in \underline{Q}^n} 1 \times \frac{1}{n} \Omega^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n).$$

Then we have the following corollary from Proposition 1.

Corollary 3: For any $R \geq 0$, any (p_S, W) , any $\theta > 0, \alpha \geq 0$, and for any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, we have

$$P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq 4 \exp \left\{ -n \frac{\theta \alpha R - \bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \theta(1 + 2\alpha)} \right\}.$$

We shall call $\bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p_S, W)$ the communication potential. The above corollary implies that the analysis of $\bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p_S, W)$ leads to an establishment of a strong converse theorem for the state dependent channels treated in this paper.

In the following argument we drive an explicit upper bound of $\bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p_S, W)$. Set

$$\mathcal{F}_t := (p_{Y_t|V_t}, \underline{Q}_t), \quad \mathcal{F}^t := \{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i=1}^t.$$

For each $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, define a function of $(u_t, s_t, x_t, y_t) \in \mathcal{U}_t \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ by

$$f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t|u_t) := \left\{ \frac{p_S(s_t)W(y_t|x_t, s_t)}{Q_{S_t}^{(i)}(s_t)Q_{Y_t|X_t, S_t, U_t}^{(i)}(y_t|x_t, s_t, u_t)} \right\}^\theta \times \left\{ \frac{\tilde{Q}_{Y_t|U_t}^{(ii)}(y_t|u_t)p_S(s_t)}{Q_{S_t|U_t}^{(ii)}(s_t|u_t)Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)}(y_t)} \right\}^{\alpha\theta}.$$

Here we note that $\tilde{Q}_{Y_t|U_t}^{(ii)}$ is uniquely determined by the component $(\{p_{Y_i|V_i}, Q_{S_i|U_i}^{(ii)}\}_{i=1}^{t-1}$ of \mathcal{F}^{t-1} and $p_{Y_t|V_t}$, that is,

$$\tilde{Q}_{Y_t|U_t}^{(ii)} = \tilde{Q}_{Y_t|U_t; (\mathcal{F}^{t-1}, p_{Y_t|V_t})}^{(ii)}.$$

For each $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we define a conditional probability distribution of (X^t, Y^t) given (K_n, S^n) by

$$p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} := \left\{ p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \right\}_{(x^t, y^t, k, s^n) \in \mathcal{X}^t \times \mathcal{Y}^t \times \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n},$$

$$:= C_t^{-1}(k, s^n) p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \times \prod_{i=1}^t f_{\mathcal{F}^i}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_i, x_i, y_i | u_i),$$

where

$$C_t(k, s^n) := \sum_{x^t, y^t} p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \times \prod_{i=1}^t f_{\mathcal{F}^i}^{(\beta,\theta)}(s_i, x_i, y_i | u_i)$$

are constants for normalization. For $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, define

$$\Phi_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) := C_t(k, s^n) C_{t-1}^{-1}(k, s^n), \quad (25)$$

where we define $C_0(k, s^n) = 1$ for $(k, s^n) \in \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n$. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 5: For each $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and for any $(k, s^n, x^t, y^t) \in \mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{X}^t \times \mathcal{Y}^t$, we have

$$p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) = (\Phi_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n))^{-1} \times p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\Phi_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) = \sum_{x^t, y^t} p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \times p_{X_t Y_t | K_n X^{t-1} S^n}(x_t, y_t | k, x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, s^n) \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t). \quad (26)$$

Proof of this lemma is given in Appendix G. Next we define a probability distribution of the random pair (K_n, S^n) taking values in $\mathcal{K}_n \times \mathcal{S}^n$ by

$$p_{K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) = \tilde{C}_t^{-1} p_{K_n S^n}(k, s^n) \prod_{i=1}^t \Phi_{i, \mathcal{F}^i}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n), \quad (27)$$

where \tilde{C}_t is a constant for normalization given by

$$\tilde{C}_t = \sum_{k, s^n} p_{K_n S^n}(k, s^n) \prod_{i=1}^t \Phi_{i, \mathcal{F}^i}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n).$$

By the above definition, we have

$$\tilde{C}_n = \exp \left\{ \Omega^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) \right\}. \quad (28)$$

For $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, define

$$\Lambda_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} := \tilde{C}_t \tilde{C}_{t-1}^{-1}, \quad (29)$$

where we define $\tilde{C}_0 = 1$. Furthermore, define

$$p_{K_n S^n; X_t Y_t; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s_t^n, x_t, y_t) = p_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(u_t, s_t, x_t, y_t) := \sum_{x^{t-1}} \sum_{s^{t-1}} p_{K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \times p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n). \quad (30)$$

Then, we have the following lemma, which is a key result to derive a single-letterized upper bound of $\bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p_S, W)$.

Lemma 6: For any $\alpha, \theta \geq 0$, any $p^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}$, and any $\underline{Q}^n \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^n$, we have

$$\Omega^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) = \sum_{t=1}^n \log \Lambda_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}, \quad (31)$$

$$\Lambda_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} = \sum_{u_t, s_t, x_t, y_t} p_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(u_t, s_t, x_t, y_t) \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t). \quad (32)$$

Proof: We first prove (31). We have the following:

$$\exp \left\{ \Omega^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) \right\} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \tilde{C}_n = \prod_{t=1}^n \tilde{C}_t \tilde{C}_{t-1}^{-1} \stackrel{(b)}{=} \prod_{t=1}^n \Lambda_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}. \quad (33)$$

Step (a) follows from (28). Step (b) follows from the definition (29) of $\Lambda_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}$. From (33), we have (31) in Lemma 6. We next prove (32). Multiplying $\Lambda_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} = \tilde{C}_t/\tilde{C}_{t-1}$ to both sides of (27), we have

$$\Lambda_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} p_{K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \tilde{C}_{t-1}^{-1} p_{K_n S^n}(k, s^n) \prod_{i=1}^t \Phi_{i,\mathcal{F}^i}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \\ &= p_{K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \Phi_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Taking summations of (34) and (35) with respect to (k, s^n) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} &= \sum_{k, s^n} p_{K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \Phi_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{k, s^n} \sum_{x^t, y^t} p_{K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \\ &\quad \times p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \\ &\quad \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n) \\ &\quad \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t). \\ &= \sum_{u_t, s_t, x_t, y_t, x^{t-1}, s^{t-1}} p_{K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(k, s^n) \\ &\quad \times p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \\ &\quad \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n) \\ &\quad \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Step (a) follows from (26) in Lemma 5. From (36) and the definition of $p_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)}$, we have (32) in Lemma 6. ■

The following proposition is a mathematical core to prove our main result.

Proposition 2: For $\theta \in (0, \alpha^{-1})$, set

$$\beta = \frac{\theta}{1 - \alpha\theta} \Leftrightarrow \theta = \frac{\beta}{1 + \alpha\beta}. \quad (37)$$

Then, for any positive α, β , and any $\theta \in (0, \alpha^{-1})$, we have

$$\bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p_S, W) \leq \frac{\Omega^{(\alpha,\beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \alpha\beta}.$$

Proof: Set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_n &:= \{q = q_{USXY} : |\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{K}_n| |\mathcal{S}^{n-1}| |\mathcal{Y}^{n-1}|\}, \\ \hat{\Omega}_n^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p_S, W) &:= \min_{q \in \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_n} \Omega^{(\alpha,\theta)}(q | p_S, W). \end{aligned}$$

We recursively determine the sequence $\{\mathcal{F}^t\}_{t=1}^n$. Note that the component $\{p_{Y_t | V_t}\}_{t=1}^n$ of $\{\mathcal{F}^t\}_{t=1}^n$ is given. Hence we determine the remaining component $\{\underline{Q}_t\}_{t=1}^n$. For given \mathcal{F}^{t-1} , we choose $q_t = q_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t}$ so that

$$q_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t} = p_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha,\theta)} \quad (38)$$

and choose the components of $\underline{Q}_t = (Q_{Y_t | X_t S_t U_t}^{(i)}, Q_{S_t | U_t}^{(ii)}, Q_{Y_t}^{(iii)})$ such that they are the distributions induced by $q_{U_t S_t X_t Y_t}$. Note that $\tilde{Q}_{Y_t | U_t}^{(ii)}$ is uniquely determined by (\mathcal{F}^{t-1}) ,

$p_{Y_t | V_t}$. We denote it by $\tilde{q}_{Y_t | U_t}$. Then, for each $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{p_S(s_t) W(y_t | x_t, s_t)}{q_{S_t}(s_t) q_{Y_t | X_t S_t U_t}(y_t | x_t, s_t, u_t)} \right\}^\theta \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \frac{\tilde{q}_{Y_t | U_t}(y_t | u_t) p_S(s_t)}{q_{S_t | U_t}(y_t | u_t) q_{Y_t}(y_t)} \right\}^{\alpha\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Furthermore for each $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{q_t} \left[\left\{ \frac{p_S^\theta(s_t) W^\theta(y_t | x_t, s_t)}{q_{S_t}^\theta(s_t) q_{Y_t | X_t S_t U_t}^\theta(y_t | x_t, s_t, u_t)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \frac{q_{Y_t | U_t}^{\alpha\theta}(y_t | u_t) p_S^{\alpha\theta}(s_t) \tilde{q}_{Y_t | U_t}^{\alpha\theta}(y_t | u_t)}{q_{S_t | U_t}^{\alpha\theta}(y_t | u_t) q_{Y_t}^{\alpha\theta}(y_t)} \right\} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \left(\mathbb{E}_{q_t} \left[\left\{ \frac{p_S^\theta(s_t) W^\theta(y_t | x_t, s_t)}{q_{S_t}^\theta(s_t) q_{Y_t | X_t S_t U_t}^\theta(y_t | x_t, s_t, u_t)} \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \frac{q_{Y_t | U_t}^{\alpha\theta}(y_t | u_t) p_S^{\alpha\theta}(s_t)}{q_{S_t | U_t}^{\alpha\theta}(s_t | u_t) q_{Y_t}^{\alpha\theta}(y_t)} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha\theta}} \right] \right)^{1-\alpha\theta} \\ &\quad \times \left(\mathbb{E}_{q_t} \left[\frac{\tilde{q}_{Y_t | U_t}(y_t | u_t)}{q_{Y_t | U_t}(y_t | u_t)} \right] \right)^{\alpha\theta} \\ &= \exp \left\{ [1 - \alpha\theta] \Omega^{(\alpha, \frac{\theta}{1-\alpha\theta})}(q_t | p_S, W) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \exp \left\{ \frac{\Omega^{(\alpha,\beta)}(q_t | p_S, W)}{1 + \alpha\beta} \right\} \stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \exp \left\{ \frac{\hat{\Omega}_n^{(\alpha,\beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \alpha\beta} \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{=} \exp \left\{ \frac{\Omega^{(\alpha,\beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \alpha\beta} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Step (a) follows from (38), (39), and Lemma 6. Step (b) follows from Hölder's inequality. Step (c) follows from (37). Step (d) follows from $q_t \in \hat{\mathcal{Q}}_n$ and the definition of $\hat{\Omega}_n^{(\alpha,\beta)}(p_S, W)$. Step (e) follows from that by Property 2 part a), the bounds $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ is sufficient to describe $\hat{\Omega}_n^{(\alpha,\beta)}(p_S, W)$. Hence we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\underline{Q}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{Q}}^n} \frac{1}{n} \Omega^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) \leq \frac{1}{n} \Omega^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p^{(n)}, \underline{Q}^n) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log \Lambda_{t,\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha,\theta)} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{\Omega^{(\alpha,\beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Step (a) follows from (31) in Lemma 6. Step (b) follows from (40). Since (41) holds for any $n \geq 1$ and any $p^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(p_S, W)$, we have

$$\bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha,\theta)}(p_S, W) \leq \frac{\Omega^{(\alpha,\beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \alpha\beta},$$

completing the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 3: For any $R \geq 0$ and for any $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfying $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \log \left\{ \frac{4}{P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})} \right\} \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \frac{\theta \alpha R - \bar{\Omega}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \theta[1 + 2\alpha]} \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \frac{\beta \alpha R - \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \alpha \beta} = \frac{\beta \alpha R - \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \beta(1 + 3\alpha)} \\ & = F^{(\alpha, \beta)}(R|p_S, W). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Step (a) follows from Corollary 3. Step (b) follows from Proposition 2 and (37). Here we note that since $F^{(\alpha, \beta)}(R|p_S, W) \leq 0$ if $\alpha\beta = 0$, (42) holds also for $\alpha\beta = 0$. Since we have (42) for any nonnegative α and β , we have (4) in Theorem 3. ■

Proof of Corollary 2: Since g is an inverse function of ϑ , the definition (6) of ν_n is equivalent to

$$g\left(\frac{\nu_n}{\rho(p_S, W)}\right) = \sqrt{\frac{4}{n\rho(p_S, W)} \log\left(\frac{4}{1-\varepsilon}\right)}. \quad (43)$$

By the definition of $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, \rho(p_S, W))$, we have that $\nu_n \leq (1/4)\rho(p_S, W)$ for $n \geq n_0$. We assume that for $n \geq n_0$, $R \leq C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$. Then there exists a sequence $\{(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})\}_{n \geq n_0}$ such that for $n \geq n_0$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R, P_e^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Then by Theorem 3 and Property 2 part b), we have that for $n \geq n_0$,

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq P_c^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq 4 \exp\left\{-n\tilde{F}(R|p_S, W)\right\}. \quad (44)$$

From (44), we have that for $n \geq n_0$,

$$\tilde{F}(R|p_S, W) \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{4}{1-\varepsilon} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\rho}{4} g^2\left(\frac{\nu_n}{\rho}\right). \quad (45)$$

Step (a) follows from (43). Hence, by Property 2 part f), we have that under $\nu_n \leq (1/4)\rho(p_S, W)$, the bound (45) implies

$$R \leq C(p_S, W) + \nu_n. \quad (46)$$

Since (46) holds for any $n \geq n_0$ and any $R \leq C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$, we have

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W) \leq C(p_S, W) + \nu_n \text{ for } n \geq n_0,$$

completing the proof. ■

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have dealt with the state dependent discrete memoryless channels with full state information at the sender. We have proved that for rates above the capacity the correct probability of decoding tends to zero exponentially and derived an explicit lower bound of its exponent function. ■

APPENDIX

A. General Properties on $C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon, \Gamma|W)$.

In this appendix we prove Property 1 describing general properties on $C_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$.

Proof of Property 1: We first prove the inequality

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon, \Gamma|W) \geq \sup_{m \geq 1} \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(m, \varepsilon, \Gamma|W).$$

We assume that

$$R \leq \sup_{m \geq 1} \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(m, \varepsilon|p_S, W).$$

Then, there exists positive integer m such that $R \leq \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(m, \varepsilon|W)$. Then, by the definition of $\underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(m, \varepsilon|W)$, we have that for any $n \geq m$, there exists a pair $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ such that

$$P_e^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R. \quad (47)$$

It is obvious that under (47), we have for any $\delta > 0$, and any $n \geq m$, we have

$$P_e^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R - \delta. \quad (48)$$

The bound (48) implies that $R \leq C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W)$. Hence the bound

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon, \Gamma|W) \geq \sup_{m \geq 1} \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(m, \varepsilon|p_S, W)$$

is proved. We next prove the reverse inequality. We assume that $R \leq C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W)$. Then there exists $\{(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that for any $\delta > 0$ and any n with $n \geq n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon, \delta)$ we have that

$$P_e^{(n)}(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)}) \leq \varepsilon, \quad \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R - \delta. \quad (49)$$

The bound (49) implies that

$$R - \delta \leq \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(n_0, \varepsilon|p_S, W) \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W).$$

On the other hand, by the first assumption we have $R - \delta \leq C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W) - \delta$. Hence, we have

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W) - \delta \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W).$$

Since we can take $\delta > 0$ arbitrary small, we have

$$C_{\text{GPC}}(\varepsilon|p_S, W) \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \underline{C}_{\text{GPC}}(n, \varepsilon|p_S, W),$$

completing the proof. ■

B. Cardinality Bound on Auxiliary Random Variables

In this appendix we prove Property 2 part a).

Proof of Property 2 part a): We first bound the cardinality $|\mathcal{U}|$ of U to show that the bound $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ is sufficient to describe $\hat{\Omega}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W)$. We first observe that

$$\Lambda^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} q_U(u) \zeta^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u), q_S, q_Y), \quad (50)$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} & \zeta^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u), q_S, q_Y) \\ & := \sum_{\substack{(s, x, y) \\ \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}} q_{SXY|U}(s, x, y|u) \exp \left\{ \alpha \omega_q^{(\alpha)}(s, x, y|u) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $\zeta^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u), q_S, q_Y)$ is a continuous function of $q_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u)$. We further observe that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} q_S(s) &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} q_U(u) q_{S|U}(s|u), \\ q_Y(y) &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} q_U(u) q_{Y|U}(y|u). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (51)$$

Then by the support lemma,

$$1 + |\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{Y}| - 2 = |\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{Y}| - 1 \quad (52)$$

is sufficient to express one value of (50) and $|\mathcal{S}| + |\mathcal{Y}| - 2$ values of (51). We next show that the bound $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}|$ is sufficient to describe $\hat{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)$. Observe that

$$p_{SX}(s, x) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} q_U(u) p_{SX|U}(s, x|u), \quad (53)$$

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(p) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p_U(u) \tilde{\zeta}^{(\lambda)}(p_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u)), \quad (54)$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\zeta}^{(\lambda)}(p_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u)) \\ & := \sum_{\substack{(s, x, y) \\ \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}} q_{SXY|U}(s, x, y|u) \exp \{ \lambda \tilde{\omega}_p(s, x, y|u) \}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $\tilde{\zeta}^{(\lambda)}(p_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u))$ is a continuous function of $p_{SXY|U}(\cdot|u)$. Then by the support lemma,

$$|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}| - 1 + 1 = |\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}| \quad (55)$$

is sufficient to express $|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{X}| - 1$ values of (53) and one value of (54). \blacksquare

C. Proof of Property 2 part b)

In this appendix we prove Property 2 part b). Fix $q = q_{USXY} \in \mathcal{Q}$, arbitrary. For $p_{USXY} = (p_S, q_{XU|S}, p_S, W) \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}_{p, q_{Y|U}}(s, y|u) & := \log \frac{q_{Y|U}(y|u)}{p_Y(y)} + \log \frac{p_S(s)}{p_{S|U}(s|u)}, \\ \hat{\Omega}^{(\alpha)}(p, q_{Y|U}) & := \log E_p \left[\exp \left\{ \beta \hat{\omega}_{p, q_{Y|U}}(S, Y|U) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following two lemmas.

Lemma 7: For any $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]$ and any $q = q_{USXY} \in \mathcal{Q}$, there exists $p = p_{USXY} \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$ such that

$$\Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W) \leq \beta \hat{\Omega}^{(\alpha)}(p, q_{Y|U}). \quad (56)$$

Lemma 8: For any α satisfying $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, any $p = p_{USXY} \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$, and any stochastic matrix $q_{Y|U}$ induced by $q_{USXY} \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have

$$\hat{\Omega}^{(\alpha)}(p, q_{Y|U}) \leq \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}})}(p). \quad (57)$$

From Lemmas 7 and 8 we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4: For any α, β satisfying $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]$ and any $q = q_{USXY} \in \mathcal{Q}$, there exists $p = p_{USXY} \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$ such that

$$\Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W) \leq \beta \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}})}(p). \quad (58)$$

From (58), we have that for any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]$, we have

$$\Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W) \leq \beta \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}})}(p_S, W). \quad (59)$$

Proof of Lemma 7: We fix $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \in [0, 1]$ arbitrary. For each $q = q_{USXY} \in \mathcal{Q}$, we choose $p = p_{USXY} \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$ so that $p = (p_S, q_{XU|S}, W)$. Then for any $(u, x, y, z) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{p_S(s)}{q_S(s)} \cdot \frac{W(y|x, s)}{q_{Y|XSU}(y|x, s, u)} = \frac{p_S(s) q_{XU|S}(x, u|s)}{q_S(s) q_{XU|S}(x, u|s)} \\ & \times \frac{W(y|x, s)}{q_{Y|XSU}(y|x, s, u)} = \frac{p_{USXY}(u, s, x, y)}{q_{USXY}(u, s, x, y)}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

On upper bounds of $\exp \{ \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W) \}$, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left\{ \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(q|p_S, W) \right\} \stackrel{(a)}{=} E_q \left[\left\{ \frac{p_{USXY}(U, S, X, Y)}{q_{USXY}(U, S, X, Y)} \right. \right. \\ & \times \left. \left. \frac{q_{Y|U}^\alpha(Y|U)}{p_Y^\alpha(Y)} \frac{p_S^\alpha(S)}{p_{S|U}^\alpha(S|U)} \right\}^\beta \right] \\ & \times \left[\left\{ \frac{p_Y^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(Y)}{q_Y^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(Y)} \right\}^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \left\{ \frac{p_{S|U}^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(S|U)}{q_{S|U}^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(S|U)} \right\}^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \right] \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \exp \left\{ \beta \hat{\Omega}^{(\alpha)}(p, q_{Z|U}) \right\} A_1^{\frac{\beta}{2}} A_2^{\frac{\beta}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where we set

$$A_1 := E_q \left[\frac{p_Y^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(Y)}{q_Y^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(Y)} \right], \quad A_2 := E_q \left[\frac{p_{S|U}^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(S|U)}{q_{S|U}^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\beta}}(S|U)} \right].$$

Step (a) follows from (60). Step (b) follows from Hölder's inequality. From (61), we can see that it suffices to show $A_i \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2$ to complete the proof. Note here that when $\beta \in$

$[0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]$, we have $2\alpha(\beta/\bar{\beta}) \leq 1$. Hence under $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]$, we can apply Hölder's inequality to A_1 to obtain

$$A_1 = \mathbb{E}_q \left[\frac{p_Y^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\bar{\beta}}}(Y)}{q_Y^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\bar{\beta}}}(Y)} \right] \leq \left(\mathbb{E}_q \left[\frac{p_Y(Y)}{q_Y(Y)} \right] \right)^{\frac{2\alpha\beta}{\bar{\beta}}} = 1.$$

In a similar manner we can prove $A_2 \leq 1$. Hence we have (56) in Lemma 7. \blacksquare

Proof of Lemma 8: We fix $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, $\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]$, arbitrary. For any $p = p_{USXY} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{sh}}(p_S, W)$, and any $q = q_{USXY} \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left\{ \hat{\Omega}^{(\alpha)}(p, q_{Z|U}) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_p \left[\left\{ \frac{p_{Y|U}^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}}(Y|U) p_S^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}}(S)}{p_Y^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}}(Y) p_{S|U}^{\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}}(S|U)} \right\}^{\bar{\alpha}} \left\{ \frac{q_{Y|U}(Y|U)}{p_{Y|U}(Y|U)} \right\}^{\alpha} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \exp \left\{ \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}})}(p|p_S, W) \right\} \left(\mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{q_{Y|U}(Y|U)}{p_{Y|U}(Y|U)} \right] \right)^{\alpha} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}})}(p|p_S, W) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows from Hölder's inequality. Thus we have (57) in Lemma 8. \blacksquare

Proof of Property 2 part c): We evaluate lower bounds of $F(R|p_S, W)$ to obtain the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} F(R|p_S, W) &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sup_{\substack{\alpha \in [0, 1), \\ \beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]}} \frac{\beta \alpha R - \Omega^{(\alpha, \beta)}(p_S, W)}{1 + \beta(1 + 3\alpha)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \sup_{\alpha \in [0, 1)} \sup_{\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]} \frac{\beta \left\{ \alpha R - \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}})}(p_S, W) \right\}}{1 + \beta(1 + 3\alpha)} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \sup_{\alpha \in [0, 1), \lambda = \frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}} \frac{1}{2 + 5\alpha} \left\{ \alpha R - \bar{\alpha} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}})}(p_S, W) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} \sup_{\alpha = \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}, \lambda \geq 0} \frac{\lambda R - \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)}{(1 + \lambda) \left(2 + 5 \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \right)} \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \tilde{F}^{(\lambda)}(R, |p_S, W) = \tilde{F}(R, |p_S, W). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Step (a) follows from the definition of $F(R|p_S, W)$. Step (b) follows from (59) in Corollary 4. Step (c) follows from that for each $\alpha \in [0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{\beta \in [0, \frac{1}{1+2\alpha}]} \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta[1 + 3\alpha]} = \frac{1}{2 + 5\alpha}.$$

Step (d) follows from that

$$\lambda = \frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}, \alpha \in [0, 1) \Leftrightarrow \alpha = \frac{\lambda}{1 + \lambda}, \lambda \geq 0.$$

Thus Property 2 part c) is proved. \blacksquare

D. Proof of Property 2 part c), d), and e)

In this appendix we prove Property 2 parts c), d), and e).

Proof of Property 2 part c): We first observe the following form of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(p)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(p) &= \sum_{\substack{(u, x, y, z) \\ \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}} p_{USXY}(u, s, x, y) \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{p_{Y|U}(y|u) p_S(s)}{p_Y(y) p_{S|U}(s|u)} \right]^\lambda \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(u, s, x, y) \\ \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}} p_{UY}^\lambda(u, y) p_S^\lambda(s) p_{XY|SU}^\lambda(x, y|s, u) \\ &\quad \times p_{USX|Y}^\lambda(u, s, x|y) p_Y^{1-2\lambda}(y). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

From (64), we can see that if $\lambda \in [0, 1/2]$, then

$$\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(q) \leq |\mathcal{U}| |\mathcal{S}| |\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}| \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} |\mathcal{S}|^2 |\mathcal{X}|^2 |\mathcal{Y}|.$$

Step (a) follows from $p \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$. We next evaluate a lower bound of $\tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(p)$ for any $p \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$, and any $\lambda \in [0, 1/2]$. Let S_0 be the uniformly distributed random variable on \mathcal{S} . For each $\lambda \in [0, 1/2]$, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}^{(\lambda)}(p) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}_p \left[\left\{ \frac{p_Y(Y)}{p_{Y|U}(Y|U)} \right\}^{-\lambda} \left\{ \frac{p_{S|U}(s|u)}{p_S(S)} \right\}^{-\lambda} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} |\mathcal{S}|^{-\lambda} \mathbb{E}_p \left[\left\{ \frac{p_Y(Y)}{p_{Y|U}(Y|U)} \right\}^{-\lambda} \left\{ \frac{p_{S_0}(S)}{p_S(S)} \right\}^{-\lambda} \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} |\mathcal{S}|^{-\lambda} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{p_Y(Y)}{p_{Y|U}(Y|U)} \right] \right\}^{-\lambda} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p \left[\frac{p_{S_0}(S)}{p_S(S)} \right] \right\}^{-\lambda} \\ &\geq |\mathcal{S}|^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows from (63). Step (b) follows from $p_{S|U}(s|u) \leq 1$ for $(s, u) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U}$ and the definition of S_0 . Step (c) follows from the reverse Hölder's inequality. \blacksquare

We next prove that for each $q \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{sh}}(p_S, W)$ $\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q)$ is twice differentiable for $\lambda \in [0, 1/4]$.

Proof of Property 2 part d): For simplicity of notations, set

$$\underline{a} := (u, s, x, y), \underline{A} := (U, S, X, Y), \underline{\mathcal{A}} := \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \\ \omega_q^{(\mu)}(s, x, y|u) := \varsigma(\underline{a}), \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q) := \xi(\lambda).$$

Then we have

$$\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q) = \xi(\lambda) = \log \left[\sum_{\underline{a} \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}} q(\underline{a}) e^{\lambda \varsigma(\underline{a})} \right]. \quad (65)$$

The quantity $q^{(\lambda)}(\underline{a})$, $\underline{a} \in \underline{\mathcal{A}}$ has the following form:

$$q^{(\lambda)}(\underline{a}) = e^{-\xi(\lambda)} q(\underline{a}) e^{\lambda \varsigma(\underline{a})}. \quad (66)$$

By simple computations we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi'(\lambda) &= e^{-\xi(\lambda)} \left[\sum_{\underline{a}} q(\underline{a}) \varsigma(\underline{a}) e^{\lambda \varsigma(\underline{a})} \right], \\
\xi''(\lambda) &= e^{-2\xi(\lambda)} \\
&\quad \times \left[\sum_{\underline{a}, \underline{b} \in \mathcal{A}} q(\underline{a}) q(\underline{b}) \frac{\{\varsigma(\underline{a}) - \varsigma(\underline{b})\}^2}{2} e^{\lambda\{\varsigma(\underline{a}) + \varsigma(\underline{b})\}} \right] \\
&= \sum_{\underline{a}, \underline{b} \in \mathcal{A}} q^{(\lambda)}(\underline{a}) q^{(\lambda)}(\underline{b}) \frac{\{\varsigma(\underline{a}) - \varsigma(\underline{b})\}^2}{2} \\
&= \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}} q^{(\lambda)}(\underline{a}) \varsigma^2(\underline{a}) - \left[\sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}} q^{(\lambda)}(\underline{a}) \varsigma(\underline{a}) \right]^2. \quad (67)
\end{aligned}$$

On upper bound of $\xi''(\lambda)$, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi''(\lambda) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}} q^{(\lambda)}(\underline{a}) \varsigma^2(\underline{a}) \stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}} q(\underline{a}) \varsigma^2(\underline{a}) e^{\lambda \varsigma(\underline{a}) - \xi(\lambda)} \\
&= e^{-\xi(\lambda)} \sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}} q(\underline{a}) \sqrt{e^{2\lambda \varsigma(\underline{a})}} \sqrt{\varsigma^4(\underline{a})} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sqrt{e^{\xi(2\lambda) - 2\xi(\lambda)}} \sqrt{\sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}} q(\underline{a}) \varsigma^4(\underline{a})}. \quad (68)
\end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows from (67). Step (b) follows from (66). Step (c) follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (65). Since

$$\sum_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}} q(\underline{a}) \varsigma^4(\underline{a}) < \infty$$

and the bound (68), it suffices to examine the quantity $e^{\xi(2\lambda) - 2\xi(\lambda)}$. By Property 2 part c), this quantity is bounded for $\lambda \in [0, 1/4]$. Hence $\xi''(\lambda)$ exists for $\lambda \in [0, 1/4]$. By simple analytical argument we know that $\xi'(\lambda)$ exists for $\lambda \in [0, 1/4]$. ■

We finally prove the part e).

Proof of Property 2 part e): Fix any $(q, \lambda) \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W) \times [0, 1/4]$. By the Taylor expansion of $\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q)$ with respect to λ around $\lambda = 0$, we have that for any $(q, \lambda) \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W) \times [0, 1/4]$ and for some $\gamma \in [0, \lambda]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q) &= \xi(\lambda) = \xi(0) + \xi'(0)\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\xi''(\gamma)\lambda^2 \\
&= \lambda E_q [\tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U)] + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \text{Var}_{q^{(\gamma)}} [\tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U)] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \lambda C^{(\mu)}(p_S, W) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \text{Var}_{q^{(\gamma)}} [\tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U)]. \quad (69)
\end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows from $q \in \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$,

$$E_q [\tilde{\omega}_q(S, X, Y|U)] = I_q(U; Y) - I_q(U; S),$$

and the definition of $C(p_S, W)$. Let $(\gamma_{\text{opt}}, q_{\text{opt}}) \in [0, \lambda] \times \mathcal{P}(p_S, W)$ be a pair which attains $\rho^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)$. By this definition we have that

$$\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q_{\text{opt}}) = \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W) \quad (70)$$

and that for any $\gamma \in [0, \lambda]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Var}_{q_{\text{opt}}^{(\gamma)}} [\tilde{\omega}_{q_{\text{opt}}}(S, X, Y|U)] \\
&\leq \text{Var}_{q_{\text{opt}}^{(\gamma_{\text{opt}})}} [\tilde{\omega}_{q_{\text{opt}}}(S, X, Y|U)] = \rho^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W). \quad (71)
\end{aligned}$$

On upper bounds of $\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)$, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W) &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(q_{\text{opt}}) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \lambda C(p_S, W) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \text{Var}_{q_{\text{opt}}^{(\gamma)}} [\tilde{\omega}_{q_{\text{opt}}}(S, X, Y|U)] \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \lambda C(p_S, W) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \rho^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W) \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \lambda C(p_S, W) + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \rho(p_S, W).
\end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows from (70). Step (b) follows from (69). Step (c) follows from (71). Step (d) follows from the definition of $\rho(p_S, W)$. ■

E. Proof of Property 2 part f)

In this appendix we prove Property 2 part f). To prove this property we use the following lemma.

Lemma 9: When $\tau \in (0, \rho/4]$, the maximum of

$$\frac{1}{2+7\lambda} \left(\tau\lambda - \frac{\rho}{2}\lambda^2 \right)$$

for $\lambda \in (0, 1/4]$ is attained by the positive λ_0 satisfying

$$\vartheta(\lambda_0) := \lambda_0 + \frac{7}{4}\lambda_0^2 = \frac{\tau}{\rho}. \quad (72)$$

Let $g(a)$ be the inverse function of $\vartheta(a)$ for $a \geq 0$. Then the condition of (72) is equivalent to $\lambda_0 = g(\frac{\tau}{\rho})$. The maximum is given by

$$\frac{1}{2+7\lambda_0} \left(\tau\lambda_0 - \frac{\rho}{2}\lambda_0^2 \right) = \frac{\rho}{4}\lambda_0^2 = \frac{\rho}{4}g^2 \left(\frac{\tau}{\rho} \right).$$

By an elementary computation we can prove this lemma. We omit the detail.

Proof of Property 2 part f): When $R > C(p_S, W) + \tau$, we have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{F}(R|p_S, W) &\geq \sup_{\lambda \in (0, 1/4]} \tilde{F}^{(\lambda)}(R|p_S, W) \\
&= \sup_{\lambda \in (0, 1/4]} \frac{\lambda R - \tilde{\Omega}^{(\lambda)}(p_S, W)}{2+7\lambda} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sup_{\lambda \in (0, 1/4]} \frac{1}{2+7\lambda} \left\{ \lambda [R - C(p_S, W)] - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \rho(p_S, W) \right\} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{>} \sup_{\lambda \in (0, 1/4]} \frac{1}{2+7\lambda} \left\{ \tau\lambda - \frac{\rho}{2}\lambda^2 \right\} \stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{\rho}{4}g^2 \left(\frac{\tau}{\rho} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Step (a) follows from Property 2 part c). Step (b) follows from $R > C(p_S, W) + \tau$. Step (c) follows from Lemma 9. ■

F. Proof of Lemma 1

In this appendix we prove Lemma 1. For $k \in \mathcal{K}_n$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1(k) &:= \{(s^n, x^n, y^n) : p_S^n(s^n)W(y^n|x^n, s^n) \\ &\geq Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(s^n)Q_{Y^n|X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}(y^n|x^n, s^n, k)e^{-n\eta}\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_2(k) &:= \{(s^n, x^n, y^n) : p_{S^n|K_n}(s^n|k) \\ &\geq Q_{S^n|K_n}^{(ii)}(s^n|k)e^{-n\eta}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for $k \in \mathcal{K}_n$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_3(k) &:= \{(s^n, x^n, y^n) : p_{Y^n|K_n}(y^n|k) \\ &\geq |\mathcal{K}_n|e^{-n\eta}Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}(y^n)\}, \\ \mathcal{A}(k) &:= \bigcap_{i=1}^3 \mathcal{A}_i(k). \end{aligned}$$

Define four quantities $\Delta_i, i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_0 &:= \Pr\{(S^n, X^n, Y^n) \in \mathcal{A}(K_n)\}, \\ \Delta_i &:= \Pr\{(S^n, X^n, Y^n) \notin \mathcal{A}_i(K_n)\}, i = 1, 2, \\ \Delta_3 &:= \Pr\{(S^n, X^n, Y^n) \notin \mathcal{A}_3(K_n), Y^n \in \mathcal{D}(K_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 1: We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} P_c^{(n)} &= \Pr\{Y^n \in \mathcal{D}(K_n)\} \leq \Pr\{(S^n, X^n, Y^n) \in \mathcal{A}(K_n)\} \\ &\quad + \Pr\{(S^n, X^n, Y^n) \notin \mathcal{A}(K_n), Y^n \in \mathcal{D}(K_n)\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^3 \Delta_i. \end{aligned}$$

By definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_0 &= p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n} \left\{ \begin{aligned} &0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{p_S^n(S^n)W^n(Y^n|X^n S^n)}{Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(S^n)Q_{Y^n|X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}(Y^n|X^n, S^n, K_n)} + \eta, \\ &0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{p_{S^n|K_n}(S^n|K_n)}{Q_{S^n|K_n}^{(ii)}(S^n|K_n)} + \eta, \\ &\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \leq \log \frac{p_{Y^n|K_n}(Y^n|K_n)}{Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}(Y^n)} + \eta \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (73) \end{aligned}$$

From (73), it follows that if $(\varphi^{(n)}, \psi^{(n)})$ satisfies $(1/n) \log |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq R$, then the quantity Δ_0 is upper bounded by the first term in the right members of (9) in Lemma 1. Hence it suffices to show $\Delta_i \leq e^{-n\eta}, i = 1, 2, 3$ to prove Lemma 1.

We first prove $\Delta_i \leq e^{-n\eta}$ for $i = 1, 2$. We have the following chains of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_1^c(k)}} p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n}(k, s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_1^c(k)}} p_S^n(s^n) p_{X^n K_n | S^n}(x^n, k | s^n) \\ &\quad \times W^n(y^n | x^n, s^n) \\ &\leq e^{-n\eta} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_1^c(k)}} Q_{S^n}^{(i)}(s^n) p_{X^n K_n | S^n}(x^n, k | s^n) \\ &\quad \times Q_{Y^n | X^n S^n K_n}^{(i)}(y^n | x^n, s^n, k) \leq e^{-n\eta}, \\ \Delta_2 &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_2^c(k)}} p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n}(k, s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ &\leq e^{-n\eta} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} p_{K_n}(k) \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ \in \mathcal{A}_2^c(k)}} Q_{S^n|K_n}^{(ii)}(s^n|k) \\ &\quad \times p_{X^n Y^n | S^n K_n}(x^n, y^n | s^n, k) \leq e^{-n\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove $\Delta_3 \leq e^{-n\eta}$. We have the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_3 &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{(s^n, x^n, y^n) : \\ y^n \in \mathcal{D}(k), \\ p_{Y^n|K_n}(y^n|k) < e^{-n\eta} \\ \times |\mathcal{K}_n| Q_{Y^n}^{(iv)}(y^n)}} p_{K_n S^n X^n Y^n}(k, s^n, x^n, y^n) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{K}_n|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{\substack{y^n \in \mathcal{D}(k), \\ p_{Y^n|K_n}(y^n|k) \\ < e^{-n\eta} |\mathcal{K}_n| Q_{Y^n}^{(iv)}(y^n)}} p_{Y^n|K_n}(y^n|k) \\ &\leq e^{-n\eta} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{D}(k)} Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)}(y^n) = e^{-n\eta} Q_{Y^n}^{(iii)} \left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \mathcal{D}(k) \right) \\ &\leq e^{-n\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus Lemma 1 is proved. \blacksquare

G. Proof of Lemma 5

In this appendix we prove Lemma 5.

Proof of Lemma 5: By the definition of $p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n)$, for $t = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \\ &= C_t^{-1}(k, s^n) p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{i=1}^t f_{\mathcal{F}^i}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_i, x_i, y_i | u_i, v_i). \quad (74) \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following chain of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} C_t^{-1}(k, s^n) p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times \prod_{i=1}^t f_{\mathcal{F}^i}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_i, x_i, y_i | u_i, v_i) \\
& = C_t^{-1}(k, s^n) p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} f_{\mathcal{F}^i}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_i, x_i, y_i | u_i, v_i) \\
& \quad \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t, v_t) \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{C_{t-1}(k, s^n)}{C_t(k, s^n)} p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t, v_t) \\
& = (\Phi_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(k, s^n))^{-1} \\
& \quad \times p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t, v_t). \tag{75}
\end{aligned}$$

Steps (a) and (b) follow from (74). From (75), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(k, s^n) p_{X^t Y^t | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^t, y^t | k, s^n) \\
& = p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t). \tag{76}
\end{aligned}$$

Taking summations of (76) and (77) with respect to x^t, y^t , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{t, \mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(k, s^n) & = \sum_{x^t, y^t} p_{X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} | K_n S^n; \mathcal{F}^{t-1}}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(x^{t-1}, y^{t-1} | k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times p_{X_t Y_t | X^{t-1} Y^{t-1} K_n S^n}(x_t, y_t | x^{t-1}, y^{t-1}, k, s^n) \\
& \quad \times f_{\mathcal{F}^t}^{(\alpha, \theta)}(s_t, x_t, y_t | u_t),
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \blacksquare

REFERENCES

- [1] S. I. Gel'fand and M. S. Pinsker, "Coding for channel with random parameters," *Problems of Control and Information Theory*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 19–31, 1980.
- [2] H. Tyagi and P. Narayan, "The Gel'fand-Pinsker channel: Strong converse and upper bound for the reliability function," in *Proceedings of 2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2009, pp. 1954–1957.
- [3] Y. Oohama, "Strong converse exponent for degraded broadcast channels at rates outside the capacity region," in *Proceedings of 2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 939–943.
- [4] —, "Strong converse theorems for degraded broadcast channels with feedback," in *Proceedings of 2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 2510–2514.
- [5] —, "Exponential strong converse for source coding with side information at the decoder," *Entropy*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 352 (1–32), May 2018.

- [6] —, "Exponential strong converse for one helper source coding problem," *Entropy*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 567 (1–36), June 2019.
- [7] —, "New strong converse for asymmetric broadcast channels," 2020, *preprint*; available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1604.02901.pdf>, the current version was updated at August, 2020.
- [8] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, "Broadcast channels with confidential messages," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 339–348, May 1979.
- [9] C. Heegard and A. El.Gamal, "On the capacity of computer memory with defects," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 731–739, September 1983.
- [10] Y. Steinberg, "Coding for channels with rate-limited side information at the decoder and applications," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 4283–4295, September 2008.
- [11] Y. Oohama, "Strong converse for state dependent channels with full state information at the sender and partial state information at the receiver," in *Proceedings of 2016 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, 2016, pp. 126–130.
- [12] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory, Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*. Academic Press, 1981.
- [13] V. Y. F. Tan, "A formula for the capacity of the general Gel'fand-Pinsker channel," in *Proceedings of 2013 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2013, pp. 2458–2462.
- [14] T. S. Han, *Information-Spectrum Methods in Information Theory*. Springer, 2003.
- [15] S. Arimoto, "On the converse to the coding theorem for discrete memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 357–359, May 1973.
- [16] G. Dueck and J. Körner, "Reliability function of a discrete memoryless channel at rates above capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 82–85, January 1979.