

A Unified Theory of Multiple-Access and Interference Channels via Approximate Capacity Regions for the MAC-IC-MAC

Yimin Pang, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Mahesh Varanasi, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—Approximate capacity regions are established for a class of interfering multiple access channels consisting of two multiple-access channels (MACs), each with an arbitrary number of transmitters, with one transmitter in each MAC causing interference to the receiver of the other MAC, a channel we refer to henceforth as the MAC-IC-MAC. For the discrete memoryless (DM) MAC-IC-MAC, two inner bounds are obtained that are generalizations of prior inner bounds for the two-user DM interference channel (IC) due to Chong *et al.* For the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC, it is shown that single-user coding at the non-interfering transmitters and superposition coding at the interfering transmitter of each MAC achieves a rate region that is within a quantifiable gap of the capacity region, thereby extending such a result for the two-user semi-deterministic IC by Telatar and Tse. For the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, an approximate capacity region that is within a constant gap of the capacity region is obtained, generalizing such a result for the two-user Gaussian IC by Etkin *et al.* Contrary to the aforementioned approximate capacity results for the two-user IC whose achievability requires the union of all admissible input distributions, our gap results on the semi-deterministic and the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC are achievable by only a subset and one of all admissible coding distributions, respectively. The symmetric generalized degrees of freedom (GDoF) of the symmetric Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC with more than one user per cell, which is a function of the interference strength (the ratio of INR to SNR at high SNR, both expressed in dB) and the numbers of users in each cell, is V-shaped with flat shoulders. An analysis based on signal-level partitions shows that the non-interfering transmitters utilize the signal-level partitions at the receiver where they are intended that cannot be accessed by the interfering transmitters (due to the restriction of superposition coding), thereby improving the sum symmetric GDoF to up to one degree of freedom per cell under a range of SINR exponent levels, which in turn becomes wider as the number of transmitters in each cell increases. Consequently, time-sharing between interfering and non-interfering transmitters is GDoF-suboptimal in general, as is time-sharing between the two embedded MAC-Z-MACs.

Index Terms—Approximate capacity, capacity bounds, interfering multiple-access channels, generalized degrees of freedom.

This research was supported in part by NSF Grant 1423657 and by Qualcomm Gift 24868. It was presented in part at the 51st Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2013.

Yimin Pang is with the Department of Electrical, Computer and Energy Engineering, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, US, e-mail: yipa5803@colorado.edu.

Mahesh K. Varanasi is with the Department of Electrical, Computer and Energy Engineering, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, US, e-mail: varanasi@colorado.edu.

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to the rapid increase of data demands in recent years, wireless co-band communication has drawn significant interest in both theory and practice. Bluetooth and Wi-Fi have both been established on 2.4 GHz band, and more recently 3GPP introduced LTE Licensed Assisted Access (LAA) to offload LTE packets to unlicensed spectrum at 5 GHz, which causes Wi-Fi and LAA to coexist. Such emerging technologies motivate the study of co-band interference between cellular networks in network information theory. In this paper, we obtain bounds on the capacity region and approximate capacity regions for the discrete-memoryless, semi-deterministic and Gaussian classes of mutually interfering two-cell MAC networks in which there is interference from one of the transmitters of the MAC to the receiver of the other MAC. For brevity, we refer to this two-cell network as the MAC-IC-MAC. As shown in Fig. 1, the MAC-IC-MAC captures many practical communication scenarios. Fig. 1a shows an uplink cellular network where devices 1.1 and 2.1 are located on the cell edge so that interference paths exist between the two cells as indicated by the dashed arrows, whereas devices 1.2 and 2.2 do not cause interference to the neighboring cell due to their favorable access location in their own cell. Fig. 1b represents a femtocell network, where similar partial interference exists between the macrocell and femtocell. The study of the capacity region of MAC-IC-MAC could therefore provide an approach to increasing uplink throughput and cell edge spectrum efficiency for co-band networks.




Fig. 1: Examples of the MAC-IC-MAC

From a theoretical point of view, this paper on the MAC-IC-MAC can be seen as the outcome of an effort to unify and generalize the capacity results for the MAC [1]–[3] on

the one hand, and the more recent capacity approximations for the two-user IC [4]–[10] on the other. The main results of this paper are described next.

1) *Two achievable rate regions for the DM MAC-IC-MAC:* We unify and generalize the capacity region of the DM MAC, seen as a tight inner bound, and the best known inner bounds for the two-user DM IC due to [5]–[7], [9], to obtain two inner bounds for the DM MAC-IC-MAC.

The coding scheme we employ is what would be deemed the most natural for it: each of the two interfering transmitters employ rate-splitting and superposition coding (the CMG scheme of [9]) and the non-interfering transmitters in each MAC employ single-user random coding. An analysis of such a coding scheme results in an inner bound for the capacity region that is a polytope in a number of dimensions that is two more than the total number of transmitters due to rate-splitting at the two interfering transmitters. Such a polytope is defined by an indeterminate number of sum-rate inequalities because there is no restriction on the number of users in each cell, and the problem lies in the elimination of the two auxiliary rate variables. Utilizing the particular structure of this polytope, and using a form of structured Fourier-Motzkin elimination, the two split rates are projected out to obtain an explicit polyhedral description of the achievable rate region. The union of such polytopes over all admissible coding distributions is an inner bound as well but two sets of inequalities defining the polytopes are shown to be redundant in this case, thereby generalizing the CMG inner bound for the two-user DM IC in [9], named the compact HK region therein.

2) *A quantifiable gap to the capacity region of the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC:* We also unify and extend the capacity region of the DM MAC, viewed as a tight outer bound, and the Telatar-Tse outer bound for the semi-deterministic two-user DM IC of [8]—which is within a quantifiable gap of the capacity region—to the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC, to obtain an outer bound for the latter, while also assuring a similar quantifiable gap to its capacity region. In extending the outer bound of [8], certain set functions have to be identified in order to handle exponentially many partial sum rate restrictions and the appropriate genie information must be chosen to extend the genie-aided argument of [8] to the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC in a natural way.

3) *Constant gap to capacity for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC:* The capacity region of the (scalar) Gaussian MAC is well-known [3] and that of the Gaussian IC was characterized to within one bit in [10]. In this paper, we obtain a one-bit gap to capacity region approximation for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC and a two-bit gap to capacity region attainable with a single coding scheme (i.e., with a single distribution). This clarifies that the previously obtained one-bit gap result on the Gaussian IC of [10] involves the consideration of all possible coding distributions in its achievable scheme, while also demonstrating that a two-bit gap result for the two-user IC can be shown to be achievable by the single random coding scheme proposed in [10].

4) *The generalized degrees of freedom (GDoF) region for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC:* The constant gap capacity approximation for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC yields its GDoF

region. In particular, the symmetric GDoF curve, shown in Fig. 2, which is a function of α , the interference strength (the ratio of INR to SNR at high SNR, both expressed in dB) and the number of users in a cell, is V-shaped with flat shoulders on both sides. It reveals that in a Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC with $K \geq 2$ users per cell with equal rates, all transmitters can send information at an approximately interference-free rate in the high SNR regime when $\alpha = \frac{\log \text{INR}}{\log \text{SNR}} \in [0, 1 - \frac{1}{K}] \cup [1 + \frac{1}{K}, \infty)$. As a byproduct, we have that the sum symmetric DoF (i.e., GDoF at $\alpha = 1$) of the K -user symmetric Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is $\frac{K}{K+1}$.

When $K = 1$, the MAC-IC-MAC is the two-user IC, and the symmetric GDoF is given by the well-known "W" curve [10]. For a comparison of the sum symmetric GDoF of the MAC-IC-MAC for $K = 1, 2, 3$ and 4, see Fig. 5.

In Section III-E, a signal-level (or power partition) method is described that is inspired by the works of [11], using which a few examples are discussed to explain the attainability of the sum symmetric GDoF in the symmetric MAC-IC-MAC with two transmitters per cell, for various values of α . The insight gained here is that the non-interfering transmitters utilize the signal-level partitions at the receiver where they are intended that cannot be accessed by the interfering transmitters (due to the restriction of superposition coding), thereby improving the sum symmetric GDoF to up to one degree of freedom per cell under a range of SINR exponent levels, which in turn becomes wider as the number of transmitters in each cell increases.




Fig. 2: Symmetric GDoF of Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, when each MAC contains more than one user.

A. Related Previous Works

Previous related works are summarized as follows. Multiple access channels are the best understood multi-terminal networks with the capacity region determined by Liao [1], Ahlswede [2] and Wyner [3]. Some of the key papers on two-user interference channels are [4]–[6], [8]–[13].

For the interference channel, the Han-Kobayashi achievable scheme (HK scheme) in [5], as well as its alternative, the CMG scheme of [9], give the (same) best inner bound to the capacity region known to date. Telatar and Tse [8] found an outer bound for the class of semi-deterministic interference channels and quantified the gap to the CMG inner bound. For Gaussian scalar and vector interference channels, Etkin et al [10] and Karmakar and Varanasi [13] characterized approximate capacity regions to within constant, channel coefficient- and SNR-independent gaps, respectively.

For the two-cell interfering multiple-access channel with an arbitrary number of transmitters in each cell, the work

by [14] used interference alignment to achieve interference-free degrees of freedom when the number of users in each cell goes to infinity. Perron et al. [15] defined a type of multiple-access interference channel with only four nodes, where one of the receivers must decode the messages from both transmitters. The capacity region within a quantifiable gap was obtained for the semi-deterministic case. Chaaban and Sezgin studied a fully connected two-cell channel in which a two-user MAC interferes with a point-to-point link [16]. The capacity region is found for very strong and some cases of strong interference and upper and lower bounds on the sum-rate in the weak interference regime (with the lower bound achievable by treating interference as noise) are also obtained. Subsequently, in [17], they showed that when the interference is weak, treating interference as noise in their model is sub-optimal. The cognitive radio version of that model was studied by the same authors in [18]. Buhler and Wunder [19] derived upper bounds on the sum rate and an achievable scheme for the linear deterministic version of the model in [16]. Fritschek and Wunder obtain a result on the reciprocity between the two-cell deterministic interfering MAC (IMAC) and the two-cell deterministic interfering broadcast channel (IBC) in [20], and obtain an achievable region under a weak interference condition for both those channels. In [21], the deterministic IMAC was revisited using the lower triangular deterministic model introduced by [22], and a constant gap sum capacity as well as the sum GDoF were obtained. For the Gaussian IMAC, Fritschek and Wunder [23] close the gap between the achievable sum rate regions for Gaussian IMAC and the deterministic IMAC. Their coding scheme employs signal scale alignment and lattice coding. Zhu et al. [24] studied the interference Z MAC, a special case of the channel studied in [16], with only one-sided interference links from the two MAC transmitters to the point-to-point link receiver. The authors therein obtained the capacity region or the sum capacity under certain channel conditions using superposition encoding and joint decoding. In the conference version of this paper [25], an approximate capacity region was presented for a special case of the MAC-IC-MAC with a two-user MAC in the first cell and a point-to-point link in the second cell¹.

B. Notations

The notations used throughout the paper are summarized as follows. The j -th user in the i -th cell is indexed as i,j , where $i \in \{1,2\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, K_i\}$ and K_i is the number of the user in cell- i . Hence, the j -th transmitter in the i -th cell is denoted as $\text{Tx}i,j$, whose message, transmit symbol, and rate are denoted as $M_{i,j}$, $X_{i,j}$ and $R_{i,j}$, respectively.

Let Θ_i be the set of indices of all users in the i -th cell, i.e. $\Theta_i = \{i,1, \dots, i,K_i\}$. For the sake of convenience, the K_i -tuples of messages, input symbols and rates of users in cell i be denoted as M_{Θ_i} , X_{Θ_i} and R_{Θ_i} . For example, the input symbols of cell-1 $\{X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,K_1}\}$ are denoted simply

as X_{Θ_1} . Similarly, M_{Θ_1} denotes the K_1 -tuple of messages $\{M_{1,1}, \dots, M_{1,K_1}\}$, and R_{Θ_1} denotes the K_1 -tuple of their rates $\{R_{1,1}, \dots, R_{1,K_1}\}$.

Throughout, we let Ω_i denote any non-empty subset of Θ_i , i.e., $\Omega_i \in 2^{\Theta_i} \setminus \emptyset$, where 2^{Θ_i} is the power set of Θ_i . Moreover, we let \mathcal{I}_i denote any non-empty subset of Θ_i that necessarily contains the element $i,1$. The sets $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_i$ and $\bar{\Omega}_i$ are defined as the complements of \mathcal{I}_i and Ω_i relative to Θ_i . Furthermore, the collection of input symbols of users indexed by elements of \mathcal{I}_i or Ω_i are written as $X_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ and X_{Ω_i} .

We use capital letters to denote random variables or sequences, such as $X_{i,j}$ and $X_{i,j}^n$, where $X_{i,j}^n = (X_{i,j,1}, \dots, X_{i,j,n})$, so that the t -th random variable of the random sequence $X_{i,j}^n$ is denoted by $X_{i,j,t}$. The underlying alphabets are denoted by $\mathcal{X}_{i,j}$ and $\mathcal{X}_{i,j}^n$, and specific values of $X_{i,j}$ and $X_{i,j}^n$ by $x_{i,j}$ and $x_{i,j}^n$. Unless specified explicitly, we will use the usual short hand notation for (conditional) probability distributions where the lower case arguments also denote the random variables whose (conditional) distribution is being considered. For example, $p(y_i|x_{i,j})$ denotes $p_{Y_i|X_{i,j}}(y_i|x_{i,j})$.

If random variables X , Y and Z form a Markov chain, we denote it as $X - \circ - Y - \circ - Z$.

In the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC to be defined in the next section, a signal path from the transmitter $\text{Tx}i,j$ to the receiver $\text{Rx}i$ is represented as $i,j \rightarrow i$, so that $h_{i,j \rightarrow i}$ denotes the path attenuation from $\text{Tx}i,j$ to $\text{Rx}i$. Similarly, the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and interference-to-noise ratio (INR) from $\text{Tx}i,j$ and $\text{Tx}i',j$ to $\text{Rx}i$ are written as $\text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i}$ and $\text{INR}_{i',j \rightarrow i}$, respectively, where $i, i' \in \{1,2\}$ and $i \neq i'$.

The achievable schemes of this paper involve message splitting at the two transmitters that cause interference at their unintended receiver. A common sub-message sent by $\text{Tx}i,1$ and decoded at both receivers is denoted as $m_{i,1c}$. The private sub-message of $\text{Tx}i,1$ to be decoded only at the intended receiver $\text{Rx}i$ is denoted as $m_{i,1p}$. The rate of $m_{i,1c}$ and $m_{i,1p}$ are written as $R_{i,1c}$ and $R_{i,1p}$, respectively.

We use \mathbb{C} to denote the set of complex numbers, $X \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ to denote zero-mean, circularly symmetric complex Gaussian random variable with variance σ^2 , and $|\cdot|$ to denote the magnitude of a complex number.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the three classes of channel models of the MAC-IC-MAC and formulates the problem. Section III presents the main results of this paper with outlines of proofs. Section IV concludes the paper. Some detailed proofs are relegated to the appendices.

II. CHANNEL MODELS AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we introduce three classes of MAC-IC-MACs, namely, the general discrete memoryless MAC-IC-MAC, the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC and the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC.

A. Discrete Memoryless MAC-IC-MAC (DM MAC-IC-MAC)

In a DM MAC-IC-MAC, as shown in Fig. 3, there are two uplink communication cells: $(\text{Tx}1,1, \dots, \text{Tx}1,K_1 \rightarrow \text{Rx}1)$ and $(\text{Tx}2,1, \dots, \text{Tx}2,K_2 \rightarrow \text{Rx}2)$. Two interference links exist

¹Since we are studying a more general channel model here than the conference version of this paper in [25], the missing proofs in [25] can be completed by setting $K_1 = 2$ and $K_2 = 1$ in the results and proofs in Section III and Appendices C. Typographical errors in [25] are also corrected therein.

between these two cells between the first users of each cell as shown in Fig. 3. The definition of DM MAC-IC-MAC is given next.




Fig. 3: The Discrete Memoryless MAC-IC-MAC

Definition 1. A (K_1, K_2) discrete memoryless MAC-IC-MAC is a $(K_1 + K_2)$ -transmitter and 2-receiver network $(\mathcal{X}_{\Theta_1} \times \mathcal{X}_{\Theta_2}, p(y_1, y_2 | x_{\Theta_1}, x_{\Theta_2}), \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2)$ with transition probability satisfying

$$p(y_1^n, y_2^n | x_{\Theta_1}^n, x_{\Theta_2}^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n (p(y_{1t} | x_{\Theta_1 t}, x_{2.1t}) p(y_{2t} | x_{\Theta_2 t}, x_{1.1t})) \quad (1)$$

The input and output symbols $X_{i,j}$ and Y_i are taken from discrete alphabets $\mathcal{X}_{i,j}$ and \mathcal{Y}_i respectively, where $j \in \{1, \dots, K_i\}$. Message $M_{i,j}$ is generated from set $\mathcal{M}_{i,j}$ uniformly at random, and encoded at transmitter $\text{Tx}i.j$. Receiver Rxi decodes M_{Θ_i} as \hat{M}_{Θ_i} .

Given the channel as defined in Definition 1, a $(n, R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2}, P_e^{(n)})$ coding scheme for a DM MAC-IC-MAC consists of

- $M_{i,j}$, the message of transmitter $\text{Tx}i.j$, assumed to be uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{M}_{i,j} \in \{1, \dots, 2^{nR_{i,j}}\}$, for each $i,j \in \Theta_i$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$;
- Encoding functions $f_{i,j}(\cdot)$ such that

$$f_{i,j}(\cdot) : \mathcal{M}_{i,j} \mapsto \mathcal{X}_{i,j}^n, m_{i,j} \mapsto x_{i,j}^n(m_{i,j}).$$

- Decoding functions $g_i(\cdot)$ such that

$$g_i(\cdot) : \mathcal{Y}_i^n \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^{K_i} \mathcal{M}_{i,j}, y_i^n \mapsto \hat{m}_{\Theta_i}(y_i^n).$$

The probability of error $P_e^{(n)}$ is defined to be

$$P_e^{(n)} = P \left\{ M_{\Theta_1} \neq \hat{M}_{\Theta_1} \text{ or } M_{\Theta_2} \neq \hat{M}_{\Theta_2} \right\}.$$

A $K_1 + K_2$ rate-tuple $(R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2})$ is said to be achievable if there exists a sequence of $(n, R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2}, P_e^{(n)})$ coding schemes for which $P_e^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The capacity region, denoted as \mathcal{C} , is the closure of all achievable rate-tuples.

B. Semi-Deterministic MAC-IC-MAC

In a semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC, the received interference has a special structure: the output Y_i is determined by X_{Θ_i} and the output $S_{i'}$ resulting from passing $X_{i',1}$ through a DM point-to-point channel $p(s_{i'} | x_{i',1})$, as shown in Fig. 4. A formal definition is given next.




Fig. 4: Semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC

Definition 2. Let S_i be a random variable over the alphabet \mathcal{S}_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. A MAC-IC-MAC is semi-deterministic if the outputs Y_i satisfy

$$Y_i = \phi_i(X_{\Theta_i}, S_{i'}) \quad (2)$$

where $i' \in \{1, 2\}$, $i' \neq i$, ϕ_i is a deterministic function and for any fixed inputs x_{Θ_i} , the mapping

$$\phi_i(x_{\Theta_i}, \cdot) : \mathcal{S}_{i'} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_i, s_{i'} \mapsto \phi_i(x_{\Theta_i}, s_{i'}) \quad (3)$$

is invertible.

This structure is seen, for instance, in the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC.

Let \mathcal{C}^{sd} denote the capacity region of the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC.

C. Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC

Consider an additive Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, whose input-output relation can be written as

$$Y_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{K_1} h_{1,j \rightarrow 1} X_{1,j} + h_{2,1 \rightarrow 1} X_{2,1} + Z_1 \quad (4)$$

$$Y_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{K_2} h_{2,j \rightarrow 2} X_{2,j} + h_{1,1 \rightarrow 2} X_{1,1} + Z_2 \quad (5)$$

where $X_{i,j}$ and Y_i are complex input and output symbols, $h_{i,j \rightarrow i}, h_{i,j \rightarrow i'} \in \mathbb{C}$ are path attenuations from $\text{Tx}i.j$ to Rxi and Rxi' , respectively, and $Z_i \in \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ is the additive Gaussian noise. The transmitted codeword $x_{i,j}^n \in \mathcal{X}_{i,j}^n$ at $\text{Tx}i.j$ should meet the average per-codeword power constraints:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n |x_{i,j,t}|^2 \leq P_{i,j}. \quad (6)$$

The SNRs and INRs at receiver Rx*i* are defined to be

$$\text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} = P_{i,j} |h_{i,j \rightarrow i}|^2 \quad (7)$$

$$\text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i} = P_{i',1} |h_{i',1 \rightarrow i}|^2 \quad (8)$$

where $P_{i,j}$ is the maximum average transmission power at Tx*i,j*. We denote the capacity region of Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC by \mathcal{C}^G .

Other than not being a discrete alphabet channel and having input (power) constraints, the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is a special case of the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC, as can be seen by choosing S_i in (2) to be $S_i = h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'} X_{i,1} + Z_{i'}$ and the functions ϕ_i to be weighted sum with weights determined by the channel coefficients.

III. RESULTS

In this section, we present the main results of this paper, namely, inner and outer bounds on the capacity region of the DM, semi-deterministic and Gaussian MAC-IC-MACs.

First, we define two generic regions in Section III-A which we will use repeatedly in the following sections to describe inner and outer bounds on the capacity region of the three MAC-IC-MAC models. Section III-B states two inner bounds in Theorems 1 and 2 on the capacity region \mathcal{C} of the general DM MAC-IC-MAC, supported by a random coding argument. The first bound is a single polytope bound obtained by fixing one ‘‘coding’’ distribution of auxiliary/input random variables and the second is a union of polytopes (compact region) bound with the union taken over certain admissible coding distributions.

In Section III-C, we extend the genie-aided arguments of [8] for the two-user semi-deterministic IC to the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC to obtain an outer bound for \mathcal{C}^{sd} in Theorem 3 of Section III-C. Moreover, we also quantify the gap between the single-polytope and union-of-polytopes inner bounds of Theorems 1 and 2 (when specialized to the semi-deterministic channel) and the outer bound in Theorems 4 and 5. Our quantifiable gap analysis reveals insights beyond those available even in the previously studied two-user semi-deterministic IC, and also clarifying past studies in the process.

In Section III-D, the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is investigated. In particular, in Theorem 6, we obtain an inner bound based on a universal coding scheme where the interfering transmitters perform power splitting that is independent of the rate-pair to be achieved (but dependent on channel coefficients) and the non-interfering transmitters encode with single-user Gaussian codebooks. Moreover, a single-polytope, and hence explicit, outer bound for \mathcal{C}^G is obtained in Theorem 7. These inner and outer bounds are shown to be within a two-bit gap of each other, and hence of \mathcal{C}^G , in Theorem 8. If the power split can be chosen based on the rate-tuple to be achieved in addition to the channel coefficients then a one-bit gap to capacity can be achieved as shown in Lemma 3.

Finally, in Section III-E, the GDoF region of the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is obtained in Theorem 9 and specialized to

the symmetric GDoF region in Corollary 2. A careful study of it shows how the non-interfering transmitters improve the sum symmetric GDoF as a function of the relative interference strength parameter α , defined as the ratio of the INR to SNR (with both expressed in the dB scale), at high SNR.

Remark 1. The study of the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC at high SNR is also relevant to the fully-connected $(K_1 + K_2)$ -transmitter, 2-receiver, two-cell interference networks when the interference from all but one transmitter in each cell are sufficiently weak so that they are received at the unintended receiver at the noise level (and are therefore treated as noise).

A. Two Generic Regions

For brevity, we provide the definitions of two generic regions in this subsection in terms of which all key results of this paper are succinctly expressed.

Definition 3. For any sets $\Omega_i \subseteq \Theta_i = \{i.1, \dots, i.K_i\}$, $\Upsilon'_i \subseteq \Theta_i \setminus \{i.1\}$ and $\Upsilon_i = \Upsilon'_i \cup \{i.1\}$, where $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} be non-negative, real-valued functions of set Υ_i so that,

$$\mathcal{A} : \{\Upsilon_i \in 2^{\Theta_i} : i.1 \in \Upsilon_i\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad \Upsilon_i \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\Upsilon_i} \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{E} : \{\Upsilon_i \in 2^{\Theta_i} : i.1 \in \Upsilon_i\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad \Upsilon_i \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\Upsilon_i} \quad (10)$$

and \mathcal{B}_{Ω_i} and \mathcal{G}_{Ω_i} be non-negative real-valued functions of set Ω_i so that,

$$\mathcal{B} : 2^{\Theta_i} \setminus \emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_i} \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{G} : 2^{\Theta_i} \setminus \emptyset \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \quad \Omega_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_i}. \quad (12)$$

There is a slight abuse of notation in the definitions of set functions \mathcal{A} , \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{G} in (9)-(12), which we clarify. The domains $\{\Upsilon_i \in 2^{\Theta_i} : i.1 \in \Upsilon_i\}$ of functions \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{E} or $2^{\Theta_i} \setminus \emptyset$ of \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{G} , depend on $i \in \{1, 2\}$, which means we are actually using the same function name for two different functions. However, which input domain a set function is referring to can be easily identified by the subscript of its argument (such as in Υ_1 or Ω_2 , respectively).

Definition 4. Let the Cartesian product of the domains of $(\Upsilon_1, \Omega_1, \Upsilon_2, \Omega_2)$

$$\Xi \triangleq \{\Upsilon_1 \in 2^{\Theta_1} : 1.1 \in \Upsilon_1\} \times \{2^{\Theta_1} \setminus \emptyset\} \times \{\Upsilon_2 \in 2^{\Theta_2} : 2.1 \in \Upsilon_2\} \times \{2^{\Theta_2} \setminus \emptyset\} \quad (13)$$

Define the region $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G})$ to be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}) = \left\{ (R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_1+K_2} : \right. \\ \forall (\Upsilon_1, \Omega_1, \Upsilon_2, \Omega_2) \in \Xi \\ \sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_1} \\ \sum_{1.j \in \Upsilon_1} R_{1,j} \leq \mathcal{A}_{\Upsilon_1} + \mathcal{E}_{\Upsilon_2} \\ \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_2} \\ \sum_{2.j \in \Upsilon_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\Upsilon_1} + \mathcal{A}_{\Upsilon_2} \end{aligned} \quad (14) \quad (15) \quad (16) \quad (17)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_2} \quad (18)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_1} + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (20)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_1} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (21)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} + \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_2} \quad (22)$$

Thus, $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G})$ is a polytope defined via nine classes of partial sum-rate inequalities.

Definition 5. Let us also define $\mathcal{R}_c(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{K_1+K_2}$ for given set functions $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}$ and \mathcal{G} to be the rate region

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_c(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}) = \left\{ (R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_1+K_2} : \right. \\ \left. \forall (\mathcal{Y}_1, \Omega_1, \mathcal{Y}_2, \Omega_2) \in \Xi \right. \\ \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_1} \quad (23) \\ \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_2} \quad (24) \\ \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_2} \quad (25) \\ \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_1} + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (26) \\ \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (27) \\ \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_1} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (28) \\ \left. \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_2} + \mathcal{G}_{\Omega_2} \right\}. \quad (29) \end{aligned}$$

The subscript 'c' in $\mathcal{R}_c(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G})$ indicates that this region is in *compact* form since it can be obtained by removing the two classes of inequalities (15) and (17) from $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G})$. Thus, $\mathcal{R}_c(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G})$ is a polytope defined via just seven classes of partial sum-rate inequalities.

Note that in Definitions 3 and 5, for those sets of inequalities whose bounds don't depend on all of the subsets $\mathcal{Y}_1, \Omega_1, \mathcal{Y}_2$ and Ω_2 , duplicated copies will be produced when either \mathcal{R} or \mathcal{R}_c is written exhaustively according to those definitions. However, we adopt those definitions for the analytical convenience of using the single domain Ξ , instead of individually

specifying the domains for each set of inequalities in the two definitions. Duplicated copies are of course to be ejected in any explicit specification of the regions.

Remark 2. As will be observed in the later section, each set function $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}$ or \mathcal{G} represents a mutual information term for a certain set Ω_i or \mathcal{Y}_i . Their exact form will be assigned according to the channel model – DM, semi-deterministic or Gaussian – and whether the bound under consideration is an inner bound or an outer bound. When a particular region needs to be specified, we will specialize each of the four set functions, and a rate region can be described by replacing the generic set functions with the specified ones.

B. Inner Bounds on the Capacity Region of DM MAC-IC-MAC

As mentioned earlier, the HK scheme, and its alternative, the CMG scheme, leads to the best inner bound to date for the two-user interference channel. In this section, we use the CMG scheme at the interfering transmitters of the MAC-IC-MAC. More specifically, we employ the superposition coding of the “the cloud-satellite” type at Tx*i*.1 and use a single-user random codebook for transmitter Tx*i*.*j*, *j* ≠ 1. Applying the joint-typicality decoding argument we derive two inner bounds for the DM MAC-IC-MAC, as stated in Theorems 1 and 2.

Definition 6. Let \mathcal{P}_{in} be the set of distributions P_{in} of joint random variables $(Q, U_1, X_{\Theta_1}, U_2, X_{\Theta_2})$ that can be factored as

$$\begin{aligned} p(q, u_1, x_{\Theta_1}, u_2, x_{\Theta_2}) \\ = p(q)p(u_1, x_{1.1}|q) \prod_{1,j \in \Theta_1 \setminus \{1.1\}} p(x_{1,j}|q) \\ \cdot p(u_2, x_{2.1}|q) \prod_{2,j \in \Theta_2 \setminus \{2.1\}} p(x_{2,j}|q). \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

Definition 7. Given any jointly distributed random variables $(Q, U_1, X_{\Theta_1}, U_2, X_{\Theta_2})$ with distribution $P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}$, define the non-negative real-valued set functions $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}$ and \mathcal{G} as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_i} \triangleq I(X_{\mathcal{Y}_i}; Y_i | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_i}, U_i, U_{i'}, Q) \quad (31)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq I(X_{\Omega_i}; Y_i | X_{\bar{\Omega}_i}, U_{i'}, Q) \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_i} \triangleq I(X_{\mathcal{Y}_i}, U_{i'}; Y_i | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_i}, U_i, Q) \quad (33)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq I(X_{\Omega_i}, U_{i'}; Y_i | X_{\bar{\Omega}_i}, Q) \quad (34)$$

and, using Definition 4, define the associated region

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(Q, U_1, X_{\Theta_1}, U_2, X_{\Theta_2}) \triangleq \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}) \triangleq \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G}). \quad (35)$$

Theorem 1. For DM MAC-IC-MAC,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}.$$

Proof: We outline the proof here, and relegate the details to Appendix A. The proof is given in two parts.

First, with the interfering transmitters employing the CMG rate-splitting and superposition coding scheme and the non-interfering transmitters using independent random coding (as in a MAC), and each receiver decoding all its desired messages and the common sub-message of the interfering transmitter using simultaneous non-unique decoding, standard random

coding analysis leads to an intermediate rate region containing two auxiliary random variables which represent the common sub-message (also referred as “cloud” codewords) of interfering transmitters, and two auxiliary rates corresponding to these codebooks. In particular, 1) as in a MAC, the non-interfering transmitter $\text{Tx}i.j$, $j \neq 1$ sends information $m_{i,j}$ by some codeword $x_{i,j}^n(m_{i,j})$ using a single-user random codebook; 2) as in the CMG achievable scheme [9], the interfering transmitter $\text{Tx}i.1$ splits its message $m_{i,1}$ into common and private sub-messages $m_{i,1c}$ and $m_{i,1p}$, respectively. The common information is first encoded into the cloud center codeword $u_i^n(m_{i,1c})$, and then, based on the private sub-message $m_{i,1p}$, the entire message $m_{i,1}$ is encoded into the codeword $x_{i,1}^n(u_i^n(m_{i,1c}), m_{i,1p})$ for transmission; 3) $\text{Rx}i$ uniquely decodes the intended messages $m_{i,j}$, $j \neq 1$ and the public and private information $m_{i,1c}$ and $m_{i,1p}$, all from its intended transmitters, and non-uniquely the common information $m_{i',1c}$ from the non-intended transmitter $\text{Tx}i'.1$. Though the number of inequalities in each class is indeterminate because the number of users in each cell are arbitrary, it turns out that only four appropriately chosen classes of error events are needed to obtain conditions on rates to assure reliable communication for all users.

Second, the Fourier-Motzkin method is used to eliminate the two auxiliary rates analytically to project the rate region onto $\mathbb{R}_+^{K_1+K_2}$ of message rates, despite the numbers of users in both cells being arbitrary. In this step, the combinatorial structure of the inequality system created in the first step is utilized. The detailed proof is given in Appendix A. ■

Remark 3. Without a recognition of the presence of the structure in the reliability conditions, one would have to resort to a hand-crafted Fourier-Motzkin elimination procedure which would severely restrict the values of K_1 and K_2 for which it could be carried out with reasonable effort as noted in the next two remarks.

Remark 4. When $K_1 = K_2 = 1$, the only admissible 4-tuple $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Omega_1, \mathcal{Y}_2, \Omega_2)$ is $(\{1.1\}, \{1.1\}, \{2.1\}, \{2.1\})$. Hence, Theorem 1 recovers (as it should) the inner bound of the two-user DM IC for fixed input distribution as obtained via Fourier-Motzkin elimination by Kobayashi and Han in [7, Theorem D] and stated by Chong *et al* in [9, Lemma 4].

Remark 5. In the $K_1 = 2$ and $K_2 = 1$ case, Fourier-Motzkin elimination was again used to obtain the rate region in the conference version of this paper in [25]. A “compact form” of that rate region is given in Corollary 1 (to follow).

Next, Theorem 1 implies that the union over admissible distributions

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} \triangleq \bigcup_{P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}} \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}) \quad (36)$$

is also achievable. That is, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. However, when considering such a union, it turns out that the sets of inequalities (15) and (17) become redundant as stated in Theorem 2 to follow.

Definition 8. Let the non-negative real-valued set functions A , B , E and G be as defined in (31)-(34), and define the region

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}) \triangleq \mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(A, B, E, G) \quad (37)$$

for any fixed $P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}$. We also define the region \mathcal{R}_{c} as the union of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}})$ over \mathcal{P}_{in} , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}} \triangleq \bigcup_{P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}} \mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}). \quad (38)$$

Theorem 2. For a (K_1, K_2) DM MAC-IC-MAC,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}.$$

Proof: Clearly, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ by Theorem 1. Moreover, since $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}})$ involves two sets of inequalities fewer than does $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}})$, we have $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}})$ for each $P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}$. Hence, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}$. It remains to show that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} \supseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}$. We show in Appendix B that indeed $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}$ is empty. ■

Remark 6. When $K_1 = 1$, $K_2 = 1$, the only admissible 4-tuple $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \Omega_1, \mathcal{Y}_2, \Omega_2)$ is $(\{1.1\}, \{1.1\}, \{2.1\}, \{2.1\})$. It can be verified that Theorem 2 recovers (as it should) the main result of [9] which is the CMG representation of the celebrated HK region of [5]. In particular, Theorem 2 becomes the inner bound of [9, Theorem 2], referred to therein as the “compact” HK region, which is union over admissible distributions of polyhedra described by 7 inequalities.

Corollary 1. When $K_1 = 2$, $K_2 = 1$, Theorem 2 gives a generalization of the CMG representation for the two-user IC to the $(2, 1)$ MAC-IC-MAC, which is a union over admissible distribution of polyhedra described by 19 inequalities in 7 classes, namely²,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\text{c}} = \bigcup_{P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}} \Big\{ & (R_{1.1}, R_{1.2}, R_{2.1}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 : \\ & \{R_{\{1.2\}} \leq B_{\{1.2\}} \\ & R_{\{1.1\}} \leq B_{\{1.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{1.1\}} \leq B_{\{1.1,1.2\}}\} \quad (23) \\ & \{R_{\{2.1\}} \leq B_{\{2.1\}}\} \quad (24) \\ & \{R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{1.1\}} + G_{\{2.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{1.1,1.2\}} + G_{\{2.1\}}\} \quad (25) \\ & \{R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq G_{\{1.1\}} + A_{\{2.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq G_{\{1.2\}} + A_{\{2.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq G_{\{1.1,1.2\}} + A_{\{2.1\}}\} \quad (26) \\ & \{R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq E_{\{1.1\}} + E_{\{2.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq E_{\{1.1,1.2\}} + E_{\{2.1\}}\} \quad (27) \\ & \{2R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{1.1\}} + G_{\{1.1\}} + E_{\{2.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{1.1\}} + G_{\{1.2\}} + E_{\{2.1\}} \\ & 2R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{1.1,1.2\}} + G_{\{1.1\}} + E_{\{2.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.1\}} + 2R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{1.1,1.2\}} + G_{\{1.2\}} + E_{\{2.1\}} \\ & 2R_{\{1.1\}} + 2R_{\{1.2\}} + R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{1.1,1.2\}} + G_{\{1.1,1.2\}} \\ & \quad + E_{\{2.1\}}\} \quad (28) \\ & \{R_{\{1.1\}} + 2R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{2.1\}} + G_{\{2.1\}} + E_{\{1.1\}} \\ & R_{\{1.1\}} + R_{\{1.2\}} + 2R_{\{2.1\}} \leq A_{\{2.1\}} + G_{\{2.1\}} \end{aligned}$$

²We group inequalities of the same class in curly brackets with the corresponding equation number from the set (23)-(29) as subscript.

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{\{1.1, 1.2\}} \}_{(29)} \} \quad (39)$$

The inner bound of (39) for the (2, 1) MAC-IC-MAC coincides with the result given in the conference version of this paper [25, Theorem 1].

Remark 7. Since we are studying a more general channel model here than in [25], the missing proofs in [25] can be completed by setting $K_1 = 2$ and $K_2 = 1$ in the results and proofs in Section III and the appendices. Some clarifications are provided regarding [25] in Appendix C.

Remark 8. Theorems 1 and 2 assert that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}})$ (hence \mathcal{R}_{in}) and \mathcal{R}_{c} are achievable by fixed (and union of) input distribution(s) and by the union over admissible input distributions, respectively. However, the per coding distribution region in \mathcal{R}_{c} , namely $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}})$, is not known to be achievable by its associated single input distribution P_{in} (cf. Example 1 for a case when $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}) \supsetneq \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}})$).

Remark 9. In the special case where the two MACs are non-interacting (i.e., there is no interference from either MAC to the other), it is easily verified that \mathcal{R}_{in} reduces to the Cartesian product of the capacity regions of the two MACs, as it should.

C. Bounds for the Semi-Deterministic MAC-IC-MAC

The inner bounds stated in the previous subsection are of course applicable to the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC. However, our goal is, as it was in the work of Telatar and Tse for the two-user semi-deterministic IC [8], to obtain inner and outer bounds for it so that the gap between the two (and hence gap to the capacity region) is *quantifiable*.

Since this section is long, we give a summary of it first.

In Section III-C1, to obtain an inner bound, we consider a region contained in the inner bound of Theorem 2 obtained by restricting the union of regions therein to a class $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}$ (to be defined in (46)) that depends on the semi-deterministic property. Denote the resulting inner bound as $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}^{\text{sd}}$.

In Section III-C2, we use the semi-deterministic property given in (2) to determine an outer bound $\mathcal{R}_{\text{o}}^{\text{sd}}$. The key idea is to allow a genie to give Rx*i* side information $T_{i',1}$ which has the same distribution as $S_{i'}$ given $X_{\Theta_{i'}}$ to help Rx*i*'s decoding and obtain an outer bound for this genie-aided semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC. Since providing side information to the receivers does not decrease capacity, an outer bound to the original semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC can therefore be characterized. This extends the outer bound of [8] for the two-user semi-deterministic IC to the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC.

We will then show in Section III-C3 that the gap between the inner bound $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and the outer bound $\mathcal{R}_{\text{o}}^{\text{sd}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ is quantifiable for each $(Q, X_{\Theta_1}, X_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$, which leads to a quantifiable gap between the union inner and outer bounds $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}^{\text{sd}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{o}}^{\text{sd}}$, thereby extending the main result of [8] to the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC.

Furthermore, in Section III-C4, we quantify the gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ to investigate if the rate region $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ (defined in (53)) contributed by the restricted set of coding

distributions $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ could also be guaranteed to be within a quantifiable gap to the outer bound. This question is answered in the affirmative by Lemma 1 in Section III-C4. The motivation for this is given next.

As mentioned in Remark 8, it is unclear that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ is achievable by its associated distribution $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. Similarly, there is no guarantee that any rate-tuple $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}^{\text{sd}}$ will be achievable by some $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$, i.e., it is not clear if the inequalities (15) and (17) will still be redundant when only the union over $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ is considered. However, we know from Theorem 1 that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ is achievable by its coding distribution $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. Moreover, in Lemma 1, we will show that for any fixed $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$, the gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ is quantifiable for a given $p(q, x_{\Theta_1}, x_{\Theta_2})$. Hence the gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{o}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ (and hence between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{o}}^{\text{sd}}$) is quantifiable as well, although it is larger. Thus, in contrast to $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}^{\text{sd}}$ which requires for its achievability the consideration of *all* distributions in \mathcal{P}_{in} , the achievability of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ requires the consideration of only distributions in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$.

1) *Inner bound:* As mentioned previously, we specify the joint distribution of the auxiliary random variables U_1 and U_2 given Q , X_{Θ_1} and X_{Θ_2} in the inner bounds of Theorems 1 and 2 as follows: The cloud symbols (U_1, U_2) take values in $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ according to the conditional distribution

$$p(u_1, u_2 | x_{\Theta_1}, x_{\Theta_2}, q) = p_{S_1 | X_{1.1}}(u_1 | x_{1.1}, q) \times p_{S_2 | X_{2.1}}(u_2 | x_{2.1}, q) \quad (40)$$

but independently of (S_1, S_2) conditioned on Q , X_{Θ_1} and X_{Θ_2} . The choice $p(q, x_{\Theta_1}, x_{\Theta_2})$ is taken to be arbitrary. We denote $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ as the set of distributions $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ that satisfies (40) so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} = & \{ P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}} : p(q, u_1, x_{\Theta_1}, u_2, x_{\Theta_2}) \\ & = p(q)p(x_{1.1}|q)p_{S_1|X_{1.1}}(u_1|x_{1.1}, q) \\ & \prod_{1,j \in \Theta_1 \setminus \{1.1\}} p(x_{1,j}|q)p(x_{2.1}|q)p_{S_2|X_{2.1}}(u_2|x_{2.1}, q) \\ & \cdot \prod_{2,j \in \Theta_2 \setminus \{2.1\}} p(x_{2,j}|q) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Based on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$, we define the set functions $\underline{\mathbf{A}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{G}}$ for region $\mathcal{R}_{\text{c}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ that have the same function maps as \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{G} given by (31)-(34) of Definition 7.

Definition 9. Given any jointly distributed random variables $(Q, U_1, X_{\Theta_1}, U_2, X_{\Theta_2})$ with distribution $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$, define the non-negative real-valued set functions $\underline{\mathbf{A}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{G}}$ as

$$\underline{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathcal{R}_i} \triangleq H(Y_i | X_{\mathcal{R}_i}, U_i, U_{i'}, Q) - H(S_{i'} | U_{i'}, Q) \quad (42)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{B}}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq H(Y_i | X_{\Omega_i}, U_{i'}, Q) - H(S_{i'} | U_{i'}, Q) \quad (43)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{E}}_{\mathcal{R}_i} \triangleq H(Y_i | X_{\mathcal{R}_i}, U_i, Q) - H(S_{i'} | U_{i'}, Q) \quad (44)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{G}}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq H(Y_i | X_{\Omega_i}, Q) - H(S_{i'} | U_{i'}, Q). \quad (45)$$

The set functions $\underline{\mathbf{A}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$, $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{G}}$ are derived by specializing the set functions \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{B} , \mathbf{E} and \mathbf{G} given in Definition 7 by substituting the distribution in (40) in place of that in (35).

Since $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}$, Theorem 2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}} &\triangleq \bigcup_{P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}} \mathcal{R}_c(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}) \\ &\triangleq \bigcup_{P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}} \mathcal{R}_c(\underline{A}, \underline{B}, \underline{E}, \underline{G}) \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

is achievable.

In the next section, we obtain an outer bound to the capacity region that has the same structure as that of the inner bound $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$ so that the gap between the two can be quantified.

2) *Outer bound:* To describe the outer bound, consider the following definition.

Definition 10. Let $\mathcal{P}_o^{\text{sd}}$ be the set of distributions P_o^{sd} of the ensemble $(Q, T_1, X_{\Theta_1}, T_2, X_{\Theta_2})$ which can be factored as

$$\begin{aligned} p(q, t_1, x_{\Theta_1}, t_2, x_{\Theta_2}) \\ = p(q) p_{S_1|X_1}(t_1|x_{1.1}) \prod_{1.j \in \Theta_1} p(x_{1.j}|q) \\ \times p_{S_2|X_2}(t_2|x_{2.1}) \prod_{2.j \in \Theta_2} p(x_{2.j}|q). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Definition 11. Given any set of random variables $(Q, X_{\Theta_1}, T_1, X_{\Theta_2}, T_2)$ with joint distribution P_o^{sd} , let the set functions \underline{A} , \underline{B} , \underline{E} and \underline{G} be

$$\bar{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_i} \triangleq H(Y_i|X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_i}, T_i, X_{i'.1}, Q) - H(S_{i'}|X_{i'.1}, Q) \quad (48)$$

$$\bar{B}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq H(Y_i|X_{\bar{\Omega}_i}, X_{i'.1}, Q) - H(S_{i'}|X_{i'.1}, Q) \quad (49)$$

$$\bar{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_i} \triangleq H(Y_i|X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_i}, T_i, Q) - H(S_{i'}|X_{i'.1}, Q) \quad (50)$$

$$\bar{G}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq H(Y_i|X_{\bar{\Omega}_i}, Q) - H(S_{i'}|X_{i'.1}, Q) \quad (51)$$

where the auxiliary random variables (T_1, T_2) take values in $S_1 \times S_2$ according to

$$p(t_1, t_2|x_{\Theta_1}, x_{\Theta_2}, q) = p_{S_1|X_1}(t_1|x_{1.1}) \cdot p_{S_2|X_2}(t_2|x_{2.1}) \quad (52)$$

and are conditionally independent of S_i given X_{Θ_i} .

Theorem 3. For the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC, defining the region $\mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}(P_o^{\text{sd}}) \triangleq \mathcal{R}_c(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{E}, \bar{G})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{\text{sd}} &\subseteq \mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}} \\ &\triangleq \bigcup_{P_o^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_o^{\text{sd}}} \mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}(P_o^{\text{sd}}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof: For the two-user semi-deterministic IC, a proof is given in [8, Theorem 1] for a similar outer bound with a genie-aided argument. When extending their proof technique, the intra-cell sum rates $R_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$ or R_{Ω_i} for a given user subset \mathcal{Y}_i or Ω_i , instead of each individual rate, are upper bounded and for which purpose the transmitted signals of unconsidered transmitters in the same MAC, i.e., $X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_i}$ or $X_{\bar{\Omega}_i}$, are fed to the receiver Rx_i as part of side information. The fact that each transmitter in a MAC encodes its own message independently is utilized, and consequently, we obtain four classes of intra-cell sum-rate upper bounds with the same structure as shown in the proof of [8, Theorem 1]. Linearly combining these upper bounds across two MACs cancels the negative entropy terms which are not in the form of $H(\text{output}|\text{input})$ in several

different ways, which leads to the seven classes of inequalities as given in the theorem. Please refer to Appendix D for details. ■

3) *Quantifiable gap:* Next, we show that the inner bound $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$ is within a quantifiable gap of the outer bound $\mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}$.

Theorem 4. Consider the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC. For any rate tuple $(R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}(P_o^{\text{sd}})$, let \tilde{R}_{Θ_i} be the rate tuple

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}_{\Theta_i} = &\left((R_{i.1} - I(X_{i'.1}; S_{i'}|U_{i'}, Q))^+, \right. \\ &(R_{i.2} - I(X_{i'.1}; S_{i'}|U_{i'}, Q))^+, \\ &\left. \dots, (R_{i.K_i} - I(X_{i'.1}; S_{i'}|U_{i'}, Q))^+ \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$, such that

$$(\tilde{R}_{\Theta_1}, \tilde{R}_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}).$$

Proof: The inequality systems of outer and compact form inner bounds have the same algebraic structure. Also there is one-to-one correspondence between the involved intra-cell sum rate term on the left hand side and the set function on the right hand side of each inequality in both bounds. Hence, we need only show that the difference between every corresponding pair of set functions from the two bounds, i.e., $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_i} - \underline{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$, $\bar{B}_{\Omega_i} - \underline{B}_{\Omega_i}$, etc, is within $I(X_{i'.1}; S_{i'}|U_{i'}, Q)$. For example, the difference between $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}$ and $\underline{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}$ can be quantified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} &\leq H(Y_1|X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_1}, T_1, X_{2.1}, Q) - H(S_2|X_{2.1}, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(Y_1|X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_1}, U_1, X_{2.1}, Q) - H(S_2|X_{2.1}, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} H(Y_1|X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_1}, U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|X_{2.1}, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} H(Y_1|X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_1}, U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + I(X_{2.1}; S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &= \underline{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + I(X_{2.1}; S_2|U_2, Q). \end{aligned}$$

The steps (a), (b) and (c) hold true because (a) random variables U_i , T_i and S_i are i.i.d. conditioned on $X_{i.1}$ as stated by (41) and (47). Hence, as long as we choose $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ so that $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ and P_o^{sd} have identical marginal distribution $p(q, x_{\Theta_1}, x_{\Theta_2})$, we can replace U_1 with T_1 in the conditional entropy term $H(Y_1|X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_1}, U_1, X_{2.1}, Q)$. (b) $Q - \circ - U_2 - \circ - X_{2.1}$ (form a Markov chain) (c) given X_{Θ_1} , there is a one-to-one correspondence between Y_1 and S_2 . Other terms can be verified similarly, which proves the theorem. ■

Remark 10. In the MAC-DIC-MAC (DIC stands for deterministic IC) where the channel side information S_i is a deterministic function of the respective $X_{i.1}$, we have $T_i = S_i$ and hence the gap becomes zero. So, the inner bound $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ is the capacity region for the MAC-DIC-MAC. When $K_1 = K_2 = 1$, this result recovers the result for the DIC of El Gamal and Costa in [26].

4) *Achievability by coding distributions in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$:* In the previous section we quantified the gap to capacity of the inner bound $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$ of (46). Note however that it is unclear if

each region in the union that defines it, namely $\mathcal{R}_c(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$, is achievable with its single associated coding distribution $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. Hence, it is unclear if any rate-tuple in $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$ is achievable by some $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. In particular, recall that in the proof of Theorem 2 (cf. Appendix B), we showed that $\mathcal{R}_c \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}$ is empty by constructing an auxiliary inner bound inside \mathcal{R}_{in} with some $U_i = \emptyset$. By choosing $p(u_i|x_{i,1})$ as (40), and with U_i and S_i are i.i.d. conditioned on $X_{i,1}$, there is no guarantee that U_i could be chosen to be \emptyset . Hence, it is unclear if $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ is empty.

The fact that any rate-tuple in $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$ may not be achievable by some $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ might be seen as an undesirable feature. In this section, we analyze the gap to capacity of an inner bound that, even though subsumed by $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$, does not have that undesirable feature.

Since $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}$, Theorem 1 implies that $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ is an inner bound to \mathcal{C} and, moreover, it is achievable by its associated single coding distribution $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. Also, it is clear that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \triangleq \bigcup_{P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}} \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}) \subseteq \mathcal{C} \quad (53)$$

and that any rate-tuple in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ is achievable by some distribution in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$. We will quantify in this section the gap to capacity of the smaller inner bound $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ to capacity. The gap is naturally expected to be larger than that found between $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}$ and capacity in the previous section.

As stated previously, the strategy is to first quantify the gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and then use the result of Theorem 4 on the gap between $\mathcal{R}_c(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_o(P_o^{\text{sd}})$ to quantify the gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_o(P_o^{\text{sd}})$.

Lemma 1. Given $P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$, for any rate tuple $(R_{\theta_1}, R_{\theta_2}) \in \mathcal{R}_c(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$, let \tilde{R}_{θ_i} be the rate tuple

$$\left((R_{i,1} - I(X_{i,1}; S_i|U_i))^+, (R_{i,2} - I(X_{i,1}; S_i|U_i))^+, \dots, (R_{i,K_i} - I(X_{i,1}; S_i|U_i))^+ \right).$$

Then we have

$$(\tilde{R}_{\theta_1}, \tilde{R}_{\theta_2}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}).$$

Proof: The bounds $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_c(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ differ from each other in that $\mathcal{R}_c(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ has intra-cell sum rate $\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} R_{i,j}$ only bounded by B_{Ω_i} , whereas $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ has $\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} R_{i,j}$ additionally bounded by $A_{\mathcal{R}_i} + E_{\mathcal{R}_i'}$. The semi-deterministic structure of channel (2) and the coding distribution (40) are fully considered in the proof. Please refer to Appendix E for details. ■

Remark 11. If $K_1 = K_2 = 1$, Lemma 1 quantifies the gap between the non-compact and compact form inner bounds for two-user semi-deterministic IC. To the best of our knowledge, this gap was not observed heretofore in the literature on the two-user IC.

Now we are ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 5. For any rate tuple $(R_{\theta_1}, R_{\theta_2}) \in \mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}$, let $I_0 = I(X_{1,1}; S_1|U_1, Q) + I(X_{2,1}; S_2|U_2, Q)$ and \tilde{R}_{θ_i} be the

rate tuple $((R_{i,1} - I_0)^+, (R_{i,2} - I_0)^+, \dots, (R_{i,K_i} - I_0)^+)$. Then we have

$$(\tilde{R}_{\theta_1}, \tilde{R}_{\theta_2}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}.$$

Proof: Combining Lemma 1 and Theorem 4, it can be inferred that for any $\mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}(P_o^{\text{sd}})$, $\exists P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ so that the gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}(P_o^{\text{sd}})$ will not exceed the sum of the gaps from $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ to $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and from $\mathcal{R}_c^{\text{sd}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ to $\mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}(P_o^{\text{sd}})$. This sum gap is hence at most $I_0 = I(X_{1,1}; S_1|U_1, Q) + I(X_{2,1}; S_2|U_2, Q)$. Taking the union over $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_o^{\text{sd}}$ for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}(P_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}(P_o^{\text{sd}})$, we can conclude that the gap between the union bounds $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_o^{\text{sd}}$ is also quantifiable and within I_0 . ■

D. The Approximate Capacity Region of the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC to Within Two Bits

The quantifiable gap for the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC requires the inner bound in Theorem 2, which is a union bound over $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. When the channel gets further specialized to the Gaussian case, can we specify a universal (single distribution) coding scheme whose achievable rate region is within a constant gap of the capacity region for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC? In this subsection, we will answer this question in the affirmative. Indeed, we will give inner and outer bounds for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC as explicit single polyhedral regions, and show these are within two bits of each other, independently of all channel parameters.

1) *Inner bound:* We provide an inner bound for a simple coding scheme first. We will show in Section III-D3 that such a strategy has an achievable rate region that is within a two-bit gap to the capacity region.

Definition 12. Suppose $\mathcal{C}(P) = \log(1 + P)$ for some $P \geq 0$. Define the coefficient

$$\mu_i \triangleq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}} \right\}, \quad (54)$$

set functions A , B , E and G as

$$A_{\mathcal{R}_i} \triangleq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\mu_i \text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i} + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i}}{1 + \mu_{i'} \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}} \right) \quad (55)$$

$$B_{\Omega_i} \triangleq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i}}{1 + \mu_{i'} \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}} \right) \quad (56)$$

$$E_{\mathcal{R}_i} \triangleq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\mu_i \text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i} + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i}}{1 + \mu_{i'} \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}} + \frac{(1 - \mu_{i'}) \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}}{1 + \mu_{i'} \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}} \right) \quad (57)$$

$$G_{\Omega_i} \triangleq \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} + (1 - \mu_{i'}) \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}}{1 + \mu_{i'} \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}} \right) \quad (58)$$

and the region

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G \triangleq \mathcal{R}(A, B, E, G)$$

The superscript “G” denotes Gaussian.

Theorem 6. For the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G \subseteq \mathcal{C}^G$.

Proof: Consider a single coding scheme in which all transmitters use all available power, $\text{Tx}i,j$, $j \neq 1$, uses a Gaussian codebook, and the interfering transmitter $\text{Tx}i,1$ splits its

message into common and private sub-messages and employs additive superposition coding with Gaussian codebooks with powers $P_{i,1c}$ and $P_{i,1p}$, respectively. In particular, the Etkin-Tse-Wang (ETW) power-split [10]

$$P_{i,1p} = \min(P_{i,1}, \frac{1}{|h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}|^2}) \quad (59)$$

$$P_{i,1c} = P_{i,1} - P_{i,1p}. \quad (60)$$

is used so that the unintended private message from Tx i arrives at Rx i' at no more than noise power.

This scheme can be viewed as the CMG scheme with a coding distribution from \mathcal{P}_{in} where both the distribution of U_i and X_i are fixed to be Gaussian, and

$$p(x_i|u_i) = p(u_i + v_i|u_i).$$

Thus, Theorem 1 applies. All we need is the explicit evaluation of the mutual information terms in its bounds for our particular coding scheme, which gives $A_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$, B_{Ω_i} , $E_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$ and G_{Ω_i} of (58), hence the result. \blacksquare

Remark 12. Note that the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is semi-deterministic. However, the coding distribution used to obtain Theorem 6 is not in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}^{\text{sd}}$. Hence, we cannot directly apply the results in Section III-C due to the average power constraint (6) on the transmitted codeword $X_{i,1}$. In other words, choosing U_i according to $p(u_i|x_i) = p(s_i|x_i)$ will not always be feasible since the side information S_i may have arbitrarily large power.

Remark 13. Define the region

$$\mathcal{R}_c^G \triangleq \mathcal{R}_c(A, B, E, G).$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G \subseteq \mathcal{R}_c^G$, but the achievability of \mathcal{R}_c^G by ETW coding scheme is not clear. In fact, the power split scheme (59) and (60) we used for $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G$ is not enough to achieve \mathcal{R}_c^G for all channel settings, as shown in the next example.

Example 1. We choose $K_1 = K_2 = 1$ (two-user IC), $\text{SNR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 1} = 50$, $\text{SNR}_{2,1 \rightarrow 2} = 20$, $\text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2} = 10$, $\text{INR}_{2,1 \rightarrow 1} = 15$. The computation of the set functions in Definition 12 gives the achievable region $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G$ to be

$$R_{1,1} \leq B_{\{1,1\}} = 4.7004 \quad (61)$$

$$R_{1,1} \leq A_{\{1,1\}} + E_{\{2,1\}} = 4.4318 \quad (62)$$

$$R_{2,1} \leq B_{\{2,1\}} = 3.4594 \quad (63)$$

$$R_{2,1} \leq A_{\{2,1\}} + E_{\{1,1\}} = 4.1293 \quad (64)$$

$$R_{1,1} + R_{2,1} \leq A_{\{1,1\}} + G_{\{2,1\}} = 5.7616 \quad (65)$$

$$R_{1,1} + R_{2,1} \leq G_{\{1,1\}} + A_{\{2,1\}} = 5.7814 \quad (66)$$

$$R_{1,1} + R_{2,1} \leq E_{\{1,1\}} + E_{\{2,1\}} = 6.0168 \quad (67)$$

$$2R_{1,1} + R_{2,1} \leq A_{\{1,1\}} + G_{\{1,1\}} + E_{\{2,1\}} = 9.4762 \quad (68)$$

$$R_{1,1} + 2R_{2,1} \leq E_{\{1,1\}} + A_{\{2,1\}} + G_{\{2,1\}} = 8.0835 \quad (69)$$

Hence, due to inequality (62), $R_{1,1}$ can be at most 4.4318 bits per channel use, while in \mathcal{R}_c^G which is defined by all inequalities of $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G$ except (62) and (64), $R_{1,1}$ can take values up to 4.7004 bits per channel use. Nevertheless, we will show in the next lemma that the gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G$ and \mathcal{R}_c^G is no more than one bit.

Lemma 2. *There is no more than a one-bit gap between $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G$ and \mathcal{R}_c^G .*

Proof: The extra bounds in $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}^G$ compared to those in \mathcal{R}_c^G are only on the intra-cell sum rates $\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j}$ and $\sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j}$. Without loss of generality, it is sufficient to show that for any $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2 \in \{2^{\Theta_1 \setminus \{1,1\}} \cup \{1,1\}\} \times \{2^{\Theta_2 \setminus \{2,1\}} \cup \{2,1\}\}$, $\exists \Omega_1 \in 2^{\Theta_1} \setminus \emptyset$ such that the gap between B_{Ω_1} and $A_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + E_{\mathcal{Y}_2}$ is within one bit. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + E_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \\ & \geq C \left(\frac{\mu_1 \text{SNR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 1} + \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \setminus \{1,1\}} \text{SNR}_{1,j \rightarrow 1}}{1 + \mu_2 \text{INR}_{2,1 \rightarrow 1}} \right) \\ & \quad + C \left(\frac{(1 - \mu_1) \text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2}}{1 + \mu_1 \text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2}} \right) \\ & = C \left(\frac{\mu_1 \text{SNR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 1} + \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \setminus \{1,1\}} \text{SNR}_{1,j \rightarrow 1}}{1 + \mu_2 \text{INR}_{2,1 \rightarrow 1}} \right) \\ & \quad + \log \left(\frac{1 + \text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2}}{1 + \mu_1 \text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2}} \right) \\ & \geq C \left(\frac{\text{SNR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 1} \frac{\mu_1 \text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2}}{1 + \mu_1 \text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2}} + \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \setminus \{1,1\}} \text{SNR}_{1,j \rightarrow 1}}{1 + \mu_2 \text{INR}_{2,1 \rightarrow 1}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Note the power splitting scheme ensures $\mu_1 \text{INR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 2} \leq 1$, hence the above term should satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{\mathcal{Y}_1} + E_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \\ & \geq C \left(\frac{\text{SNR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 1}/2 + \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \setminus \{1,1\}} \text{SNR}_{1,j \rightarrow 1}}{1 + \mu_2 \text{INR}_{2,1 \rightarrow 1}} \right) \\ & > C \left(\frac{\text{SNR}_{1,1 \rightarrow 1} + \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \setminus \{1,1\}} \text{SNR}_{1,j \rightarrow 1}}{1 + \mu_2 \text{INR}_{2,1 \rightarrow 1}} \right) - 1 \\ & = B_{\mathcal{Y}_1} - 1 = B_{\Omega_1} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

Recall \mathcal{Y}_1 is defined to be a user index subset which contains user 1.1 while Ω_1 an arbitrary user subset, so for a given \mathcal{Y}_1 we can always find a corresponding Ω_1 such that $\Omega_1 = \mathcal{Y}_1$. \blacksquare

2) *Outer bound:* Our goal is to obtain a single region outer bound. First, using the idea from the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC that the genie information T_i is chosen to be i.i.d with S_i conditioned on X_i , we let $T_i = h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'} X_i + Z_{i'}$, where $Z_{i'} \perp Z_i$. Then we show that Gaussian input distribution with full power for all inputs gives a single region that is also an outer bound (i.e., it equals the union of regions outer bound of Theorem 3, when applied to the Gaussian channel).

We define the outer bound first.

Definition 13. Define $\mathcal{R}_o^G \triangleq \mathcal{R}_c(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{E}, \bar{G})$ where the set functions \bar{A} , \bar{B} , \bar{E} and \bar{G} are given as

$$\bar{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_i} \triangleq C \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{Y}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} + \frac{\text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i}}{1 + \text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}} \right) \quad (70)$$

$$\bar{B}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq C \left(\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} \right) \quad (71)$$

$$\bar{E}_{\mathcal{R}_i} \triangleq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} + \frac{\text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i}}{1 + \text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}} + \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right) \quad (72)$$

$$\bar{G}_{\Omega_i} \triangleq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} + \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right). \quad (73)$$

Theorem 7. For the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, $\mathcal{C}^G \subseteq \mathcal{R}_o^G$.

Proof: Please see Appendix F. ■

3) *Two-bit gap:* Lastly, we show that the gap between \mathcal{R}_{in}^G and \mathcal{R}_o^G is within two bits, which implies the inner bound of Theorem 6 (and hence its associated universal coding scheme) is within a two-bit gap of the capacity region. To this end, we first show in Lemma 3 that the gap between \mathcal{R}_c^G and \mathcal{R}_o^G is not more than one bit.

Lemma 3. There is no more than a one-bit gap between \mathcal{R}_c^G and \mathcal{R}_o^G .

Proof: It is enough to show the gap between each corresponding pair of sets of weighted sum rate bounds of \mathcal{R}_c^G and \mathcal{R}_o^G are within one bit of each other. We bound, for instance, the gap between $E_{\mathcal{R}_i}$ and $\bar{E}_{\mathcal{R}_i}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathcal{R}_i} &= \log \left(2 + \mu_i \text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i} + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - \mu_{i'}) \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right) - \log (1 + \mu_{i'} \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}) \\ &\geq \log \left(2 + \mu_i \text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i} + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - \mu_{i'}) \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right) - 1 \\ &= \log \left(2 + \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}} \right\} \text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i} + \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} - \min \{ \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i}, 1 \} \right) - 1 \\ &\geq \mathcal{C} \left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} + \frac{\text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i}}{1 + \text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{INR}_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right) - 1 \\ &= \bar{E}_{\mathcal{R}_i} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Other gaps can be verified similarly, which proves the lemma. ■

This leads us to the main result of this section.

Theorem 8. The universal coding scheme for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC of Theorem 6 achieves a rate region that is within a two-bit gap of its capacity region.

Proof: To prove the result, it is sufficient to show that there is no more than a two-bit gap between \mathcal{R}_{in}^G and \mathcal{R}_o^G . The gap between \mathcal{R}_{in}^G and \mathcal{R}_o^G should not exceed the sum of gaps from \mathcal{R}_{in}^G to \mathcal{R}_c^G and from \mathcal{R}_c^G to \mathcal{R}_o^G , both of which are equal to 1 bit by Lemmas 2 and 3, respectively. Hence the result. ■

E. The GDoF Region

The GDoF region characterizes the simultaneously accessible signal-level dimensions (per channel use) by the users of a network in the limit of high SNR, while the ratios of the SNRs and INRs relative to a reference SNR, each expressed in the dB scale, are held constant, with each constant taken, in the most general case, to be arbitrary.

Given the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC model as defined by (4) and (5), let ρ be a nominal value for SNR or INR, define $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_{1,1 \rightarrow 1}, \dots, \alpha_{1,K_1 \rightarrow 1}, \alpha_{2,1 \rightarrow 2}, \dots, \alpha_{2,K_2 \rightarrow 2}, \alpha_{1,1 \rightarrow 2}, \alpha_{2,1 \rightarrow 1})$ with

$$\alpha_{i,j \rightarrow i} = \frac{\log(\text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i})}{\log \rho} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{i,1 \rightarrow i'} = \frac{\log(\text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'})}{\log \rho}$$

Definition 14. The GDoF region of a (K_1, K_2) Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC $\mathcal{D}(K_1, K_2, \bar{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{R}_+^{K_1+K_2}$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \{(d_{\Theta_1}, d_{\Theta_2}) : d_{i,j} = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_{i,j}}{\log \rho}, i \in \{1, 2\}, j \in \{1, \dots, K_i\}, \\ \text{and } (R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathcal{C}^G(K_1, K_2, \bar{\alpha})\} \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

and where $\mathcal{C}^G(K_1, K_2, \bar{\alpha})$ denotes its capacity region.

Since we have the capacity region to within a two-bit gap for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, computing the GDoF region can be easily done by substituting $\text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} = \rho^{\alpha_{i,j \rightarrow i}}$ and $\text{INR}_{i',j \rightarrow i} = \rho^{\alpha_{i',j \rightarrow i}}$ in (70)-(73), and computing the limits of each set function under $\rho \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 15. For any two real numbers x and y , let $(x - y)^+ \triangleq \max\{0, x - y\}$. Define the set functions a , b , e and g as

$$a_{\mathcal{R}_i} = \max \left\{ \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \alpha_{i,j \rightarrow i}, (\alpha_{i,1 \rightarrow i} - \alpha_{i,1 \rightarrow i'})^+ \right\} \quad (75)$$

$$b_{\Omega_i} = \max_{i,j \in \Omega_i} \alpha_{i,j \rightarrow i} \quad (76)$$

$$e_{\mathcal{R}_i} = \max \left\{ \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \alpha_{i,j \rightarrow i}, (\alpha_{i,1 \rightarrow i} - \alpha_{i,1 \rightarrow i'})^+, \alpha_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right\} \quad (77)$$

$$g_{\Omega_i} = \max \left\{ \max_{i,j \in \Omega_i} \alpha_{i,j \rightarrow i}, \alpha_{i',1 \rightarrow i} \right\}. \quad (78)$$

Theorem 9. The GDoF region $\mathcal{D}(K_1, K_2, \bar{\alpha})$ of the (K_1, K_2) Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is equal to

$$\mathcal{D}_c(a, b, e, g) = \left\{ (d_{\Theta_1}, d_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{K_1+K_2} : \right.$$

$$\left. \forall (\Upsilon_1, \Omega_1, \Upsilon_2, \Omega_2) \in \Xi \right.$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} d_{1,j} \leq b_{\Omega_1} \quad (79)$$

$$\sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} d_{2,j} \leq b_{\Omega_2} \quad (80)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Upsilon_1} d_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} d_{2,j} \leq a_{\mathcal{R}_1} + g_{\Omega_2} \quad (81)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} d_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Upsilon_2} d_{2,j} \leq g_{\Omega_1} + a_{\mathcal{R}_2} \quad (82)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Upsilon_1} d_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Upsilon_2} d_{2,j} \leq e_{\mathcal{R}_1} + e_{\mathcal{R}_2} \quad (83)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} d_{1,j} + \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} d_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} d_{2,j} \leq a_{\mathcal{T}_1} + g_{\Omega_1} + e_{\mathcal{T}_2} \quad (84)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} d_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} d_{2,j} \\ + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} d_{2,j} \leq e_{\mathcal{T}_1} + a_{\mathcal{T}_2} + g_{\Omega_2} \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (85)$$

Remark 14. The GDoF of the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC applies also to a fully connected $(K_1 + K_2)$ -transmitter-2-receiver interference network (referred to as interfering multiple-access channel or IMAC, in which there are two MACs but all transmitters in one MAC cause interference to the receiver of the other MAC), when the interference from all but one transmitter in each cell is sufficiently weak to be at the noise level, or mathematically, when the corresponding INR exponents of these links are equal to zero.

Remark 15. The GDoF of the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC can be used to compute an outer bound for the IMAC. This outer bound would be an intersection of the GDoF regions of the $K_1 K_2$ embedded MAC-IC-MACs within the IMAC obtained by removing all but two interference links (since removing interference links doesn't decrease capacity). It would be interesting to describe the set of SNR and INR exponents $\bar{\alpha}$ for which simple achievable schemes achieve that outer bound. For instance, one could use the achievable scheme of this work over the IMAC (i.e., treat the signal from all but one interfering transmitter as noise at each receiver) for each of the $K_1 K_2$ embedded MAC-IC-MACs within the IMAC. The union of the corresponding GDoF regions gives an inner bound to the GDoF region of the fully connected IMAC. For what set of $\bar{\alpha}$ do the above outer and inner bounds coincide, and hence yield the GDoF region of the IMAC?

In order to get some intuitive understanding of the general GDoF region of Theorem 9, we consider the symmetric case. A Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is said to be symmetric if $K_1 = K_2 = K$ and $\text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} = \text{SNR}$ and $\text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'} = \text{INR}$, i.e. all SNRs are identical and all INRs are identical. Note this does not mean the channel attenuations $h_{i,j \rightarrow i}$ s or $h_{i',1 \rightarrow i}$ s are identical, since transmitters may choose different transmission power. SNR and INR terms can thus be normalized as

$$\text{INR} = \text{SNR}^\alpha = \rho^\alpha$$

which implies $\alpha_{i,j \rightarrow i} = 1$ and $\alpha_{i,1 \rightarrow i'} = \alpha$. In this symmetric case, we write the general GDoF region $\mathcal{D}(K_1, K_2, \bar{\alpha})$ simply as $\mathcal{D}(K, \alpha)$ since $K_1 = K_2 = K$ and since the dependence on $\bar{\alpha}$ is only through α .

Furthermore, for the symmetric Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, a further simplified yet instructive metric, the *symmetric GDoF*, denoted as $d_{\text{sym}}(K, \alpha)$ is defined as follows.

Definition 16. For a symmetric K -user (per cell) Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC with GDoF region $\mathcal{D}(K, \alpha)$, the *symmetric*

generalized degrees-of-freedom $d_{\text{sym}}(K, \alpha)$ is defined as the solution to the following equation

$$d_{\text{sym}}(K, \alpha) \triangleq \max_{\substack{d=d_{1,1}=\dots=d_{1,K_1}=d_{2,1}=\dots=d_{2,K_2} \\ (d_{\Theta_1}, d_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathcal{D}(K, \alpha)}} d.$$

The symmetric GDoF of Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC can be easily obtained by specializing the GDoF region given in Theorem 9. When $K = 1$ (the MAC-IC-MAC is the 2-user IC), Theorem 9 recovers the well-known "W"-shaped symmetric GDoF curve established by Etkin *et al* in [10], as it must; for $K \geq 2$, the symmetric GDoF is stated next.

Corollary 2. The symmetric GDoF $d_{\text{sym}}(K, \alpha)$ for $K \geq 2$ of the symmetric K -user Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC is given as

$$d_{\text{sym}}(K, \alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & 0 \leq \alpha < 1 - \frac{1}{K} \\ -\frac{1}{K+1}\alpha + \frac{2}{K+1} & 1 - \frac{1}{K} \leq \alpha < 1 \\ \frac{1}{K+1}\alpha & 1 \leq \alpha < 1 + \frac{1}{K} \\ 1 & \alpha \geq 1 + \frac{1}{K} \end{cases}.$$

Remarkably, the symmetric GDoF curve for the $K \geq 2$ case for any K is a simpler, raised "V"-shaped curve with flat shoulders on both sides of the curve (as shown in Fig. 2), illustrating the benefit of adding non-interfering transmitters to the cell. Indeed, maximum symmetric GDoF (which is $\frac{1}{K}$) can be achieved for $\alpha \in [0, 1 - \frac{1}{K}] \cup [1 + \frac{1}{K}, \infty)$ compared to the "W" shape obtained in [10] for $K = 1$.

To see the overall improvement with increasing K we plot the numerical results of the *sum-symmetric* GDoF, i.e. $K d_{\text{sym}}(K, \alpha)$ for $K = 1, 2, 3, 4$ in Fig. 5. When $K = 1$, the sum-symmetric GDoF is just the symmetric GDoF and we see the familiar "W" curve of the symmetric GDoF curve for two-user IC of [10]. As K increases, the sum-symmetric GDoF increases for all α , while the width of the flat shoulder also increases, leading to maximum GDoF of 1 for an increasing range of α . Thus, Fig. 5 gives the clearest indication of the benefit of adding interference-free transmitters to the entire cell GDoF, which is a measure of cell spectrum efficiency when all users are provided the same GDoF.

Remark 16. Note that the sum symmetric DoF (i.e., GDoF at $\alpha = 1$) is $\frac{K}{K+1}$, approaching 1 as K becomes large. This is also the worst case sum symmetric GDoF over α . This is reminiscent of the sum-symmetric DoF of the two-cell fully-connected IMAC obtained in [14] but that result applies to a multi-carrier setting.

Returning to the symmetric MAC-IC-MAC, we see that adding even just one non-interfering transmitter to the two-user IC improves GDoF significantly. This can be easily observed at $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ in Fig. 5. Because of interference, a two-user IC only allows each user to achieve $\frac{1}{2}$ DoF, while a (2, 2) MAC-IC-MAC could achieve full GDoF while providing $\frac{1}{2}$ DoF to each of the four transmitters, thus doubling sum GDoF.

F. Signal-Level Partitioning

We explain the GDoF benefit of having interference-free transmitters in the MAC-IC-MAC by formalizing the development of signal level partitioning in the context of the MIMO




Fig. 5: $Kd_{\text{sym}}(K, \alpha)$, the sum symmetric GDoF per cell versus α for $K = 1, 2, 3, 4$

interference channel by Karmakar and Varanasi in [11]. That work also includes signal space partitioning which is not needed here. We start by describing signal level partitioning in a Gaussian point-to-point link first followed by the two-user Gaussian MAC and then the MAC-IC-MAC. In the latter case, we restrict the discussion to symmetric GDoF, with the extension to asymmetric settings being straightforward, in principle.

Consider a single interference-free Gaussian link $Y = hX + Z$ in a network with unit transmit power constraint and unit noise variance with coefficient $|h|^2 = \rho^\alpha$, with ρ denoting a nominal or reference SNR which can be regarded as say the SNR of a reference link when we generalize the discussion to a network. Let α be a rational number. Define β so that $\beta^p = \rho$ for some positive rational number $p > 1$ such that $n = p\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. The transmit signal X can be decomposed into m signal-level partitions (in the dB scale) such that $m = q\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, with $q \geq p$ being another rational number. Assign the power $\beta^{-i} - \beta^{-i-1}$ to the i^{th} signal level for $i \in [0 : m-1]$. This is shown in the left hand side of Fig. 6 where the top of each partition is aligned with its power level, denoted by the dashed lines. For instance, Partition 1 (P1 in the figure) has power $1 - \beta^{-1}$, partition 2 has power $\beta^{-1} - \beta^{-2}$, etc. Since for large SNR, we have $\beta^{-i} - \beta^{-i-1} \approx \beta^{-i}$ we denote the top of i^{th} partition simply as β^{-i} in Fig. 6. Independent information is encoded in each signal partition and the encoded signals are combined using additive superposition. At the receiver the power in the m signal levels are amplified by the factor $\rho^\alpha = \beta^n$. Hence, the top n partitions are above the noise level (i.e., they are "heard" by the receiver). Successive decoding is used at the receiver from the top level to the last one that is above the noise level, i.e., information in each partition is decoded by treating all the signals in the lower partitions as noise. It is easy to verify that this way one obtains $\frac{1}{p}$ DoF for each of the n signal levels, since for any $i \in [0, n-1]$

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \left(1 + \frac{\beta^{-i} - \beta^{-i-1}}{\beta^{-i-1} - \beta^{-m}} \right)}{\log \rho} = \frac{1}{p}.$$

Hence the overall DoF of α is achieved.

In Fig. 6, we consider $\alpha = 1$ in the point-to-point Gaussian link so that $|h|^2 = \rho$ with the received SNR being ρ itself. Let $p = 2$ and any $q \geq p$. The receiver's perspective is shown on the right hand side of the figure where it is seen that all signal levels are lifted by $n = 2$ levels, with the rest being below the noise level. The information in the two levels can be successively decoded to achieve $1/2$ DoF per level since $\beta = \sqrt{\rho}$.

Note that in the simple point-to-point link there is no need to send information over two signals levels or consider values of α other than 1. However, when that link is considered as one out of several links in a multi-user channel that has some reference link with nominal SNR that is ρ and with the other links having disparate strengths of the form ρ^α (with α in general depending on the link being considered) the above model is much more useful.




Fig. 6: Signal level partitioning at the transmitter and receiver of a Gaussian link $Y = \sqrt{\rho}X + Z$ with $E[|X|^2] \leq 1$ and zero-mean Gaussian noise Z with unit variance. There are $q\alpha = q$ partitions at the transmitter but only $p\alpha = p = 2$ of them are seen above the noise level at the receiver.

To analyze a multi-terminal network with disparate SNR and INR exponents (relative to nominal ρ), we extend the aforementioned exponent partitioning with a sufficiently fine resolution (i.e., with p chosen sufficiently large) so that the signal partitions from different transmitters that arrive at a receiver will be *aligned* at that receiver, for all receivers. Consider for instance the simple example of the Gaussian MAC $Y = h_1X_1 + h_2X_2 + Z$ where $|h_1|^2 = \rho^{0.8}$ and $|h_2|^2 = \rho^{1.2}$. Here, we choose $p = \frac{5}{2}$ so that $\beta = \rho^{0.4}$, i.e., the exponent resolution of the signal level is set at 0.4. The resulting signals levels at the two transmitters and at the receiver are illustrated in Fig. 7 on its left and right sides, respectively. Note that all the partitions of the two transmitted signals are aligned at the receiver's grid without aliasing. In particular, the top two signal levels (or partitions) of X_1 and the top three partitions of X_2 can be "heard" by the receiver (i.e., they are above the noise level), and the overall observable partitions is thus three. It can be easily inferred that the following GDoF region is achievable for this MAC:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq d_1 \leq 0.8 \\ 0 &\leq d_2 \leq 1.2 \\ d_1 + d_2 &\leq 1.2. \end{aligned}$$

signal from the two receivers' perspectives. In this case, the interfering transmitters use the highest signal level (out of 9) to send common information that will be decoded uniquely at both receivers (it arrives at level 4). Private information at each interfering transmitter is encoded at the lowest three levels so it can be treated as noise at the other (non-intended) receiver. This leaves 4 signal levels unoccupied at each receiver if you just consider the interfering transmitters. These four levels are opportunistically filled by the non-interfering transmitter in each cell, so that each transmitter can achieve $\frac{4}{9}$ DoF for a per-cell sum symmetric DoF of $\frac{8}{9}$.




Fig. 11: Achieving sum symmetric GDoF $\frac{8}{9}$ per-cell when $\alpha = \frac{2}{3}$ for (2, 2) Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC.

Next, we consider achievability using time-sharing between the respective GDoF-optimal strategies in the embedded 2-user IC and 2 non-interfering point-to-point links (recall $K = 2$) in the MAC-IC-MAC. Hence, Tx1.1 and Tx2.1 transmit (in the embedded 2-user IC) while Tx1.2 and Tx2.2 are turned off for some fraction of time and in the other strategy Tx1.2 and Tx2.2 transmit while Tx1.1 and Tx2.1 are turned off during the remaining fraction of time.

Let $d_{\text{sym}}(1, \alpha)$ be the symmetric DoF of the two-user IC at SNR $= \rho$ and INR $= \rho^\alpha$. To share the DoF evenly, transmitters Tx1.1 have to use $\frac{1}{d_{\text{sym}}(1, \alpha) + 1}$ of time and leave the rest $\frac{d_{\text{sym}}(1, \alpha)}{d_{\text{sym}}(1, \alpha) + 1}$ portion to transmitters Tx1.2. This way we get per-cell sum symmetric GDoF of $\frac{2d_{\text{sym}}(1, \alpha)}{d_{\text{sym}}(1, \alpha) + 1}$ which is plotted in Fig. 12 as the red curve (with the legend “K=2 with time-sharing scheme 1”) in comparison to the fundamental sum symmetric GDoFs in the 2-user IC and the (2,2) MAC-IC-MAC. Clearly, the time-sharing scheme is sub-optimal, except when $\alpha = 0, 1, 2$. The reason for this can be observed from Fig. 8. Say when $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, the role of Tx1.2 in the optimal scheme is to fill the unused signal levels left by transmitters Tx1.1 and Tx2.1 instead of time sharing DoF with them.

Time-sharing can be performed in a different way. Continuing with the (2,2) MAC-IC-MAC as an example, let Tx1.1, Tx1.2 and Tx2.2 transmit for the first half-time, and let Tx1.2, Tx2.1 and Tx2.2 transmit in the other half-time. Due to symmetry, the GDoF Tx1.2 achieves in the first half-time will be exactly the GDoF Tx2.2 achieves in the second half-time. Therefore, to get the same GDoF for all transmitters, we should let $d_{1.1} = d_{1.2} + d_{2.2}$ and $d_{2.1} = 0$ in the first half-time, then $d_{2.1} = d_{1.2} + d_{2.2}$ and $d_{1.1} = 0$ in the second half-time. Following the fundamental GDoF region given in

Theorem 9 and performing linear programming to compute the maximum sum symmetric GDoF, the resulting GDoF curve is plotted in yellow in Fig. 12 (with the legend “K=2 with time-sharing scheme 2”). This time-sharing scheme yields a V-shape sum-symmetric GDoF defined by the points (0,1), (1,2/3) and (2,1). At these three points and these three points only, this time-sharing scheme coincides with the fundamental per cell sum-symmetric GDoF. Hence, time-sharing between the two embedded MAC-Z-P2Ps is not sufficient to achieve the fundamental sum-symmetric GDoF either.




Fig. 12: An illustration of the sub-optimality of two time-sharing schemes for the (2,2) MAC-IC-MAC. In scheme 1, time-sharing occurs between the two interfering transmitters and the two non-interfering transmitters. In scheme 2, time-sharing occurs between the two embedded MAC-Z-P2Ps. Both these time-sharing schemes are sub-optimal. The fundamental sum-symmetric GDoF per cell of (2,2) MAC-IC-MAC as well as the symmetric GDoF of the two-user IC are also depicted for comparison.

Remark 17. To summarize, (a) superposition coding helps reserve certain signal-level partitions for each interfering transmitter at its intended receiver (b) it reserves certain signal-level partitions for the common sub-message of an interfering transmitter at its unintended receiver (c) there are in general still unused signal-level partitions at each receiver that are not accessible to interfering transmitters, intended or not, but which are open to be exploited by non-interfering transmitters and (d) when there are more than one non-interfering transmitters in each cell (say when $K = 3$) the signal-level partitions that are inaccessible to interfering transmitters can be time-shared by the intended non-interfering transmitters toward the achievement of optimal GDoF.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Classical results on the capacity of the DM and Gaussian multiple-access channels of [1]–[3] and those on the two-user interference channel of [4], [5] as well as recent results on capacity bounds and approximations for the interference channel are unified and generalized in this work by obtaining bounds

and capacity approximations for the two-cell, (K_1, K_2) -user MAC-IC-MAC. In particular, we generalize the inner bounds of [7] and [9] from the 2-user DM IC to the (K_1, K_2) -user DM MAC-IC-MAC, bound the capacity region of the semi-deterministic DM MAC-IC-MAC to within a quantifiable gap, thus extending the work of [8] on the semi-deterministic two-user DM IC, and finally, we obtain capacity approximations to within a constant gap and hence up to GDoF accuracy for the Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC, thereby generalizing the results of [10].

A single coding scheme in the Gaussian setting is shown to have an achievable rate region that is within two bits of the capacity region. Improvements in cell spectrum efficiency with increasing number of users in the symmetric MAC-IC-MAC is quantified and illustrated via the per-cell sum-symmetric GDoF. Some examples of achieving GDoF via signal-level partitioning are discussed in detail to reveal the role of non-interfering transmitters in improving spectrum efficiency.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We prove achievability through a random coding argument. We fix a coding distribution $P_{\text{in}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{in}}$, and obtain reliability conditions in the form of partial sum-rate restrictions, which together give the achievable region $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}})$.

A. The Achievable Scheme

- 1) Generate time sharing sequence q^n according to $p(q^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n p(q_t)$.
- 2) $\text{Tx}i.j$, $j \neq 1$, independently generates $2^{nR_{i,j}}$ sequences $x_{i,j}^n$ according to $p(x_{i,j}^n | q^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n p(x_{i,j,t} | q_t)$ and indexes them by $k_{i,j} \in \{1, \dots, 2^{nR_{i,j}}\}$;
- 3) $\text{Tx}i.1$ generates $2^{nR_{i,1c}}$ sequences $u_{i,1c}^n$ according to $p(u_{i,1c}^n | q^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n p(u_{i,1c,t} | q_t)$ and indexes them by $k_{i,1c} \in \{1, \dots, 2^{nR_{i,1c}}\}$. For each $u_{i,1c}^n(k_{i,1c})$, it generates $2^{n(R_{i,1} - R_{i,1c})}$ sequences $x_{i,1}^n$ according to $p(x_{i,1}^n | u_{i,1c}^n(k_{i,1c}), q^n) = \prod_{t=1}^n p(x_{i,1,t} | u_{i,1c,t}(k_{i,1c}), q_t)$ and indexes them by $(k_{i,1c}, k_{i,1p}) \in \{1, \dots, 2^{nR_{i,1c}}\} \times \{1, \dots, 2^{n(R_{i,1} - R_{i,1c})}\}$.
- 4) Once the codebooks are generated, they are fixed for the duration of communication and revealed to receivers Rx1 and Rx2.
- 5) A K_i -tuple message $(m_{i,1}, \dots, m_{i,K_i}) = ((k_{i,1c}, k_{i,1p}), k_{i,2}, \dots, k_{i,K_i})$ in cell- i is encoded to $((x_{i,1}^n(k_{i,1c}, k_{i,1p}), x_{i,2}^n(k_{i,2}), \dots, x_{i,K_i}^n(k_{i,K_i}))$ at $\text{Tx}i.1, \text{Tx}i.2, \dots, \text{Tx}i.K_i$, respectively, and sent over the channel.
- 6) Upon receiving y_i^n , each $\text{Rx}i$ declares its decoded messages $(\hat{m}_{i,1}, \dots, \hat{m}_{i,K_i})$ as the unique index-tuple $((\hat{k}_{i,1c}, \hat{k}_{i,1p}), \hat{k}_{i,2}, \dots, \hat{k}_{i,K_i})$ for which $q^n, x_{i,1}^n(\hat{k}_{i,1c}, \hat{k}_{i,1p}), x_{i,2}^n(\hat{k}_{i,2}), \dots, x_{i,K_i}^n(\hat{k}_{i,K_i}), u_{i,1c}^n(\hat{k}_{i',1c})$ and y_i^n are jointly typical, for some $\hat{k}_{i',1c} \in \{1, \dots, 2^{nR_{i',1c}}\}$. If such an index-tuple cannot be found, $\text{Rx}i$ declares an error.

Suppose $(k_{i,1c}, k_{i,1p}) = (1, 1)$, $k_{i,2} = \dots = k_{i,K_i} = 1$ is sent. For any \mathcal{Y}_i or Ω_i , we define four classes of error events as

- Class 1: $\hat{k}_{i,1c} = 1$, $\hat{k}_{i,1p} \neq 1$, $\hat{k}_{i,j} \neq 1 \forall i.j \in \mathcal{Y}_i \setminus \{i.1\}$, $\hat{k}_{i',1c} = 1$;
- Class 2: $\hat{k}_{i,j} \neq 1$ for all $i.j \in \Omega_i \setminus \{i.1\}$ and if $i.1 \in \Omega_i$, then $\hat{k}_{i,1c} \neq 1$; and $\hat{k}_{i',1c} = 1$;
- Class 3: $\hat{k}_{i,1c} = 1$, $\hat{k}_{i,1p} \neq 1$, $\hat{k}_{i,j} \neq 1 \forall i.j \in \mathcal{Y}_i \setminus \{i.1\}$, $\hat{k}_{i',1c} \neq 1$;
- Class 4: $\hat{k}_{i,j} \neq 1$ for all $i.j \in \Omega_i \setminus \{i.1\}$ and if $i.1 \in \Omega_i$, then $\hat{k}_{i,1c} \neq 1$; and $\hat{k}_{i',1c} \neq 1$.

Any possible error event at $\text{Rx}i$ that affects messages sent by transmitters $\text{Tx}i.j$, $\forall i.j \in \Omega_i$ also belongs to one of the four error event classes, depending on the correctness of each of following components: (1) the common message $m_{i,1c}$ from $\text{Tx}i.1$, if $i.1 \in \Omega_i$; (2) the private message $m_{i,1p}$ from $\text{Tx}i.1$, if $i.1 \in \Omega_i$; (3) the common message $m_{i',1c}$ from $\text{Tx}i'.1$. We illustrate the classification in Table I. On the other hand, for any \mathcal{Y}_i , there exists some Ω_i such that $\Omega_i = \mathcal{Y}_i$. Since we always have $i.1 \in \mathcal{Y}_i$, any error event that involves the message sent by transmitters $\text{Tx}i.j$, $\forall i.j \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ should also fall into one of the four cases given by the last two columns of Table I.

The probabilities of each of the four classes can be bounded via a careful application of the joint typicality lemma (cf. Chapter 2, [27]), by the set functions A, B, E and G as following, respectively, corresponding to each of the two receivers. Consequently, including the non-negativity of $R_{i,1c}$ and $\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{Y}_i} R_{i,j} - R_{i,1c}$, we have

$$\sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} - R_{1,1c} \leq A_{\mathcal{Y}_1} \quad (86)$$

$$\sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \leq B_{\Omega_1} \quad (87)$$

$$\sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} - R_{1,1c} + R_{2,1c} \leq E_{\mathcal{Y}_1} \quad (88)$$

$$\sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} + R_{2,1c} \leq G_{\Omega_1} \quad (89)$$

$$-R_{1,1c} \leq 0 \quad (90)$$

$$R_{1,1c} - \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} \leq 0 \quad (91)$$

$$\sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} - R_{2,1c} \leq A_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (92)$$

$$\sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq B_{\Omega_2} \quad (93)$$

$$\sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} - R_{2,1c} + R_{1,1c} \leq E_{\mathcal{Y}_2} \quad (94)$$

$$\sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} + R_{1,1c} \leq G_{\Omega_2} \quad (95)$$

$$-R_{2,1c} \leq 0 \quad (96)$$

$$R_{2,1c} - \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{Y}_2} R_{2,j} \leq 0 \quad (97)$$

B. Fourier Motzkin Elimination

Inequalities (86)-(97) group many inequalities that all have the same structure together into one class of inequalities.

	$i.1 \notin \Omega_i$	$\hat{k}_{i.1c} = 1$ $\hat{k}_{i.1p} \neq 1$ $\hat{k}_{i,j} \neq 1, \forall i,j \in \Omega_i \setminus \{i.1\}$	$\hat{k}_{i.1c} \neq 1$ $\hat{k}_{i.1p}$ arbitrary $\hat{k}_{i,j} \neq 1, \forall i,j \in \Omega_i \setminus \{i.1\}$
$\hat{k}_{i,j} = 1$	Class 2	Class 1	Class 2
$\hat{k}_{i,j} \neq 1$	Class 4	Class 3	Class 4

TABLE I: Error events affecting messages sent by transmitters $\text{Tx}i.j, \forall i,j \in \Omega_i$.

This allows us to manipulate each class of inequalities as if it were one inequality. This elegant structure of the initial inequality system given in (86)-(97) allows us to apply Fourier Motzkin elimination analytically. Without loss of generality, we first eliminate $R_{1.1c}$. Note all the lower bounds to $R_{1.1c}$ are contributed by the classes of inequalities (86), (88) and (90), and upper bounds by the classes of inequalities (91), (94) and (95). Now, $R_{1.1c}$ can be eliminated by having the minimum of its upper bounds be greater than the maximum of the lower bounds. The system of inequalities after eliminating $R_{1.1c}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& 0 \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} \quad * \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} - R_{2.1c} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \\
& R_{2.1c} \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_1} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + R_{2.1c} + \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \\
& - \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} \leq 0 \quad * \\
& \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} - R_{2.1c} \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_2} \quad * \\
& \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq G_{\Omega_2} \quad * \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1.j} + R_{2.1c} \leq G_{\Omega_1} \\
& \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} - R_{2.1c} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_2} \\
& -R_{2.1c} \leq 0 \\
& R_{2.1c} - \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The starred inequalities are clearly redundant by the non-negativity of rate and mutual information as well as the fact that, by the chain rule of mutual information, $A_{\mathcal{R}_i} \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_i}$ and $B_{\Omega_i} \leq G_{\Omega_i}$. Removing these redundancies, we proceed to the elimination of $R_{2.1c}$. Lower bounds on $R_{2.1c}$ are provided by the terms with right hand side valued $A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2}$, $E_{\mathcal{R}_2}$, $A_{\mathcal{R}_2}$ and 0, upper bounds by $E_{\mathcal{R}_1}$, $E_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2}$, G_{Ω_1} , and 0. Eliminating $R_{2.1c}$, a new system shows up as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 0 \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_1} \quad * \\
& \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_2} + E_{\mathcal{R}_1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2} + E_{\mathcal{R}_1} \quad * \\
& - \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq 0 \quad * \\
& 0 \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_2} \quad * \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1.j} \leq G_{\Omega_1} \quad * \\
& \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} + \sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_2} + G_{\Omega_1} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \\
& + \sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2} + G_{\Omega_1} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \quad * \\
& \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} + \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} \\
& + \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_2} + E_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \\
& + \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2} + E_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \quad * \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \\
& \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq E_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The starred inequalities can again be easily identified as redundancies. Eventually, we obtain a region given by

$$\sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1.j} \leq B_{\Omega_1} \quad (98)$$

$$\sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + E_{\mathcal{R}_2} \quad (99)$$

$$\sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq B_{\Omega_2} \quad (100)$$

$$\sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_2} + E_{\mathcal{R}_1} \quad (101)$$

$$\sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{R}_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2.j} \leq A_{\mathcal{R}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \quad (102)$$

$$\sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1.j} + \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{R}_2} R_{2.j} \leq G_{\Omega_1} + A_{\mathcal{R}_2} \quad (103)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \leq E_{\mathcal{T}_1} + E_{\mathcal{T}_2} \quad (104)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \\ + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \leq A_{\mathcal{T}_1} + G_{\Omega_1} + E_{\mathcal{T}_2} \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \\ + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq E_{\mathcal{T}_1} + A_{\mathcal{T}_2} + G_{\Omega_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

The non-negative achievable $(K_1 + K_2)$ rate tuples $(R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2})$ that satisfy (98)-(106) are precisely the ones that are defined as $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}})$ in (35). Hence, the region $\mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}(P_{\text{in}})$ is an inner bound to the capacity region and Theorem 1 is proved.

APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 2

In this proof, we need to show that inequalities (99) and (101) in Appendix A are redundant when we take the inner bound as the union of fixed pmf inner bounds over all admissible input distributions. We demonstrate the redundancies by contradiction that the region $\mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_c \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}$ is empty.

Suppose $\mathcal{R}_1 \neq \emptyset$. We construct a region \mathcal{R}_2 inside \mathcal{R}_{in} by setting U_1 or U_2 to be trivial (a constant). Then it must be true that $\mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}_2 = \emptyset$. However, through an explicit computation of \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 , we show that $\mathcal{R}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{R}_2$, which means $\mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}_2 \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Hence, $\mathcal{R}_1 = \emptyset$.

We first prove the redundancy of (99). Define $\mathcal{R}_2 = \{(R_{\Theta_1}, R_{\Theta_2}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}} : U_1 = \emptyset\}$. Since $\mathcal{R}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{in}}$, it is clear that

$$\mathcal{R}_1 \cap \mathcal{R}_2 = \emptyset \quad (107)$$

Region \mathcal{R}_2 can be obtained by setting $U_1 = \emptyset$ in the initial system (86)-(97). It can then be shown by performing Fourier-Motzkin elimination procedure as we have done in Appendix A to eliminate $R_{2,1c}$, that the region \mathcal{R}_2 contains all rate pairs that satisfy just the following three groups of inequalities,

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \leq I(X_{\Omega_1}; Y_1 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}, U_2, Q) \quad (108)$$

$$\sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq I(X_{\Omega_2}; Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) \quad (109)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \leq I(X_{\Omega_1}, U_2; Y_1 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}, Q) \\ + I(X_{\mathcal{T}_2}; Y_2 | X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_2}, U_2, Q). \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

On the other hand, region \mathcal{R}_1 is constituted by all the inequalities for region \mathcal{R}_c and $\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} \geq A_{\mathcal{T}_1} + E_{\mathcal{T}_2}$.

We explicitly write them as

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \leq B_{\Omega_1} \quad (111)$$

$$-\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} \leq -A_{\mathcal{T}_1} - E_{\mathcal{T}_2} \quad (112)$$

$$\sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq B_{\Omega_2} \quad (113)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq A_{\mathcal{T}_1} + G_{\Omega_2} \quad (114)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \leq G_{\Omega_1} + A_{\mathcal{T}_2} \quad (115)$$

$$\sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \leq E_{\mathcal{T}_1} + E_{\mathcal{T}_2} \quad (116)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \\ + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \leq A_{\mathcal{T}_1} + G_{\Omega_1} + E_{\mathcal{T}_2} \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} + \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \\ + \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq E_{\mathcal{T}_1} + A_{\mathcal{T}_2} + G_{\Omega_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

From inequality (111), we know

$$\sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \leq B_{\Omega_1} = I(X_{\Omega_1}; Y_1 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}, U_2, Q) \quad (119)$$

adding inequalities (112) and (114), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{2,j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} &\leq G_{\Omega_2} - E_{\mathcal{T}_2} \\ &= I(X_{\Omega_2}, U_1; Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) \\ &\quad - I(X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_1; Y_2 | X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_2}, U_2, Q) \\ &= H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) - H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_2}, U_2, Q) \\ &\leq H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) - H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_2}, X_{2,1}, Q) \\ &= H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) - H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_2}, X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, Q) \\ &= H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) - H(Y_2 | X_{\Theta_2}, Q) \\ &= H(Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) - H(Y_2 | X_{\Omega_2}, X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) \\ &= I(X_{\Omega_2}; Y_2 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_2}, Q) \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

adding inequalities (112) and (117), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{2,j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} + \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} &\leq G_{\Omega_1} \\ &= I(X_{\Omega_1}, U_2; Y_1 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}, Q) \\ &\leq I(X_{\Omega_1}, U_2; Y_1 | X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}, Q) + I(X_{\mathcal{T}_2}; Y_2 | X_{\bar{\mathcal{T}}_2}, U_2, Q). \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

Note inequalities (108)-(110) are identical to (119)-(121), which means a rate-tuple in \mathcal{R}_1 is in \mathcal{R}_2 , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{R}_2 \quad (122)$$

therefore contradicts (107), so (99) is redundant.

Due to the symmetry of the channel, (101) is redundant too, and so are both of them together. Hence, (99) and (101) are both redundancies, which completes the proof.

APPENDIX C CLARIFICATIONS IN [25]

We clarify some points in the conference version of this paper [25] in this appendix which considers the $K_1 = 2$ and $K_2 = 1$ case.

In [25], Theorem 1 (which is Corollary 1 in this paper) correctly states that $\cup_{p(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}_{inner}(p)$, which is equivalent to \mathcal{R}_c in this paper, is achievable. Its proof in Appendix A of [25] is not complete. The missing part is to prove the redundancies of two extra inequalities after Fourier-Motzkin elimination of the initial system given in Appendix A of [25]. The missing proof is contained in Appendix B of this paper.

The probability distribution given in Definition 8 of [25] should not contain u_1 and u_2 . In Theorems 11 and 12 of [25], the probability distribution should be the one which is defined in Definition 10, instead of $p(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}$.

The phrase “For a given $p(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}$ ” should be removed in Definitions 14 and 16, because both these bounds are single region bounds resulting from one fixed input distribution.

In Theorem 18, the outer bound is again a single region bound. There should be no union over \mathcal{P} .

APPENDIX D PROOF OF THEOREM 3

The work by Telatar and Tse in [8] has given an outer bound for two-user semi-deterministic IC, which is a special case of semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC. In their proof, each multi-letter mutual information term is expressed as the difference of corresponding conditional entropy terms. The genie information T_i^n is chosen to be distributed as (52) to ensure that the multi-letter negative entropy terms which do not appear in the form of $H(\text{output}|\text{input})$ (and are therefore hard to single-letterize) can be eventually canceled. This technique is extended to the semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC in this appendix.

We show in our proof to follow, that in the presence of the non-interfering transmitters, the intra-cell sum rate $\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{Y}_i} R_{i,j}$ and $\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} R_{i,j}$ can be upper bounded into four classes by grouping their transmitted signals as $X_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$ (or X_{Ω_i}), and feeding the remaining transmit signals $X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_i}$ together with the genie information T_i^n (if $i.1 \in \mathcal{Y}_i$ or $i.1 \in \Omega_i$, resp.) to the receiver. Notably, the algebraic structure of these four classes of bounds still allows the cancellation of the negative conditional entropies of the form $H(\text{output}|\text{input})$. The details are given shortly.

Moreover, giving a subset of intended signals $X_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^n$ (or $X_{\Omega_i}^n$), genie information T_i^n or the non-intended signal $X_{i'.1}^n$ to help Rx*i* decode will not decrease the capacity region of the channel. For any considered subset \mathcal{Y}_i (or Ω_i), we always give $X_{\mathcal{Y}_i}^n$ (or $X_{\Omega_i}^n$) to help Rx*i* to decode. Besides, if we give both the genie information T_i^n and the interference signal $X_{i'.1}^n$, the partial sum rate $\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{Y}_i} R_{i,j}$ can be upper bounded by $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$; if we give only genie information T_i^n , the partial sum rate $\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{Y}_i} R_{i,j}$ can be upper bounded by $\bar{E}_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$; if we only give the interference signal $X_{i'.1}^n$, the partial sum rate $\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} R_{i,j}$ (with or without $i.1 \in \Omega_i$) can be upper bounded by \bar{B}_{Ω_i} ; if we

give neither T_i^n nor $X_{i'.1}^n$, the partial sum rate $\sum_{i,j \in \Omega_i} R_{i,j}$ can be upper bounded by \bar{G}_{Ω_i} .

Next, we provide the promised details. For some fixed $P_o^{\text{sd}} \in \mathcal{P}_o^{\text{sd}}$, applying Fano's inequality, chain rule, independence and Markov chain property, we obtain following four classes of upper bounds:




Fig. 13: Genie aided semi-deterministic MAC-IC-MAC, where a genie provides information T_1 to Rx1 and T_2 to Rx2.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & n \sum_{1,j \in \mathcal{Y}_1} R_{1,j} \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(X_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^n; Y_1^n, X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1}^n, T_1^n, X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{=} I(X_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^n; T_1^n | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1}^n, X_{2.1}^n) \\
 & \quad + I(X_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^n; Y_1^n | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1}^n, T_1^n, X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & \stackrel{(c)}{=} I(X_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^n; T_1^n) + I(X_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^n; Y_1^n | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1}^n, T_1^n, X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & = H(T_1^n) - H(T_1^n | X_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^n) + H(Y_1^n | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1}^n, T_1^n, X_{2.1}^n) \\
 & \quad - H(Y_1^n | X_{\mathcal{Y}_1}^n, T_1^n, X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & \stackrel{(d)}{=} H(T_1^n) - H(T_1^n | X_{1.1}^n) + H(Y_1^n | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1}^n, T_1^n, X_{2.1}^n) \\
 & \quad - H(S_2^n | X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & \leq H(T_1^n) + \sum_{t=1}^n [H(Y_{1t} | X_{\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_1 t}, T_{1t}, X_{2.1t}) \\
 & \quad - H(T_{1t} | X_{1.1t}) - H(S_{2t} | X_{2.1t})] + n\epsilon_n \\
 & = n\bar{A}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} - nH(T_1 | X_{1.1}) + H(T_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \tag{123}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & n \sum_{1,j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \\
 & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(X_{\Omega_1}^n; Y_1^n, X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}^n, X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & \stackrel{(b)}{=} I(X_{\Omega_1}^n; Y_1^n | X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}^n, X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & = H(Y_1^n | X_{\Omega_1}^n, X_{2.1}^n) - H(Y_1^n | X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}^n, X_{\Omega_1}^n, X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
 & \stackrel{(d)}{=} H(Y_1^n | X_{\Omega_1}^n, X_{2.1}^n) - H(S_2^n | X_{2.1}^n) + n\epsilon_n
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{t=1}^n [H(Y_{1t}|X_{\bar{\Omega}_1 t}, X_{2.1t}) - H(S_{2t}|X_{2.1t})] + n\epsilon_n \\ &= n\bar{B}_{\Omega_1} + n\epsilon_n \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &n \sum_{1.j \in \mathcal{T}_1} R_{1,j} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n; Y_1^n, X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n, T_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} I(X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n; T_1^n | X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n) + I(X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n; Y_1^n | X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n, T_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} I(X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n; T_1^n) + I(X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n; Y_1^n | X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n, T_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &= H(T_1^n) - H(T_1^n | X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n) + H(Y_1^n | X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n, T_1^n) \\ &\quad - H(Y_1^n | X_{\Theta_1}^n, T_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} H(T_1^n) - H(T_1^n | X_{1.1}^n) + H(Y_1^n | X_{\mathcal{T}_1}^n, T_1^n) \\ &\quad - H(S_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^n [H(Y_{1t}|X_{\mathcal{T}_1 t}, T_{1t}) - H(T_{1t}|X_{1.1t})] \\ &\quad + H(T_1^n) - H(S_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &= n\bar{E}_{\mathcal{T}_1} + nH(S_2|X_{2.1}) - nH(T_1|X_{1.1}) \\ &\quad + H(T_1^n) - H(S_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &n \sum_{1.j \in \Omega_1} R_{1,j} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(X_{\Omega_1}^n; Y_1^n, X_{\Omega_1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} I(X_{\Omega_1}^n; Y_1^n | X_{\Omega_1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &= H(Y_1^n | X_{\Omega_1}^n) - H(Y_1^n | X_{\Omega_1}^n, X_{\Omega_1}^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} H(Y_1^n | X_{\Omega_1}^n) - H(S_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^n H(Y_{1t}|X_{\bar{\Omega}_1 t}) - H(S_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\ &= n\bar{G}_{\Omega_1} + nH(S_2|X_{2.1}) - H(S_2^n) + n\epsilon_n. \end{aligned} \quad (126)$$

The steps (a)-(d) hold because: (a) giving $X_{\mathcal{T}_i}^n$, $X_{\Omega_i}^n$, $X_{i'.1}^n$, or T_i^n to help Rx i decode will not decrease the capacity region; (b) chain rule of conditional mutual information and the independence of input symbols; (c) T_i^n is independent of $X_{\mathcal{T}_i}^n$ and $X_{i'.1}^n$; (d) semi-deterministic property.

Similarly, we could have 4 upper bounds on rate R_{Θ_2} too,

$$n \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} \leq n\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}_2} - nH(T_2|X_{2.1}) + H(T_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \quad (127)$$

$$n \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} \leq n\bar{B}_{\Omega_2} + n\epsilon_n \quad (128)$$

$$\begin{aligned} n \sum_{2.j \in \mathcal{T}_2} R_{2,j} &\leq n\bar{E}_{\mathcal{T}_2} + nH(S_1|X_{1.1}) - nH(T_2|X_{2.1}) \\ &\quad + H(T_2^n) - H(S_1^n) + n\epsilon_n \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

$$\begin{aligned} n \sum_{2.j \in \Omega_2} R_{2,j} &\leq n\bar{G}_{\Omega_2} + nH(S_1|X_{1.1}) - H(S_1^n) + n\epsilon_n. \end{aligned} \quad (130)$$

By construction (c.f. Definition 11), we have

$$H(T_i|X_{i.1}) = H(S_i|X_{i.1}) \quad (131)$$

and

$$H(T_i) = H(S_i). \quad (132)$$

Taking (131) and (132) into consideration, the seven inequalities in Theorem 3 can be obtained by following linear combinations of inequalities: (124), (128), (123)+(130), (126)+(127), (125)+(129), (123)+(126)+(129) and (127)+(130)+(125).

APPENDIX E PROOF OF LEMMA 1

To prove the lemma, we show that for any admissible $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$, there exists a pair Ω_1, Ω_2 such that the gap between B_{Ω_i} and $A_{\mathcal{T}_i} + E_{\mathcal{T}_i'}$ is within $I(X_{i.1}; S_i|U_i)$. Without loss of generality, we prove this for $i = 1$.

If the set \mathcal{T}_1 contains only one user, i.e., $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{1.1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\{1.1\}} + E_{\mathcal{T}_2} &= I(X_{1.1}; Y_1|U_1, U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + I(X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_1; Y_2|X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_2, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(Y_1|U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(Y_2|X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} H(Y_1|U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(Y_2|X_{\Theta_2}, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(Y_1|U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(S_1|Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} H(Y_1|U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(U_1|Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} H(Y_1|U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(U_1|U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &= H(Y_1, U_1|U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &= H(Y_1|U_2, Q) + H(U_1|Y_1, U_2, Q) \\ &\quad - H(S_2|U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &= H(Y_1|U_2, Q) + H(U_1|Y_1, Q) \\ &\quad - H(S_2|U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{\geq} H(Y_1|U_2, Q) + H(U_1|X_{1.1}, Q) \\ &\quad - H(S_2|U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\geq H(Y_1|U_2, Q) + H(S_1|X_{1.1}, Q) \\ &\quad - H(S_2|U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &= H(Y_1|U_2, Q) + H(S_1|X_{1.1}, U_1, Q) \\ &\quad - H(S_2|U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &= I(X_{1.1}; Y_1|U_2, Q) - I(X_{1.1}; S_1|U_1, Q). \end{aligned}$$

The steps (a), (b), (c) and (d) hold true because: (a) given X_{Θ_i} , the mapping from $S_{i'}$ to Y_i is one-to-one, since the channel is semi-deterministic (cf. Definition 2); (b) conditioning reduces entropy; (c) the coding scheme forces $p(u_i|x_{i.1}, q) = p(s_i|x_{i.1}, q)$, therefore $H(S_i|X_{i.1}, Q) = H(U_i|X_{i.1}, Q)$ and

$H(S_{i,1}|Q) = H(U_{i,1}|Q)$; (d) random variables U_1 and U_2 are independent conditioned on Q and (e) according to the definition of the channel, the output Y_i only relies on X_{Θ_i} and $X_{\Theta_i'}$, i.e. $p(y_i|x_{\Theta_i}, x_{\Theta_i'}, u_i) = p(y_i|x_{\Theta_i}, x_{\Theta_i'})$. When only the interfering transmitter Tx1.1 is considered, the conditional distribution $p(y_1|x_{1,1}, u_1)$ is computed as

$$\begin{aligned} p(y_1|x_{1,1}, u_1) &= \sum_{x_{2,1}} p(y_1, x_{2,1}|x_{1,1}, u_1) \\ &= \sum_{x_{2,1}} p(x_{2,1}|x_{1,1}, u_1) p(y_1|x_{1,1}, x_{2,1}, u_1) \\ &= \sum_{x_{2,1}} p(x_{2,1}|x_{1,1}) p(y_1|x_{1,1}, x_{2,1}) \\ &= \sum_{x_{2,1}} p(y_1, x_{2,1}|x_{1,1}) \\ &= p(y_1|x_{1,1}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have $U_1 - \circ - X_{1,1} - \circ - Y_1$.

If \mathcal{T}_1 has more than one user, the gap can be shown as follows

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathcal{T}_1} + E_{\mathcal{T}_2} &= I(X_{\mathcal{T}_1}; Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + I(X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_1; Y_2|X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_2, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, U_2, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(Y_2|X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(b),(c)}{\geq} H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(Y_2|X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_2, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(Y_2|X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, X_{\mathcal{T}_2}, U_2, X_{1,1}, Q) \\ &\quad - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &= H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(Y_2|X_{\Theta_2}, X_{1,1}, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(S_1|X_{1,1}, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad + H(S_1|X_{1,1}, U_1, Q) - H(S_1|U_1, Q) \\ &= H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, U_1, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad - I(S_1; X_{1,1}|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} H(Y_1|X_{\mathcal{T}_1}, X_{1,1}, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad - I(S_1; X_{1,1}|U_1, Q) \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{=} H(Y_1|X_{\bar{\Omega}_1}, X_{2,1}, Q) - H(S_2|U_2, Q) \\ &\quad - I(S_1; X_{1,1}|U_1, Q) \\ &\geq B_{\bar{\Omega}_1} - I(S_1; X_{1,1}|U_1, Q). \end{aligned}$$

The steps (a), (b), (c) and (d) hold true because: (a) given X_{Θ_i} , the mapping from $S_{i'}$ to Y_i is one-to-one, since the channel is semi-deterministic (cf. Definition 2); (b) conditioning reduces entropy; (c) random variables $Q - \circ - U_i - \circ - X_{i,1}$ forms a Markov chain; (d) for a given \mathcal{T}_1 with more than one user, we

can always find some $\bar{\Omega}_1 \in 2^{\Theta_1}$ such that $\bar{\Omega}_1 = \bar{\mathcal{T}}_1 \cup \{1,1\}$ and $\bar{\Omega} \neq \emptyset$, which completes the proof.

APPENDIX F PROOF OF THEOREM 7

According to Theorem 3, we characterize the outer bound on the capacity region of Gaussian MAC-IC-MAC by maximizing the set functions in Definition 3. The genie random variable T_i is chosen as $T_i = h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'} X_{i,1} + Z'_{i'}$, where $Z'_{i'} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$ and is independent of $Z_{i'}$ and X_{Θ_i} . For conciseness, we compute $\bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}_i}$ for instance,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{A}_{\mathcal{T}_i} &= h(Y_i|X_{\mathcal{T}_i}, T_i, X_{i',1}, Q) - h(S_{i',1}|X_{i',1}, Q) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[h(Y_{it}|X_{\mathcal{T}_it}, T_{it}, X_{i',1,t}) - h(S_{i't}|X_{i',1,t}) \right] + \epsilon_n \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left[h\left(\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{T}_i} |h_{i,j \rightarrow i}|^2 X_{i,j,t} + Z_{it}, |h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}|^2 X_{i,1,t} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + Z'_{i't} \right) - h(|h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}|^2 X_{i,1,t} + Z'_{i't}) - h(Z_{i't}) \right] + \epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \log \left(1 + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{T}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} (|h_{i,j \rightarrow i}|^2 P_{i,j,t}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{|h_{i,1 \rightarrow i}|^2 P_{i,1,t}}{1 + |h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}|^2 P_{i,1,t}} \right) + \epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \log \left(1 + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{T}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} |h_{i,j \rightarrow i}|^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n P_{i,j,t} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{|h_{i,1 \rightarrow i}|^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n P_{i,1,t}}{1 + |h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}|^2 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n P_{i,1,t}} \right) + \epsilon_n \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \log \left(1 + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{T}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} |h_{i,j \rightarrow i}|^2 P_{i,j} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{|h_{i,1 \rightarrow i}|^2 P_{i,1}}{1 + |h_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}|^2 P_{i,1}} \right) + \epsilon_n \\ &= \log \left(1 + \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{T}_i \setminus \{i,1\}} \text{SNR}_{i,j \rightarrow i} + \frac{\text{SNR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i}}{1 + \text{INR}_{i,1 \rightarrow i'}} \right) \\ &\quad + \epsilon_n. \end{aligned}$$

Step (a) holds because the Gaussian distribution maximize conditional entropy, (hence, the optimality of Gaussian input distribution); Step (b) holds due to the log-sum inequality; Step (c) states the optimality of full power transmission. Other terms can be verified in a similar way, which completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. H.-J. Liao, "Multiple access channels." Ph.D. dissertation, HAWAII UNIV HONOLULU, 1972.
- [2] R. Ahlswede, "Multi-way communication channels," in *Second International Symposium on Information Theory: Tsahkadsor, Armenia, USSR, Sept. 2-8, 1971*, 1973.
- [3] A. Wyner, "Recent results in the shannon theory," *IEEE Transactions on information Theory*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 2-10, 1974.
- [4] A. Carleial, "Interference channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 60-70, 1978.

- [5] T. S. Han and K. Kobayashi, "A new achievable rate region for the interference channel," *IEEE transactions on information theory*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 49–60, 1981.
- [6] H.-F. Chong, M. Motani, and H. K. Garg, "A comparison of two achievable rate regions for the interference channel," in *Proc. Information Theory and Applications Workshop*, 2006, pp. 6–10.
- [7] K. Kobayashi and T. Han, "A further consideration on the HK and the CMG regions for the interference channel," in *Proc. Information Theory and Applications Workshop*, 2007.
- [8] E. Telatar and D. Tse, "Bounds on the capacity region of a class of interference channels," in *Information Theory, 2007. ISIT 2007. IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 2871–2874.
- [9] H.-F. Chong, M. Motani, H. K. Garg, and H. E. Gamal, "On the han-kobayashi region for the interference channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 3188–3194, 2008.
- [10] R. H. Etkin, D. N. Tse, and H. Wang, "Gaussian interference channel capacity to within one bit," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 5534–5562, 2008.
- [11] S. Karmakar and M. K. Varanasi, "The generalized degrees of freedom region of the mimo interference channel and its achievability," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 7188–7203, 2012.
- [12] G. Kramer, "Review of rate regions for interference channels," in *2006 international Zurich seminar on communications*, 2006.
- [13] S. Karmakar and M. K. Varanasi, "The capacity region of the mimo interference channel and its reciprocity to within a constant gap," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 4781–4797, 2013.
- [14] C. Suh and D. Tse, "Interference alignment for cellular networks," in *Communication, Control, and Computing, 2008 46th Annual Allerton Conference on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1037–1044.
- [15] E. Perron, S. Diggavi, and E. Telatar, "The interference-multiple-access channel," in *Communications, 2009. ICC'09. IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 1–5.
- [16] A. Chaaban and A. Sezgin, "On the capacity of the 2-user gaussian mac interfering with a p2p link," in *Wireless Conference 2011-Sustainable Wireless Technologies (European Wireless), 11th European*. VDE, 2011, pp. 1–6.
- [17] S. Gharekhloo, A. Chaaban, C. Di, and A. Sezgin, "(Sub-)optimality of treating interference as noise in the cellular uplink with weak interference," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 322–356, Jan 2016.
- [18] A. Chaaban and A. Sezgin, "Capacity results for a primary mac in the presence of a cognitive radio," in *Global Telecommunications Conference (GLOBECOM 2011), 2011 IEEE*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–5.
- [19] J. Böhler and G. Wunder, "The multiple access channel interfering with a point to point link: Linear deterministic sum capacity," in *Communications (ICC), 2012 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 2365–2369.
- [20] R. Fritschek and G. Wunder, "Upper bounds and duality relations of the linear deterministic sum capacity for cellular systems," in *Communications (ICC), 2014 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1884–1889.
- [21] —, "Constant-gap sum-capacity approximation of the deterministic interfering multiple access channel," in *Information Theory (ISIT), 2015 IEEE International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 2643–2647.
- [22] U. Niesen and M. A. Maddah-Ali, "Interference alignment: From degrees of freedom to constant-gap capacity approximations," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 4855–4888, 2013.
- [23] R. Fritschek and G. Wunder, "Enabling the multi-user generalized degrees of freedom in the gaussian cellular channel," in *Information Theory Workshop (ITW), 2014 IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 107–111.
- [24] F. Zhu, X. Shang, B. Chen, and H. V. Poor, "On the capacity of multiple-access-z-interference channels," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 7732–7750, 2014.
- [25] Y. Pang and M. K. Varanasi, "Bounds on the capacity region of a class of multiple access interference channels," in *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2013 51st Annual Allerton Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 599–606.
- [26] A. Gamal and M. Costa, "The capacity region of a class of deterministic interference channels (corresp.)," *IEEE Transactions on information Theory*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 343–346, 1982.
- [27] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network information theory*. Cambridge university press, 2011.

Yimin Pang (S'11) received his Bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering from Xidian University, Xi'an, China, in 2008 and his Master's degree from Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, in 2011. He is currently working towards his doctoral degree in the Department of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering at the University of Colorado Boulder, CO. His research interests are in information theory and wireless communications.

Mahesh K. Varanasi (S'87-M'89-SM'95-F'10) received the B.E. degree in electronics and communications engineering from Osmania University, Hyderabad, India, in 1984 and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from Rice University, Houston, TX, USA, in 1987 and 1989, respectively.

Since 1989, he has been a member of the faculty of the University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA, where he is currently a Professor of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering. He has been a Professor (by courtesy) of the Department of Mathematics since 2010 and an affiliated faculty member of the Department of Applied Mathematics since 2013. His research and teaching interests are in the areas of network information theory, wireless communications and coding, statistical inference and learning theory, and signal processing.

Dr. Varanasi is a Highly Cited Researcher according to the ISI Web of Science. He is the recipient of the 2017 and 2018 Qualcomm Faculty Awards. Dr. Varanasi served as an Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS during 2007-2009. He was an Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON INFORMATION THEORY during 2014-2017. He was a General Chair of the 2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Vail, Colorado.