

# Generalized Common Informations: Measuring Commonness by the Conditional Maximal Correlation

Lei Yu, Houqiang Li, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and Chang Wen Chen, *Fellow, IEEE*

## Abstract

In literature, different common informations were defined by Gács and Körner, by Wyner, and by Kumar, Li, and Gamal, respectively. In this paper, we define two generalized versions of common informations, named *approximate* and *exact information-correlation functions*, by exploiting the conditional maximal correlation as a commonness or privacy measure. These two generalized common informations encompass the notions of Gács-Körner's, Wyner's, and Kumar-Li-Gamal's common informations as special cases. Furthermore, to give operational characterizations of these two generalized common informations, we also study the problems of private sources synthesis and common information extraction, and show that the information-correlation functions are equal to the minimum rates of commonness needed to ensure that some conditional maximal correlation constraints are satisfied for the centralized setting versions of these problems. As a byproduct, the conditional maximal correlation has been studied as well.

## Index Terms

Common information, conditional maximal correlation, information-correlation function, sources synthesis, information extraction

## I. INTRODUCTION

Common information, as an information measure on the common part between two random variables, was first investigated by Gács and Körner [1] in content of distributed common information extraction problem: extracting a same random variable from each of two sources individually. The common information of the sources is defined by the maximum information of the random variable that can be extracted from them. For correlated memoryless sources  $X, Y$  (taken from finite alphabets), [1] shows that the Gács-Körner common information between them is

$$C_{GK}(X; Y) = \sup_{f, g: f(X)=g(Y)} H(f(X)). \quad (1)$$

Lei Yu is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore (e-mail: leiyu@nus.edu.sg). This work was done when he was at University of Science and Technology of China. Houqiang Li is with the Department of Electronic Engineering and Information Science, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China (e-mail: lihq@ustc.edu.cn). Chang Wen Chen is with Department of Computer Science and Engineering, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA (e-mail: chenw@buffalo.edu).

It also can be expressed as

$$C_{GK}(X; Y) = \inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U)=0} I(XY; U), \quad (2)$$

(the proof of (2) is given in Appendix A), where

$$C_{GK}(X; Y|U) := \sup_{f, g: f(X, U)=g(Y, U)} H(f(X, U) | U) \quad (3)$$

denotes the conditional common information between  $X, Y$  given  $U$ . The constraint  $C_{GK}(X; Y|U) = 0$  in (2) implies all the common information between  $X, Y$  is contained in  $U$ .

Wyner [3] studied distributed source synthesis (or distributed source simulation) problem, and defined common information in a different way. Specifically, he defined common information as the minimum information rate needed to generate sources in a distributed manner with asymptotically vanishing normalized relative entropy between the induced distribution and some target joint distribution. Given a target distribution  $P_{XY}$ , this common information is proven to be

$$C_W(X; Y) = \inf_{P_{U|XY}: X \rightarrow U \rightarrow Y} I(XY; U). \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, as a related problem, the problem of *exactly* generating target sources was studied by Kumar, Li, and Gamal recently [12]. The notion of exact common information (rate) (denoted as  $K_{KLG}(X; Y)$ ) is introduced, which is defined to be the minimum code rate to ensure the induced distribution is exactly (instead approximately) same to some target joint distribution. By comparing these common informations, it is easy to show that  $C_{GK}(X; Y) \leq I(X; Y) \leq C_W(X; Y) \leq K_{KLG}(X; Y) \leq H(XY)$ .

Observe that in the definitions of Gács-Körner and Wyner common informations, different dependency constraints are used. Gács-Körner common information requires the common variable  $U$  to be some function of each of the sources (or equivalently, there is no conditional common information given  $U$ ); while Wyner common information requires the sources conditionally independent given the common variable  $U$ . These two constraints are closely related to an important dependency measure, *Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi maximal correlation* (or simply *maximal correlation*). This correlation measures the maximum (Pearson) correlation between square integrable real-valued random variables generated by the individual random variables. According to the definition, maximal correlation is invariant on bijective mappings (or robust to bijective transform), hence it reveals some kind of intrinsic dependency between two sources. This measure was first introduced by Hirschfeld [5] and Gebelein [4], then studied by Rényi [6], and recently it has been exploited to some interesting problems of information theory, such as measure of non-local correlations [9], maximal correlation secrecy [10], converse result of distributed communication [14], etc. Furthermore, maximal correlation also indicates the existence of Gács-Körner or Wyner common information: There exists Gács-Körner common information between two sources if and only if the maximal correlation between them equals one; and there exists Wyner common information between two sources if and only if the maximal correlation between them is positive.

The common informations proposed by Gács and Körner and by Wyner (or by Kumar, Li, and Gamal) are defined in two different problems: distributed common information extraction and distributed source synthesis. In these problems, the common informations are defined from different points of view. One attempt to unify them can

be found in [11], where Kamath and Anantharam converted common information extraction problem into a special case of distributed source synthesis problem by specifying the synthesized distribution to be that of the common randomness. In this paper, we attempt to give another unification of the existing common informations. Specifically, we unify and generalize the Gács-Körner and Wyner common informations by defining a generalized common information, (*approximate*) *information-correlation function*. In this generalized definition, the conditional maximal correlation (the conditional dependency of the sources given the common randomness) is exploited to measure the privacy (or commonness), and the mutual information is used to measure the information amount of such common randomness. The Gács-Körner common information and Wyner common information are two special and extreme cases of our generalized definition with correlation respectively being 0 and  $1^{-1}$ , and hence both of them can be seen as hard-measures of common information. However, in our definition, correlation could be any number between 0 and 1, hence our definition gives a soft-measure of common information. Our results give a more comprehensive answer to the classic problem: What is the common information between two correlated sources? Furthermore, similarly we also unify and generalize the Gács-Körner and Kumar-Li-Gamal common informations into another generalized common information, (*exact*) *information-correlation function*. To give an operational interpretation of the approximate and exact generalized common informations, we also study common information extraction problem and private sources synthesis problem, and show that the information-correlation functions correspond to the minimum achievable rates under privacy constraints for the centralized case of each problem.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II summarizes definitions and properties of maximal correlation. Section III defines information-correlation function and provides the basic properties. Sections IV and V investigate the private sources synthesis problem and common information extraction problem respectively. Finally, Section VI gives the concluding remarks.

#### A. Notation and Preliminaries

We use  $P_X(x)$  to denote the probability distribution of random variable  $X$ , which is also shortly denoted as  $P_X$  or  $P(x)$ . We also use  $P_X$  and  $Q_X$  to denote different probability distribution with common alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$ . We use  $P_X^U$  to denote the uniform distribution over the set  $\mathcal{X}$ , unless otherwise stated. We use  $f_P$  or  $f_Q$  to denote a quantity or operation  $f$  that is defined on pmf  $P$  or  $Q$ . The total variation distance between two probability measures  $P$  and  $Q$  with common alphabet is defined by

$$\|P - Q\|_{TV} := \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |P(A) - Q(A)| \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of the probability space.

In this paper, some achievability schemes involves a random codebook  $\mathcal{C}$  (or a random binning  $\mathcal{B}$ ). For simplicity, we also denote the induced conditional distribution  $P_{X|\mathcal{C}=c}$  (given  $\mathcal{C} = c$ ) as  $P_X$  (suppressing the condition  $\mathcal{C} = c$ ), which can be seen as a *random pmf*.

For any pmfs  $P_X$  and  $Q_X$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , we write  $P_X \stackrel{\epsilon}{\approx} Q_X$  if  $\|P_X - Q_X\|_{TV} < \epsilon$  for non-random pmfs, or  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|P_X - Q_X\|_{TV} < \epsilon$  for random pmfs. For any two sequences of pmfs  $P_{X^{(n)}}$  and  $Q_{X^{(n)}}$  on  $\mathcal{X}^{(n)}$  (where  $\mathcal{X}^{(n)}$  is

<sup>1</sup> $1^{-}$  implies the correlation approaching 1 from the left.

arbitrary and it differs from  $\mathcal{X}^n$  which is a Cartesian product), we write  $P_{X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}}$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{X^{(n)}} - Q_{X^{(n)}}\|_{TV} = 0$  for non-random pmfs, or  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|P_{X^{(n)}} - Q_{X^{(n)}}\|_{TV} = 0$  for random pmfs.

The following properties of total variation distance hold.

**Property 1.** [19], [22] *Total variation distance satisfies:*

1) *If the support of  $P$  and  $Q$  is a countable set  $\mathcal{X}$ , then*

$$\|P - Q\|_{TV} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |P(x) - Q(x)|. \quad (6)$$

2) *Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and let  $f(x)$  be a function with bounded range of width  $b > 0$ . Then*

$$P_X \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} Q_X \Rightarrow |\mathbb{E}_P f(X) - \mathbb{E}_Q f(X)| < \epsilon b, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_P$  indicates that the expectation is taken with respect to the distribution  $P$ .

3)  $P_{X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}} \Rightarrow P_{X^{(n)}} P_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}} P_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}}$ ,

$$P_{X^{(n)}} P_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}} Q_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}} \Rightarrow P_{X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}}.$$

4) *For any two sequences of non-random pmfs  $P_{X^{(n)}Y^{(n)}}$  and  $Q_{X^{(n)}Y^{(n)}}$ , if  $P_{X^{(n)}} P_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}} Q_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}}$ , then there exists a sequence  $x^{(n)} \in \mathcal{X}^{(n)}$  such that  $P_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}=x^{(n)}} \approx Q_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}=x^{(n)}}$ .*

5) *If  $P_{X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}}$  and  $P_{X^{(n)}} P_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}} \approx P_{X^{(n)}} Q_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}}$ , then  $P_{X^{(n)}} P_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}} \approx Q_{X^{(n)}} Q_{Y^{(n)}|X^{(n)}}$ .*

## II. (CONDITIONAL) MAXIMAL CORRELATION

In this section, we first define several correlations, including (Pearson) correlation, correlation ratio, and maximal correlation, and then study their properties. These concepts and properties will be used to define and investigate information-correlation functions in subsequent sections.

In this section, we assume all alphabets are general (not limited to finite or countable) unless otherwise stated.

### A. Definition

**Definition 1.** For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  with alphabets  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , the (Pearson) correlation of  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined by

$$\rho(X; Y) = \begin{cases} \frac{\text{cov}(X, Y)}{\sqrt{\text{var}(X)}\sqrt{\text{var}(Y)}}, & \text{if } \text{var}(X)\text{var}(Y) > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \text{var}(X)\text{var}(Y) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Moreover, the conditional correlation of  $X$  and  $Y$  given another random variable  $U$  is defined by

$$\rho(X; Y|U) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(X, Y|U)]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(Y|U)]}}, & \text{if } \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(Y|U)] > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(Y|U)] = 0. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

**Definition 2.** For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  with alphabets  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , the correlation ratio of  $X$  on  $Y$  is defined by

$$\theta(X; Y) = \sup_g \rho(X; g(Y)), \quad (10)$$

where the supremum is taken over all the functions  $g : \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, the conditional correlation ratio of  $X$  on  $Y$  given another random variable  $U$  with alphabet  $\mathcal{U}$  is defined by

$$\theta(X; Y|U) = \sup_g \rho(X; g(Y, U)|U), \quad (11)$$

where the supremum is taken over all the functions  $g : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ .

*Remark 1.* Note that in general  $\theta(X; Y) \neq \theta(Y; X)$  and  $\theta(X; Y|U) \neq \theta(Y; X|U)$ .

**Definition 3.** For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  with alphabets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , the maximal correlation of  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined by

$$\rho_m(X; Y) = \sup_{f, g} \rho(f(X); g(Y)), \quad (12)$$

where the supremum is taken over all the functions  $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}, g : \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, the conditional maximal correlation of  $X$  and  $Y$  given another random variable  $U$  with alphabet  $\mathcal{U}$  is defined by

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_{f, g} \rho(f(X, U); g(Y, U)|U), \quad (13)$$

where the supremum is taken over all the functions  $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathbb{R}, g : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{U} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ .

It is easy to verify that

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_f \theta(f(X, U); Y|U). \quad (14)$$

Note that the unconditional versions of correlation coefficient, correlation ratio, and maximal correlation have been well studied in literature. The conditional versions are first introduced by Beigi and Gohari recently [9], where it is named as *maximal correlation of a box* and used to study the problem of non-local correlations. In this paper, we will well study conditional maximal correlation (and conditional correlation ratio), and give some useful properties.

## B. Properties

According to the definition, maximal correlation remains the same after applying bijective transform (one-to-one correspondence) on each of the variables. Hence it is robust to bijective transform. Furthermore, for finite valued random variables maximal correlation  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  can be characterized by the second largest singular value  $\lambda_2(u)$  of the matrix  $Q_u$  with entries

$$Q_u(x, y) := \frac{p(x, y|u)}{\sqrt{p(x|u)p(y|u)}} = \frac{p(x, y, u)}{\sqrt{p(x, u)p(y, u)}}. \quad (15)$$

**Lemma 1.** (Singular value characterization). For any random variables  $X, Y, U$ ,

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \lambda_2(u). \quad (16)$$

*Remark 2.* This shows the conditional maximal correlation is consistent with the unconditional version ( $U = \emptyset$ ) [2]

$$\rho_m(X; Y) = \lambda_2. \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, for any random variables  $X, Y, U$  with finite alphabets, the supremum in (12), (13) and (16) is actually a maximum.

The proof of this lemma is given in Appendix B. This lemma gives a simple approach to compute (conditional) maximal correlation. Observe that  $\lambda_2(u)$  is equal to the maximal correlation  $\rho_m(X; Y|U = u)$  between  $X$  and  $Y$  under condition  $U = u$ , and under distribution  $P_{XY|U=u}$ . Hence Lemma 1 leads to the following result.

**Lemma 2.** (Alternative characterization). For any random variables  $X, Y, U$ ,

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \rho_m(X; Y|U = u). \quad (18)$$

Note that the right-hand side of (18) was first defined by Beigi and Gohari [9]. This lemma implies the equivalence between the conditional maximal correlation defined by us and that defined by Beigi and Gohari.

Furthermore, Lemmas 1 and 2 also hold for continuous random variables, if the constraint of  $P(u) > 0$  is replaced with  $p(u) > 0$ . Here  $p(u)$  denotes the probability density function (pdf) of  $U$ . Notice that Lemmas 1 and 2 imply that  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  can be different for different distributions of  $X, Y$ , even if the distributions are only different up to a zero measure set. In measure theory, people usually do not care the difference with zero measure. Therefore, we refine the definition of conditional maximal correlation for continuous random variables by defining a robust version as follows.

$$\tilde{\rho}_m(X; Y|U) := \inf_{q_{XYU}: q_{XYU} = p_{XYU} \text{ a.s.}} \rho_{m,q}(X; Y|U), \quad (19)$$

for continuous random variables  $X, Y, U$ , with pdf  $p_{XYU}$ . We name  $\tilde{\rho}_m(X; Y|U)$  as *robust conditional maximal correlation*. Obviously, for discrete random variables case, robust conditional maximal correlation is consistent with conditional maximal correlation. Moreover, if we take  $\inf_{q_{XYU}: q_{XYU} = p_{XYU} \text{ a.s.}}$  operation on each side of an equality or inequality about  $q_{XYU}$ , it usually does not change the equality or inequality. Hence in this paper, we only consider conditional maximal correlations rather than their robust versions.

**Lemma 3.** (TV bound on maximal correlation). For any random variables  $X, Y, U$  with finite alphabets,

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U) \geq \frac{\rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U) - \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}{1 + \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}, \quad (20)$$

where  $P_m = \min_{x,y,u: P(x,y,u) > 0} P(x, y|u)$ , and  $\delta = \max_{u: P(u) > 0} \|P_{XY|U=u} - Q_{XY|U=u}\|_{TV}$ .

*Remark 3.* Lemma 3 implies

$$\frac{\rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U) - \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}{1 + \frac{4\delta}{P_m}} \leq \rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U) \leq \left(1 + \frac{4\delta}{Q_m}\right) \rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U) + \frac{4\delta}{Q_m}, \quad (21)$$

where  $Q_m = \min_{x,y,u: Q(x,y,u) > 0} Q(x, y|u)$ .

*Proof:* Assume  $u$  achieves the supremum in (18), and  $f, g$  satisfying  $\mathbb{E}_P[f(X, U)|U = u] = 0, \mathbb{E}_P[g(Y, U)|U = u] = 0, \text{var}_P[f(X, U)|U = u] = 1, \text{var}_P[g(Y, U)|U = u] = 1$ , achieves  $\rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U)$ . Then  $P(x|u)f^2(x, u) \leq \sum_x P(x|u)f^2(x, u) = 1$  for any  $x, u$ , i.e.,

$$|f(x, u)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{P(x|u)}} \quad (22)$$

for any  $x, u$  such that  $P(x|u) > 0$ . Furthermore, for any  $x, u$  such that  $P(x|u) > 0$ , we have  $P(x|u) \geq P(x, y|u) \geq P_m$ . Hence (22) implies

$$|f(x, u)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_m}}. \quad (23)$$

Similarly, we have

$$|g(y, u)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_m}}. \quad (24)$$

According to Property (7), the following inequalities hold.

$$|\mathbb{E}_Q[f(X, U)g(Y, U)|U] - \mathbb{E}_P[f(X, U)g(Y, U)|U]| \leq \frac{2\delta}{P_m} \quad (25)$$

$$|\mathbb{E}_Q[f(X, U)|U]| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{P_m}} \|P_{X|U} - Q_{X|U}\|_{TV} \leq \frac{2\delta}{\sqrt{P_m}} \quad (26)$$

$$|\mathbb{E}_Q[g(Y, U)|U]| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{P_m}} \|P_{Y|U} - Q_{Y|U}\|_{TV} \leq \frac{2\delta}{\sqrt{P_m}} \quad (27)$$

$$|\mathbb{E}_Q[f^2(X, U)|U] - 1| \leq \frac{2\delta}{P_m} \quad (28)$$

and

$$|\mathbb{E}_Q[g^2(Y, U)|U] - 1| \leq \frac{2\delta}{P_m}. \quad (29)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U = u) \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_Q[f(X, U)g(Y, U)|U] - \mathbb{E}_Q[f(X, U)|U]\mathbb{E}_Q[g(Y, U)|U]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Q[f^2(X, U)|U] - \mathbb{E}_Q^2[f(X, U)|U]}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Q[g^2(Y, U)|U] - \mathbb{E}_Q^2[g(Y, U)|U]}} \quad (30)$$

$$\geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_Q[f(X, U)g(Y, U)|U] - \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Q[f^2(X, U)|U] - \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Q[g^2(Y, U)|U] - \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}} \quad (31)$$

$$\geq \frac{\rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U = u) - \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}\sqrt{1 + \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}} \quad (32)$$

$$= \frac{\rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U = u) - \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}{1 + \frac{4\delta}{P_m}}. \quad (33)$$

■

**Lemma 4.** (Continuity and discontinuity). Assume  $X, Y, U$  have finite alphabets. Then given  $P_U$ ,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  is continuous in  $P_{XY|U}$ . Given  $P_{XY|U}$ ,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  is continuous on  $\{P_U : P_U(u) > 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}\}$ . But in general,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  is discontinuous in  $P_{XYU}$ .

*Proof:* (21) implies for given  $P_U$ , as  $\max_{u: P(u) > 0} \|P_{XY|U=u} - Q_{XY|U=u}\|_{TV} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U) \rightarrow \rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U)$ . Hence for given  $P_U$ ,  $\rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U)$  is continuous in  $P_{XY|U}$ . Furthermore, since given  $P_{XY|U}$ ,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \lambda_2(u)$ , we have for given  $P_{XY|U}$ ,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  is continuous on  $\{P_U : P_U(u) > 0, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}\}$ . But it is worth noting that  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  may be discontinuous at  $P_U$  such that  $P_U(u) = 0$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . Therefore,  $Q_{XYU} \rightarrow P_{XYU}$  in total variation sense does not necessarily imply  $\rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U) \rightarrow \rho_m(X; Y|U)$ . That is, the conditional maximal correlation may be discontinuous in probability distribution  $P_{XYU}$ . ■

Furthermore, some other properties hold.

**Lemma 5.** (Concavity). Given  $P_{XY|U}$ ,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  is concave in  $P_U$ .

*Proof:*

Fix  $P_{XY|U}$ . Assume  $R_U = \lambda P_U + (1 - \lambda) Q_U$ ,  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , then by Lemma 2, we have

$$\rho_{m,R}(X; Y|U) = \sup_{u: R(u) > 0} \rho_m(X; Y|U = u) \quad (34)$$

$$= \sup_{u: P(u) > 0 \text{ or } Q(u) > 0} \rho_m(X; Y|U = u) \quad (35)$$

$$= \max \left\{ \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \rho_m(X; Y|U = u), \sup_{u: Q(u) > 0} \rho_m(X; Y|U = u) \right\} \quad (36)$$

$$= \max \{ \rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U), \rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U) \}. \quad (37)$$

Hence  $\rho_{m,R}(X; Y|U) \geq \lambda \rho_{m,P}(X; Y|U) + (1 - \lambda) \rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U)$ , i.e.,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  is concave in  $P_U$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 6.** For any random variables  $X, Y, Z, U$ , the following inequalities hold.

$$0 \leq |\rho(X; Y|U)| \leq \theta(X; Y|U) \leq \rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq 1. \quad (38)$$

Moreover,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 0$  if and only if  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally independent given  $U$ ;  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 1$  if and only if  $X$  and  $Y$  have Gács-Körner common information given  $U$ .

*Proof:*

$$|\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(X, Y|U)]| = |\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X|U])(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|U])]| \quad (39)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X|U])^2] \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|U])^2]} \quad (40)$$

$$= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)] \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(Y|U)]}, \quad (41)$$

where (40) follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Hence

$$0 \leq |\rho(X; Y|U)| \leq 1 \quad (42)$$

which further implies

$$0 \leq |\rho(X; Y|U)| \leq \theta(X; Y|U) \leq \rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq 1 \quad (43)$$

since both  $\theta(X; Y|U)$  and  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  are conditional correlations for some variables.

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally independent given  $U$ , then for any functions  $f$  and  $g$ ,  $f(X, U)$  and  $g(Y, U)$  are also conditionally independent given  $U$ . This leads to  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 0$ .

Conversely, if  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 0$ , then

$$\rho(f(X, U); g(Y, U)|U) = 0 \quad (44)$$

for any functions  $f$  and  $g$ . For any  $x, u$ , set  $f(X, U) = 1\{X = x, U = u\}$  and  $g(Y, U) = 1\{Y = y, U = u\}$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(X, Y|U)] = \mathbb{P}(X = x, Y = y|U = u) - \mathbb{P}(X = x|U = u)\mathbb{P}(Y = y|U = u) \quad (45)$$



$$= P_{XY|U}(x, y|u) - P_{X|U}(x|u)P_{Y|U}(y|u). \quad (46)$$

Hence (44) implies

$$P_{XY|U}(x, y|u) = P_{X|U}(x|u)P_{Y|U}(y|u). \quad (47)$$

This implies  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally independent given  $U$ . Therefore,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 0$  if and only if  $X$  and  $Y$  are conditionally independent given  $U$ .

Assume  $X$  and  $Y$  have Gács-Körner common information given  $U$ , i.e.,  $f(X, U) = g(Y, U)$  with probability 1 for some functions  $f$  and  $g$  such that  $H(f(X, U)|U) > 0$ . Then  $\mathbb{E}\text{var}(f(X, U)|U)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(g(Y, U)|U) > 0$ , and

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) \geq \rho(f(X, U); g(Y, U)|U) \geq 1. \quad (48)$$

Combining this with  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq 1$ , we have  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 1$ .

Assume  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 1$ , then  $f(X, U) = g(Y, U)$  with probability 1 for some functions  $f$  and  $g$  such that  $\mathbb{E}\text{var}(f(X, U)|U)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(g(Y, U)|U) > 0$ , or equivalently,  $H(f(X, U)|U) > 0$ . This implies  $X$  and  $Y$  have Gács-Körner common information given  $U$ . Therefore,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 1$  if and only if  $X$  and  $Y$  have Gács-Körner common information given  $U$ . ■

**Lemma 7.** *For any random variables  $X, Y, Z, U$ , the following properties hold.*

$$\theta(X; YZ|U) \geq \theta(X; Y|U); \quad (49)$$

$$\rho_m(X; YZ|U) \geq \rho_m(X; Y|U); \quad (50)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(X; Y|U) &= \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|YU]|U)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}} \\ &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YU)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}}; \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_m(X; Y|U) &= \sup_f \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[f(X, U)|YU]|U)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(f(X, U)|U)]}} \\ &= \sup_f \sqrt{1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(f(X, U)|YU)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(f(X, U)|U)]}}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

*In particular if  $U$  is degenerate, then the inequalities above reduce to*

$$\theta(X; YZ) \geq \theta(X; Y); \quad (53)$$

$$\rho_m(X; YZ) \geq \rho_m(X; Y); \quad (54)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(X; Y) &= \sqrt{\frac{\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|Y])}{\text{var}(X)}} \\ &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|Y)]}{\text{var}(X)}}; \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_m(X; Y) &= \sup_f \sqrt{\frac{\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[f(X)|Y])}{\text{var}(f(X))}} \\
&= \sup_f \sqrt{1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(f(X)|Y)]}{\text{var}(f(X))}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

*Remark 4.* Correlation ratio is also closely related to Minimum Mean Square Error (MMSE). The optimal MMSE estimator is  $\mathbb{E}[X|YU]$ , hence the variance of the MMSE for estimating  $X$  given  $(Y, U)$  is  $\text{mmse}(X|YU) = \mathbb{E}(X - \mathbb{E}[X|YU])^2 = \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YU)] = \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)](1 - \theta^2(X; Y|U))$ .

*Proof:* According to definitions of conditional correlation ratio and conditional maximal correlation, (49) and (50) can be proven easily.

In fact, we may, without loss of the generality, consider only such function  $g$  for which  $\mathbb{E}[g(Y, U)|U = u] = 0, \forall u$  and  $\text{var}(g(Y, U)|U = u) = 1, \forall u$  and suppose  $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0, \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)] = 1$ ; for this case we have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(X, g(Y, U)|U)] = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X|U])(g(Y, U) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y, U)|U])] \tag{57}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X|U])|YU](g(Y, U) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y, U)|U])] \tag{58}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[X|YU] - \mathbb{E}[X|U])(g(Y, U) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y, U)|U])] \tag{59}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[X|YU] - \mathbb{E}[X|U])^2] \mathbb{E}[(g(Y, U) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y, U)|U])^2]} \tag{60}$$

$$= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|YU]|U)] \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(g(Y, U)|U)]}. \tag{61}$$

Therefore,

$$\theta(X; Y|U) = \sup_g \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(X, g(Y, U)|U)]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)] \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(g(Y, U)|U)]}} \tag{62}$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|YU]|U)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}}. \tag{63}$$

It is easy to verify that equality holds if and only if  $g(Y, U) = \alpha \mathbb{E}[X|YU]$  for some constant  $\alpha > 0$ . Hence

$$\theta(X; Y|U) = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|YU]|U)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}}. \tag{64}$$

Furthermore, by law of total variance

$$\text{var}(Y) = \mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|X) + \text{var}(\mathbb{E}(Y|X)) \tag{65}$$

and the conditional version

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)] = \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YU)] + \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|YU]|U)], \tag{66}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta(X; Y|U) &= \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|YU]|U)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}} \\
&= \sqrt{1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YU)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Furthermore, since  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_f \theta(f(X, U); Y|U)$ , (52) follows straightforwardly from (67).  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 8.** (Correlation ratio equality). For any random variables  $X, Y, U$ ,

$$1 - \theta^2(X; YZ|U) = (1 - \theta^2(X; Z|U))(1 - \theta^2(X; Y|ZU)); \quad (68)$$

$$1 - \rho_m^2(X; YZ|U) \geq (1 - \rho_m^2(X; Z|U))(1 - \rho_m^2(X; Y|ZU)); \quad (69)$$

$$\theta(X; YZ|U) \geq \theta(X; Y|ZU); \quad (70)$$

$$\rho_m(X; YZ|U) \geq \rho_m(X; Y|ZU). \quad (71)$$

*Remark 5.* (71) is very similar to  $I(X; YZ|U) \geq I(X; Y|ZU)$ . Furthermore,  $\rho_m(X; Y|UV) \geq \rho_m(X; Y|U)$  or  $\rho_m(X; Y|UV) \leq \rho_m(X; Y|U)$  does not always hold. This is also similar to that  $I(X; Y|UV) \geq I(X; Y|U)$  or  $I(X; Y|UV) \leq I(X; Y|U)$  does not always hold.

*Proof:* From (51), we have

$$1 - \theta^2(X; YZ|U) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YZU)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}, \quad (72)$$

$$1 - \theta^2(X; Z|U) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|ZU)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}, \quad (73)$$

and

$$1 - \theta^2(X; Y|ZU) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YZU)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|ZU)]}. \quad (74)$$

Hence (68) follows immediately.

Suppose  $f$  achieves  $\rho_m(X; YZ|U)$ , i.e., the supremum in (13), then

$$1 - \rho_m^2(X; YZ|U) = 1 - \theta^2(f(X, U); YZ|U) \quad (75)$$

$$= (1 - \theta^2(f(X, U); Z|U))(1 - \theta^2(f(X, U); Y|ZU)) \quad (76)$$

$$\geq (1 - \rho_m^2(X; Z|U))(1 - \rho_m^2(X; Y|ZU)). \quad (77)$$

Furthermore,  $\theta^2(X; Z|U) \geq 0$ , hence (70) follows immediately from (68).

Suppose  $f'$  achieves  $\rho_m(X; Y|ZU)$ , then

$$\rho_m(X; Y|ZU) = \theta(f'(X, U); Y|ZU) \leq \theta(f'(X, U); YZ|U) \leq \rho_m(X; YZ|U). \quad (78)$$

$\blacksquare$

**Lemma 9.** For any  $P_{UXYV}$  such that  $U \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$  and  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow V$ , we have

$$\rho_m(UX; VY) = \max\{\rho_m(X; Y), \rho_m(U; V|XY)\}. \quad (79)$$

*Remark 6.* A similar result can be found in [9, Eqn. (4)], where Beigi and Gohari only proved the equality above as an inequality.

*Proof:* Beigi and Gobari [9, Eqn. (4)] have proven  $\rho_m(UX; VY) \leq \max\{\rho_m(X; Y), \rho_m(U; V|XY)\}$ . Hence we only need to prove that  $\rho_m(UX; VY) \geq \max\{\rho_m(X; Y), \rho_m(U; V|XY)\}$ . According to the definition,  $\rho_m(UX; VY) \geq$

$\rho_m(X; Y)$  is straightforward. From (71) of Lemma 8, we have  $\rho_m(UX; VY) \geq \rho_m(UX; V|Y) \geq \rho_m(U; V|XY)$ .

This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

We also prove that conditioning reduces covariance gap as shown in the following lemma, the proof of which is given in Appendix C.

**Lemma 10.** (Conditioning reduces covariance gap). For any random variables  $X, Y, Z, U$ ,

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|ZU)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|ZU)} - \mathbb{E}\text{cov}(X, Y|ZU) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z)} - \mathbb{E}\text{cov}(X, Y|Z), \quad (80)$$

i. e.,

$$\sqrt{(1 - \theta^2(X; U|Z))(1 - \theta^2(Y; U|Z))}(1 - \rho(X, Y|ZU)) \leq 1 - \rho(X, Y|Z). \quad (81)$$

In particular, if  $Z$  is degenerate, then

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|U)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|U)} - \mathbb{E}\text{cov}(X, Y|U) \leq \sqrt{\text{var}(X)\text{var}(Y)} - \text{cov}(X, Y), \quad (82)$$

i. e.,

$$\sqrt{(1 - \theta^2(X; U))(1 - \theta^2(Y; U))}(1 - \rho(X, Y|U)) \leq 1 - \rho(X, Y). \quad (83)$$

*Remark 7.* The following two inequalities follows immediately.

$$\sqrt{(1 - \rho_m^2(X; U|Z))(1 - \theta^2(Y; U|Z))}(1 - \theta(X, Y|ZU)) \leq 1 - \theta(X, Y|Z), \quad (84)$$

and

$$\sqrt{(1 - \rho_m^2(X; U|Z))(1 - \rho_m^2(Y; U|Z))}(1 - \rho_m(X, Y|ZU)) \leq 1 - \rho_m(X, Y|Z). \quad (85)$$

Furthermore, there are also some other remarkable properties.

**Lemma 11.** (Tensorization). Assume given  $U$ ,  $(X^n, Y^n)$  is a sequence of pairs of conditionally independent random variables, then we have

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n|U) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i|U). \quad (86)$$

*Proof:* The unconditional version

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i), \quad (87)$$

for a sequence of pairs of independent random variables  $(X^n, Y^n)$  is proven in [2, Thm. 1]. Using this result and Lemma 1, we have

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n|U) = \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \rho_m(X^n; Y^n|U = u) \quad (88)$$

$$= \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i|U = u) \quad (89)$$

$$= \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i|U = u) \quad (90)$$

$$= \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i|U). \quad (91)$$

**Lemma 12.** (Gaussian case). For jointly Gaussian random variables  $X, Y, U$ , we have

$$\rho_m(X; Y) = \theta(X; Y) = \theta(Y; X) = |\rho(X; Y)|, \quad (92)$$

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \theta(X; Y|U) = \theta(Y; X|U) = |\rho(X; Y|U)|. \quad (93)$$

*Proof:* The unconditional version (92) is proven in [13, Sec. IV, Lem. 10.2]. On the other hand, given  $U = u$ ,  $(X, Y)$  also follows jointly Gaussian distribution, and  $\rho(X; Y|U = u) = \rho(X; Y|U)$  for different  $u$ . Hence  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \rho_m(X; Y|U = u) = \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} |\rho(X; Y|U = u)| = |\rho(X; Y|U)|$ .

Furthermore, both  $\theta(X; Y|U)$  and  $\theta(Y; X|U)$  are between  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  and  $|\rho(X; Y|U)|$ . Hence (93) holds. ■

**Lemma 13.** (Data processing inequality). If random variables  $X, Y, Z, U$  form a Markov chain  $X \rightarrow (Z, U) \rightarrow Y$ , then

$$|\rho(X; Y|U)| \leq \theta(X; Z|U)\theta(Y; Z|U), \quad (94)$$

$$\theta(X; Y|U) \leq \theta(X; Z|U)\rho_m(Y; Z|U), \quad (95)$$

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq \rho_m(X; Z|U)\rho_m(Y; Z|U). \quad (96)$$

Moreover, the equalities hold in (94)-(96), if  $(X, Z, U)$  and  $(Y, Z, U)$  have the same joint distribution. In particular if  $U$  is degenerate, then

$$|\rho(X; Y)| \leq \theta(X; Z)\theta(Y; Z), \quad (97)$$

$$\theta(X; Y) \leq \theta(X; Z)\rho_m(Y; Z), \quad (98)$$

$$\rho_m(X; Y) \leq \rho_m(X; Z)\rho_m(Y; Z). \quad (99)$$

*Proof:* Consider that

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(X, Y|U)] = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X|U])(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|U])] \quad (100)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X|U])(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|U])|ZU]] \quad (101)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X - \mathbb{E}[X|U]|ZU]\mathbb{E}[Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|U]|ZU]] \quad (102)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[X|ZU] - \mathbb{E}[X|U])(\mathbb{E}[Y|ZU] - \mathbb{E}[Y|U])] \quad (103)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[X|ZU] - \mathbb{E}[X|U])^2]\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[Y|ZU] - \mathbb{E}[Y|U])^2]} \quad (104)$$

$$= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|ZU]|U)]\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[Y|ZU]|U)]} \quad (105)$$

where (102) follows by conditional independence, and (104) follows the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Hence

$$|\rho(X; Y|U)| = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(X, Y|U)]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(Y|U)]}} \quad (106)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[X|ZU]|U)]\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\mathbb{E}[Y|ZU]|U)]}{\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)]\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(Y|U)]}} \quad (107)$$

$$= \theta(X; Z|U)\theta(Y; Z|U). \quad (108)$$

It is easy to verify the equalities hold if  $(X, Z, U)$  and  $(Y, Z, U)$  have the same joint distribution.

Similarly, (95) and (96) can be proven as well. ■

Furthermore, correlation ratio and maximal correlation are also related to rate-distortion theory.

**Lemma 14.** (*Relationship to rate-distortion function*) Let  $R_{X|U}(D)$  denote the conditional rate distribution function for source  $X$  given  $U$  with quadratic distortion measure  $d(x, \hat{x}) = (x - \hat{x})^2$ . Then from rate-distortion theory, we have

$$I(X; Y|U) \geq R_{X|U}(\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YU)]) \quad (109)$$

$$= R_{X|U}(\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)](1 - \theta^2(X; Y|U))) \quad (110)$$

$$\geq R_{X|U}(\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)](1 - \rho^2(X; Y|U))). \quad (111)$$

From Shannon lower bound,

$$I(X; Y|U) \geq R_{X|U}(\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|YU)]) \quad (112)$$

$$\geq h(X|U) - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|U)](1 - \theta^2(X; Y|U))). \quad (113)$$

If  $(X, U)$  is jointly Gaussian, then

$$I(X; Y|U) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1}{1 - \theta^2(X; Y|U)} \right) \quad (114)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2(X; Y|U)} \right). \quad (115)$$

In particular if  $U$  is degenerate, then

$$I(X; Y) \geq R_X(\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|Y)]) \quad (116)$$

$$= R_X(\text{var}(X)(1 - \theta^2(X; Y))). \quad (117)$$

From Shannon lower bound,

$$I(X; Y) \geq R_X(\mathbb{E}[\text{var}(X|Y)]) \quad (118)$$

$$\geq h(X) - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi e(1 - \theta^2(X; Y))). \quad (119)$$

If  $X$  is Gaussian, then

$$I(X; Y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1}{1 - \theta^2(X; Y)} \right) \quad (120)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2(X; Y)} \right). \quad (121)$$

From the properties above, it can be observed that maximal correlation or correlation ratio has many similar properties as those of mutual information, such as invariance to one-to-one transform, chain rule (correlation ratio equality), data processing inequality, etc. On the other hand, maximal correlation or correlation ratio also has some different properties, such as for a sequence of pairs of independent random variables, the mutual information

between them is the sum of mutual information of all pairs of components (i.e., additivity); while the maximal correlation is the maximum one of the maximal correlations of all pairs of components (i.e., tensorization).

### C. Extension: Smooth Maximal Correlation

Next we extend maximal correlation to smooth version. Analogous extensions can be found in [15] and [16], where Rényi divergence and generalized Brascamp-Lieb-like (GBLL) rate are extended to the corresponding smooth versions.

**Definition 4.** For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  with alphabets  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , the  $\epsilon$ -smooth (Pearson) correlation and the  $\epsilon$ -smooth conditional (Pearson) correlation of  $X$  and  $Y$  given another random variable  $U$  are respectively defined by

$$\tilde{\rho}^\epsilon(X; Y) := \inf_{Q_{XY}: \|Q_{XY} - P_{XY}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon} \rho_Q(X; Y), \quad (122)$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}^\epsilon(X; Y|U) := \inf_{Q_{XYU}: \|Q_{XYU} - P_{XYU}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon} \rho_Q(X; Y|U). \quad (123)$$

**Definition 5.** For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  with alphabets  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , the  $\epsilon$ -smooth correlation ratio and the  $\epsilon$ -smooth conditional correlation ratio of  $X$  and  $Y$  given another random variable  $U$  are respectively defined by

$$\tilde{\theta}^\epsilon(X; Y) := \inf_{Q_{XY}: \|Q_{XY} - P_{XY}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon} \theta_Q(X; Y), \quad (124)$$

and

$$\tilde{\theta}^\epsilon(X; Y|U) := \inf_{Q_{XYU}: \|Q_{XYU} - P_{XYU}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon} \theta_Q(X; Y|U). \quad (125)$$

**Definition 6.** For any random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  with alphabets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , the  $\epsilon$ -smooth maximal correlation and the  $\epsilon$ -smooth conditional maximal correlation of  $X$  and  $Y$  given another random variable  $U$  are respectively defined by

$$\tilde{\rho}_m^\epsilon(X; Y) := \inf_{Q_{XY}: \|Q_{XY} - P_{XY}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon} \rho_{m,Q}(X; Y), \quad (126)$$

and

$$\tilde{\rho}_m^\epsilon(X; Y|U) := \inf_{Q_{XYU}: \|Q_{XYU} - P_{XYU}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon} \rho_{m,Q}(X; Y|U). \quad (127)$$

According to definition, obviously we have

$$\tilde{\rho}^\epsilon(X; Y|U) \leq \rho(X; Y|U), \quad (128)$$

$$\tilde{\theta}^\epsilon(X; Y|U) \leq \theta(X; Y|U), \quad (129)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_m^\epsilon(X; Y|U) \leq \rho_m(X; Y|U). \quad (130)$$

Furthermore, note that adding  $\inf_{Q_{XYU}: \|Q_{XYU} - P_{XYU}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon}$  operation before both sides of an equality or inequality about  $P_{XYU}$  does not change the equality or inequality. Hence some of above lemmas still hold for  $\epsilon$ -smooth version, e.g., Lemmas 1, 2, 6, and 7, and also (70) and (71) of Lemma 8.

### III. GENERALIZED COMMON INFORMATION: INFORMATION-CORRELATION FUNCTION

In this section, we generalize the existing common informations, and define  $\beta$ -approximate common information (or approximate information-correlation function) and  $\beta$ -exact common information (or exact information-correlation function), which measure how much information are approximately or exactly  $\beta$ -correlated between two variables. Different from the existing common informations,  $\beta$ -common information is a function of conditional maximal correlation  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ , and hence it provides a soft-measure of common information.

As in the previous section, in this section we also assume all alphabets are general unless otherwise stated.

#### A. Definition

Suppose  $U$  is a common random variable extracted from  $X, Y$ , satisfying privacy constraint  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq \beta$ , then the  $\beta$ -private information corresponding to  $U$  should be  $H(XY|U)$ . We define the  $\beta$ -private information as the maximum of such private informations over all possible  $U$ .

**Definition 7.** For sources  $X, Y$ , and  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ , the  $\beta$ -approximate private information of  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined by

$$B_\beta(X; Y) = \sup_{P_{U|XY}: \rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq \beta} H(XY|U). \quad (131)$$

Common information is defined as  $C_\beta(X; Y) = H(XY) - B_\beta(X; Y)$ , which is equivalent to the following definition.

**Definition 8.** For sources  $X, Y$ , and  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ , the  $\beta$ -approximate common information (or approximate information-correlation function) of  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined by

$$C_\beta(X; Y) = \inf_{P_{U|XY}: \rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq \beta} I(XY; U). \quad (132)$$

Similarly, exact common information can be generalized to  $\beta$ -exact common information as well.

**Definition 9.** For sources  $X, Y$ , and  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ , the  $\beta$ -exact common information (rate) (or exact information-correlation function) of  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined by

$$K_\beta(X; Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U_n|X^n Y^n}: \rho_m(X^n; Y^n|U_n) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n). \quad (133)$$

Furthermore, for  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ , we also define

$$C_{\beta-}(X; Y) = \lim_{\alpha \uparrow \beta} C_\alpha(X; Y), \quad (134)$$

$$K_{\beta-}(X; Y) = \lim_{\alpha \uparrow \beta} K_\alpha(X; Y). \quad (135)$$

#### B. Properties

These two generalized common informations have the following properties.

**Lemma 15.** (a) For the infimum in (132), it suffices to consider the variable  $U$  with alphabet  $|\mathcal{U}| \leq |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| + 1$ .



(b) For any random variables  $X, Y$ ,  $C_\beta(X; Y)$  and  $K_\beta(X; Y)$  are decreasing in  $\beta$ . Moreover,

$$C_\beta(X; Y) \leq K_\beta(X; Y), \text{ for } 0 \leq \beta \leq 1, \quad (136)$$

$$C_\beta(X; Y) = K_\beta(X; Y) = 0, \text{ for } \rho_m(X; Y) \leq \beta \leq 1, \quad (137)$$

$$C_0(X; Y) = C_W(X; Y), \quad (138)$$

$$K_0(X; Y) = K_{KLG}(X; Y), \quad (139)$$

$$C_{1-}(X; Y) = K_{1-}(X; Y) = C_{GK}(X; Y), \quad (140)$$

where  $K_{KLG}(X; Y) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U_n|X^n Y^n}: X^n \rightarrow U_n \rightarrow Y^n} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n)$  denotes the exact common information (rate) proposed by Kumar, Li, and Gamal [12].

(c) If  $P_{U|X,Y}$  achieves the infimum in (132), then  $\rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq \rho_m(X; Y|V)$  for any  $V$  such that  $XY \rightarrow U \rightarrow V$ .

*Remark 8.* For any random variables  $X, Y$ ,  $C_\beta(X; Y)$  is decreasing in  $\beta$ , but it is not necessarily convex or concave; see the Gaussian source case in the next subsection.  $C_\beta(X; Y)$  and  $K_\beta(X; Y)$  are discontinuous at  $\beta = 1$ , if there is common information between the sources. Lemma 15 implies Gács-Körner common information, Wyner common information and exact common information are extreme cases of  $\beta$ -approximate common information or  $\beta$ -exact common information.

*Proof:* To show (a), we only need to show for any variable  $U$ , there always exists another variable  $U'$  such that  $|\mathcal{U}'| \leq |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| + 1$ ,  $\rho_m(X; Y|U') = \rho_m(X; Y|U)$ , and  $I(XY; U') = I(XY; U)$ . Suppose  $\rho_m(X; Y|U = u^*) = \rho_m(X; Y|U)$ . According to Support Lemma [7], there exists a random variable  $U'$  with  $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  and  $|\mathcal{U}'| \leq |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| + 1$  such that

$$P_{U'}(u^*) = P_U(u^*), \quad (141)$$

$$H(XY|U') = H(XY|U), \quad (142)$$

$$P_{XY} = \sum_{u'} P_{U'} P_{XY|U'}. \quad (143)$$

(141) implies  $\rho_m(X; Y|U') = \rho_m(X; Y|U)$ . (143) implies  $H(XY)$  is also preserved, and hence  $I(XY; U) = I(XY; U')$ . This completes the proof of (a).

(b) (136) and (137) follow straightforwardly from the definitions. According to the definitions and Lemma 6 ( $\rho_m(X; Y|U) = 0$  if and only if  $X \rightarrow U \rightarrow Y$ ), we can easily obtain (138) and (139). Next we prove (140).

Consider

$$C_{1-}(X; Y) = \inf_{P_{U|X,Y}: \rho_m(X; Y|U) < 1} I(XY; U). \quad (144)$$

Assume Gács-Körner common information is  $f_{GK}(X, Y)$ . Set  $U = f_{GK}(X, Y)$ , then we have

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) < 1, \quad (145)$$

$$I(XY; U) = H(f_{GK}(X, Y)) = C_{GK}(X; Y). \quad (146)$$




Fig. 1. Illustration of the relationship among joint entropy, mutual information, Wyner common information, generalized common information, and Gács-Körner common information, where  $W, V$  and  $U$  are the Wyner, Gács-Körner, and  $\beta$ -common random variables, respectively, and Region 1 represents  $H(XY|U)$  and Region 2 represents  $H(XY|V)$ . These terms satisfy  $C_{GK} \leq I(X;Y) \leq C_W$  and  $C_{GK} = C_0 \leq C_\beta \leq C_{1-}(X;Y) = C_W$ ,  $\forall 0 \leq \beta < 1$ .

Hence by definition,

$$C_{1-}(X;Y) \leq C_{GK}(X;Y). \quad (147)$$

On the other hand, for any  $U$  such that  $\rho_m(X;Y|U) < 1$ , the Gács-Körner common information is determined by  $U$ , i.e.,  $f_{GK}(X,Y) = g(U)$  for some function  $g$ . Therefore, we have

$$I(XY;U) = I(XY;U, f_{GK}(X,Y)) \geq H(f_{GK}(X,Y)) = C_{GK}(X;Y). \quad (148)$$

Hence

$$C_{1-}(X;Y) \geq C_{GK}(X;Y). \quad (149)$$

Combining (147) and (149) gives us

$$C_{1-}(X;Y) = C_{GK}(X;Y). \quad (150)$$

Similarly  $K_{1-}(X;Y) = C_{GK}(X;Y)$  can be proven as well.

(c) Suppose  $P_{U|X,Y}$  achieves the infimum in (132). If  $V$  satisfies both  $XY \rightarrow U \rightarrow V$  and  $XY \rightarrow V \rightarrow U$ , the we have  $\rho_m(X;Y|U) = \rho_m(X;Y|UV) = \rho_m(X;Y|V)$ .

If  $V$  satisfies  $XY \rightarrow U \rightarrow V$  but does not satisfy  $XY \rightarrow V \rightarrow U$ , then  $I(XY;U) = I(XY;UV) > I(XY;V)$ . Hence  $\rho_m(X;Y|U) \leq \rho_m(X;Y|V)$ , otherwise it contradicts with that  $P_{U|X,Y}$  achieves the infimum in (132). ■

Fig. 1 illustrates the relationship among joint entropy, mutual information, Gács-Körner common information, Wyner common information, and generalized common information.

**Lemma 16.** (Additivity and subadditivity). Assume  $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$  is a sequence of pairs of independent random variables, then we have

$$C_\beta(X^n; Y^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n C_\beta(X_i; Y_i), \quad (151)$$

and

$$K_\beta(X_i; Y_i) \leq K_\beta(X^n; Y^n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n K_\beta(X_i; Y_i). \quad (152)$$

*Proof:* For (151) it suffices to prove the  $n = 2$  case, i.e.,

$$C_\beta(X^2; Y^2) = C_\beta(X_1; Y_1) + C_\beta(X_2; Y_2). \quad (153)$$

Observe for any  $P_{U|X^2Y^2}$ ,

$$\rho_m(X^2; Y^2|U) \geq \rho_m(X_i; Y_i|U), i = 1, 2, \quad (154)$$

and

$$I(X^2Y^2; U) \geq I(X_1Y_1; U) + I(X_2Y_2; U|X_1Y_1) \quad (155)$$

$$= I(X_1Y_1; U) + I(X_2Y_2; UX_1Y_1) \quad (156)$$

$$\geq I(X_1Y_1; U) + I(X_2Y_2; U). \quad (157)$$

Hence we have

$$C_\beta(X^2; Y^2) \geq C_\beta(X_1; Y_1) + C_\beta(X_2; Y_2). \quad (158)$$

Moreover, if we choose  $P_{U|X^2Y^2} = P_{U_1|X_1Y_1}^* P_{U_2|X_2Y_2}^*$  in  $C_\beta(X^2; Y^2)$ , where  $P_{U_i|X_iY_i}^*, i = 1, 2$ , is the distribution achieving  $C_\beta(X_i; Y_i)$ , then we have

$$\rho_m(X^2; Y^2|U) = \max_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i|U_i) \leq \beta, \quad (159)$$

and

$$I(X^2Y^2; U) = I(X_1Y_1; U_1) + I(X_2Y_2; U_2) = C_\beta(X_1; Y_1) + C_\beta(X_2; Y_2). \quad (160)$$

Therefore,

$$C_\beta(X^2; Y^2) = \inf_{P_{U|X^2Y^2}: \rho_m(X^2; Y^2|U) \leq \beta} I(X^2Y^2; U) \leq C_\beta(X_1; Y_1) + C_\beta(X_2; Y_2). \quad (161)$$

(158) and (161) implies (151) holds for  $n = 2$ .

Furthermore, the first inequality of (152) can be obtained directly from the definition of  $K_\beta$ . The second inequality of (152) can be obtained by restricting  $P_{U|X^nY^n}$  to the one with independent components (similar as the proof of (161)). ■

For continuous sources, a lower bound on approximate common information is given in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** (Lower bound on  $C_\beta(X; Y)$ ). For any continuous sources  $(X, Y)$  with correlation coefficient  $\beta_0$ , we have

$$C_\beta(X; Y) \geq h(XY) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ (2\pi e(1 - \beta_0))^2 \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right] \quad (162)$$

for  $0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_0$ , and  $C_\beta(X; Y) = 0$  for  $\beta_0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ .

*Proof:*

$$I(XY; U) = h(XY) - h(XY|U) \quad (163)$$

$$\geq h(XY) - \mathbb{E}_U \frac{1}{2} \log [(2\pi e)^2 \det(\Sigma_{XY|U})] \quad (164)$$

$$\geq h(XY) - \frac{1}{2} \log [(2\pi e)^2 \det(\mathbb{E}_U \Sigma_{XY|U})] \quad (165)$$




Fig. 2. Information-correlation function for Gaussian sources in Theorem 2 with  $\beta_0 = 0.9$ .

$$= h(XY) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ (2\pi e)^2 [\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|U)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|U) - (\mathbb{E}\text{cov}(X, Y|U))^2] \right] \quad (166)$$

$$= h(XY) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ (2\pi e)^2 \mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|U)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|U)(1 - \rho^2(X; Y|U)) \right] \quad (167)$$

$$\geq h(XY) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ (2\pi e)^2 \left( \frac{1 - \beta_0}{1 - \rho(X, Y|U)} \right)^2 (1 - \rho^2(X; Y|U)) \right] \quad (168)$$

$$= h(XY) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ (2\pi e(1 - \beta_0))^2 \frac{1 + \rho(X; Y|U)}{1 - \rho(X; Y|U)} \right] \quad (169)$$

$$\geq h(XY) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ (2\pi e(1 - \beta_0))^2 \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right], \quad (170)$$

where (165) follows from the function  $\log(\det(\cdot))$  is concave on the set of symmetric positive definite square matrices [8, p.73], (168) follows from Lemma 10, and (170) follows from

$$\rho(X; Y|U) \leq \beta. \quad (171)$$

■

The equality holds in Theorem 1 if  $X, Y$  are jointly Gaussian. The proof is given in Appendix D.

**Theorem 2.** (Gaussian sources). For jointly Gaussian sources  $X, Y$  with correlation coefficient  $\beta_0$ ,

$$C_\beta^{(G)}(X; Y) = \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left[ \frac{1 + \beta_0}{1 - \beta_0} / \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right]. \quad (172)$$

*Remark 9.* Specialized to the Wyner common information,  $C_W^{(G)}(X; Y) = C_0^{(G)}(X; Y) = \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left[ \frac{1 + \beta_0}{1 - \beta_0} \right]$ , which was first given in [21].

For the doubly symmetric binary source, an upper bound on common information is given in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** (Doubly symmetric binary source (DSBS)). For doubly symmetric binary source  $(X, Y)$  with crossover probability  $p_0$ , i.e.,  $P_{XY} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(1-p_0) & \frac{1}{2}p_0 \\ \frac{1}{2}p_0 & \frac{1}{2}(1-p_0) \end{bmatrix}$ , we have

$$C_\beta^{(B)}(X; Y) \leq 1 + H_2(p_0) - H_4\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(1-p_0 + \sqrt{\frac{1-2p_0-\beta}{1-\beta}}\right), \frac{1}{2}\left(1-p_0 - \sqrt{\frac{1-2p_0-\beta}{1-\beta}}\right), \frac{p_0}{2}, \frac{p_0}{2}\right) \quad (173)$$

for  $0 \leq \beta < 1 - 2p_0$ , and  $C_\beta^{(B)}(X; Y) = 0$  for  $\beta \geq 1 - 2p_0$ , where  $H_2$  and  $H_4$  denote the binary and quaternary entropy functions, respectively, i.e.,

$$H_2(p) = -p \log p - (1-p) \log(1-p), \quad (174)$$

$$H_4(a, b, c, d) = -a \log a - b \log b - c \log c - d \log d. \quad (175)$$

*Proof:* Assume  $p$  is a value such that  $2p\bar{p} = p_0$ ,  $\bar{p} := 1 - p$ . Then  $(X, Y)$  can be expressed as

$$X = U \oplus V \oplus Z_1, \quad (176)$$

$$Y = U \oplus V \oplus Z_2, \quad (177)$$

where  $U \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$ ,  $V \sim \text{Bern}(\alpha)$  with  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ ,  $Z_1 \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ , and  $Z_2 \sim \text{Bern}(p)$  are independent. Hence we have  $P_{V \oplus Z_1, V \oplus Z_2} = \begin{bmatrix} a & p\bar{p} \\ p\bar{p} & b \end{bmatrix}$  with  $a = \alpha p^2 + \bar{\alpha} \bar{p}^2$ ,  $b = \alpha \bar{p}^2 + \bar{\alpha} p^2$ , and

$$\rho_m(X, Y|U) = \rho_m(V \oplus Z_1, V \oplus Z_2). \quad (178)$$

By using the formula

$$\rho_m^2(X, Y) \leq \left[ \sum_{x,y} \frac{P^2(x, y)}{P(x)P(y)} \right] - 1 \quad (179)$$

for  $(X, Y)$  with at least one of them being binary-valued, we have

$$\rho_m(X, Y) = 1 - 2p_0. \quad (180)$$

Hence  $C_\beta^{(B)}(X; Y) = 0$  for  $\beta \geq 1 - 2p_0$ . Next we consider the case

$$\beta \leq 1 - 2p_0. \quad (181)$$

To guarantee  $\rho_m(V \oplus Z_1, V \oplus Z_2) \leq \beta$ , we choose

$$a = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - p_0 + \sqrt{\frac{1 - 2p_0 - \beta}{1 - \beta}} \right) \quad (182)$$

$$b = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - p_0 - \sqrt{\frac{1 - 2p_0 - \beta}{1 - \beta}} \right). \quad (183)$$

This leads to the inequality (335). This completes the proof. ■

### C. Relationship to Rate-Distortion Function

The approximate information-correlation function can be rewritten as

$$C_\beta(X; Y) = \inf_{P_{U|X,Y}: d(P_{UXY}) \leq \beta} I(XY; U). \quad (184)$$

where  $d(P_{UXY}) := \rho_m(X; Y|U)$ . This expression has a form similar to rate-distortion function, if we consider maximal correlation as a special “distortion measure”. But it is worth nothing that maximal correlation is taken on the distribution of  $X, Y$ , instead of on them itself.

Information-correlation function is also related to the rate-privacy function [20]

$$g_\beta(X; Y) := \sup_{P_{U|Y}: \rho_m(X; U) \leq \beta} I(Y; U), \quad (185)$$

in which  $U$  can be thought of as the extracted information from  $Y$  under privacy constraint  $\rho_m(X; U) \leq \beta$ . But there are three differences between  $g_\beta(X; Y)$  and  $C_\beta(X; Y)$ . 1) The privacy constraint in  $g_\beta(X; Y)$  is a constraint on unconditional maximal correlation, and moreover, this unconditional maximal correlation is that between the remote source  $X$  and extracted information  $U$ , instead of between the sources. Hence  $g_\beta(X; Y)$  is not symmetric respect to  $X, Y$ . 2) In  $g_\beta(X; Y)$ ,  $U$  is extracted from  $Y$  instead of both  $X, Y$ , hence  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow U$  is restricted in  $g_\beta(X; Y)$ . 3) The optimization in  $C_\beta(X; Y)$  is infimum, while in  $g_\beta(X; Y)$  is supremum.

## IV. PRIVATE SOURCES SYNTHESIS

In order to provide an operational interpretation for information-correlation functions  $C_\beta(X; Y)$  and  $K_\beta(X; Y)$ , in this section, we consider *private sources synthesis problem*. We show that the information-correlation functions correspond to the minimum achievable rates for the centralized setting version of this problem.

### A. Problem Setup

Consider private sources synthesis problem shown in Fig. 3, where a simulator generates two source sequences  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$  from a common random variable  $M$ .  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$  are restricted to follow i.i.d. according to a target distribution  $\prod P_{XY}$ .

**Definition 10.** A generator is defined by a pmf  $P_M$  and a stochastic mapping  $P_{X^n Y^n | M} : \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ .

Furthermore, Shannon’s zero-error source coding theorem states that, it is possible to compress a message  $M$  (using a variable length coding) at rate  $R$  for sufficiently large  $n$  if  $R > \frac{1}{n} H(M)$ ; and conversely, it is possible only if  $R \geq \frac{1}{n} H(M)$ . Hence we define the achievability of tuple  $(R, \beta)$  as follows.

**Definition 11.** The tuple  $(R, \beta)$  is approximately or exactly achievable if there exists a sequence of generators such that

1) rate constraint:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R; \quad (186)$$

2) privacy constraint:

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \forall n; \quad (187)$$




Fig. 3. Private source synthesis problem: (left) centralized setting; (right) distributed setting. In this problem we assume 1) rate constraint  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R$ ; 2) privacy constraint  $\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta$ ; 3) source distribution constraint  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{X^n Y^n} - Q_{X^n Y^n}\|_{TV} = 0$  in approximate synthesis sense, or  $P_{X^n Y^n} = Q_{X^n Y^n}$  in exact synthesis sense. For distributed setting, the  $M$  in the constraints is replaced with  $M_1 M_2$ .

3) approximate sources distribution constraint:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{X^n Y^n} - \prod P_{XY}\|_{TV} = 0, \quad (188)$$

or exact sources distribution constraint:

$$P_{X^n Y^n} = \prod P_{XY}, \forall n. \quad (189)$$

**Definition 12.** The rate-correlation function for approximate private sources synthesis is defined by  $R_{PSS}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is approximately achievable}\}$ . Similarly, the rate-correlation function for exact private sources synthesis is defined by  $R_{PSS}^{(E)}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is exactly achievable}\}$ .

Furthermore, we also consider distributed setting, which is shown in Fig. 3 (b). For this case, the source synthesis problem is named *distributed private sources synthesis*.

**Definition 13.** A distributed generator is defined by a pmf  $P_M$  and two stochastic mappings:  $P_{X^n|M} : \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{X}^n$  and  $P_{Y^n|M} : \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}^n$ .

**Definition 14.** The tuple  $(R, \beta)$  is approximately or exactly achievable for distributed setting if there exists a sequence of distributed generators such that

- 1) rate constraint: (186);
- 2) privacy constraint: (187);
- 3) approximate source distribution constraint: (188), or exact source distribution constraint: (189).

**Definition 15.** The rate-correlation function for distributed approximate or exact private sources synthesis is defined by  $R_{DPSS}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is approximately achievable}\}$  and  $R_{DPSS}^{(E)}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is exactly achievable}\}$ , respectively.

For distributed setting, privacy constraint

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) = 0 \quad (190)$$

is satisfied immediately. Therefore,

$$R_{DPSS}(\beta) = R_{DPSS}(0), \quad (191)$$

$$R_{DPSS}^{(E)}(\beta) = R_{DPSS}^{(E)}(0). \quad (192)$$

We assume the synthesized sources have finite alphabets.

### B. Main Result

1) *Centralized Setting:* For approximate private sources synthesis, we have the following theorems. The proof of Theorem 4 is given in Appendix E.

**Theorem 4.** *For approximate private sources synthesis,*

$$R_{PSS}(\beta) = C_\beta(X; Y). \quad (193)$$

*Remark 10.* From the proof we can see that using fixed-length coding is sufficient to achieve the rate-correlation function  $R_{PSS}(\beta)$ .

**Theorem 5.** *For exact private sources synthesis,*

$$R_{PSS}^{(E)}(\beta) = K_\beta(X; Y). \quad (194)$$

*Proof: Achievability:* Suppose  $R > K_\beta(X; Y)$ . We will show that the rate  $R$  is achievable.

**Input Process Generator:** Generate input source  $M$  according to pmf  $P_{U_n}$ .

**Source Generator:** Upon  $m$ , the generator generate sources  $(X^n, Y^n)$  according to  $P_{X^n Y^n | U_n}(x^n, y^n | m)$ .

For such generator, the induced overall distribution is

$$P_{X^n Y^n M}(x^n, y^n, m) := P_{X^n Y^n U_n}(x^n, y^n, m). \quad (195)$$

This means

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \quad (196)$$

since

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | U_n) \leq \beta. \quad (197)$$

Since  $K_\beta(X; Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n)$  for some  $U_n$ ,  $R \geq \frac{1}{n} (H(U_n) + 1)$  for  $n$  large enough. By the achievability part of Shannon's zero-error source coding theorem, it is possible to exactly generate  $(X^n, Y^n)$  at rate at most  $\frac{1}{n} (H(U_n) + 1)$ . Hence rate  $R$  is achievable and thus  $R_{PSS}^{(E)}(\beta) \leq K_\beta(X; Y)$ .

*Converse:* Now suppose a rate  $R$  is achievable. Then there exists an  $(n, R)$ -generator that exactly generates  $(X^n, Y^n)$  such that

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta. \quad (198)$$

By the converse for Shannon's zero-error source coding theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R. \quad (199)$$



Therefore,

$$R \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U_n|X^n Y^n}: \rho_m(X^n, Y^n|U_n) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n) = K_\beta(X; Y). \quad (200)$$

That is

$$R_{PSS}^{(E)}(\beta) \geq K_\beta(X; Y). \quad (201)$$

■

2) *Distributed Setting*: For distributed private sources synthesis, we have similar results.

**Theorem 6.** *For distributed approximate private sources synthesis,*

$$R_{DPSS}(\beta) = C_0(X; Y). \quad (202)$$

*Remark 11.* From the proof we can see that similar to centralized case, using fixed-length coding is also sufficient to achieve the rate-correlation function  $R_{DPSS}(\beta)$  for distributed case.

*Proof:* The theorem was essentially same to Wyner's result [3]. In the following, we prove this theorem by following similar steps to the proof of the centralized case.

*Achievability:* Consider the generator used for the centralized case (see Appendix E-A). Similar to the centralized case, we can prove if  $R > C_0(X; Y)$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|P_{X^n Y^n} - Q_{X^n Y^n}\|_{TV} = 0. \quad (203)$$

Owing to the distributed setting, Markov chain  $X^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y^n$  holds. By Lemma 6, we have

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n|M) = 0. \quad (204)$$

Hence

$$R_{DPSS}(\beta) \leq C_0(X; Y). \quad (205)$$

*Converse:* By slightly modified the proof of centralized case and combining with Markov chain  $X^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y^n$ , we can show that

$$R_{DPSS}(\beta) \geq C_0(X; Y). \quad (206)$$

■

**Theorem 7.** *For distributed exact private sources synthesis,*

$$R_{DPSS}^{(E)}(\beta) = K_0(X; Y). \quad (207)$$

*Proof: Achievability:* Suppose  $R > K_0(X; Y)$ . We will show that the rate  $R$  is achievable.

**Input Process Generator:** Generate input source  $M$  according to  $P_{U_n}$ .

**Source Generator:** Upon  $m$ , the generator 1 generates source  $X^n$  according to  $P_{X^n|U_n}(x^n|m)$ , and the generator 2 generates source  $Y^n$  according to  $P_{Y^n|U_n}(y^n|m)$ .

Similar to the centralized case, since  $\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | U_n) = 0$ , i.e.,  $X^n \rightarrow U_n \rightarrow Y^n$ , the induced overall distribution is

$$P_{X^n Y^n M}(x^n, y^n, m) := P_{U_n}(m) P_{X^n | U_n}(x^n | m) P_{Y^n | U_n}(y^n | m) = P_{X^n Y^n U_n}(x^n, y^n, m). \quad (208)$$

This means

$$P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n, y^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY}(x_i, y_i). \quad (209)$$

and

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) = 0 \leq \beta. \quad (210)$$

Hence the rate  $R$  is achievable, which further implies

$$R_{DPSS}^{(E)}(\beta) \leq K_0(X; Y). \quad (211)$$

*Converse:* Suppose a rate  $R$  is achievable. Then there exists an  $(n, R)$ -generator that exactly generates  $(X^n, Y^n)$  such that

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta. \quad (212)$$

Owing to the distributed setting, Markov chain  $X^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y^n$  holds naturally. By Lemma 6, we have

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) = 0. \quad (213)$$

Furthermore, by the converse for Shannon's zero-error source coding theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R. \quad (214)$$

Therefore,

$$R \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U_n | X^n Y^n : \rho_m(X^n, Y^n | U_n) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n) = K_0(X; Y). \quad (215)$$

That is

$$R_{DPSS}^{(E)}(\beta) \geq K_0(X; Y). \quad (216)$$

■

## V. COMMON INFORMATION EXTRACTION

In this section, we study another problem, *common information extraction problem*, which provides another operational interpretation for information-correlation functions  $C_\beta(X; Y)$  and  $K_\beta(X; Y)$ . Similar to private sources synthesis problem, the information-correlation functions are proven to be the minimum achievable rates for the centralized setting version of this problem as well.




Fig. 4. Common information extraction problem: (left) centralized setting; (right) distributed setting. In this problem we assume 1) rate constraint  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R$ ; 2) weak privacy constraint: for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\tilde{\rho}_m^\epsilon(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \forall n$ , or strong privacy constraint:  $\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \forall n$ . For distributed setting, the variable  $M$  in the constraints is replaced with  $M_1 M_2$ .

#### A. Problem Setup

As a counterpart of private sources synthesis problem, we consider common information extraction problem shown in Fig. 4, where an extractor extracts common random variable  $M$  from two source sequences  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$ .  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$  are i.i.d. according to  $P_{XY}$ .

**Definition 16.** An extractor is defined by a stochastic mapping:  $P_{M|X^n Y^n} : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \mapsto \mathcal{M}$ .

The extractor should extract an enough amount of common information to satisfy the privacy constraint measured by conditional maximal correlation.

**Definition 17.** The tuple  $(R, \beta)$  is weakly or strongly achievable if there exists a sequence of extractors such that

1) rate constraint:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R; \quad (217)$$

2a) weak privacy constraint: for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , it holds that

$$\tilde{\rho}_m^\epsilon(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \forall n, \quad (218)$$

where  $\tilde{\rho}_m^\epsilon(X^n; Y^n | M)$  denotes  $\epsilon$ -smooth conditional maximal correlation; see (127);

2b) or strong privacy constraint:

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \forall n. \quad (219)$$

Common information corresponds to the smallest information rate that makes the privacy constraint satisfied, hence the common information indeed represents a kind of “core” information.

Now we define the rate-correlation functions as follows.

**Definition 18.** The rate-correlation functions for weakly and strongly common information extraction problems are defined by  $R_{CIE}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is weakly achievable}\}$  and  $R_{CIE}^{(E)}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is strongly achievable}\}$ , respectively.

Furthermore, we also consider distributed common information extraction.

**Definition 19.** A distributed extractor is defined by two stochastic mappings  $P_{M_1|X^n} : \mathcal{X}^n \mapsto \mathcal{M}_1$  and  $P_{M_2|Y^n} : \mathcal{Y}^n \mapsto \mathcal{M}_2$ .

**Definition 20.** The tuple  $(R, \beta)$  is achievable for distributed setting if there exists a sequence of distributed extractors such that

1) rate constraint: (217);

2a) weak privacy constraint: for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , it holds that

$$\tilde{\rho}_m^\epsilon(X^n; Y^n | M_1, M_2) \leq \beta, \forall n, \quad (220)$$

2b) or strong privacy constraint:

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M_1, M_2) \leq \beta, \forall n. \quad (221)$$

**Definition 21.** The rate-correlation functions for distributed weakly and strongly common information extraction problems are defined by  $R_{DCIE}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is weakly achievable}\}$  and  $R_{DCIE}^{(E)}(\beta) := \inf \{R : (R, \beta) \text{ is strongly achievable}\}$ , respectively.

We also assume the sources have finite alphabets.

## B. Main Result

1) *Centralized Setting:* For weakly common information extraction, we have the following theorems. The proof of Theorem 8 is given in Appendix F.

**Theorem 8.** For weakly common information extraction,

$$R_{CIE}(\beta) = C_\beta(X; Y). \quad (222)$$

*Remark 12.* From the proof we can see that using fixed-length coding is sufficient to achieve the rate-correlation function  $R_{CIE}(\beta)$ .

**Theorem 9.** For strongly common information extraction,

$$R_{CIE}^{(E)}(\beta) = K_\beta(X; Y). \quad (223)$$

*Proof: Achievability:* Suppose  $R > K_\beta(X; Y)$ . We will show that the rate  $R$  is achievable.

**Extractor:** Upon  $(x^n, y^n)$ , the extractor generates  $m$  according to  $P_{U_n|X^n Y^n}(m|x^n, y^n)$ .

For such extractor, the induced overall distribution is

$$P_{X^n Y^n M}(x^n, y^n, m) = P_{X^n Y^n U_n}(x^n, y^n, m). \quad (224)$$

Hence

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) = \rho_m(X^n; Y^n | U_n) \leq \beta. \quad (225)$$

Since  $K_\beta(X; Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n)$ ,  $R \geq \frac{1}{n} (H(U_n) + 1)$  for  $n$  large enough. By the achievability part of Shannon's zero-error source coding theorem, it is possible to exactly generate  $(X^n, Y^n)$  at rate at most  $\frac{1}{n} (H(U_n) + 1)$ . Hence rate  $R$  is achievable and thus  $R_{CIE}^{(E)}(\beta) \leq K_\beta(X; Y)$ .

*Converse:* Now suppose a rate  $R$  is achievable. Then there exists a sequence of extractors that generate  $M$  such that

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \forall n. \quad (226)$$

By the converse for Shannon's zero-error source coding theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R. \quad (227)$$

Therefore,

$$R \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U_n | X^n Y^n} : \rho_m(X^n, Y^n | U_n) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n) = K_\beta(X; Y). \quad (228)$$

That is

$$R_{CIE}^{(E)}(\beta) \geq K_\beta(X; Y). \quad (229)$$

■

2) *Distributed Setting:* For distributed common information extraction, we have similar results. The following theorems hold for weakly and strongly common information extraction, respectively. The proof of Theorem 10 is given in Appendix G.

**Theorem 10.** *For distributed weakly common information extraction,*

$$C_\beta^{(D, LB)}(X; Y) \leq R_{DCIE}(\beta) = C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y) \leq C_\beta^{(D, UB)}(X; Y), \quad (230)$$

where

$$C_\beta^{(D, UB)}(X; Y) := \inf_{P_{U|X} P_{V|Y} : \rho_m(X, Y | UV) \leq \beta} I(XY; UV), \quad (231)$$

$$C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U|X^n} P_{V|Y^n} : \rho_m(X^n, Y^n | UV) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; UV), \quad (232)$$

$$C_\beta^{(D, LB)}(X; Y) := \inf_{\substack{P_T P_{UV|XYT} : UT \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y, X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow VT, \\ \rho_m(UX; VY|T) \leq \rho_m(X; Y), \\ \rho_m(X, Y | UV T) \leq \beta}} I(XY; UV|T). \quad (233)$$

*Remark 13.* From the proof we can see that similar to centralized case, using fixed-length coding is also sufficient to achieve the rate-correlation function  $R_{DCIE}(\beta)$  for distributed case.

**Theorem 11.** *For distributed strongly common information extraction,*

$$R_{DCIE}^{(E)}(\beta) = K_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y), \quad (234)$$

where

$$K_\beta^{(D)}(X^n; Y^n) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U_n | X^n} P_{V_n | Y^n} : \rho_m(X^n, Y^n | U_n V_n) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n V_n). \quad (235)$$

*Proof: Achievability:* Suppose  $R > K_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y)$ . We will show that the rate  $R$  is achievable.

**Extractor:** Upon  $(x^n, Y^n)$ , the extractor 1 generates  $m_1$  according to  $P_{U_n|X^n}(m_1|x^n)$ , and extractor 2 generates  $m_2$  according to  $P_{V_n|Y^n}(m_2|y^n)$ .

For such extractor, the induced overall distribution is

$$P_{X^n Y^n M_1 M_2}(x^n, Y^n, m_1, m_2) = P_{X^n Y^n U_n V_n}(x^n, Y^n, m_1, m_2). \quad (236)$$

Hence

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M_1 M_2) = \rho_m(X^n; Y^n | U_n V_n) \leq \beta. \quad (237)$$

Since  $\overline{G}_\beta(X; Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n V_n)$ ,  $R \geq \frac{1}{n} (H(U_n V_n) + 1)$  for  $n$  large enough. By the achievability part of Shannon's zero-error source coding theorem, it is possible to exactly generate  $(X^n, Y^n)$  at rate at most  $\frac{1}{n} (H(U_n V_n) + 1)$ . Hence rate  $R$  is achievable and thus  $R_{DCIE}^{(E)}(\beta) \leq K_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y)$ .

*Converse:* Now suppose a rate  $R$  is achievable. Then there exists a sequence of extractors that generate  $(M_1, M_2)$  such that

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M_1 M_2) \leq \beta, \forall n. \quad (238)$$

By the converse for Shannon's zero-error source coding theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M_1 M_2) \leq R. \quad (239)$$

Therefore,

$$R \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M_1 M_2) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{p_{U_n|X^n} p_{V_n|Y^n} : \rho_m(X^n, Y^n | U_n V_n) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} H(U_n V_n) = K_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y). \quad (240)$$

That is

$$R_{DCIE}^{(E)}(\beta) \geq K_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y). \quad (241)$$

■

## VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we unify and generalize Gács-Körner and Wyner common informations, and define a generalized version of common information, (approximate) information-correlation function, by exploiting maximal correlation as a commonness or privacy measure. The Gács-Körner common information and Wyner common information are two special and extreme cases of our generalized definition. Furthermore, similarly exact information-correlation function has been defined as well, which is a generalization of Gács-Körner common information and Kumar-Li-Gamal common information. We study the problems of common information extraction and private sources synthesis, and show that these two information-correlation functions are equal to the optimal rates under given correlation constraints in the centralized cases of these problems.

Our results have a sequence of applications:

- **Dependency measure:** The generalized common informations defined by us provide a fresh look at dependency. The more common information the sources share, the more dependent they are. To normalize the (approximate) information-correlation function, we can define

$$\Gamma_\beta(X; Y) = \frac{C_\beta(X; Y)}{H(X, Y)}, \quad (242)$$

or

$$\Gamma_\beta(X; Y) = 1 - 2^{-2C_\beta(X; Y)}. \quad (243)$$

Furthermore, we define *correlation-information function* as the inverse function of information-correlation function, i.e.,

$$\beta_C(X; Y) = \inf_{P_{U|XY}: I(XY; U) \leq C} \rho_m(X; Y|U), \quad (244)$$

which represents the source dependency after extracting  $C$ -rate common information from  $X, Y$ . Obviously  $\beta_C(X; Y) = \rho_m(X; Y)$  when  $C = 0$ . Dependency measure can be further applied to feature extraction and image classification. Furthermore, conditional maximal correlation can be also applied to measure the dependency of distributed sources, which has been exploited to derive some converse results of distributed communication; see our another work [14].

- **Game theory and correlation based secrecy:** The common information extraction can be equivalently transformed into a zero-sum game problem. Consider two adversarial parties. One is Player A, and another one is Players B and C. Players A and B share a source  $X$ , and Players A and C share another source  $Y$ . Sources  $X, Y$  are correlated and memoryless. Players B and C cooperate to maximize the conditional correlation  $\rho(f(X^n, M); g(Y^n, M)|M)$  (or  $\rho_Q(f(X^n, M); g(Y^n, M)|M)$  for some distribution  $Q_{X^n Y^n M}$ ) over all functions  $f, g$ , where  $M$  is a message received from Player A through a rate-limited channel, and  $f(X^n, M)$  and  $g(Y^n, M)$  are the outputs of Players B and C respectively. Player A generates  $M$  from  $X^n, Y^n$  and wants to minimize the optimal correlation induced by Players B and C (assume Player A does not know the distribution  $Q$  Players A and B choose). Then our result on common information extraction can directly apply to this case, and it implies the exact (or approximate) information-correlation function is equal to the minimum rate needed for Player A to force B and C's optimal strategy satisfying  $\sup_{f, g} \rho(f(X^n, M); g(Y^n, M)|M) \leq \beta$  (or  $\inf_{\|Q_{X^n Y^n M} - P_{X^n Y^n M}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon} \sup_{f, g} \rho_Q(f(X^n, M); g(Y^n, M)|M) \leq \beta$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ).
- **Privacy protection in data collection or data mining:** In data collection or data mining, privacy protection of users' data is an important problem. To that end, we need first identify which part is common information and which part is private information. Our result gives a better answer to this question and hence it can be directly applied to privacy protection in data collection or data mining.
- **Privacy constrained source simulation:** As stated in [11], the private sources simulation problem has natural applications in numerous areas – from game-theoretic coordination in a network to control of a dynamical system over a distributed network with privacy protection. Our results are expected to be exploited in many future remote-controlled applications, such as drone-based delivery system, privacy-preserving navigation, secure network service, etc.

## APPENDIX A

### PROOF OF EQUATION (2)

First we prove  $\inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U) = 0} I(XY; U) \leq C_{GK}(X; Y)$ . Assume  $f^*, g^*$  achieve the supremum in (1), then we claim that setting  $U = f^*(X) = g^*(Y)$ , it holds that  $C_{GK}(X; Y|U) = 0$ . We use contradiction to

prove this claim. Suppose  $C_{GK}(X; Y|U) > 0$ , i.e., there exists a pair of  $f', g'$  such that  $f'(X, U) = g'(Y, U)$  and  $H(f'(X, U)|U) > 0$ . Since  $U$  is a function of  $X$  and also a function of  $Y$ , we can express  $f'(X, U)$  as  $f''(X)$  and  $g'(Y, U)$  as  $g''(Y)$  for some functions  $f''$  and  $g''$ . Setting  $f(X) = (f^*(X), f''(X))$  and  $g(Y) = (g^*(Y), g''(Y))$ , we have  $f(X) = g(Y)$  and

$$H(f(X)) = H(U) + H(f'(X, U)|U) > H(U). \quad (245)$$

This contradicts with the assumption of  $f^*, g^*$  achieving the supremum in (1). Therefore,  $C_{GK}(X; Y|U) = 0$ . This implies

$$\inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U)=0} I(XY; U) \leq H(U) = C_{GK}(X; Y). \quad (246)$$

Next we prove  $\inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U)=0} I(XY; U) \geq C_{GK}(X; Y)$ . We also assume  $f^*, g^*$  achieve the supremum in (1). Then we claim that for any  $U$  such that  $C_{GK}(X; Y|U) = 0$ , it holds that  $f^*(X) = g^*(Y) = \kappa(U)$  for some function  $\kappa$ , i.e.,  $U$  contains the common randomness of  $X, Y$ . Next we prove this claim.

Assume  $f', g'$  achieve the supremum in (3). Then we have  $C_{GK}(X; Y|U) = 0$  implies  $H(f'(X, U)|U) = 0$ , which further implies  $f'(X, U)$  is a function of  $U$ ; see [17, Problem 2.5]. Setting  $f(X, U) = (f^*(X), f'(X, U))$  and  $g(Y, U) = (g^*(Y), g'(Y, U))$ , we have  $f(X, U) = g(Y, U)$  and

$$H(f'(X, U)|U) \leq H(f(X, U)|U). \quad (247)$$

Owing to the optimality of  $f', g'$ , the equality in (247) should hold. Therefore,  $H(f^*(X)|U, f'(X, U)) = 0$ . This implies  $f^*(X)$  is a function of  $U$  and  $f'(X, U)$ . Combining it with that  $f'(X, U)$  is a function of  $U$ , we have  $f^*(X)$  is a function of  $U$ . Therefore,  $f^*(X) = g^*(Y) = \kappa(U)$  for some function  $\kappa$ .

Using the claim, we have

$$\inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U)=0} I(XY; U) \geq \inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U)=0} I(XY; \kappa(U)) \quad (248)$$

$$= \inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U)=0} I(XY; f^*(X)) \quad (249)$$

$$= H(f^*(X)) \quad (250)$$

$$= C_{GK}(X; Y). \quad (251)$$

Combining these two cases above, we have  $\inf_{P_{U|XY}: C_{GK}(X; Y|U)=0} I(XY; U) = C_{GK}(X; Y)$ .

## APPENDIX B

### PROOF OF LEMMA 1

A proof for the unconditional version of the lemma can be found in [23]. Here we extend the proof to the conditional version. To that end, we only consider finite valued random variables. For countably infinitely valued or continuous random variables, the result can be proven similarly.



For finite valued random variables, we will show maximal correlation  $\rho_m(X; Y|U)$  can also be characterized by the second largest singular value of the matrix  $Q_u$  with entries  $Q_u(x, y) := \frac{p(x, y|u)}{\sqrt{p(x|u)p(y|u)}} = \frac{p(x, y, u)}{\sqrt{p(x, u)p(y, u)}}$ . Without loss of generality, we can rewrite

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_{f, g} \mathbb{E}[f(X, U)g(Y, U)], \quad (252)$$

where the maximization is taken over all  $f, g$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[f(X, U)] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y, U)] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}\text{var}(f(X, U)) = \mathbb{E}\text{var}(g(Y, U)) = 1$ . Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X, U)g(Y, U)] = \sum_{x, y, u} (f(x, u)\sqrt{p(x, u)})Q_u(x, y)(g(y, u)\sqrt{p(y, u)}), \quad (253)$$

$$\sum_x \sqrt{p(x, u)}Q_u(x, y) = \sqrt{p(y, u)}, \sum_y Q_u(x, y)\sqrt{p(y, u)} = \sqrt{p(x, u)}, \quad (254)$$

and the conditions  $\mathbb{E}[f(X, U)] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[g(Y, U)] = 0$  are respectively equivalent to requiring that  $(x, u) \mapsto f(x, u)\sqrt{p(x, u)}$  is orthogonal to  $(x, u) \mapsto \sqrt{p(x, u)}$  and that  $(y, u) \mapsto g(y, u)\sqrt{p(y, u)}$  is orthogonal to  $(y, u) \mapsto \sqrt{p(y, u)}$ . By Singular Value Decomposition,  $Q_u = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{u,i} a_{u,i} b_{u,i}^T$ , where  $\lambda_{u,1} = 1$ ,  $a_{u,1} = (\sqrt{p(x, u)})_x$ ,  $b_{u,1} = (\sqrt{p(y, u)})_y$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X, U)g(Y, U)] = \sum_{x, y, u} (f(x, u)\sqrt{p(x, u)})Q_u(x, y)(g(y, u)\sqrt{p(y, u)}) \quad (255)$$

$$= \sum_u f_u^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{u,i} a_{u,i} b_{u,i}^T \right) g_u \quad (256)$$

$$= \sum_u \sum_{i=2}^n \lambda_{u,i} c_{u,i} d_{u,i} \quad (257)$$

$$\leq \sum_u \sum_{i=2}^n \lambda_{u,i} \frac{c_{u,i}^2 + d_{u,i}^2}{2}, \quad (258)$$

where  $f_u := (f(x, u)\sqrt{p(x, u)})_x$ ,  $g_u := (g(y, u)\sqrt{p(y, u)})_y$ ,  $c_{u,i} := f_u^T a_{u,i}$ ,  $d_{u,i} := g_u^T b_{u,i}$ ,  $i \geq 2$ . Furthermore,

$$\sum_u \|f_u\|^2 = \sum_u \|g_u\|^2 = 1, \quad (259)$$

$$\sum_{i=2}^n c_{u,i}^2 = \|f_u\|^2, \quad (260)$$

$$\sum_{i=2}^n d_{u,i}^2 = \|g_u\|^2. \quad (261)$$

Hence

$$\sum_u \sum_{i=2}^n c_{u,i}^2 = 1, \quad (262)$$

$$\sum_u \sum_{i=2}^n d_{u,i}^2 = 1. \quad (263)$$

Combining these with (252) and (258) gives us

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) \leq \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \lambda_{u,2}. \quad (264)$$

On the other hand, it is easy to verify that the upper bound  $\sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \lambda_{u,2}$  can be achieved by choosing

$$f_u = \begin{cases} a_{u,2}, & \text{if } u = u^*; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (265)$$

and

$$g_u = \begin{cases} b_{u,2}, & \text{if } u = u^*; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (266)$$

Therefore,

$$\rho_m(X; Y|U) = \sup_{u: P(u) > 0} \lambda_{u,2}. \quad (267)$$

## APPENDIX C

### PROOF OF LEMMA 10

By the law of total covariance, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\text{cov}(X, Y|Z) = \mathbb{E}\text{cov}(X, Y|ZU) + \mathbb{E}_Z \text{cov}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU), \mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)). \quad (268)$$

Hence to prove Lemma 10, we only need to show

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|ZU)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|ZU)} + \mathbb{E}_Z \text{cov}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU), \mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z)}. \quad (269)$$

To prove this, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|ZU)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|ZU) \\ &= (\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z) - \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU))) (\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z) - \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU))) \end{aligned} \quad (270)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z) - \mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z)\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z)\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU)) + \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU))\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)) \end{aligned} \quad (271)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z) - 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z)\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)) \cdot \mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z)\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU))} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU))\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)) \end{aligned} \quad (272)$$

$$= \left( \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z)\mathbb{E}\text{var}(Y|Z)} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU))\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU))} \right)^2 \quad (273)$$

where (270) follows from the law of total variance

$$\mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z) = \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(X|ZU) + \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU)). \quad (274)$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(X|ZU) \geq 0$ , from (274), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU)) \leq \mathbb{E}\text{var}(X|Z). \quad (275)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)) \leq \mathbb{E} \text{var}(Y|Z). \quad (276)$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU)) \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)) \leq \mathbb{E} \text{var}(X|Z) \mathbb{E} \text{var}(Y|Z). \quad (277)$$

Combining (273) and (277), we have

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \text{var}(X|ZU) \mathbb{E} \text{var}(Y|ZU)} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \text{var}(X|Z) \mathbb{E} \text{var}(Y|Z)} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU)) \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU))}. \quad (278)$$

Furthermore, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it holds that

$$|\mathbb{E}_Z \text{cov}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU), \mathbb{E}(Y|ZU))| = |\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU) - \mathbb{E}(X|Z))(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU) - \mathbb{E}(Y|Z))]| \quad (279)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU) - \mathbb{E}(X|Z))^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU) - \mathbb{E}(Y|Z))^2} \quad (280)$$

$$= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU)) \mathbb{E}_Z \text{var}_U(\mathbb{E}(Y|ZU))}. \quad (281)$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E} \text{var}(X|ZU) \mathbb{E} \text{var}(Y|ZU)} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \text{var}(X|Z) \mathbb{E} \text{var}(Y|Z)} - |\mathbb{E}_Z \text{cov}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU), \mathbb{E}(Y|ZU))| \quad (282)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \text{var}(X|Z) \mathbb{E} \text{var}(Y|Z)} - \mathbb{E}_Z \text{cov}_U(\mathbb{E}(X|ZU), \mathbb{E}(Y|ZU)), \quad (283)$$

which implies (269). This completes the proof.

## APPENDIX D

### PROOF OF THEOREM 2

From Theorem 1, the following inequality follows immediately.

$$C_\beta^{(G)}(X; Y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1 + \beta_0}{1 - \beta_0} / \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right). \quad (284)$$

On the other hand,  $(X, Y)$  can be expressed as

$$X = \alpha U + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} Z_1, \quad (285)$$

$$Y = \alpha U + \sqrt{1 - \alpha^2} Z_2, \quad (286)$$

with

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{\beta_0 - \beta}{1 - \beta}} \quad (287)$$

and the covariance of  $(Z_1, Z_2)$

$$\Sigma_{(Z_1, Z_2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \beta \\ \beta & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (288)$$

where  $U \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Hence we have

$$\rho(X, Y|U) \leq \beta \quad (289)$$

and

$$I(XY; U) = \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1 + \beta_0}{1 - \beta_0} / \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right). \quad (290)$$

Hence

$$C_{\beta}^{(G)}(X; Y) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1 + \beta_0}{1 - \beta_0} / \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right). \quad (291)$$

Combining (284) and (291) gives us

$$C_{\beta}^{(G)}(X; Y) = \frac{1}{2} \log^+ \left( \frac{1 + \beta_0}{1 - \beta_0} / \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right). \quad (292)$$

This completes the proof.

## APPENDIX E PROOF OF THEOREM 4

### A. Achievability

**Codebook Generation:** Suppose  $R > C_{\beta}(X; Y)$ . Randomly and independently generate sequences  $u^n(m), m \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$  with each according to  $\prod_{i=1}^n P_U(u_i)$ . The codebook  $C = \{u^n(m), m \in [2^{nR}]\}$ .

**Input Process Generator:** Generate input source  $M$  according to the uniform distribution over  $[2^{nR}]$ .

**Source Generator:** Upon  $m$ , the generator generates sources  $(X^n, Y^n)$  according to  $\prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|U}(x_i, y_i | u_i(m))$ .

For such generator, the induced overall distribution is

$$P_{X^n Y^n M}(x^n, y^n, m) := 2^{-nR} \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|U}(x_i, y_i | u_i(m)). \quad (293)$$

According to soft-cover lemma [18], if  $R > I(XY; U)$ , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_C \|P_{X^n Y^n} - \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY}\|_{TV} = 0. \quad (294)$$

Given  $U^n(m) = u^n$ ,  $(X^n, Y^n)$  is a conditionally independent sequence, i.e.,

$$P_{X^n Y^n | M}(x^n, y^n | m) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|U}(x_i, y_i | u_i(m)). \quad (295)$$

Hence according to Lemma 11, we get

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i | U_i(M)). \quad (296)$$

Furthermore, from Lemma 2, we have

$$\rho_m(X_i; Y_i | U_i(M)) = \sup_{u: P_{U_i}(u) > 0} \lambda_{2, P_{XY|U}}(u) \leq \sup_{u: P_U(u) > 0} \lambda_{2, P_{XY|U}}(u) \leq \beta. \quad (297)$$

Hence

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta. \quad (298)$$

This implies

$$R_{PSS}(\beta) \leq C_{\beta}(X; Y). \quad (299)$$

### B. Converse

Assume there exists a sequence of distributed generators such that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R$ ,  $\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta$ ,  $\forall n$ , and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|P_{X^n Y^n} - \prod P_{XY}\|_{TV} = 0$ . Consider that

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; M) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i Y_i; M | X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (300)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i Y_i | X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) - H(X_i Y_i | M X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (301)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_Q(X_i Y_i) - H(X_i Y_i | M X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (302)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i Y_i) - H(X_i Y_i | M X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (303)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i Y_i; M X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (304)$$

$$= I(X_T Y_T; M X^{T-1} Y^{T-1} | T) \quad (305)$$

$$= I(X_T Y_T; M X^{T-1} Y^{T-1} T) \quad (306)$$

$$\geq I(X_T Y_T; MT) \quad (307)$$

$$= I(XY; V), \quad (308)$$

where  $T$  is a time-sharing random variable uniformly distributed  $[1 : n]$  and independent of all other random variables, and  $X := X_T, Y := Y_T, V := MT$ . Combining the inequality above with

$$\frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; M) \leq \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R \quad (309)$$

gives us

$$I(XY; V) \leq R. \quad (310)$$

On the other hand,

$$\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | M) \geq \sup_i \rho_m(X_i; Y_i | M) \quad (311)$$

$$= \sup_{i, m} \rho_m(X_i; Y_i | M = m) \quad (312)$$

$$= \sup_{i, m} \rho_m(X_T; Y_T | M = m, T = i) \quad (313)$$

$$= \rho_m(X_T; Y_T | M, T) \quad (314)$$

$$= \rho_m(X; Y | V), \quad (315)$$

where (311) follows from the definition of maximal correlation, and (312) follows from Lemma 2.

Combining (310) with (315) gives us

$$R \geq \inf_{P_{U|X,Y} : \rho_m(X; Y | V) \leq \beta} I(X, Y; V) = C_\beta(X; Y). \quad (316)$$

Hence

$$R_{PSS}(\beta) \geq C_\beta(X; Y). \quad (317)$$

This completes the proof.

## APPENDIX F PROOF OF THEOREM 8

### A. Achievability

**Codebook Generation:** Suppose  $R > C_\beta(X; Y)$ . Randomly and independently generate sequences  $u^n(m), m \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$  with each according to  $\prod_{i=1}^n P_U(u_i)$ . The codebook  $C = \{u^n(m), m \in [2^{nR}]\}$ .

**Extractor:** Upon  $(X, Y^n)$ , the extractor generates sources  $m$  using a likelihood encoder  $P_{M|X^n Y^n}(m|x^n, y^n) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|U}(x_i, y_i|u_i(m))$ , where  $\propto$  indicates that appropriate normalization is required.

For such extractor, the induced overall distribution  $P_{X^n Y^n M}$  is related to an ideal distribution

$$Q_{X^n Y^n M}(x^n, y^n, m) := 2^{-nR} \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|U}(x_i, y_i|u_i(m)). \quad (318)$$

According to soft-covering lemma [18], if  $R > I(XY; U)$ , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|P_{X^n Y^n} - Q_{X^n Y^n}\|_{TV} = 0, \quad (319)$$

where

$$Q_{X^n Y^n}(x^n, y^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY}(x_i, y_i). \quad (320)$$

On the other hand, observe that  $P_{M|X^n Y^n} = Q_{M|X^n Y^n}$ . Hence by Property 1, we further have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|P_{X^n Y^n M} - Q_{X^n Y^n M}\|_{TV} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{C}} \|P_{X^n Y^n} - Q_{X^n Y^n}\|_{TV} = 0. \quad (321)$$

Given  $U^n(m) = u^n$ ,  $(X^n Y^n)$  is an independently distributed sequence under distribution  $Q$ . That is

$$Q_{X^n Y^n | M}(x^n, y^n | m) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|U}(x_i, y_i | u_i(m)). \quad (322)$$

Hence according to Lemma 11, we get

$$\rho_{m, Q}(X^n; Y^n | M) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \rho_{m, Q}(X_i; Y_i | U_i(M)). \quad (323)$$

Furthermore, from Lemma 2, we have

$$\rho_{m, Q}(X_i; Y_i | U_i(M)) = \sup_{u: P_{U_i}(u) > 0} \lambda_{2, P_{XY|U}}(u) \leq \sup_{u: P_U(u) > 0} \lambda_{2, P_{XY|U}}(u) \leq \beta. \quad (324)$$

Hence

$$\rho_{m, Q}(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta. \quad (325)$$

This implies

$$R_{CIE}(\beta) \leq C_\beta(X; Y). \quad (326)$$

### B. Converse

Assume there exists a sequence of extractors such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(M) \leq R, \quad (327)$$

and

$$\inf_{Q_{X^n, Y^n, M} : \|Q_{X^n, Y^n, M} - P_{X^n, Y^n, M}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon_n} \rho_{m, Q}(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta, \forall n, \quad (328)$$

for some  $\epsilon_n$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n = 0$ .

Assume  $Q_{X^n, Y^n, M}$  achieves the infimum in (328). Hence  $\|Q_{X^n, Y^n, M} - P_{X^n, Y^n, M}\|_{TV} \rightarrow 0$ . Then by the total-variation bound on entropy, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{n} H_P(X^n Y^n M) - \frac{1}{n} H_Q(X^n Y^n M) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} 2 \|Q_{X^n, Y^n, M} - P_{X^n, Y^n, M}\|_{TV} \log \frac{|\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \times [2^{nR}]|}{2 \|Q_{X^n, Y^n, M} - P_{X^n, Y^n, M}\|_{TV}} \end{aligned} \quad (329)$$

$$= 2 \|Q_{X^n, Y^n, M} - P_{X^n, Y^n, M}\|_{TV} \log \frac{2^R |\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}|}{2 \|Q_{X^n, Y^n, M} - P_{X^n, Y^n, M}\|_{TV}} \quad (330)$$

$$\rightarrow 0, \quad (331)$$

and similarly,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} H_P(X^n Y^n) - \frac{1}{n} H_Q(X^n Y^n) \right| \leq 2 \|Q_{X^n, Y^n} - P_{X^n, Y^n}\|_{TV} \log \frac{|\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}|}{2 \|Q_{X^n, Y^n} - P_{X^n, Y^n}\|_{TV}} \rightarrow 0, \quad (332)$$

and

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} H_P(M) - \frac{1}{n} H_Q(M) \right| \leq 2 \|Q_M - P_M\|_{TV} \log \frac{2^R}{2 \|Q_M - P_M\|_{TV}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (333)$$

Furthermore, observe  $\frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; M) = \frac{1}{n} H(X^n Y^n) + \frac{1}{n} H(M) - \frac{1}{n} H(X^n Y^n M)$ . Hence

$$\frac{1}{n} I_P(X^n Y^n; M) \leq \frac{1}{n} H_P(M) \quad (334)$$

$$\leq R. \quad (335)$$

On the other hand, consider that

$$I_P(X^n Y^n; M) = \sum_{i=1}^n I_P(X_i Y_i; M | X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (336)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n I_P(X_i Y_i; M X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (337)$$

$$= n I_P(X_T Y_T; M X^{T-1} Y^{T-1} | T) \quad (338)$$

$$= n I_P(X_T Y_T; M X^{T-1} Y^{T-1} T) \quad (339)$$

$$\geq n I_P(X_T Y_T; M T) \quad (340)$$

$$\geq n I_Q(X_T Y_T; M T) - n \epsilon_n \quad (341)$$

$$= n I_Q(X Y; V) - n \epsilon_n, \quad (342)$$

where  $T$  is a time-sharing random variable uniformly distributed  $[1 : n]$  and independent of all other random variables, and  $X := X_T, Y := Y_T, V := MT$ . Combining the inequality above with (335) gives us

$$I_Q(XY; V) \leq R + \epsilon_n. \quad (343)$$

Furthermore,

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X^n; Y^n | M) \geq \max_i \rho_{m,Q}(X_i; Y_i | M) \quad (344)$$

$$= \max \rho_{m,Q}(X_i; Y_i, m | M = m) \quad (345)$$

$$= \max \rho_{m,Q}(X_T; Y_T, m | M = m, T = i) \quad (346)$$

$$= \rho_{m,Q}(X_T; Y_T | M, T) \quad (347)$$

$$= \rho_{m,Q}(X; Y | V), \quad (348)$$

where (344) follows from the definition of maximal correlation, and (345) and (347) follow from Lemma 2. Furthermore, (328) implies  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{m,Q}(X^n; Y^n | M) \leq \beta$ . Hence

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X; Y | V) \leq \beta. \quad (349)$$

Combining (343) with (349) gives us

$$R \geq \inf_{P_{V|X,Y}: \rho_m(X;Y|V) \leq \beta} I(XY; V) - \epsilon_n = C_\beta(X; Y) - \epsilon_n. \quad (350)$$

Hence

$$R_{CIE}(\beta) \geq C_\beta(X; Y). \quad (351)$$

This completes the proof.

## APPENDIX G

### PROOF OF THEOREM 10

#### A. Achievability

For the achievability part, we only need to show the upper bound  $C_\beta^{(D,UB)}(X; Y)$  is achievable. It is also equivalent to showing that  $(R, \beta)$  with  $R > C_\beta^{(D,UB)}(X; Y)$  is achievable. Next we use a random binning strategy, OSRB (Output Statistics of Random Binning) [22] to prove this, instead of using soft-covering technique. This is because the “soft-covering” lemma is not easily applicable to complicated network structures, but OSRB is. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the random binning technique can be applied to prove the centralized setting case as well. Next we give the proof by following the basic proof steps of [22].

*Part (1) of the proof:* We define two protocols, source coding side of the problem (Protocol A) and the main problem (Protocol B). Fig. 5 illustrates how the source coding side of the problem can be used to prove the common information extraction problem.

**Protocol A** (*Source coding side of the problem*). Let  $(X^n, Y^n, U^n, V^n)$  be i.i.d and distributed according to  $P_{XY} P_{U|X} P_{V|Y}$ . Consider the following random binning (see the left diagram of Fig. 5): uniformly and independently assign two bin indices  $m_1 \in [1 : 2^{nR_1}]$  and  $f_1 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_1}]$  to each sequence  $u^n$ ; and similarly, uniformly






Fig. 5. (Left) Source coding side of the problem (Protocol A). We pass i.i.d. sources  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$  through virtual discrete memoryless channels  $P_{U|X}$  and  $P_{V|Y}$  respectively to generate i.i.d. sequences  $U^n$  and  $V^n$ . We describe  $U^n$  and  $V^n$  through two random bins  $M_i$  and  $F_i$  at rates  $R_i$  and  $\tilde{R}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , where  $M_i$  will serve as the message for the receiver  $i$  in the main problem, while  $F_i$  will serve as the shared randomness. We use SW decoder for decoding. (Right) The common information extraction problem assisted with the shared randomness (Protocol B). We pass the sources  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$  and the shared randomnesses  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  through the reverse encoders to generate sequences  $U^n$  and  $V^n$ . The joint distribution of  $X^n, Y^n, M_1, M_2, F_1, F_2$  of protocol A is equal to that of protocol B in total variation sense.

and independently assign two bin indices  $m_2 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_2}]$  and  $f_2 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_2}]$  to each sequence  $v^n$ . Furthermore, we use Slepian-Wolf (SW) decoders to recover  $u^n, v^n$  from  $(m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2)$ . Denote the outputs of the decoders by  $\hat{u}^n$  and  $\hat{v}^n$ , respectively.

The pmf induced by the random binning, denoted by  $P$ , can be expressed as

$$P(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) = P(x^n, y^n) P(u^n | x^n) P(v^n | y^n) P(f_1 | u^n) P(f_2 | v^n) P(m_1 | u^n) P(m_2 | v^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n | m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2) \quad (352)$$

$$= P(x^n, y^n) P(f_1, u^n | x^n) P(f_2, v^n | y^n) P(m_1 | u^n) P(m_2 | v^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n | m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2) \quad (353)$$

$$= P(x^n, y^n) P(f_1 | x^n) P(f_2 | y^n) P(u^n | x^n, f_1) P(v^n | y^n, f_2) P(m_1 | u^n) P(m_2 | v^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n | m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2). \quad (354)$$

**Protocol B** (*Common information extraction problem assisted with the shared randomness*). In this protocol we assume that the transmitters (extractors) and the receivers have access to the shared randomnesses  $F_1, F_2$  where  $F_i$  is uniformly distributed over  $[1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_i}]$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Then, the protocol proceeds as follows (see also the right diagram of Fig. 5):

- The transmitter 1 generates  $U^n$  according to the conditional pmf  $P(u^n | x^n, f_1)$  of protocol A; and the transmitter 2 generates  $V^n$  according to the conditional pmf  $P(v^n | y^n, f_2)$  of protocol A.
- Next, knowing  $u^n$ , the transmitter 1 generates  $m_1$  according to the conditional pmf  $P(m_1 | u^n)$  of protocol A. Similarly, the transmitter 2 generates  $m_2$  according to the conditional pmf  $P(m_2 | v^n)$  of protocol A.
- Finally, upon  $(m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2)$ , the receiver uses the Slepian-Wolf decoder  $P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n | m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2)$  of protocol A to obtain an estimate of  $(u^n, v^n)$ .

The pmf induced by the protocol, denoted by  $\tilde{P}$ , can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{P}(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) \\ &= P(x^n, y^n) P^U(f_1) P^U(f_2) P(u^n | x^n, f_1) P(v^n | y^n, f_2) P(m_1 | u^n) P(m_2 | v^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n | m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2). \end{aligned} \quad (355)$$

*Part (2a) of the proof (Sufficient conditions that make the induced pmfs approximately the same):* Observe that  $f_1$  is a bin index of  $u^n$  and  $f_2$  is a bin index of  $v^n$  in protocol A. For the random binning in protocol A, [22, Thm. 1] says that if

$$\tilde{R}_1 < H(U|XY) \quad (356)$$

$$\tilde{R}_2 < H(V|XY) \quad (357)$$

$$\tilde{R}_1 + \tilde{R}_2 < H(UV|XY) \quad (358)$$

then  $P(x^n, y^n) P(f_1 | x^n) P(f_2 | y^n) \approx P(x^n, y^n) P^U(f_1) P^U(f_2)$ . Combining this with (354) and (355) gives us

$$\tilde{P}(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) \approx P(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n). \quad (359)$$

*Part (2b) of the proof (Sufficient conditions that make the Slepian-Wolf decoders succeed):* [22, Lem. 1] says that if

$$R_1 + \tilde{R}_1 > H(U|V) \quad (360)$$

$$R_2 + \tilde{R}_2 > H(V|U) \quad (361)$$

$$R_1 + R_2 + \tilde{R}_1 + \tilde{R}_2 > H(UV) \quad (362)$$

then

$$P(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) \approx P(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2) 1\{\hat{u}^n = u^n, \hat{v}^n = v^n\}. \quad (363)$$

Using (359), (363) and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\tilde{P}(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) \approx P(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2) 1\{\hat{u}^n = u^n, \hat{v}^n = v^n\}. \quad (364)$$

*Part (3) of the proof (Eliminating the shared randomness  $F_1, F_2$ ):* (364) holds for the random pmfs induced by random binning, by Property 1, which guarantees existence of a fixed binning such that (364) holds for the induced non-random pmfs. (364) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{P}(x^n, y^n, u^n, v^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) \\ & \approx P(f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) P(x^n, y^n | u^n, v^n) 1\{\hat{u}^n = u^n, \hat{v}^n = v^n\}. \end{aligned} \quad (365)$$

From (365) we further have

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{P}(x^n, y^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) \\ & \approx P(f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2, \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) P_{X^n Y^n | U^n V^n}(x^n, y^n | \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n) \end{aligned} \quad (366)$$

$$= P(f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2) 1\{\hat{u}^n = \hat{u}^n(m_1, f_1), \hat{v}^n = \hat{v}^n(m_2, f_2)\} P_{X^n Y^n | U^n V^n}(x^n, y^n | \hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n), \quad (367)$$

where  $P_{X^n Y^n | U^n V^n} = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|UV}$ , and  $\hat{u}^n(m_1, f_1)$  and  $\hat{v}^n(m_2, f_2)$  correspond to the Slepian-Wolf decoders. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{P}(x^n, y^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2) \\ & \approx Q(x^n, y^n, f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2) \end{aligned} \quad (368)$$

$$:= P(f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2) P_{X^n Y^n | U^n V^n}(x^n, y^n | \hat{u}^n(m_1, f_1), \hat{v}^n(m_2, f_2)). \quad (369)$$

Observe that under  $Q$ , given  $F_1 F_2 M_1 M_2$ ,  $X^n Y^n$  follows

$$Q_{X^n Y^n | F_1 F_2 M_1 M_2}(x^n, y^n | f_1, f_2, m_1, m_2) = \prod_{i=1}^n P_{XY|UV}(x_i, y_i | \hat{u}_i(m_1, f_1), \hat{v}_i(m_2, f_2)). \quad (370)$$

Hence by Lemma 11, we get

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X^n; Y^n | F_1 F_2 M_1 M_2) = \sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \rho_{m,Q}(X_i; Y_i | \hat{U}_i(M_1, F_1), \hat{V}_i(M_2, F_2)). \quad (371)$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 2, we have

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X_i; Y_i | \hat{U}_i(M_1, F_1), \hat{V}_i(M_2, F_2)) = \sup_{u,v: P_{U_i V_i}(u,v) > 0} \lambda_{2, P_{XY|UV}}(u, v) \quad (372)$$

$$\leq \sup_{u,v: P_{UV}(u,v) > 0} \lambda_{2, P_{XY|UV}}(u, v) \quad (373)$$

$$\leq \beta. \quad (374)$$

Therefore,

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X^n; Y^n | F_1 F_2 M_1 M_2) \leq \beta. \quad (375)$$

By choosing  $F_1 = f_1, F_2 = f_2$  for arbitrary  $(f_1, f_2)$ , it holds that

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X^n; Y^n | F_1 = f_1, F_2 = f_2, M_1, M_2) \leq \beta. \quad (376)$$

Finally, specifying  $P(m_1 | x^n, f_1)$  as the encoder 1 and  $P(m_2 | x^n, f_2)$  as the encoder 2 (which is equivalent to, for encoder 1, generating random sequences  $u^n$  according to  $P(u^n | x^n, f_1)$  and then transmitting the bin index  $m_1$  assigned to  $u^n$ , and for encoder 2, doing similar operations), and  $P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n, \hat{v}^n | m_1, m_2, f_1, f_2)$  as the decoder results in a pair of encoder-decoder obeying the desired constraints:

$$\rho_{m,Q}(X^n; Y^n | M_1 M_2) = \rho_{m,Q}(X^n; Y^n | F_1 = f_1, F_2 = f_2, M_1, M_2) \leq \beta. \quad (377)$$

Observe that the common information extraction above only requires  $R_1 + R_2 > I(XY; UV) = I_Q(XY; UV)$ . This implies  $C_\beta^{(D,UB)}(X; Y)$  is achievable, which in turn implies

$$R_{DCIE}(\beta) \leq C_\beta^{(D,UB)}(X; Y). \quad (378)$$

Furthermore,  $C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U|X^n} P_{V|Y^n}: \rho_m(X^n; Y^n | UV) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; UV)$  is also achievable, since it is a multiletter extension of  $C_\beta^{(D,UB)}(X; Y)$ .

### B. Converse

Assume there exists an extractor such that

$$\inf_{Q_{X^n, Y^n, M_1, M_2} : \|Q_{X^n, Y^n, M_1, M_2} - P_{X^n, Y^n, M_1, M_2}\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon_n} \rho_{m, Q}(X^n; Y^n | M_1, M_2) \leq \beta, \forall n, \quad (379)$$

for some  $\epsilon_n$  such that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_n = 0$ .

Set  $U = M_1, V = M_2$  and follow similar steps to Subsection F-B, then we have

$$C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P_{U|X^n} P_{V|Y^n} : \rho_m(X^n; Y^n | UV) \leq \beta} \frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; UV) \leq R. \quad (380)$$

Hence

$$R_{DCIE}(\beta) \geq C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y). \quad (381)$$

Combining this with the achievability of  $C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y)$  gives us

$$R_{DCIE}(\beta) = C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y). \quad (382)$$

Now we remain to show

$$C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y) \geq C_\beta^{(D, LB)}(X; Y). \quad (383)$$

Consider  $P_{U|X^n} P_{V|Y^n}$  such that  $\rho_m(X^n; Y^n | UV) \leq \beta$  and  $\frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; UV) \leq R$ . Then the following equations hold.

$$U \rightarrow X_T \rightarrow Y_T, \quad (384)$$

$$X_T \rightarrow Y_T \rightarrow V, \quad (385)$$

$$\rho_m(X_T, Y_T | UV T) \leq \rho_m(X^n; Y^n | UV), \quad (386)$$

$$\rho_m(U X_T; V Y_T | T) \leq \rho_m(U X^n; V Y^n) = \rho_m(X^n; Y^n) = \rho_m(X; Y), \quad (387)$$

and

$$I_Q(X^n Y^n; UV) = \sum_{i=1}^n I_Q(X_i Y_i; UV | X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (388)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n I_Q(X_i Y_i; UV X^{i-1} Y^{i-1}) \quad (389)$$

$$= n I_Q(X_T Y_T; UV X^{T-1} Y^{T-1} | T) \quad (390)$$

$$= n I_Q(X_T Y_T; UV X^{T-1} Y^{T-1} T) \quad (391)$$

$$\geq n I_Q(X_T Y_T; UV | T) \quad (392)$$

$$= n I_Q(XY; UV | T), \quad (393)$$

where  $T$  is a time-sharing random variable uniformly distributed  $[1 : n]$  and independent of all other random variables, and  $X := X_T, Y := Y_T$ . Therefore,

$$C_\beta^{(D)}(X; Y) \geq C_\beta^{(D, LB)}(X; Y). \quad (394)$$

This completes the proof.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Gács and J. Körner, “Common information is far less than mutual information,” *Probl. Contr Inform. Theory* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 149-162, 1973.
- [2] H. S. Witsenhausen, “On sequences of pairs of dependent random variables,” *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 100-113, Jan. 1975.
- [3] A. Wyner, “The common information of two dependent random variables,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 163-179, Mar. 1975.
- [4] H. Gebelein, “Das statistische Problem der Korrelation als Variationsund Eigenwert-problem und sein Zusammenhang mit der Ausgleichungsrechnung,” *Zeitschrift für angew. Math. und Mech.* 21, pp. 364-379, 1941.
- [5] H. O. Hirschfeld, “A connection between correlation and contingency,” *Proc. Cambridge Philosophical Soc.* 31, pp 520-524, 1935.
- [6] A. Rényi, “On measures of dependence,” *Acta Math. Hung.*, vol. 10, pp. 441-451, 1959.
- [7] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [8] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004.
- [9] S. Beigi and A. Gohari, “Monotone measures for non-local correlations,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 5185-5208, 2015.
- [10] C. T. Li and A. El Gamal, “Maximal correlation secrecy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.5374*, Oct. 2016.
- [11] S. Kamath and V. Anantharam, “On non-interactive simulation of joint distributions,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3419-3435, Jun. 2016.
- [12] G. R. Kumar, C. T. Li, and A. El Gamal, “Exact common information,” in *Proc. IEEE Symp. Inf. Theory*, Honolulu, HI, USA, Jun./Jul. 2014, pp. 161-165.
- [13] Y. A. Rozanov, *Stationary Random Processes*. San Francisco, CA: Holden-Day, 1967.
- [14] L. Yu, H. Li, and C. W. Chen, “Distortion Bounds for Transmitting Correlated Sources with Common Part over MAC,” in *Proc. 54th Ann. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., and Comput.*, Sep. 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.01345>.
- [15] J. Liu, P. Cuff, and S. Verdú, “ $E_\gamma$ -Resolvability,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 2629-2658, May 2017.
- [16] J. Liu, T. A. Courtade, P. Cuff, and S. Verdú, “Smoothing Brascamp-Lieb inequalities and strong converses for CR generation,” in *Proc. IEEE Symp. Inf. Theory*, Jul. 2016, pp. 1043-1047.
- [17] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, Wiley, New York, 1991.
- [18] P. Cuff, “Distributed channel synthesis,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7071-7096, 2013.
- [19] C. Schieler, and P. Cuff, “The henchman problem: Measuring secrecy by the minimum distortion in a list,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 3436-3450, Jun. 2016.
- [20] S. Asoodeh, M. Diaz, F. Alajaji, and T. Linder, “Information extraction under privacy constraints,” *Information*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2016.
- [21] G. Xu, W. Liu, and B. Chen, “Wyner’s common information for continuous random variables—A lossy source coding interpretation,” in *Proc. 45th Annu. Conf. CISS*, 2011, pp. 16.
- [22] M. Yassaee, M. Aref, and A. Gohari, “Achievability proof via output statistics of random binning,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, pp. 6760–6786, Nov 2014.
- [23] V. Anantharam, A. Gohari, S. Kamath, and C. Nair, “On maximal correlation, hypercontractivity, and the data processing inequality studied by erkip and cover,” *arXiv:1304.6133[cs.IT]*, 2013.