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Abstract

The coding problem for wiretap channels with causal channel state information available at the encoder and/or the decoder is studied under the strong secrecy criterion. This problem consists of two aspects: one is due to naive wiretap channel coding and the other is due to one-time pad cipher based on the secret key agreement between Alice and Bob using the channel state information. These two aspects are closely related to each other and investigated in details from the viewpoint of achievable rates with strong secrecy. In particular, the key result, Theorem 1, is established for wiretap channels with causal channel state information available only at the encoder, which is the basis for treating general cases with various kinds of channel state informations at the encoder (Alice), decoder (Bob) and wiretapper (Eve). What is to be emphasized is that in order to prove Theorem 1 we newly devised the “iterative” forward-backward coding scheme, which is of independent interest as a coding procedure.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper the coding problem for the wiretap channel (WC) with causal channel state information (CSI) available at the encoder (Alice) and/or the decoder (Bob) is studied. The concept of WC (without CSI) originates in Wyner [1] and was extended to a more general WC by Csiszár and Körner [2]. These landmark papers have been followed by many subsequent extensions and generalizations from the viewpoint of theory and practice. In particular, among others, the WC with CSI has also been extensively investigated in the literature. Early works include Mittpant, Vinck and Luo [6], Chen and Vinck [7], and Liu and Chen [8] that have studied the capacity-equivocation region for degraded WCs with noncausal CSI to establish inner and/or outer bounds on the region, which was motivated
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by physical-layer security problems to actually intervene in practical fading channel communications. Moreover, subsequent recent developments in this direction can be found also in Dai, Zhuang and Vinck [10], Boche and Schaefer [11], Dai and Luo [17], Prabhakaran, Eswaran and Ramchandran [23], etc.

Generally speaking, the coding scheme with causal/noncausal CSI outperforms the one without CSI, because knowledge of the CSI enables us to share a common secret key between Alice and Bob to augment the secrecy capacity. More specifically, then, in addition to the standard WC coding (called the Wyner’s (naive) WC coding [1], [2]) without resorting to the CSI, we may incorporate also the cryptographic scheme called the Shannon’s one-time pad (OTP) cipher (cf. Shannon [4]) based on the secret key agreement (cf. Maurer [12], Ahlswede and Csiszár [13]) using the CSI between Alice and Bob.

Recent works taking account of such a secrecy key agreement aspect include Khisti, Diggavi and Wornell [14], Chia and El Gamal [16], Sonee and Hodtani [18], and Fujita [19]. However, we cannot say that the secrecy capacity problem in these works with causal CSI has now been fully solved. This is because the problem with causal/noncausal CSI necessarily includes the two separate but closely related schemes as mentioned in the above paragraph. In particular, Khisti, Diggavi and Wornell [14] addresses the problem of key capacity that focuses on the maximum rate of secret key agreement between Alice and Bob rather than on the maximum rate of secure message transmission.

Among others, Chia and El Gamal [16] addresses the case with causal common CSI available at both Alice and Bob, whereas Fujita [19] deals with the case with causal CSI available only at Alice (given a physically degraded WC). Both includes lower bounds on the weak secrecy capacity, but with tight secrecy capacity formulas in special cases. The present paper is motivated mainly by these two papers, and the main result to be given in this paper is in nice accordance with their results. In particular, we have newly established the “iterative” forward-and-backward coding scheme for WCs with causal CSI available at Alice under the strong secrecy criterion (instead of the standard weak secrecy criterion as in [16], [19]) with reasonable lower bounds on the strong secrecy capacity.

The present paper is organized as follows.

In Section II, we give the statement of the problem and the key result (Theorem I) for the WC with causal CSI available only at Alice along with comparison with the work of Chia and El Gamal [16].

In Section III, we give the detailed proof of Theorem I to establish lower bounds on the strong secrecy capacity. The main ingredients for the proof are Slepian-Wolf coding, Csiszár-Körner’s key construction, Gallager’s maximum likelihood decoding, and Han-Verdú’s resolvability argument, where in the process of these proofs we do not invoke the argument of typical sequences at all, which enables us to cope with alphabets that are not necessarily finite (as in Gaussian WCs). This provides the basis for dealing with the problems in the subsequent sections.

In Section IV, in order to obtain insights into the significance of Theorem I we provide several simple illustrative examples, for some of which the exact secrecy capacities are actually determined.

In Section V since the present work has close bearing with that of Fujita [19], we compare both of them to scrutinize the details of these works.

In Section VI we conclude the paper with several remarks.
II. Problem Statement and the Result

A stationary memoryless WC $\omega$ as illustrated in Fig. 1 is specified by giving the conditional (transition) probability

$$p(y, z|x, s) = P_{YZ|X,S}(y, z|x, s)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

with input random variable $X$ (for Alice), outputs random variables $Y$ (for Bob), $Z$ (for Eve), and CSI random variable $S$, which are assumed to take values in alphabets $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{S}$, respectively. Alice $X$ (sender), who only has access to stationary memoryless CSI $S$ available, wants to send a confidential message $M \in \mathcal{M} = [1 : 2^{nR}]$ (over $n$ channel transmissions) to Bob $Y$ (legitimate receiver) while keeping it secret from Eve $Z$ (eavesdropper), where we use here and hereafter the notation $[i : j] = \{i, i + 1, \ldots, j - 1, j\}$ for $j \geq i$, and $R \geq 0$ is called the rate.

![Diagram of WC with CSI available only at Alice](image)

A $(n, 2^{nR})$ code for the channel $\omega$ with causal CSI $S$ at the encoder consists of

(i) a message set $\mathcal{M} = [1 : 2^{nR}]$,

(ii) a stochastic “causal” encoder $f_i : \mathcal{M} \times S^i \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ subject to conditional probability $p(x|m, s^i)$ to produce the channel input $X_i(M) = f_i(M, S^i)$ at each time $i \in [1 : n]$, and

(iii) a decoder $g : \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ (for Bob) to assign an estimate $\hat{M}$ to each received sequence $Y$, where we use the notation $a^i = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_i$ (in particular, $a = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n$; the bold-faced letters indicate sequences of length $n$) and assume that the message $M$ is uniformly distributed on the message set $\mathcal{M}$.

The probability of error is defined to be $P_e = \Pr\{\hat{M} \neq M\}$. The information leakage at Eve with output sequence $Z$, which measures the amount of information about $M$ that leaks out to Eve, is defined to be $I_E = I(M; Z)$ (the mutual information between $M$ and $Z$). It should be noted here that this measure is not $R_E = \frac{1}{n}I(M; Z)$ (the information leakage rate). This means that in this paper we are concerned only with the strong secrecy but not the weak secrecy as was the case in the literature (e.g., cf. Chia and El Gamal [16], Fujita [19]).

A secrecy rate $R$ is said to be achievable if there exists a sequence of codes $(n, 2^{nR})$ with $P_e \rightarrow 0$ and $I_E \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The strong secrecy capacity $C_s^{\text{CSI}}$ is the supremum of all achievable rates with the strong secrecy criterion.

In order to implement the coding scheme for the $\omega$, it is convenient to introduce its modified equivalent channel $\omega^*$ as follows: Let $U$ be an arbitrary auxiliary random variable with values in a set $\mathcal{U}$ that is independent of the CSI variable $S$, and let $h : \mathcal{U} \times S \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be a stochastic mapping subject to conditional probability $p(x|u, s)$. According
to the Shannon strategy \[5\], we define the \( \omega^* \) as the WC specified by the conditional probability

\[
p(y, z|u, s) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(y, z|x, s)p(x|u, s),
\]

which gives a new WC with input variable \( U \) (Alice), outputs variables \( Y, Z \) (Bob and Eve) and CSI variable \( S \), i.e., the channel \( \omega^* \) is a concatenation of \( \omega \) and \( h \) (i.e., \( \omega^* = \omega \circ h \)). Thus, hereafter we may focus solely on the coding problem for the channel \( \omega^* \) from the standpoint of achievable rates.

Let us now describe the main result. Set

\[
R_{\text{CSI-0}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = I(U; Y) - I(U; Z),
\]

\[
R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ I(U; Y) - I(U; SZ) + H(S|Z) - H(S|UY), I(U; Y) - H(S|UY) \right],
\]

\[
R_{\text{CSI-2}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ H(S|Z) - H(S|UY), I(U; Y) - H(S|UY) \right],
\]

where \( I(\cdot; \cdot), I(\cdot; \cdot|\cdot) \) denote the (conditional) mutual informations; and \( H(\cdot), H(\cdot|\cdot) \) denote the (conditional) entropies. Moreover, for simplicity we use the notation \( A_1A_2 \cdots A_m \) to denote \( (A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_m) \). Then, we have the following lower bound on the strong secrecy capacity \( C_{\text{CSI}}^s \):

**Theorem 1:** Let us consider the WC with CSI as in Fig[1]. Then, the strong secrecy capacity \( C_{\text{CSI}}^s \) is lower bounded as

\[
C_{\text{CSI}}^s \geq \max \left[ \max_{p(u), p(x|u, s)} R_{\text{CSI-0}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)), \right. \\
\left. \max_{p(u), p(x|u, s)} R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)), \right. \\
\left. \max_{p(u), p(x|u, s)} R_{\text{CSI-2}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \right],
\]

where \( p(u), p(x|u, s) \) ranges over all possible (conditional) probability distributions such that \( p(u, s) = p(u)p(s) \), and notice here that \( p(s) \) is a given distribution and so cannot be varied.

The expression on the right-hand side \(4\) for \( R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \) looks a little bit involved, so it is convenient to classify it into three cases as follows:

**Case 0:** \( H(S|Z) - H(S|UY) \leq 0 \); then

\[
R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \leq R_{\text{CSI-0}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)),
\]

which implies that in this case the standard (naive) WC coding without resorting to the OTP cipher with the secret key shared using CSI is enough to guarantee the achievability (cf. Csiszár and Körner \[2\], El Gamal and Kim \[28\], Dai and Luo \[17\]). This is actually attained by employing the “one-time” CSI coding in the sense of Han, Endo and Sasaki \[21\].
Case 1): $I(U;Y) - I(U;SZ) > 0$ and $H(S|Z) - H(S|UY) > 0$; then

$$R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ I(U;Y) - I(U;SZ) \\
+ H(S|Z) - H(S|UY), \\
I(U;Y) - H(S|UY) \right],$$

which implies that the achievable rate here consists of two parts; the first one from naive WC coding and the second one from OTP cipher, as will be mentioned below.

Case 2): $I(U;Y) - I(U;SZ) \leq 0$ and $H(S|Z) - H(S|UY) > 0$; then

$$R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ H(S|Z) - H(S|UY) \\
- (I(U;SZ) - I(U;Y)), \\
I(U;Y) - H(S|UY) \right],$$

We notice here that in this case

$$R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \leq R_{\text{CSI-2}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$$

holds, which implies that in this case the achievability of $R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$ follows from that of $R_{\text{CSI-2}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$.

The latter corresponds to the situation where all confidential message is protected by OTP cipher using the CSI, not via naive WC coding, and so it suffices to show only the achievability of $R_{\text{CSI-2}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$ (see, the proof for Case 3) later in Section 3).

Here, the term $H(S|UY)$ in (4), (5), (8), (9) specifies the rate of (auxiliary) Slepian-Wolf coding for information reconciliation in secret key agreement (for OPT cipher) between Alice and Bob using the CSI; in (8) the term $I(U;Y) - I(U;SZ)$ specifies the transmission rate of confidential message via naive WC coding; the term $H(S|Z) - H(S|UY)$ in (4), (5), (8), (9) specifies the key rate to transmit an additional confidential message via OTP cipher with the secret key shared between Alice and Bob using the CSI; the term $I(U;Y) - H(S|UY)$ in (4), (5), (8), (9) specifies the upper bound on total transmission rates for two kinds of confidential messages as above except for the auxiliary message. The proof of Theorem 1 is provided in the next section.

Remark 1: Chia and El Gamal [16] have considered the WC with common CSI available at both Alice and Bob as illustrated in Fig. 1. This channel, however, equivalently reduces to that in Fig. 1 with output $Y_S \equiv SY$ instead of $Y$. Then, since $H(S|UY_S) = H(S|USY) = 0$, $R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$ and $R_{\text{CSI-2}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$ in (4), (5) reduce to

$$R_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ I(U;SY) - I(U;SZ) + H(S|Z), I(U;SY) \right],$$

$$R_{\text{CSI-2}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ H(S|Z), I(U;SY) \right],$$

† Notice here that the WC $\omega^*$ in this paper is equipped with no public authenticated noiseless channel between Alice and Bob unlike in the standard setting of secret key agreement, but all communications occur inside the WC $\omega^*$ in a one-way fashion from Alice to Bob.
where the right-hand side of (11) exactly coincides with the weak secrecy lower bound

\[
\min \left[ I(U; SY) - I(U; SZ) + H(S|Z), I(U; SY) \right]
\]

that was given by Chia and El Gamal [16]. Thus, Theorem 1 specialized to the case with the same CSI available at both Alice and Bob provides the strong secrecy version of their result. Specifically, this concludes that Theorems 1, 2 and 3 in [16] all hold with the strong secrecy criterion.

Remark 2: A remarkable feature of this paper is that we do not invoke the argument of typical sequences at all, so we do not need the finiteness of alphabets \( \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z} \), while the alphabet \( \mathcal{S} \) of CSI \( S \) needs to be finite.

Fig. 2. WC with the same CSI available at Alice and Bob \( (i = 1, 2, \cdots, n) \).

III. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The whole coding scheme involves the transmission of \( b \) independent messages over the \( b + 1 \) channel blocks each of length \( n \) (\( b \) is a sufficiently large fixed positive integer), which are indexed by \( j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, b \). The formal proof is provided in the sequel, where in block \( j \) we let \( U_j, S_j, X_j, Y_j, Z_j \) (correlated i.i.d. sequences of length \( n \) subject to joint probability \( P_{USXYZ} \)) denote the random variables to indicate channel input sequence, CSI sequence, channel input sequence for Alice, channel output sequences for Bob and Eve, respectively, whereas \( M_j, M_0j, M_1j, N_j \) denote the random variables to indicate uniformly distributed confidential messages to be sent, and auxiliary message, respectively. Their realizations are indicated by the corresponding lower case letters.

A. Proof for Case 1) of \( R_{CSI-1} \):

In what to follow, many kinds of (nonnegative) rates intervene with inequality constraints, which are listed as follows:

\[
\bar{R} \quad < \quad I(U; Y), \quad (14)
\]

\[
R \quad = \quad R_0 + R_1, \quad (15)
\]

\[
\bar{R} - R_0 \quad > \quad I(U; SZ), \quad (16)
\]

\[
R_2 \quad > \quad H(S|UY), \quad (17)
\]
Fourier-Motzkin elimination (cf. El Gamal and Kim [28]) claims that the supremum of $R$ over all rates satisfying (14)∼(19) coincides with the right-hand side of (8), so it suffices to show that rates $R$ satisfying (14)∼(19) are indeed achievable, where $\overline{R}$ is used to indicate an achievable rate for usual channel coding (non-WC) between Alice and Bob.

**Codebook generation:**

For each block $j \in [1 : b]$, split message $M_j \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$ into two independent uniform messages $M_{0j} \in [1 : 2^{nR_0}]$ and $M_{1j} \in [1 : 2^{nR_1}]$; thus $R = R_0 + R_1$, where, in the process of channel transmission, message $M_{0j}$ is protected by naive WC coding, and message $M_{1j}$ is protected by OTP cipher with the secret key shared using CSI. The codebook generation consists of the following two parts:

1) **Message codebook generation:**

For each block $j \in [0 : b]$, randomly and independently generate sequences $u_j(l), l \in [1 : 2^{n\overline{R}}]$, each according to probability distribution $\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{U}(u_i)$ ($u_j(l) = u_1u_2\cdots u_n$). This is a random code and is denoted by $H_j$. On the other hand, partition the set $[1 : 2^{n\overline{R}}]$ of indices into $2^{nR_0}$ equal-size bins $B(m_0), m_0 \in [1 : 2^{nR_0}]$. Moreover, partition the indices within each bin $B(m_0)$ into $2^{nR_1}$ equal-size sub-bins $B(m_0, m_1), m_1 \in [1 : 2^{nR_1}]$. Furthermore, partition the indices within each bin $B(m_0, m_1)$ into $2^{nR_2}$ equal-size sub-sub-bins $B(m_0, m_1, m_2), m_2 \in [1 : 2^{nR_2}]$ (cf. Fig. 3). These bins are all non-empty because of (18).

2) **Key codebook generation:**

In order to construct an efficient key $K_j = \kappa(S_j)$ of rate $R_1$ using the CSI $S_j$, we invoke the following two celebrated lemmas:
Fig. 4. Sequence diagram of block Markov coding ($C_j = K_{j-1} \oplus M_{ij}; j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, b$).

**Lemma 1 (Slepian and Wolf [3]):** Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrarily small number and let $R_2 > H(S|UY)$ (cf. (17)). Then, there exists (deterministic) functions $\sigma : S^n \rightarrow [1 : 2^{nR_2}]$ and $\phi : [1 : 2^{nR_2}] \times U^n \times Y^n \rightarrow S^n$ such that

$$\Pr\{S_j \neq \tilde{S}_j\} \leq \varepsilon$$

(20) for all sufficiently large $n$, where $\tilde{S}_j = \phi(\sigma(S_j), U_j, Y_j)$. □

For simplicity, we use also the notation $N_{j+1} \equiv \sigma(S_j)$, which is the random variable conveying the auxiliary message used for generating the common secret key between Alice and Bob.

**Lemma 2 (Csiszár and Körner [26, Corollary 17.5]):** Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrarily small number and let $R_1 + R_2 < H(S|Z)$ (cf. (19)). Then, with the same $N_{j+1} \equiv \sigma(S_j)$ as in Lemma 1, there exists a (deterministic) key function $\kappa : S^n \rightarrow [1 : 2^{nR_1}]$ such that

$$S(\kappa(S_j)\sigma(S_j)|Z_j) \leq \varepsilon$$

(21) for all sufficiently large $n$, where we use the notation (called the security index): □

We use the thus defined deterministic function $K_{j-1} \equiv \kappa(S_{j-1})$ as the key to be used in the next block $j$.

**Encoding scheme**

We use the block coding scheme as in Fig. 4 which is based on the block Markov coding scheme invented by Cover and El Gamal [15] (cf. Fig. 4) and applied to the WC with CSI by Chia and El Gamal [16]. The first block $j = 0$ provides only the CSI sequence $S_0$ for Alice to be used for encoding in the second block $j = 1$.

* Specifically, in the proof of this lemma, it suffices to make uniform random hashing $(\kappa\sigma) : S^n \rightarrow [1 : 2^{nR_1}] \times [1 : 2^{nR_2}]$ and uniform random binning $\sigma : S^n \rightarrow [1 : 2^{nR_2}]$ simultaneously to construct a pair of deterministic mappings $\kappa(S_j)\sigma(S_j) \equiv (\kappa(S_j), \sigma(S_j))$ satisfying (20) and (21). This is possible owing to rate constraints $R_2 > H(S|UY)$ and $R_1 + R_2 < H(S|Z)$.
with \( M_0 = N_0 = \text{"1"} \) (fixed dummy message). In each block \( j \in [1 : b] \), given a message triple \((M_{0j} = m_0, M_{1j} = m_1, N_j = m_2)\), Alice first computes \( c_j = k_{j-1} \oplus m_1 \) (mod \( 2^{nR_1} \)) and let \( L \overset{\Delta}{=} L(m_0, c_j, m_2) \) be the random index uniformly distributed on the bin \( B(m_0, c_j, m_2) \) with \( k_{j-1} = \kappa(s_{j-1}) \) as specified in Lemma 2. Alice then sends out for channel transmission a randomly generated sequence \( X_j \) according to conditional probability \( \prod_{i=1}^n P_{X_j|U=S}(x_i|u_i(L), s_i) \), where \( x_j = x_1x_2 \cdots x_n \), \( u_j(L) = u_1(L)u_2(L) \cdots u_n(L) \), \( s_j = s_1s_2 \cdots s_n \). We set \( U_j = u_j(L) \).

Decoding scheme and evaluation of probability of error:

Let \( Y_j \) be the output for Bob due to \( U_j \). Consider the stationary memoryless channel \( \omega_n^*(y|u) \equiv P_{Y_j|U_j}(y|u) \) with input \( u \) and output \( y \). For this channel we use the maximum likelihood decoding, that is, we let \( \hat{l} \) denote an index such that

\[
\omega_n(\hat{y}|u_j(\hat{l})) = \max_{l \in [1:2^n]} \omega_n^*(y|u_j(l)),
\]

and set \( \hat{U}_j = u_j(\hat{l}) \). Find the \((\hat{m}_0, \hat{c}, \hat{m}_2)\) such that \( \hat{l} \in B(\hat{m}_0, \hat{c}, \hat{m}_2) \). Next, compute \( \hat{m}_1 = \hat{c} \oplus \hat{k}_{j-1} \) (mod \( 2^{nR_1} \)), where \( \hat{k}_{j-1} = \kappa(\hat{s}_{j-1}) \) with \( \hat{s}_{j-1} = \phi(\hat{m}_2, u_{j-1}(\hat{l}), y_{j-1}) \) and we notice that \( \hat{s}_{j-1} = \hat{s}_{j-1} \) if \( \hat{m}_2 = m_2 \) and \( u_{j-1}(\hat{l}) = u_{j-1}(L) \) (cf. Lemmas 1 and 2). Finally, declare that the message pair \((\hat{m}_0, \hat{m}_1)\) was sent. In order to evaluate the probability of decoding error

\[
P_e(j) \equiv \Pr\{ (M_{0j}, M_{1j}) \neq (\hat{M}_{0j}, \hat{M}_{1j}) | \mathcal{H} \},
\]

we invoke

Lemma 3 (Gallager [27] Theorem 5.6.2): Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) be an arbitrarily small number and let \( R < I(U; Y) \) (cf. (14)). Then,

\[
\Pr\{ (M_{0j}, C_j, N_j \equiv M_{2j}, U_j) \neq (\hat{M}_{0j}, \hat{C}_j, \hat{N}_j \equiv M_{2j}, \hat{U}_j) | \mathcal{H} \} \leq \varepsilon
\]

for all sufficiently large \( n \). \( \square \)

Then, in view of Lemmas 1 and 2 we have

\[
P_e(j) \leq \Pr\{ (M_{0j}, C_j, N_j, U_j) \neq (\hat{M}_{0j}, \hat{C}_j, \hat{N}_j, \hat{U}_j) | \mathcal{H} \}
\]

\[
+ \Pr\{ \hat{S}_j \neq \hat{S}_j \}
\]

\[
\leq 2\varepsilon.
\]

Thus, it is concluded that the total probability of decoding error over all the \( b \) blocks is less than or equal to \( 2b\varepsilon \). It should be remarked here that the total transmission rate averaged over all \( b + 1 \) blocks is \( \frac{bR}{b+1} \) because only the \( b \) blocks of them are effective for message transmission, which can be made as close to \( R \) as desired by letting \( b \) large enough.

Evaluation of information leakage:
We use the following notation: for \( j \in [1 : b] \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H} &= \mathcal{H}_1 \mathcal{H}_2 \cdots \mathcal{H}_b, \\
M_j &= M_{0j} M_{1j}, \\
M^j &= M_1 M_2 \cdots M_j, \\
M^{[j]} &= M_j M_{j+1} \cdots M_b, \\
Z^j &= Z_1 Z_2 \cdots Z_j, \\
Z^{[j]} &= Z_j Z_{j+1} \cdots Z_b,
\end{align*}
\]

where we notice that \( Z_j \) is the channel output for Eve in block \( j \).

**Remark 3:** Since \( K_{j-1} \) and \( M_{1j} \) are independent and \( M_{1j} \) is assumed to be uniformly distributed, the OTP cipher claims that \( K_{j-1} \) and \( C_j = K_{j-1} \oplus M_{1j} \) are independent and \( C_j \) is uniformly distributed (cf. Shannon [4]). Notice here that \( K_{j-1} \) is not necessarily uniformly distributed, and hence \( M_{1j} \) and \( C_j \) are not necessarily independent. On the other hand, \( Z_{j-1} \) may affect \( Z_j \) only through \( K_{j-1} N_j \) and inversely \( Z_{j-1} \) may be affected by \( Z_j \) only through \( C_j N_j \). This property plays the crucial role in evaluating the performance of our coding scheme (cf. Fig.4).

In the sequel we show that the information leakage to Eve \( I_E = I(M^b; Z^b|\mathcal{H}) \) over the whole \( b + 1 \) blocks goes to zero as \( n \to \infty \) (the strong secrecy).

To do so, we first proceed basically along the line of [16].

\[
A \triangleq I(M^b; Z^b|\mathcal{H}) \\
= \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_j; Z^b|M^{[j]}|\mathcal{H}) \\
\leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_j; Z^b|S_j M^{[j]}|\mathcal{H}) \\
\overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_j; Z^j|S_j\mathcal{H}) \\
= \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j} M_{1j}; Z^j|S_j\mathcal{H}) \\
= \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j} M_{1j}; Z^{j-1} S_j|S_j\mathcal{H}) \\
+ \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j} M_{1j}; Z_j|Z^{j-1} S_j S_j\mathcal{H}) \\
\overset{(c)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j} M_{1j}; Z_j|Z^{j-1} S_j S_j\mathcal{H})
\]
\[ B \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j}; Z_j | Z^{j-1} S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ C \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; Z_j | M_{0j} Z^{j-1} S_j \mathcal{H}), \]

with \( B \) following from the independence of \( M_j \) and \( S_j \) given \( M^{[j+1]} \mathcal{H} \); \( b \) follows from the Markov chain property \( M_j \rightarrow Z_j S_j \rightarrow Z^{[j+1]} M^{[j+1]} \) given \( \mathcal{H} \); \( c \) follows from the independence of \( M_{0j} M_{1j} S_j \) and \( Z_j \) given \( \mathcal{H} \).

Let us now separately evaluate \( B \) and \( C \) in (28) and (29). First,

\[ B = \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j}; Z_j | Z^{j-1} S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(Z^{j-1} M_{0j}; Z_j | S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ = \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j}; Z_j | S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ + \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(Z^{j-1}; Z_j | M_{0j} S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j}; Z_j | S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ + \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(Z^{j-1}; N_j M_{0j} S_j Z_j | \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ (d) \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j}; S_j Z_j | \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ + \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(N_j; Z^{j-1} | \mathcal{H}), \]

where \( d \) follows from the independence of \( M_{0j} \) and \( S_j \) and from the Markov chain property \( Z^{j-1} \rightarrow N_j \rightarrow M_{0j} S_j Z_j \) given \( \mathcal{H} \).

Next, \( C \) can be upper bounded as

\[ C = \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; Z_j | M_{0j} Z^{j-1} S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(Z^{j-1} M_{1j}; Z_j | M_{0j} S_j \mathcal{H}) \]

\[ = D + E, \]

(31)
where
\[
D \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; Z_j | M_{0j} S_j | \mathcal{H})
\]  
(32)

\[
E \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(Z_{j-1}; Z_j | M_{0j} M_{1j} S_j | \mathcal{H}).
\]  
(33)

Then,
\[
D \leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; C_j Z_j | M_{0j} S_j | \mathcal{H}) = F + G,
\]  
(34)

where
\[
F = \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; C_j | M_{0j} S_j | \mathcal{H}),
\]
\[
G = \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; Z_j | M_{0j} S_j C_j | \mathcal{H}).
\]  
(35)

Then,
\[
F = \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; C_j | M_{0j} S_j | \mathcal{H})
\]
\[
  \overset{(f)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; C_j)
\]
\[
  = H(C_j) - H(C_j | M_{1j})
\]
\[
  \overset{(k)}{=} H(C_j) - H(K_{j-1} | M_{1j})
\]
\[
  \overset{(g)}{=} H(C_j) - H(K_{j-1})
\]
\[
  \overset{(p)}{=} D(P_{K_{j-1}} || Q_{K_{j-1}}),
\]  
(36)

where (f) follows from the independence of \( M_{1j} C_j \) and \( M_{0j} S_j | \mathcal{H} \); (k) follows from \( K_{j-1} \oplus M_{1j} = C_j \); (g) follows from the independence of \( K_{j-1} \) and \( M_{1j} \); (p) follows from that \( C_j \) is uniformly distributed on the range of \( K_{j-1} \).

Moreover,
\[
G = \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{1j}; Z_j | M_{0j} S_j C_j | \mathcal{H})
\]
\[
  \overset{(e)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(K_{j-1}; Z_j | M_{0j} S_j C_j | \mathcal{H})
\]
\[
  \overset{(j)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(K_{j-1}; N_j | M_{0j} S_j C_j | \mathcal{H})
\]
\[
  \overset{(m)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(K_{j-1}; N_j),
\]  
(37)
where \((e)\) follows from \(C_j = K_{j-1} \oplus M_{1j} \); \((j)\) follows from the data processing lemma using the Markov chain property \(K_{j-1} \rightarrow N_j \rightarrow Z_j\) given \(M_{0j}S_jC_jH\); \((m)\) follows from the independence of \(K_{j-1}N_j\) and \(M_{0j}S_jC_jH\).

On the other hand,

\[
E \leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(Z^{j-1}; K_{j-1}N_j|Z_jM_{1j}S_jH) \\
\leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(Z^{j-1}; K_{j-1}N_j) \\
= I(K_{j-1}N_j; Z^{j-1}|H),
\]

(38)

where \((h)\) follows from the Markov chain property \(Z^{j-1} \rightarrow K_{j-1}N_j \rightarrow Z_j\) given \(M_{0j}M_{1j}S_jH\); \((i)\) follows from the independence of \(Z^{j-1}K_{j-1}N_jH\) and \(M_{0j}M_{1j}S_j\).

Thus, summarizing up \(27\) to \(38\), we have the upper bound on the information leakage to Eve \(I_E = I(M^b; Z^b|H)\) as

**Lemma 4 (Information leakage bound):**

\[
I(M^b; Z^b|H) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(M_{0j}; S_jZ_j|H) \\
+ \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(N_j; Z^{j-1}|H). \\
+ \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(K_{j-1}; N_j) \\
+ \sum_{j=1}^{b} D(P_{K_{j-1}}||Q_{K_{j-1}}) \\
+ \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(K_{j-1}N_j; Z^{j-1}|H).
\]

(39) (40) (41) (42) (43)

Here, the first term \(I(M_{0j}; S_jZ_j|H)\) specifies the resolvability performance for Eve; the second term \(I(N_j; Z^{j-1}|H)\) specifies the inter-block interaction effect in the block Markov coding scheme; the third and fourth terms \(I(K_{j-1}; N_j)\), \(D(P_{K_{j-1}}||Q_{K_{j-1}})\) specify the key performance for Bob; and the fifth term \(I(K_{j-1}N_j; Z^{j-1}|H)\) specifies the key performance for Eve.

The third and fourth ones are evaluated as follows. We can rewrite the security index \(S(\kappa(S_j)\sigma(sS_j)|Z_j)\) in \(21\) of Lemma 3 as

\[
S(\kappa(S_j)\sigma(S_j)|Z_j) \\
\geq D(P_{\kappa(S_j)\sigma(S_j)}||Q_{\kappa(S_j)\times \sigma(S_j)}) \\
= D(P_{\kappa(S_j)\sigma(S_j)}||P_{\kappa(S_j)} \times P_{\sigma(S_j)})
\]
\begin{align*}
+D(P_κ(\mathbf{S}_j)||Q_κ(\mathbf{S}_j)) + D(P_σ(\mathbf{S}_j)||Q_σ(\mathbf{S}_j)) \\
\geq D(P_κ(\mathbf{S}_j)σ(\mathbf{S}_j)||P_κ(\mathbf{S}_j) \times P_σ(\mathbf{S}_j)) \\
= I(κ(\mathbf{S}_j); σ(\mathbf{S}_j)) \\
= I(K_j; N_{j+1}). \tag{44}
\end{align*}

Moreover,

\begin{align*}
S(κ(\mathbf{S}_j)σ(\mathbf{S}_j)|Z_j) \\
\geq S(κ(\mathbf{S}_j)|Z_j) \\
= D(P_{K_j}||Q_{K_j}) + I(K_j; Z_j) \\
\geq D(P_{K_j}||Q_{K_j}). \tag{45}
\end{align*}

Therefore, Lemma 2 claims that

\begin{align*}
I(K_{j-1}; N_j) &\leq ε, \tag{46} \\
D(P_{K_{j-1}}||Q_{K_{j-1}}) &\leq ε. \tag{47}
\end{align*}

In order to evaluate the second and fifth ones, we use the following lemma, which is the Alice-only CSI counterpart of [16, Proposition 1]:

**Lemma 5 (Key secrecy lemma):** Let $ε > 0$ be an arbitrarily small number and let $R_1 + R_2 < H(S|Z)$ (cf. (19)). Then, for $j \in [1 : b]$,

\begin{align*}
i) \quad I(K_{j-1}N_j; Z_{j-1}|\mathcal{H}) &\leq ε, \tag{48} \\
ii) \quad I(K_{j-1}N_j; Z^{j-1}|\mathcal{H}) &\leq bε \tag{49}
\end{align*}

for all sufficiently large $n$. \hfill \Box

**Proof:** See Appendix A.

From (49) we immediately have

\begin{equation*}
I(N_j; Z^{j-1}|\mathcal{H}) \leq I(K_{j-1}N_j; Z^{j-1}|\mathcal{H}) \leq bε. \tag{50}
\end{equation*}

Now, what remains to be done is to evaluate the first one $I(M_0j; S_jZ_j|\mathcal{H})$. To do so, we invoke the following resolvability lemma:

**Lemma 6 (Resolvability lemma):** Let $ε > 0$ be an arbitrarily small number and let $\overline{R} - R_0 > I(U; SZ)$ (cf. (16)). Then,

\begin{equation*}
I(M_0j; S_jZ_j|\mathcal{H}) \leq ε \tag{51}
\end{equation*}

for all sufficiently large $n$. \hfill \Box

**Proof:** See Appendix B.
An immediate consequence of Lemma 4 together with (46), (47), (50) and (51) is
\[ I(M^b; Z^b | H) \leq (3b + 2b^2)\varepsilon, \] (52)
thereby completing the proof for Case 1).

B. Proof for Case 2) of $R_{CSI-1}$:

As was pointed out in the foregoing section, this case is subsumed by the following Case 3) (cf. (10)).

C. Case 3): Proof for the achievability of $R_{CSI-2}$:

The remainder of Theorem 1 to be proved is the achievability of $R_{CSI-2}$ (see (5) and (6)):
\[
C_{CSI}^S \geq \max_{p(u), p(x|u, s)} R_{CSI-2}(p(u), p(x|u, s)),
\] (53)
where
\[
R_{CSI-2}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min [H(S|Z) - H(S|UY), I(U; Y) - H(S|UY)].
\] (54)

The rate constraints in this case are listed as follows ($R_0 = 0$):
\[
\begin{align*}
\overline{R} &< I(U; Y), \\
R &= R_1, \\
R_2 &> H(S|UY), \\
R_1 + R_2 &< \overline{R}, \\
R_1 + R_2 &< H(S|Z).
\end{align*}
\] (55)-(59)

These constraints are the same as those in Case 1) with $R_0 = 0$, where constraint (16) is not necessary here because of $R_0 = 0$. Fourier-Motzkin elimination claims that the supremum of $R$ over all rates satisfying (55)∼(59) coincides with the right-hand side of (54), so it suffices to show that rates $R$ satisfying (55)∼(59) are achievable.

In this case too, the whole argument developed in the proof for Case 1) holds with $R_0 = 0$ as they are, where we notice that $I(M_0; S_j Z_j | H) = 0$ in Lemma 4 and hence Lemma 6 is not needed here, thereby completing the achievability proof for this case.

IV. SIMPLE ILLUSTRATIVE CASES

Thus far we have investigated achievability problems for WCs with CSI available only at the encoder (Alice) to establish Theorem 1 on lower bounds on the (strong) secrecy capacity $C_{CSI}^S$. In this section, in order to get several insights (secrecy capacity results) into this theorem, we consider the following simple cases.

Example 1 (Han et al. [27 Example 1]): Let us consider a binary wiretap channel with $U = X = Y = Z = S = \{0, 1\}$ such that
\[
\begin{align*}
Y &= X \oplus S, \\
Z &= X.
\end{align*}
\] (60)-(61)
where $\oplus$ denotes the module-two sum and $S$ is an additive CSI. Then, $I(X; Y) = I(X; X \oplus S) \leq H(X) = I(X; X) = I(X; Z)$ for any $X$, which means that $W_E$ is more capable than $W_B$ and hence in the case without CSI at the encoder the secrecy capacity $C_s$ is zero.

On the other hand, in the case with CSI at the encoder the secrecy capacity $C_s^{CSI}$ can be positive as is seen as follows: set $X = U \oplus S$ ($U \perp S$), then $Y = (U \oplus S) \oplus S = U$ and $Z = X = U \oplus S$, and thus we have

$$R_{CSI}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$$

$$= I(U; Y) - I(U; Z)$$

$$= H(U) - I(U; U \oplus S)$$

$$= H(U | U \oplus S) = H(S | U \oplus S)$$

$$= H(S),$$

where the last step follows by setting $U \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$ because then $S \perp U \oplus S$. Therefore, $C_s^{CSI} \geq H(S) > 0$. In a special case where at each time $i$ only the current CSI $S_i$ is available at Alice, the secrecy capacity $C_s^{CSI} = C_s^{NCSI}$ coincides with this $H(S)$ (cf. [21]).

**Example 2:** Similarly to Example 3, let us consider again a binary wiretap channel with $U = X = Y = Z = S = \{0, 1\}$ where

$$Y = X,$$

$$Z = X \oplus S.$$  \[(63)\]

Then, setting $X = U \oplus S$ ($U \perp S$), we have $Y = X = U \oplus S$ and $Z = X \oplus S = U$, and then $H(S | UY) = H(S | US) = 0$, $H(S | Z) = H(S | U) = H(S)$. Therefore,

$$I(U; Y) - I(U; SZ)$$

$$= H(U \oplus S) - H(S) - H(U)$$

$$= h(\varepsilon_u * \varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_u),$$

where

$$\varepsilon_u = \Pr\{U = 1\} \quad (0 \leq \varepsilon_u \leq 1/2),$$

$$\varepsilon_s = \Pr\{S = 1\} \quad (0 \leq \varepsilon_s \leq 1/2),$$

$$h(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1 - x) \log_2 (1 - x),$$

$$x * y = x(1 - y) + (1 - x)y = (1 - 2x)y + x.$$  \[(65)\]

\[1\] $U \perp S$ means that $U$ and $S$ are independent
It is easy to see that $x \ast y$ is linear in $y$ and $h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_u)$ is a monotone decreasing function of $0 \leq \varepsilon_s \leq 1/2$ because the binary entropy function $h(x)$ is concave in $x$. Thus,

$$h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_u) \leq 0,$$

which implies that it suffices, on the contrary to Example 1, to consider only achievable rates due to OTP cipher using the CSI $S$:

$$R_{CSI2}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ H(S|Z) - H(S|UY), I(U; Y) - H(S|UY) \right]$$
$$= \min \left[ H(S), I(U; Y) \right]$$
$$= \min \left[ H(S), H(U \oplus S) - H(S) \right]$$
$$= \min \left[ H(S), 1 - H(S) \right],$$

(67)

where the last step follows by setting $U \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$. Therefore, we have $C_{CSI}^S \geq \min[H(S), 1 - H(S)]$. □

**Example 3:** Here too we use the notation as in Examples 1, 2 and consider the binary WC as specified by

$$Y = X,$$  
(68)

$$Z = X \oplus S \oplus \Phi,$$  
(69)

where $U, S, \Phi$ are mutually independent and $\Phi$ plays the role of external “additive noise” independent from the CSI $S$. Now set again $X = U \oplus S$, then

$$Y = U \oplus S,$$  
(70)

$$Z = U \oplus \Phi.$$  
(71)

Then,

$$I(U; Y) - I(U; SZ)$$
$$= H(U \oplus S) - H(S) - [H(U \oplus \Phi) - H(\Phi)]$$
$$= h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_s) - [h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_{\phi}) - h(\varepsilon_{\phi})]$$

(72)

with $\varepsilon_{\phi} = \Pr\{\Phi = 1\}$, where it is obvious that $h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_s) \geq 0$ and $h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_{\phi}) - h(\varepsilon_{\phi}) \geq 0$ because $h(x)$ is an increasing function of $0 \leq x \leq 1/2$. Moreover, the concavity of $h(x)$ yields that

$$h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_s) - h(\varepsilon_s) \geq h(\varepsilon_u \ast \varepsilon_{\phi}) - h(\varepsilon_{\phi}),$$

(73)

provided that $0 \leq \varepsilon_s \leq \varepsilon_{\phi} \leq 1/2$, and hence the right-hand side on (72) is nonnegative. On the other hand, since

$$H(S|Z) - H(S|UY) = H(S) \geq 0,$$

$$I(U; Y) - H(S|UY) = H(U \oplus S) - H(S) \geq 0,$$

(74)
we have

\[ I(U;Y) - I(U;SZ) \\
+ \left[ H(S|Z) - H(S|UY) \right] \]

\[ = H(U \oplus S) - H(S) - \left[ H(U \oplus S) - H(S) \right] + H(S). \] (75)

Thus, in this case it suffices to evaluate achievable rates summarized as

\[ R_{CSI-1}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \]

\[ = \min \left[ H(U \oplus S) - H(S) - \left( H(U \oplus S) - H(S) \right) + H(S) \right] \]

\[ = \min \left[ H(U \oplus S) - H(S) \right], \] (76)

where the last step follows by setting \( U \sim \text{Bern}(1/2) \). Thus, \( C_{CSI}^S \geq C_{CSI}^S \geq \min[H(\Phi), 1 - H(S)] \). Here it should be noted that the concavity of \( h(x) \) guarantees that the last term \( \min[H(\Phi), 1 - H(S)] \) on (76) is actually the maximum value taken over all possible \( \varepsilon_u \). We notice here also that in this example Wyner’s WC coding and Shannon’s OTP cipher using the CSI \( S \) are both simultaneously working to attain higher achievable rates.

**Example 4:** Here too we use the notation as in Examples 1, 2 and consider the binary WC as specified by

\[ Y = X \oplus S \oplus \Psi, \] (77)

\[ Z = X \oplus S \oplus \Phi, \] (78)

where \( U, S, \Phi, \Psi \) are mutually independent, and \( \Phi, \Psi \) play the role of external “additive” noises independent from the CSI \( S \). We notice here that \( Z \) is a degraded version of \( Y \) in (77) and (78). Now let \( H(\Phi) > H(\Psi) \) and set again \( X = U \oplus S \), then

\[ Y = U \oplus \Psi, \] (79)

\[ Z = U \oplus \Phi. \] (80)

Since \( H(S|UY) = H(S|Z) = H(S) \) and hence \( H(S|Z) - H(S|UY) = 0 \), it suffices only to consider

\[ R_{CSI-0}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \]

\[ = I(U;Y) - I(U;Z) \]

\[ = H(U) - H(U|Y) - (H(U) - H(U|Z)) \]

\[ = H(U|Z) - H(U|Y) \]

\[ = H(U|U \oplus \Phi) - H(U|U \oplus \Psi) \]

\[ = H(\Phi|U \oplus \Phi) - H(\Psi|U \oplus \Psi) \]

\[ = H(\Phi) - H(\Psi), \] (81)
where the last step follows by setting $U \sim \text{Bern}(1/2)$.

On the other hand, in order to show the converse part, we invoke the following lemma where $C_{NCSI}^S$ denotes the (strong) secrecy capacity with noncausal CSI (instead of causal CSI) at the encoder:

**Lemma 7 (Chen and Vinck [7]):** Let us consider a WC with CSI $S$ such that $Z$ is a degraded version of $Y$. Then, the $C_{NCSI}^S$ with noncausal CSI at the encoder is upper bounded as

$$C_{NCSI}^S \leq \max_{X:U \sim S} (I(U;Y) - I(U;Z)),$$

where $U \sim S$ means that $U$ and $S$ may be correlated.

Let us evaluate the right-hand side of (82) as follows:

$$I(U;Y) = I(U;X \oplus S \oplus \Phi) = I(U \oplus S; X \oplus \Phi) = I(X, U \oplus S; X \oplus \Psi) - I(X; X \oplus \Psi|U \oplus S) = I(X; X \oplus \Psi) - I(X; X \oplus \Psi|U \oplus S).$$

Similarly,

$$I(U;Z) = I(X; X \oplus \Phi) - I(X; X \oplus \Phi|U \oplus S).$$

Hence,

$$I(U;Y) - I(U;Z) = I(X; X \oplus \Psi) - I(X; X \oplus \Phi) - (I(X; X \oplus \Psi|U \oplus S) - I(X; X \oplus \Phi|U \oplus S)).$$

We now notice that $X \oplus \Phi$ is a degraded version of $X \oplus \Psi$ to obtain

$$I(X; X \oplus \Psi|U \oplus S) \geq I(X; X \oplus \Phi|U \oplus S),$$

from which together with (85) it follows that

$$I(U;Y) - I(U;Z) \leq I(X; X \oplus \Phi) - I(X; X \oplus \Phi).$$

It is easy in a similar way to in Example 3 to see that

$$\max_{p(x)} (I(X; X \oplus \Psi) - I(X; X \oplus \Phi)) = H(\Phi) - H(\Psi).$$
Thus, as was intuitively expected, we have
\[ C_{\text{CSI}}^S = C_{\text{NCSI}}^S = H(\Phi) - H(\Psi). \]  
(89)

For comparison, let us consider the case where the encoder is not provided the CSI $S$. In this case, it is natural to regard $S$ as an additive noise to the channel, then the above argument yields the secrecy capacity formula:
\[ C_{\text{NA}}^S = H(S \oplus \Phi) - H(S \oplus \Psi). \]  
(90)

It is obvious that
\[ H(\Phi) - H(\Psi) > H(S \oplus \Phi) - H(S \oplus \Psi), \]  
(91)
which implies that here the existence of CSI $S$ indeed outperforms the channel without CSI. Formula (89) means that the secrecy capacity for this WC does not depend on $S$, which is a consequence of elimination of “noise” $S$ by making use of the CSI and is in nice accordance with the formula of Costa [31] on writing on (Gaussian) dirty paper. A Gaussian counterpart of Example 4 is discussed in Khisti, Diggavi and Wornell [24].

**Example 5:** In this example, as in Chia and El Gamal [16], let us consider a non-binary WC such that $p(y, z|x, s) = p(y, z|x)$ and $Z$ is a degraded version of $Y$. We first observe that
\[ R_{\text{CSI-0}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = I(U; Y) - I(U; Z) = I(X; Y) - I(X; Z) \]  
(92)

by setting $X = U$. Next, in order to show the converse part, we invoke Lemma 7 as follows:
\[ I(U; Y) - I(U; Z) \leq I(X; Y) - I(X; Z), \]  
(95)

On the other hand, owing the assumed degradedness, we have
\[ I(X; Y|U) = I(X; Z|U) + I(X; Y|UZ). \]  
(94)

Then, from (93) and (94) we have
\[ I(U; Y) - I(U; Z) \leq I(X; Y) - I(X; Z), \]  
(95)

Thus, in light of Lemma 7 together with (92) and (95) it is concluded that
\[ C_{\text{CSI}}^S = C_{\text{NCSI}}^S = \max_{p(x)}(I(X; Y) - I(X; Z)), \]  
(96)
Let us now compare this result and that in [16] with common CSI $S$ available at both the encoder and decoder, the secrecy capacity of which is given as

$$C_{\text{CSI}}^s = C_{\text{NCSI}}^s = \max_{p(x)} \left[ I(X; Y) - I(X; Z) + H(S), I(X; Y) \right].$$  \hfill (97)

Clearly, in (97) the CSI contributes to making achievable rates significantly higher by $H(S)$, whereas in (96) the CSI makes no contribution. This illustrates that “two-sided” CSI (available both at Alice and Bob) indeed can outperform “one-sided” CSI (available only at Alice).

\section{Comparison with the Previous Result}

We have so far studied the problem of how to convey confidential message over WCs with \textit{causal} CSI available only at Alice under the information leakage $I_E = I(M^b; Z^b) \to 0$ (called the strong secrecy criterion). In this connection, we notice that this kind of problem with \textit{causal} CSI has not yet been brought to enough attention of the researcher, although the problem for WCs with \textit{noncausal} CSI has extensively been investigated in the literature. On the other hand, to the best of our knowledge, Fujita \cite{19} is supposed to be the first who has significantly addressed the problem of WCs with \textit{causal} CSI available only at Alice (used for key agreement with Bob), although its \textit{noncausal} counterpart had been studied by Khisti, Diggavi and Wornell \cite{24}. In this section, we develop the comparison with our results.

In order to describe the main result of \cite{19} in our terminology, define

$$F_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min_{p(x)} \left[ I(U; SY) - I(U; SY) ight.$$ \hfill (98)

$$+ H(S|Z) - H(S|Y), \\
I(U; SY) - H(S|U),$$

and let $C_{\text{CSI}}^w$ denote the secrecy capacity under the weak secrecy criterion $\frac{1}{n} I(M^b; Z^b) \to 0$ instead of $C_{\text{CSI}}^s$. Then,

\textbf{Theorem 2 (Fujita \cite{19} Lemma 1):} Let us consider a degraded WC where $Z$ is a physically degraded version of $Y$, then

$$C_{\text{CSI}}^w \geq \max_{p(u), p(x|u, s)} F_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$$ \hfill (99)

holds.

For comparison, we rewrite $F_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s))$ in (98) as follows.

$$F_{\text{CSI-1}}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) = \min \left[ I(U; Y) - I(U; SY) ight.$$ \hfill (100)

$$+ H(S|Z) - H(S|UY), \\
I(U; Y) - H(S|UY)$$
which is justified because

\begin{align}
I(U; SY) &= I(U; Y) + I(U; S|Y), \\
H(S|Y) &= H(S|UY) + I(U; S|Y).
\end{align}

Recalling that

\begin{align}
R_{CSI-1}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) &= \min \left[ I(U; Y) - I(U; SZ) + H(S|Z) - H(S|UY), \\
&\quad I(U; Y) - H(S|UY) \right],
\end{align}

and comparing it with (100), it turns out that \( R_{CSI-1}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \) exactly coincides with \( F_{CSI-1}(p(u), p(x|u, s)) \).

On the other hand, however, we have to point out that there exist several crucial differences between [19] and this paper, which is due to the completely different approaches taken to the problem. These are summarized as follows.

- [19] assumes the physical degradedness of WC, whereas this paper makes no such assumption.
- [19] confines itself to within the weak secrecy criterion problem \( \frac{1}{b} I(M; Z) \to 0 \), whereas this paper employs the strong secrecy criterion approach \( I(M; Z) \to 0 \). As a consequence, all the results in [19] (and [16]) are guaranteed to hold as they are under the strong secrecy criterion too.
- In [19] all alphabets such as \( U, S, X, Y, Z \) are required to be finite, whereas in this paper \( U, X, Y, Z \) except for \( S \) may be arbitrary (including continuous alphabet cases), so that Theorem II as stated in Section II is directly applicable also to cope well with Gaussian WCs with causal CSI available at Alice.
- The fundamental mathematical tool in [19] to deal with the problem is the typical sequence argument (of course, well established), whereas in this paper the fundamental ingredients consist of Slepian-Wolf coding, Csiszár-Körner’s key construction, Gallager’s maximum likelihood decoding, and Han-Verdú’s resolvability argument (of course, well established). This methodological difference brings about a big change from the viewpoint of information theoretic perspective and applicability. One of the consequences is that the ways of proving the main theorem are completely different. This, for example, enabled us to naturally establish the strong secrecy property, which, as is well known, cannot be attained by the typical sequence argument.
- Most importantly, we see that there exists an indeed crucial difference between [19] and this paper from the coding theoretic standpoint. Seemingly, both invoke the block Markov coding scheme as devised in [15], which is furnished with a kind of forward-and-backward coding procedure.

However, in [19], the “recursive” forward-and-backward coding procedure is employed in the sense that the \( j \)-th encoding in each block \( j \) is carried out (which is carried over to the next block \( j + 1 \)) according to the order \( j = 1, 2, \cdots, b \). During this procedure over the total \( b \) blocks no decoding is carried out. When the encoding reaches the final block \( j = b \) the decoding procedure gets started, which is carried back to block \( j = b - 1 \). This decoding procedure is repeated backward according to the order \( j = b, b - 1, \cdots, 1 \), which causes at worst “\( 2b \) block decoding delay” in the whole process. This is an unpleasing disadvantage.
On the other hand, this paper employs the “iterative” forward-and-backward coding procedure in the sense that not only the $j$-th encoding in each block $j$ (which is carried over to the next block $j + 1$) but also the decoding for the previous block $j - 1$ are carried out according to the order $j = 1, 2, \cdots, b$. This one-way coding scheme causes only “one block decoding delay,” which is a great advantage.

Why is this difference? The reason for this is that in [19] the decoding operation in block $j$ is to be made upon receiving the information $S_j Y_j$ but the decoding operation for $S_j$ is postponed to the next block $j + 1$ and it is in turn postponed to block $j + 2$, and recursively so on to reach the final block $j = b$. Thus, actually, $S_j$ is decoded according to the order $j = b, b - 1, \cdots, 1$. In contrast with this, in this paper the decoding operation in block $j$ is made upon receiving the information $Y_j$, based on which $U_j$ is decoded and used to decode $S_{j-1}$ in block $j - 1$, and then proceed to the next block $j + 1$. This means that only one block decoding delay and hence low complexities are needed.

VI. Concluding Remarks

So far we have investigated the coding problem for WCs with causal CSI at Alice and/or Bob to establish reasonable lower bounds on the strong secrecy capacity, which are summarized as Theorems 1 (the key result in this paper). In particular, it was shown that the result on the system of Chia and El Gamal [16] is directly derivable from Theorem 1 in this paper.

Although Theorem 1 treats the WC with CSI available only at Alice, it actually provides also the fundamental basis for investigating general WCs with various directions of causal CSIs available among Alice, Bob and Eve. In this connection, the reader may refer, for example, to Khisti, Diggavi and Wornell [24], and Goldfeld, Cuff and Permuter [25].

As was pointed out in Section VI, the main ingredients thereby to establish Theorems 1 actually consist of the well established information-theoretic lemmas such as Slepian-Wolf coding, Csiszár-Körner’s key construction, Gallager’s maximum likelihood decoding, and Han-Verdu’s resolvability argument, while not invoking the celebrated argument of typical sequences, which enabled us to well handle also the case with alphabets not necessarily finite, for example, including the case of Gaussian WCs with CSI.

Since the whole proof of Theorem 1 has thus been elaborated to reduce to invoking those established lemmas, some people may wonder if Theorem 1 cannot be regarded as a meaningful contribution. In this connection, we would like to quote from [16] the following paragraph:

“We used key generation from state information to improve the message transmission rate. It may be possible to extend this idea to the case when the state information is available only at the encoder. This case, however, is not straightforward to analyze since it would be necessary for the encoder to reveal some state information to the decoder (and, hence, partially to the eavesdropper) in order to agree on a secret key, which would reduce the wiretap coding part of the rate.”

In this sense, the present paper can be regarded as giving a positive pleasing answer to this intriguing problem.
without resorting to any sophisticated novel techniques, and thus we conclude that this paragraph is already enough to evidence the relevant significance of Theorem\(^1\) as well as the whole process of proofs.

**APPENDIX A**

**PROOF OF LEMMA 5**

*Proof of i)*: We can rewrite the security index \(S(\kappa(S_j)\sigma(sS_j)|Z_j)\) in (21) of Lemma 2 as

\[
S(\kappa(S_j)\sigma(S_j)|Z_j) = S(K_j N_j+1|Z_j) = D(P_{K_j N_j+1}|Q_{K_j N_j+1}) + I(K_j N_j+1; Z_j) \geq I(K_j N_j+1; Z_j),
\]

which together with Lemma 2 gives i).

*Proof of ii)*: Here we use the following recurrence relation:

\[
I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z^{j-1}|H) = I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z_{j-1}|H) + I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z^{j-2}|Z_{j-1}|H) \leq I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z_{j-1}|H) + I(K_{j-2} N_{j-1} K_{j-1} N_j; Z^{j-2}|Z_{j-1}|H) \leq (j) I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z_{j-1}|H) + I(K_{j-2} N_{j-1}; Z^{j-2}|Z_{j-1}|H) \leq (k) I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z_{j-1}|H) + I(K_{j-2} N_{j-1}; Z^{j-2}|H),
\]

where \((j)\) follows from the Markov chain property \(Z^{j-2} \rightarrow K_{j-2} N_{j-1} \rightarrow K_{j-1} N_j\) given \(Z_{j-1}|H\); \((k)\) follows from the Markov chain property \(Z^{j-2} \rightarrow K_{j-2} N_{j-1} \rightarrow Z_{j-1}\) given \(H\). Then, taking the summation of both sides in (105) over \(j \in [1 : l] (1 \leq l \leq b)\) we have

\[
I(K_{l-1} N_l; Z^{l-1}|H) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z_{j-1}|H) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{b} I(K_{j-1} N_j; Z_{j-1}|H) = (m) b \varepsilon,
\]

where we have noticed that \(I(K_{j-2} N_{j-1}; Z^{j-2}|H) = 0\) for \(j = 1\) and \((m)\) follows from i) of Lemma 5 thereby completing the proof.
APPENDIX B

PROOF OF LEMMA 6

The proof is carried out basically along the line of Han and Verdú [30, (8.3)] and Hayashi [20, Theorem 3]). We evaluate here the resolvability in terms of $I(M_0; S_j Z_j | H)$ under rate constraint

$$\overline{R} - R_0 > I(U; SZ),$$

which is developed as follows.

For each $m_0 \in [1 : 2^{nR_0}]$, let $U(m_0)$ denote the random variable $u_j(L(m_0))$ where $L(m_0)$ is distributed uniformly on the bin $B(m_0)$ with rate constraint (107), and define the channel

$$W(t | u) \overset{\Delta}{=} P_{T(m_0)}|U(m_0),$$

where $T(m_0) \overset{\Delta}{=} (S(m_0), Z(m_0))$, $t \overset{\Delta}{=} (s, z)$ and we notice that $P_{S(m_0)Z(m_0) | U(m_0)}$ does not depend on $m_0$, so that we can write $P_{USZ}$ instead of $P_{U(m_0)S(m_0)Z(m_0)}$. Now, set

$$L_n = 2^n(\overline{R} - R_0)$$

and

$$i_{UW}(u, t) = \log \frac{W(t | u)}{P_T(t)}.$$

Then,

$$I(M_0; S_j Z_j | H) = \frac{1}{2^{nR_0}} \sum_{m_0=1}^{2^{nR_0}} \mathbb{E}_H D(P_{T(m_0)}|U(m_0)) || P_{T(m_0)}) \leq (a) \mathbb{E}_H D(P_{T | U}) || P_T)$$

$$= \sum_{t \in S^n \times Z^n} \sum_{c_1 \in U^n} \cdots \sum_{c_{L_n} \in U^n} P_U(c_1) \cdots P_U(c_{L_n}) \cdot \frac{1}{L_n} \sum_{j=1}^{L_n} W(t | c_j) \log \left( \frac{1}{L_n} \sum_{k=1}^{L_n} \exp i_{UW}(c_k, t) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{c_1 \in U^n} \cdots \sum_{c_{L_n} \in U^n} P_U(c_1) \cdots P_U(c_{L_n}) \cdot \sum_{t \in S^n \times Z^n} W(t | c_1) \log \left( \frac{1}{L_n} \sum_{k=1}^{L_n} \exp i_{UW}(c_k, t) \right) \leq (b) \sum_{c_1 \in U^n} \sum_{t \in S^n \times Z^n} W(t | c_1) P_U(c_1)$$

$$\cdot \log \left( \frac{1}{L_n} \exp i_{UW}(c_1, t) + \frac{1}{L_n} \sum_{k=2}^{L_n} E \exp i_{UW}(C_k, t) \right) \leq (c) \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{1}{L_n} \exp i_{UW}(U, T) \right) \right],$$

(110)
where (a) follows from the symmetry of the random code \(H\); (b) follows from the concavity of the logarithm; (c) is the result of

\[
E[\exp iW(C_k, t)] = 1
\]

for all \(t \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n\) and \(k = 1, 2, \cdots, L_n\). Now, with \(Q(u) = P_U(u)\), apply a simple inequality with \(0 < \rho < 1\) and \(x \geq 0\):

\[
\log(1 + x) = \frac{\log(1 + x^\rho)}{\rho} \leq \frac{\log(1 + x^\rho)}{\rho} \leq \frac{x^\rho}{\rho}
\]

to (110) to eventually obtain

\[
I(M_{0j}; S_j Z_j | H) \leq \frac{1}{\rho L_n^2} E\left( \frac{W(T|U)}{P_T(T)} \right)^\rho
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\rho L_n^2} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n} \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u) \left( \frac{W(t|u)}{P_T(t)} \right)^\rho
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\rho L_n^2} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n} \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u)^{1+\rho} P_T(t)^{-\rho}.
\]  

On the other hand, by virtue of Hölder’s inequality,

\[
\left( \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u)^{1+\rho} \right) P_T(t)^{-\rho}
\]

\[
= \left( \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u)^{1+\rho} \right) \left( \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u) \right)^{-\rho}
\]

\[
\leq \left( \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u)^{1+\rho} \right)^{1-\rho}
\]  

for \(0 < \rho < 1\). Therefore, it follows from (108) that

\[
I(M_{0j}; S_j Z_j | H) \leq \frac{1}{\rho L_n^2} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n} \left( \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u)^{1+\rho} \right)^{1-\rho}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\rho} \exp \left[ -n\rho(\overline{R} - R_0) + E_0(\rho, Q) \right],
\]  

where

\[
E_0(\rho, Q) = -\log \left[ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n} \left( \sum_{u \in U^n} Q(u)W(t|u)^{1+\rho} \right)^{1-\rho} \right].
\]  

Then, by means of Gallager [27] Theorem 5.6.3, we have \(E_0(\rho, Q)|_{\rho=0} = 0\) and

\[
\frac{\partial E_0(\rho, Q)}{\partial \rho} |_{\rho=0} = -I(Q, W)
\]

\[
= -I(U; SZ)
\]

\[
(d) = -nIU; SZ,
\]  

\[(115)\]
where \((d)\) follows because \((U, SZ)\) is a correlated i.i.d. sequence with generic variable \((U, SZ)\). Thus, for any small constant \(\tau > 0\) there exists a \(\rho_0 > 0\) such that, for all \(0 < \rho \leq \rho_0\),

\[
E_0(\rho, Q) \geq -n\rho(1 + \tau)I(U; SZ)
\]

which is substituted into \((113)\) to obtain

\[
I(M_{0j}; S_j; Z_j | \mathcal{H}) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \exp \left[ -n\rho(\overline{R} - R_0 - (1 + \tau)I(U; SZ)) \right].
\]

On the other hand, in view of \((107)\), with some \(\delta > 0\) we can write

\[
\overline{R} - R_0 = I(U; SZ) + 2\delta,
\]

which leads to

\[
\overline{R} - R_0 - (1 + \tau)I(U; SZ) = I(U; SZ) + 2\delta - I(U; SZ) - \tau I(U; SZ) = 2\delta - \tau I(U; SZ).
\]

We notice here that \(\tau > 0\) can be arbitrarily small, so that the last term on the right-hand side of \((119)\) can be made larger than \(\delta > 0\). Then, \((117)\) yields

\[
I(M_{0j}; S_j; Z_j | \mathcal{H}) \leq \frac{1}{\rho} \exp[-n\rho\delta],
\]

which implies that, for any small \(\varepsilon > 0\),

\[
I(M_{0j}; S_j; Z_j | \mathcal{H}) \leq \varepsilon
\]

for all sufficiently large \(n\), completing the proof of Lemma \[6\].
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