Abstract—Consider a random access communication scenario over a channel whose operation is defined for any number of possible transmitters. Inspired by the model recently introduced by Polyanskiy for the Multiple Access Channel (MAC) with a fixed, known number of transmitters, we assume that the channel is invariant to permutations on its inputs, and that all active transmitters employ identical encoders. Unlike Polyanskiy, we consider a scenario where neither the transmitters nor the receiver know which transmitters are active. We refer to this agnostic communication setup as the Random Access Channel, or RAC. Limited feedback is used to ensure that the collection of active transmitters remains fixed during each epoch. The decoder is tasked with determining from the channel output the number of active transmitters (k) and their messages but not which transmitter sent which message. The decoding procedure occurs at a time $t_i$, depending on the decoder's estimate of the number of active transmitters, thereby achieving a rate that varies with the number of active transmitters. Single-bit feedback at each time $t_i$, $i \leq t$, enables all transmitters to determine the end of one coding epoch and the start of the next. The central result of this work demonstrates the achievability on a RAC of performance that is first-order optimal for the MAC in operation during each coding epoch. While prior multiple access schemes for a fixed number of transmitters require $2^k - 1$ simultaneous threshold rules, the proposed scheme uses a single threshold rule and achieves the same dispersion.

I. INTRODUCTION

Access points like WiFi hot spots and cellular base stations are, for wireless devices, the gateway to the network. Unfortunately, access points are also the network’s most critical bottleneck. As more kinds of devices become network-reliant, both the number of communicating devices and the diversity of their communication grows. Little is known about how to code under high variation in the number and variety of communicators.

Multiple-transmitter channels are well understood in information theory only when the number and identities of transmitters are fixed and known. Even in this known-transmitter regime, information-theoretic solutions are too complex to implement. As a result, orthogonalization methods, such as TDMA, FDMA, and orthogonal CDMA, are used instead. Orthogonalization strategies simplify coding by allocating resources (e.g. time slots) among the transmitters, but such methods can at best attain a sum-rate equal to the single-transmitter capacity of the channel, which is significantly smaller than the maximal multi-transmitter sum-rate.

Most random access protocols currently in use rely on collision avoidance, which again cannot surpass the single-transmitter capacity of the channel and may be significantly worse since the unknown transmitter set makes it difficult to schedule or coordinate among transmitters. Collision avoidance is achieved through variations of the legacy (slotted) ALOHA and carrier sense multiple access (CSMA) algorithms. ALOHA, which uses random transmission times and back-off schedules, achieves only about 37% of the single-transmitter capacity of the channel [2]. In CSMA, each transmitter tries to avoid collisions by verifying the absence of other traffic before starting a transmission over the shared channel; when collisions do occur, for example because two transmitters begin transmission at the same time, all transmissions are aborted, and a jamming signal is sent to be sure that all transmitters are aware of the collision. The procedure starts again at a random time, which again introduces inefficiencies.

The state of the art in random access coding is “treating interference as noise,” which is part of newer CDMA-based standards. While this strategy can deal with random access better than ALOHA, it is still far inferior to the theoretical limits.

Even from a purely theoretical perspective, a satisfactory solution to random access remains to be found. The MAC model in which a fixed number k out of the total available K transmitters are always active was studied by D’yachkov-Rykov [3] and Mathys [4] for zero-error coding on a noiseless adder MAC and Bassalygo and Pinsker [5] for an asynchronous model in which the information is considered erased if more than one transmitter is active at a time. See [6] for a more detailed history. While zero-error code designs are mathematically elegant, they are also combinatorial in nature, and thus their complexity scales exponentially with the number of transmitters. Two-layer MAC decoders, with outer layer codes that work to remove channel noise and inner layer codes that work to resolve conflicts, are proposed in [7], [8]. Like the codes in [3], [4], the codes in [5], [7] are designed for a predetermined number of transmitters, k; it is not clear how robust they are to randomness in the transmitters’ arrivals and departures. In [9], Minero et al. study a random access model in which the receiver knows the transmitter activity pattern, and the transmitters opportunistically send data at the highest possible rate. The receiver recovers only a portion of the messages sent, depending on the current level of activity in the channel.
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This paper poses the question of whether it is possible, in a scenario where no one knows how many transmitters are active, for the receiver to almost always recover the messages sent by all active transmitters. Surprisingly, we find that not only is reliable decoding possible in this regime, but, for the class of permutation-invariant channels considered in [6], it is possible to attain both the capacity and the dispersion of the MAC in operation; that is, we do as well in first- and second-order performance as if the transmitter activity were known everywhere a priori. Since the capacity region of a MAC varies with the number of transmitters, it is tempting to believe that the transmitters of a random access system must somehow vary their codebook size in order to match their transmission rate to the capacity region of the MAC in operation. Instead, we here allow the decoder to vary its decoding time depending on the observed channel output—thereby adjusting the rate at which each transmitter communicates by changing not the size but the blocklength of each transmitter’s codebook.

Codes that can accommodate variable decoding times are called rateless codes. Rateless codes originate with the work of Burnashev [10], who computed the error exponent of variable-length coding over a known point-to-point channel. Polyanskiy et al. [11] provides a dispersion-style analysis of the same scenario. A practical implementation of rateless codes for an erasure channel with an unknown erasure probability appears in [12]. An analysis of rateless coding over an unknown binary symmetric channel appears in [13] and is extended to an arbitrary discrete memoryless channel in [14], [15] using a decoder that tracks Goppa’s empirical mutual information and decodes once that quantity passes a threshold. In [16], Jeffrey’s prior is used to weigh unknown channels. A rateless code for noiseless random access is described in [17]: each user transmits replicas of its message in multiple time slots, possibly colliding with the messages of other transmitters. At the end of each time slot, the decoder attempts to apply successive interference cancellation starting with the messages received without collision and subsequently removing the associated interference from the time slots in which replicas are transmitted. The decoder then decides whether to terminate an epoch or to ask the transmitters to send more replicas.

Unlike the codes described in [10]–[17], which allow truly arbitrary decoding times, in this paper we allow decoding only at a predetermined list of possible times $n_0, n_1, n_2, \ldots$. This strategy both eases practical implementation and reduces feedback. In particular, the schemes in [10]–[17] transmit a single-bit acknowledgment message from the decoder to the encoder(s) once the decoder completes its decoding process. Because the decoding time is random, this so-called “single-bit” feedback forces the transmitter(s) to listen to the channel constantly, at every time step trying to discern whether or not a transmission was received. This either requires full-duplex devices or doubles the effective blocklength and can be quite expensive. Thus while the receiver technically sends only “one bit” of feedback, the transmitters receive one bit of feedback (with the alphabet \{“transmission”, “no transmission”\}) in every time step, giving a feedback rate of 1 bit per channel use rather than a total of 1 bit. In our framework, acknowledgment bits are sent only at times $n_0, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_t$, where each $n_t$ is the decoding time if the receiver believes that $i$ transmitters are active, and $n_0 \leq n_1 \leq \ldots \leq n_t$. Thus the transmitters must listen only at a finite collection of time steps, giving a total number of feedback bits equal to one plus (the receiver’s estimate of) the number of transmitters, a feedback rate approaching 0 bits per channel use as the blocklength grows.

In the central portion of this paper, we view the random access channel as a collection of all possible MACs that might arise as a result of the transmitter activity pattern. Barring the intricacies of multiuser decoding, viewing an unknown channel as a collection of possible channels, without assigning an a priori probability to each, is known as the compound channel model [18]. In the context of single-transmitter compound channels, it is known that if the decoding time is fixed, the transmission rate cannot exceed the capacity of the weakest channel from the collection [18], while the dispersion may be better (smaller) [19]. With feedback and allowing a variable decoding time, one can do much better [13]–[16].

In [6], Polyanskiy argues for removing the transmitter identification task from the physical layer encoding and decoding procedures of a MAC. As he points out, such a scenario was previously discussed by Berger [20] in the context of conflict resolution. Polyanskiy further suggests studying MACs whose conditional channel output distributions are insensitive to input permutations. For such channels, provided that all transmitters use the same codebook, the receiver can at best hope to recover the messages sent, without recovering the transmitter identity. In Section IV, we build a random access communication model from a family of permutation-invariant MACs and employ identical encoders at all transmitters and identity-blind decoding at the receiver. Although not critical for the feasibility of our approach, these assumptions lead to a number of pleasing simplifications of both our scheme and its analysis. For example, the collection of MACs comprising our compound random access channel model can be parameterized by the number of active transmitters rather than by the full transmitter activity pattern. If the maximum number of transmitters is finite, the analysis of identity-blind decoding differs little from traditional analyses that use independent realizations of a random codebook at each transmitter. We elaborate on this small difference in Section V, where we discuss an extension of our strategy to allow for transmitter identity decoding.

We provide a second-order analysis of the rate universally achieved by our multiuser scheme over all transmitter activity patterns, taking into account the possibility that the decoder may misdetect the current activity pattern and decode for a wrong channel. Leveraging our observation that for a symmetric MAC, the fair rate point is not a corner point of the capacity region, we are able to show that a single-threshold decoding rule attains the fair rate point. This differs significantly from traditional MAC analyses, in which $2^k - 1$ simultaneous threshold rules are used. In the context of a MAC with a known number of transmitters, second-order analyses...
of multiple-threshold decoding rules are given in [21]–[24] (finite alphabet MAC), and in [25] (Gaussian MAC). A non-asymptotic analysis of variable-length coding with “single-bit” feedback over a (known) Gaussian MAC appears in [26].

Other relevant recent works on the MAC include the following. To account for massive numbers of transmitters, Chen and Guo [27], [28] introduced a notion of capacity for the multiple access scenario in which the maximal number of transmitters grows with the blocklength and an unknown subset of transmitters is active at a given time. They showed that time sharing, which achieves the conventional MAC capacity, is inadequate to achieve capacity in that regime. Sarwate and Gastpar showed in [29] that rate-0 feedback, such as the feedback in our approach, does not increase the capacity of the discrete memoryless MAC. In compound MACs, it is possible to increase the capacity with limited feedback by using a simple training phase to estimate the channel state, though no such scheme increases that capacity beyond the rate achievable when the state is known to the encoders and the decoder [29].

In short, this paper develops a random access architecture that can handle uncoordinated transmissions of a large and random number of transmitters and delivers theoretical performance guarantees. Our system model and the proposed communication strategy are laid out in Section II. The main result is presented in Section III. The proofs are found in Section IV. An extension of our strategy that enables transmitter identity decoding is discussed in Section V. Interestingly, the problem of decoding for \( K \geq 1 \) unknown transmitters is substantially different from the problem of detecting whether there are any active transmitters at all. Universal hypothesis tests to solve the latter are described in Section VI. The discussion in Section VII concludes the paper.

II. PROBLEM SETUP

For any positive integers \( i,j \), we let \( [i] = \{1, \ldots, i\} \) and \( [i : j] = \{i, \ldots, j\} \), where \( [i : j] = \emptyset \) when \( i > j \).

For any sequence \( x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t) \) and any ordered set \( C \subseteq \mathbb{N} \), we denote vector \( x_C = (x_c : c \in C) \). All-zero and all-one vectors are denoted by \( \mathbf{0} \) and \( \mathbf{1} \), respectively. For any vectors \( x_C \) and \( y_C \), we write \( x_C \leq y_C \) if \( x_c \leq y_c \) for all \( c \in C ; x_C = y_C \) if there exists a permutation \( \pi \) of \( y_C \) such that \( x_C = \pi(y_C) ; x_C \neq y_C \) if \( x_C \neq \pi(y_C) \) for all permutations \( \pi \) of \( y_C \). For any set \( A \), \( \{A\} = \{B : B \subset A \mid |B| = k\} \). We employ the standard \( o(\cdot) \) and \( O(\cdot) \) notations: \( f(n) = o(g(n)) \) if \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 0 \), and \( f(n) = O(g(n)) \) if \( \limsup_{n \to \infty} \left| \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} \right| < \infty \).

A memoryless symmetric random access channel (henceforth called simply a RAC) is a memoryless channel with 1 receiver and an unknown number of transmitters. It is described by a family of stationary, memoryless MACs

\[
\left\{ \left( X^k, P_{Y^k|x^k} (y^k | x^k), Y^k \right) \right\}_{k=0}^{K} \text{, (1)}
\]

each indexed by a number of transmitters, \( k \); the maximal number of transmitters is \( K \) for some \( K \leq \infty \). When \( k = 0 \), no transmitters are active; we discuss this case separately below. For \( k \geq 1 \), the \( k \)-transmitter MAC has input alphabet \( X^k \), output alphabet \( Y^k \), and conditional distribution \( P_{Y^k|x^k} \). When \( k \) transmitters are active, the RAC output is \( Y = Y^k \).

By assumption, the impact of a channel input on the channel output is independent of the transmitter from which it comes; therefore each channel in (1) is assumed to be permutation-invariant \([6]\), giving

\[
P_{Y^k|x^k} (y^k | x^k) = P_{Y^k|x^k} (y^k | \hat{x}^k) \quad \forall \hat{x}^k \subseteq x^k \text{. (2)}
\]

Since, for any \( s < k \), a MAC-\( s \) is physically identical to a MAC-\( k \) operated with \( s \) active and \( k - s \) silent transmitters, we use \( 0 \in X' \) to represent transmitter silence and require reducibility:

\[
P_{Y^k|x^k} (y|x^k) = P_{Y^k|x^k} (y|x^k, 0^{k-s}) \text{ (3)}
\]

for all \( s < k \), \( x^k \in X^k \), and \( y \in Y^k \). An immediate consequence of reducibility is that \( Y^s \subseteq Y^k \) for any \( s < k \). Another consequence is that when there are no active transmitters, the MAC \( \{X^0, P_{Y^0|x^0} (y|x^0), Y_0\} \) satisfies \( X^0 = \{0\} \) and \( P_{Y_0|x^0} (y|x^0) = P_{Y^k|x^k} (y|0^k) \) for all \( k \).

We here propose a new RAC communication strategy. In the proposed strategy, communication occurs in epochs, with each epoch beginning in the time step following the previous epoch’s end. Each epoch ends with a positive acknowledgment bit (ACK), which the receiver broadcasts to all transmitters. At the beginning of each epoch, each transmitter independently decides whether to be active or silent in that epoch; the decision is binding for the length of the epoch, meaning that a transmitter must either actively transmit for all time steps in the epoch or remain silent for the same period. Thus while the total number of transmitters is potentially unlimited and may change arbitrarily from one epoch to the next, the number of active transmitters, \( k \), stays constant during the entire transmission period between two positive ACKs.

Each transmitter uses the epoch to describe a message \( W \) from the alphabet \([M]\); when the active transmitters are \([k]\), the messages \( W[k] \in [M]^k \) are independent and uniformly distributed. The receiver makes a decision at each time \( n_0, n_1, \ldots \), choosing to end the epoch at time \( n_0 \) if it believes no transmitters are active, and choosing to decode at time \( n_1 \) if it believes that at that time that the number of active transmitters is \( t \). The transmitters are informed of the decoder’s decision about when to stop transmitting through a single-bit acknowledgment \( Z_i \) broadcasted at each time \( n_i \) with \( i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, t\} \); here \( Z_i = 0 \) for all \( i < t \) and \( Z_i = 1 \), with “1” signaling the end of one epoch and the beginning of the next.

It is important to stress that in this domain, each transmitter knows nothing about the set of active transmitters \( A \subset \mathbb{N} \) beyond its own membership and what it learns from the receiver’s feedback, and the receiver knows nothing about \( A \) beyond what it learns from the channel output \( Y \); we call this agnostic random access. In addition, since designing a
different encoder for each transmitter is expensive from the perspective of both code design and code operation, as in [6], we assume that every transmitter employs the same encoder; we call this identical encoding. Under these assumptions, what the transmitters and receiver can learn about $A$ is quite limited.

In particular, together, the properties of the permutation-invariance and identical encoding imply that the decoder can at best distinguish which messages were transmitted rather than by whom they were sent. In practice, transmitter identity could be included in the header of each log $M$-bit message or at some other layer of the stack; transmitter identity is not, however, handled by the RAC code. Instead, since the channel output statistics depend on the dimension of the channel input but not the identity of the active transmitters, the receiver’s task is to decode the messages transmitted but not the identities of their senders. We therefore assume without loss of generality that $|A| = k$ implies $A = [k]$, and thus the family of $k$-transmitter MACs in (2) indeed fully describes the behavior of a RAC.\footnote{\footnotetext{1}}

The single-bit feedback strategy described above uses rateless coding to deal with the agnostic nature of random access. Specifically, the code design fixes the blocklengths $n_0 < n_1 < n_2 < \ldots < n_k$, where $n_k$ is the decoding blocklength when the decoder believes that the number of active transmitters $k$ is equal to $t$. As we show in Section IV below, with an appropriately designed decoding rule, correct decoding is performed at time $n_k$ with high probability. Naturally, the greater the number of active transmitters, the longer it takes to decode. Since the argument employed to bound the performance of our proposed codes relies on a random design algorithm, we index the family of possible codes by the elements of some set $U$ and include $u \in U$ as an argument for both the RAC encoder and the RAC decoder. We then represent random encoding as the application of a code indexed by some random variable $U \in U$ chosen independently for each new epoch. Deterministic codes are represented under this code definition by setting the distribution on $U$ as $P[U = u_0] = 1$ for some $u_0 \in U$. The following definition formalizes such rateless codes for agnostic random access.

**Definition 1.** An $(M, \{(n_k, \epsilon_k)\}_{k=0}^K)$ RAC code comprises a (rateless) encoding function\footnote{\footnotetext{2}}

$$f: U \times [M] \rightarrow X^{nk}$$

and a collection of decoding functions:

$$g_k: U \times X^{nk} \rightarrow [M]^k \cup \epsilon, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, K$$

where\footnote{\footnotetext{3}} $|U| \leq K + 1$. At the start of each epoch, a random variable $U \in U$ with probability distribution $P_U$ is generated independently of the transmitter activity and revealed to the transmitters and the receiver, thereby initializing the encoders and the decoder. If $k$ transmitters are active, then, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_k$, the $k$ messages are correctly decoded at time $n_k$. That is,\footnote{\footnotetext{4}}

$$\frac{1}{M^k} \sum_{\mathcal{L} \in [M]^k} \mathbb{P}\left[ \left\{ g_k(U, X_{nk}) \neq \mathcal{L} \right\} \cup \left\{ k-1 \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \{ g_t(U, X_{nt}) \neq \epsilon \} \right\} \mid W[k] = \mathcal{L} \right] \leq \epsilon_k, \quad (6)$$

where $W[k]$ are the independent and equiprobable messages of transmitters $[k]$, and the given probability is calculated using the conditional distribution $P_{Y_{nk} | X_{nk}} = P_{Y_k | X_k}$, where $X_{nk} = f(U, W_s | X_{nk})$, $s = 1, \ldots, k$. If $k = 0$ transmitters are active, the unique message in set $[M]^0 = \{0\}$ is decoded at time $n_0$, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon_0$. That is,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[ g_0(U, X_{0n}) \neq 0 \mid W[0] = 0 \right] \leq \epsilon_0. \quad (7)$$

Implementing a RAC code with random code choice $U$ can be accomplished by treating the random variable $U$ that specifies the codebook used in the current epoch as common randomness available to the transmitters and the receiver. Operationally, this common randomness can be implemented by allowing the receiver to choose random instance $U$ at the start of each epoch and to broadcast that value to the transmitters just after the ACK bit that ends the previous epoch. While broadcasting the value of $U$ increases the epoch-ending feedback from 1 bit to $\lceil \log|U| \rceil + 1$ bits, Theorem 7 shows that $|U| \leq K + 1$ suffices to achieve the optimal performance. At the start of each epoch, transmitters decide whether to be active or silent independently of the codebook indicated by the $\log|U|$-bit string. In Section IV, we employ a general random coding argument to show that a given error vector $(\epsilon_0, \ldots, \epsilon_K)$ is achievable when averaged over the ensemble of codes. Unfortunately, this traditional approach does not show the existence of a deterministic RAC code, i.e. a code with $|U| = 1$, that achieves the given error vector $(\epsilon_0, \ldots, \epsilon_K)$, since showing that the random code’s expected error probability meets each of our $K + 1$ error constraints, does not show directly that any of the codes in the ensemble meets all of our error constraints simultaneously. A similar issue arises in [11], [30]. For example, in [11], a variable-length feedback code needs to satisfy both that the average error cannot exceed $\epsilon$ and that the expected decoding time cannot exceed $\ell$. To design a single code satisfying both constraints, [11] relies on common randomness. Similarly, in [30], a variable-length feedback code must satisfy an error exponent criterion for a continuum of binary symmetric or Z channels, and the existence of a deterministic code is shown by exploiting the ordering among the channels in the given family. While channel symmetry likely can be leveraged to show the existence of a deterministic code [11, eq. (29)], the
symmetries in a RAC are rather different from those in point-to-point channels. We leave that question for future work.

The code model introduced in Definition 1 employs identical encoding in addition to common randomness. Under identical encoding, each transmitter uses the same encoder, f, to form a codeword of length $n_K \ (n_K \leq \infty)$. That codeword is fed into the channel symbol by symbol. According to Definition 1, if $k$ transmitters are active, then with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon_k$, the decoder recovers the sent messages correctly after observing the first $n_k$ channel outputs. As noted previously, the decoder $g_k$ does not attempt to recover transmitter identity; successful decoding means that the list of messages it outputs coincides with the list of messages sent.

The following definitions are useful for the discussion that follows. When $k$ transmitters are active, marginal distribution $P_{Y_k}$ is determined by input distribution $P_{X(k)}$. The information density and conditional information density are defined as

\begin{align*}
  i_k(x_A; y_k) & \triangleq \log \frac{P_{Y_k|X_A}(y_k|x_A)}{P_{Y_k}(y_k)} \quad (8) \\
  i_k(x_A; y_k|x_B) & \triangleq \log \frac{P_{Y_k|X_A,x_B}(y_k|x_A,x_B)}{P_{Y_k|x_B}(y_k|x_B)} \quad (9)
\end{align*}

for any $A, B \subseteq [k]$, $x_A \in X_A$, $x_B \in X_B$, and $y_k \in Y_k$; here $i_k(x_A; y_k|x_B)$ when $B = \emptyset$ and $i_k(x_A; y_k|x_B) \equiv 0$ when $y_k \notin Y_k$ or $A = \emptyset$. The corresponding mutual informations are

\begin{align*}
  I_k(X_A; Y_k) & \triangleq \mathbb{E}[i_k(X_A; Y_k)] \quad (10) \\
  I_k(X_A; Y_k|X_B) & \triangleq \mathbb{E}[i_k(X_A; Y_k|X_B)] \quad (11).
\end{align*}

Throughout the paper, we also denote for brevity

\begin{align*}
  I_k & \triangleq I_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k), \\
  V_k & \triangleq \text{Var} [i_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k)] . \quad (13)
\end{align*}

Since the decoder does not know the number of transmitters ($k$), the decoder may evaluate the information density $i_t(x_A; y_k)$ for more than one candidate value $t$ of the number of transmitters. The expected value of the $t$th information density $i_t(x_A; y_k)$ evaluated on channel output $Y_k$ is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[i_t(X_A; Y_k)]$.

To ensure the existence of codes satisfying the error constraints in Definition 1, we assume that there exists a $P_X$ such that when $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_K$ are distributed i.i.d. $P_X$, then the conditions in (14)–(19) below are satisfied.

The friendliness assumption states that for all $s \leq k \leq K$,

\begin{align*}
  I_k(X_{[s]}; Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]} = 0^{k-s}) \geq I_k(X_{[s]}; Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]}). \quad (14)
\end{align*}

Friendliness implies that a transmitter that remains silent is at least as good from the perspective of the decoder as a transmitter that reveals its transmission to the decoder.

Naturally, (14) can always be satisfied with an appropriate designation of the “silence” symbol.

The interference assumption states that for any $s$ and $t$, $X_{[s]}$ and $X_{[s+1:t]}$ are conditionally dependent given $Y_k$, giving

\begin{align*}
  P_{X_[s]|Y_k} \neq P_{X_{[s]}|Y_k} \cdot P_{X_{[s+1:t]}|Y_k} \quad \forall 1 \leq s < t \leq k, \forall k. \quad (15)
\end{align*}

Assumption (15) eliminates all trivial RACs in which different transmitters do not interfere.

In order for the decoder to be able to distinguish the time-$n_0$ output $Y_{n_0}$ when no transmitters are active from the time-$n_0$ output $Y_{n_0}$ when $k \geq 1$ transmitters are active, we assume that there exists a $\delta_0 > 0$ such that the output distributions satisfy

\begin{align*}
  \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_k(x) - F_0(x)| \geq \delta_0 \text{ for all } k \in [K], \quad (16)
\end{align*}

where $F_k(x)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of $P_{Y_k}$ for $k \in \{0, \ldots, K\}$. The measure of discrepancy between distributions on the left-hand side of (16) is known as the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance. The assumption in (16) is only needed to detect the scenario when no transmitters are active; the remainder of the code functions proceed unhampered when (16) fails. When $K$ is finite, (16) is equivalent to $P_{Y_0} \neq P_{Y_k}$ for all $k \in [K]$.

Finally, the following moment assumptions enable the second-order analysis presented in Theorem 1 below:

\begin{align*}
  \text{Var} [i_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k)] \geq 0 \quad (17) \\
  \mathbb{E}[|i_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k) - I_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k)|^2] < \infty. \quad (18)
\end{align*}

In the case when $i_t(X_{[s]}; Y_k) > -\infty$ almost surely, we also require

\begin{align*}
  \text{Var} [i_t(X_{[s]}; Y_k)] < \infty \quad \forall s \leq t \leq k. \quad (19)
\end{align*}

In the discussion that follows, we say that a channel satisfies conditions (2), (3), (14)–(19) if there exists an input distribution $P_X$ under which those conditions are satisfied. All discrete memoryless channels (DMCs) satisfy (18)–(19) [31, Lemma 46] as do Gaussian noise channels. Common channel models from the literature typically satisfy (17) as well. Example channels that meet the constraints (2), (3), (14)–(19) include the Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) RAC,

\begin{align*}
  Y_k = \sum_{i=1}^{K} X_i + Z, \quad (20)
\end{align*}

where each $X_i \in \mathbb{R}$ operates under a power constraint $P$ and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, N)$ for some $N > 0$, and the adder-erasure RAC [8],

\begin{align*}
  Y_k = \begin{cases} 
    \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i, \ w.p. \ 1 - \delta \\
    \epsilon, \ w.p. \ \delta 
  \end{cases} \quad (21)
\end{align*}

where $X_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Y_k \in \{0, \ldots, K\} \cup \epsilon$.

For the AWGN RAC, $i_t(X_{[s]}; Y_k) > -\infty$ almost surely and (19) is satisfied, while for the adder-erasure RAC, $i_t(X_{[s]}; Y_k) = -\infty$ for some channel realizations and user activity patterns, and (19) is not required.
We conclude this section with a series of lemmata that describe the natural orderings possessed by RACs that satisfy (2), (3), (14), and (15). These properties are key to the feasibility of our achievability scheme, which appears in the next section. Proofs are relegated to Appendix A.

The first lemma shows that the quality of the channel for each active transmitter deteriorates as more transmitters join (even though the sum capacity may increase).

**Lemma 1.** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k$ be i.i.d. Under permutation-invariance (2), reducibility (3), friendliness (14), and interference (15),

$$I_k \leq \frac{I_k}{k} < \frac{I_s}{s} \quad \text{for } k > s \geq 1. \quad (22)$$

The second lemma shows that a similar relationship holds even when the number of transmitters is fixed.

**Lemma 2.** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k$ be i.i.d. Under permutation-invariance (2), reducibility (3) and interference (15),

$$\frac{1}{k} I_k(X[k]; Y_k) < \frac{1}{s} I_s(X[s]; Y_k|X_s[k+1]) \quad \text{for } k > s \geq 1. \quad (23)$$

The third lemma compares the expected values of the mutual information density computed under various possible channels and conditional distributions observed by the decoder.

**Lemma 3.** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k$ be i.i.d. If a RAC is permutation-invariant (2), reducible (3), friendly (14), and exhibits interference (15), then for any $1 \leq s \leq t < k$, we have

$$E[I_t(X[s]; Y_k)] \leq I_k(X[s]; Y_k) < I_t(X[s]; Y_t). \quad (24)$$

The orderings in Lemma 1–3 are used in bounding the performance of our agnostic random access code.

### III. Main Result

Theorem 1 bounds the performance of a finite blocklength RAC code. For any number $k \geq 1$ of active transmitters, the code achieves a rate vector $R_k = (R_1, \ldots, R_k) = \log \frac{M}{n_k}$, with sum-rate $kR$ converging as $O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$ to $I_k(X[k]; Y_k)$ for some input distribution $P_{X[k]}(x[k]) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} P_X(x_i)$ independent of $k$. For any family of MACs for which a single $P_X$ maximizes $I_k(X[k]; Y_k)$ for all $k$, the rate of the proposed sequence of codes converges to the symmetrical rate point on the capacity region of the MAC with the same number of transmitters.\(^6\)

**Theorem 1. (Achievability)** For any RAC

$$\left\{ \left( X^k; P_{Y_k|X[k]}(y_k|x[k]), Y_k \right) \right\}_{k=0}^{K},$$

satisfying (2), (3), any $K < \infty$ and any fixed $P_X$ satisfying (14)–(19), there exists an $(M, \{\{n_k, \epsilon_k\}_{\kappa=0}^{K}\})$ code provided that

$$\log M \leq \frac{1}{k} \left\{ n_k I_k - \sqrt{n_k V_k Q^{-1}(\epsilon_k)} - \frac{1}{2} \log n_k + O(1) \right\}, \quad (25)$$

for all $1 \leq k \leq K$, and

$$n_0 \geq C \log n_1 + o(\log n_1), \quad (26)$$

where $C$ is a positive constant, and $Q(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{x}^{\infty} \exp \left\{ -\frac{u^2}{2} \right\} du$ is the Gaussian complementary cumulative distribution function.

To shed light on the statement of Theorem 1, consider a channel satisfying (14)–(19) for which the same distribution $P_X$ achieves the maximum of $I_k$ for all $k$. For example, for the adder-erasure RAC in (21), Bernoulli(1/2) attains $\max P_{X_k} I_k$ for all $k$. Thanks to Lemma 1, for $M$ large enough and any $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \ldots, \epsilon_K$, one can pick $n_1 < n_2 < \ldots < n_K$ so that the right side of (25) is equal to $\log M$, for all $k$. Therefore, somewhat counter-intuitively, Theorem 1 certifies that for some channels, rateless codes with encoders that are, until acknowledgment, agnostic to the transmitter activity pattern perform as well (in both first and second order terms in (25)) as the best known transmission scheme designed with complete knowledge of transmitter activity. Moreover, the state of no active transmitters is correctly detected at time

$$n_0 \geq C \log n_1 + o(\log n_1) \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \epsilon_0,$$

for any fixed $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$, allowing a new epoch to begin very quickly when no transmitters are active in the current epoch. The constant $C$ depends on the output distributions $P_{Y_k}, k = 0, \ldots, K$, and the hypothesis test chosen in Section VI.

Our achievable region (Theorem 1) is consistent with the general achievability results for 2-transmitter MACs (when no time-sharing is allowed) given in [21], [23]. Indeed, for the rate points converging to a point on the sum-rate boundary, the achievable region in [21], [23] reduces to

$$R_1 + R_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{V_2}{n}} Q^{-1}(\epsilon) + O \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right). \quad (27)$$

The result of (27) is proved for Gaussian MACs in [25, Th. 2, case iii]. That proof extends in a straightforward manner to general MACs satisfying interference (15) and moment assumptions (17).

The following example investigates the achievable rates of the adder-erase RAC in (21).

**Example 1.** For the adder-erase RAC, the capacity achieving distribution is the equiprobable (Bernoulli(1/2)) distribution for all $k$ (see proof of Theorem 6 in Appendix B). Although one can exactly calculate $I_k$ and $V_k$ for this channel for a fixed $k$ (denoted by “True” in Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b), the following characterizations, which capture the first- and second-order behavior of $I_k$ and $V_k$ in $k$ and demonstrate how each depends on $k$ and $\delta$, are useful for building intuition:

$$I_k = (1 - \delta) \left( \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\pi e k}{2} - \frac{1}{12 k^2} \right) + O(k^{-3}) \text{ nats} \quad (28)$$

\(^6\)It is important to note here that we are comparing the RAC achievable rate with rate-0 feedback to the MAC capacity without feedback. While rate-0 feedback does not change the capacity region of a discrete memoryless MAC [29], its impact more broadly remains an open problem.
\[ V_k = (1 - \delta) \left[ \frac{\delta}{4} \ln \frac{\pi e k}{2} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k} \right] - \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta \ln \frac{\pi e k}{2}}{12} \right) + O \left( \frac{\ln k}{k^3} \right) \text{nats}^2. \]  

Neglecting the \( O(\cdot) \) terms in (28)–(29), we obtain approximations that are quite tight even for small \( k \), as shown in Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b. Both \( I_k \) and \( \sqrt{V_k} \) are of order \( O(\ln k) \), indicating that as \( k \) grows, the sum-rate capacity grows albeit slowly, so that the per-user rate vanishes as \( O \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \), while the dispersion \( V_k \) also grows, and the speed of approach to the sum-rate capacity is slower. Interestingly, the dispersion behavior is different for the pure adder RAC (\( \delta = 0 \)), in which case \( V_k = \frac{1}{2} + O \left( \frac{1}{k} \right) \) is almost constant as a function of \( k \). The derivation of (28) and (29) relies on an approximation for the probability mass function of the \((k,\frac{1}{2})\) Binomial distribution using a higher order Stirling’s approximation (Appendix B).

Fig. 2 shows the approximate rate per transmitter, \( R_k = \frac{\log M}{n_k} \) (neglecting the \( O(1) \) term in (25)), achieved by the proposed scheme as a function of the number of active transmitters, \( k \), and the choice of blocklength \( n_1 \) for a fixed error probability \( \epsilon_k = 10^{-6} \) for all \( k \). Fixing \( n_1 \) and \( \epsilon_k \) fixes the maximum achievable message size, \( M \), according to (25), and the remaining \( n_k \) for \( k \geq 2 \) are found by choosing the smallest \( n_k \) that satisfies (25) using the given \( M \) and \( \epsilon_k \). Each curve illustrates the decrease in the rate per transmitter (\( R_k \)) as the number of active users \( k \) increases. The curves differ in their choice of blocklength \( n_1 \) when 1 user is active (and the resulting changes in \( M \) and \( n_0, n_2, \ldots, n_K \)); here \( n_1 \) is fixed to 20, 100, 500 and 2500. For a fixed \( k \), the points on the same vertical line demonstrate how the gap between the per-user capacity and the finite-blocklength achievable rate decreases as we increase blocklength.

Given a permutation-invariant (2) and reducible (3) RAC, \( M, \epsilon = (\epsilon_0, \ldots, \epsilon_K) \) and any \( P_X \) such that (14)–(19) are satisfied for the given RAC under input distribution \( P_X \), let
\[ \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon, P_X) = \{(R_0, \ldots, R_K) : (25) \text{ and } (26) \text{ hold}\}, \]
where
\[ R_k = \frac{\log M}{n_k} \text{ for all } k \in \{0, \ldots, K\}, \]
and let
\[ \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon) = \bigcup_{P_X : (14)-(19) \text{ hold}} \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon, P_X) \]
denote the achievable rate region. A point in a set is called dominant if no other points in the set are element-wise greater than equal to that point. To optimize the achievable rate vector over the allowed input distributions, we must choose a distribution \( P_X \) that achieves a dominant point for the set \( \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon) \). Note that for the dominant points for \( \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon) \) corresponding to different values of \( P_X \), the difference between the left and right sides of the inequalities in (25) is \( O(1) \). If a preference relation between these dominant rate vectors is given, we can select one of them according to that preference relation. If the achievable rate region \( \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon) \) is not convex, it can be improved to its convex hull by employing time-sharing. For the modifications in the coding strategy to incorporate time-sharing, see [21], [23], [24].

By viewing the RAC as a compound channel and using [19, Lemma 4], for the RACs with finite input and output alphabets, we can find the largest achievable rate vector on the line \( \frac{R_k}{R_k} = \alpha_k \) for all \( k \in [K] \) belonging to the set of achievable rate vectors \( \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon) \). However, that rate vector may not be a dominant point for \( \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon) \), since fixing the ratio \( \alpha_k \) for all \( k \) fixes a direction in \( \mathcal{R}(M, \epsilon) \) without regard to whether there exists a dominant point in that direction. As an alternative, we can limit attention to dominant points using standard techniques for Lagrangian optimization.
Therefore, for the channel in Fig. 3b, the achievable rate $P_X^*$ and the transition probability matrix $P_{Y_2|X_1,X_2}$ achieve different dominant points of $R(M, \epsilon)$, respectively. In both figures, the rate $R_k$ for the channel reduces to the binary symmetric channel with crossover probability $\epsilon_k$.

To illustrate what happens when different $P_X^*$ values achieve different dominant points of $R(M, \epsilon)$, we consider the following example.

**Example 2.** Consider a RAC with $K = 2$, $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}_2 = \{0, 1\}$, and the transition probability matrix $P_{Y_2|X_1,X_2}$

\[
P_{Y_2|X_1,X_2} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 1-b & b & 1-a \\
1-b & b & 1-b & a \\
1 & b & 1-b & 1-b & a
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where $a, b \in [0, 1]$. This RAC is permutation-invariant since the “01” and the “10” columns are identical. When $k = 1$, the channel reduces to the binary symmetric channel with crossover probability $b$. Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b illustrate the set of achievable rate vectors $R(M, \epsilon)$ (neglecting the $O(1)$ term in (25)) with $\log M = 1000$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ for the channel in (33) with $a = 0.7, b = 0.11$, and $a = b = 0.11$, respectively. In both figures, the rate $R_0$ when no transmitters are active is ignored. The blue and the red curves show the finite blocklength and the capacity boundary ($\log M \to \infty$, $\epsilon_k \to 0$ for all $k$), respectively. In Fig. 3a, the dominant points are demonstrated by the thick blue curve. The input distribution $P_X^* = \text{Bernoulli}(0.35)$ achieves the dominant point $(R_1, R_2) = (0.400, 0.204)$, and the corresponding region $R(M, \epsilon, P_X^*)$ is shown as the region bounded by the dashed curve. In Fig. 3b, the only dominant point $(0.437, 0.227)$ is achieved by the input distribution $P_X^* = \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$. Therefore, for the channel in Fig. 3b, the achievable rate region $R(M, \epsilon)$ coincides with $R(M, \epsilon, P_X^*)$, and we must choose $P_X^*$ as our input distribution. For this channel, $P_X^* = \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ simultaneously maximizes the mutual informations $I_1$ and $I_2$, and the maxima are $I_1 = I_2 = 0.5$.
\(P_X, \) there exists an \((M, \{(nk, \epsilon k)\}_k)\) code with

\begin{align}
\epsilon_0 & \leq \mathbb{P}[h(Y_{0}^{n_0}) > \gamma_0], \\
\epsilon_k & \leq \mathbb{P}[\epsilon_k(X_{[s]}^{n_k}; Y_{[s]}^{n_k}) \leq \log \gamma_k] \\
& + \mathbb{P}[h(Y_{[s]}^{n_k}) \leq \gamma_0] \\
& + 1 - \prod_{i=0}^{k-1}(M - i) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{i} (\mathbb{P}[\epsilon_i(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}) > \log \gamma_i] \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\mathbb{P}[\epsilon_i(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}) > \log \gamma_i] \\
& \geq n_t \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t})] + \lambda_{s,t}^k \\
& > \log \gamma_t - n_t \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t})] - \lambda_{s,t}^k]
\end{align}

for all \(k \geq 1, \) where for any \((X_{[s]}^{n_s}; X_{[s]}^{n_s}; Y_{[s]}^{n_s})\) represents a random sequence drawn i.i.d. according to \(F_{X_{[s]}^{n_s}; X_{[s]}^{n_s}; Y_{[s]}^{n_s}}(x_{[s]}, y_{[s]}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} P_X(x_i) P_Y(x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}).\)

For \(k = 0, \) the only error term in (34) is the probability that the decoder does not correctly estimate that the number of active transmitters is 0 at time \(n_0.\) For \(k \geq 1, \) in the operational regime of interest, that is, when \(\epsilon_k's\) are nonvanishing with \(n_k,\) the dominating term is (35), which is the probability that the true codeword set produces a low information density. The remaining terms are negligible, as shown in the refined asymptotic analysis of the bound in Theorem 2 (see Section IV-C, below). The remaining terms bound the probability that the decoder incorrectly estimates the number of active transmitters as 0 (36), the probability that two or more transmitters send the same message (37), the probability that the decoder estimates the number of active transmitters as \(t\) for some \(1 \leq t < k\) and decodes those \(t\) messages correctly (38), and the probability that the decoder estimates the number of active transmitters as \(t\) for some \(1 \leq t < k\) and decodes the messages from \(s\) of those \(t\) transmitters incorrectly and the messages from the remaining \(t - s\) of those transmitters correctly (39)–(40).

One advantage of Theorem 2 is that the bound on the error probability for \(k\) active transmitters is not a function of the maximum number of active transmitters, \(K;\) it only depends on the RACs up to \(k\) active transmitters. For \(k = 1, 2,\) the expression in (35)–(40) particularizes to

\begin{align}
\epsilon_1 & \leq \mathbb{P}[\epsilon_1(X_{[s]}^{n_1}; Y_{[s]}^{n_1}) \leq \log \gamma_1] + \mathbb{P}[h(Y_{[s]}^{n_1}) \leq \gamma_0] \\
& + (M - 1)\mathbb{P}[\epsilon_1(X_{[s]}^{n_1}; Y_{[s]}^{n_1}) > \log \gamma_1 - \lambda_{1,1}^1] \\
\epsilon_2 & \leq \mathbb{P}[\epsilon_2(X_{[s]}^{n_2}; Y_{[s]}^{n_2}) \leq \log \gamma_2] + \mathbb{P}[h(Y_{[s]}^{n_2}) \leq \gamma_0] \\
& + 1 - \prod_{i=0}^{k-1}(M - i) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{i} (\mathbb{P}[\epsilon_i(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}) > \log \gamma_i] \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\mathbb{P}[\epsilon_i(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_i}) > \log \gamma_i] \\
& \geq n_t \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t})] + \lambda_{s,t}^k \\
& > \log \gamma_t - n_t \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t(X_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t}; Y_{[s+1:t]}^{n_t})] - \lambda_{s,t}^k]
\end{align}

Although it is highly desirable to prove a converse result with the second-order term matching that in (25), it remains an open problem whether such a converse exists. Dueck [32] derived the first strong converse for the discrete memoryless MAC by leveraging the blowing-up lemma under the average-error definition of capacity. Ahlswede [33] further improved Dueck’s result by using a so-called “wringing technique” to show that the codeword pairs are almost independent. This technique leads to the following upper-bound on the sum-rate with blocklength \(n\) and average error probability \(\epsilon,\) for 2-transmitter discrete memoryless MAC:

\begin{align}
n(R_1 + R_2) \leq nI(X_1, X_2; Y) + c(\epsilon) \sqrt{n} \log n,
\end{align}

where

\begin{align}
c(\epsilon) = \frac{6|X_1||X_2||Y|}{1 - \epsilon} + 2\epsilon + \log \frac{1 + \epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} + C,
\end{align}

and \(C\) is a positive constant depending on \(|X_1|, |X_2|, |Y|\). It is useful to notice that [33] exhibits a second-order term \(O(\sqrt{n} \log n)\) of a different order than the achievable result given in Theorem 1. However, the coefficient of the second-order term in (43), \(c(\epsilon),\) is positive for any \(\epsilon \in (0, 1),\) so there is no contradiction with our Theorem 1. One drawback of Ahlswede’s converse is that for a \(k\)-transmitter MAC with the same input alphabet \(X\) for all transmitters, the coefficient, \(c(\epsilon) = O(|X|^k)\) grows exponentially with the number of transmitters, \(k,\)

For the AWGN MAC described in (20), Fong and Tan [34, Th. 1] showed that Ahlswede’s second-order term of \(O(\sqrt{n} \log n)\) can be improved to \(O(\sqrt{n} \log n)\) by applying Ahlswede’s wringing technique [33] to quantized inputs. For maximum-error capacity, Moulin [35] proposed a new converse technique, which relies on strong large deviations for binary hypothesis tests and leads to a second-order term that matches our result in (25). Moulin’s result does not give a converse for the average-error capacity, since it is known that the capacity regions for the maximum and average error probability can be different in general [36]. Proving a converse for the average-error performance criterion with a second-order term that matches our achievability in Theorem 1 requires new techniques since the standard type splitting argument used in, for example, [31, Th. 48] for point-to-point channels does

\footnote{In [33, Lemma 2], it is mistakenly stated that \(c(\epsilon)\) depends only on \(|X_1|;\) however, by following the arguments in [33, (3.9)–(3.18)], we see that \(|X_1|\) should be corrected to \(|X_1||X_2||Y|.\)
not directly apply to the MAC. The issue here is that when we consider a subset of codewords with the same empirical distribution, $P_{X_1X_2}$, the saddle point condition (e.g. [37, Th. 4.4]) implies only that

$$D(P_Y|X_1X_2||P_{X_1X_2}) \leq \max_{P_{X_1X_2}} I(X_1,X_2;Y),$$  

(45)

where $P_Y$ denotes the output distribution that achieves the maximum in the right side of (45). Here, the right-hand side is greater than the sum-capacity of the MAC, $\max_{P_{X_1},P_{X_2}} I(X_1,X_2;Y)$, which restricts the input to be a product distribution due to a lack of cooperation between transmitters. Hence, a naive application of the standard technique for point-to-point channels does not even yield the correct first-order term in the converse.

A description of the proposed RAC code and the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 appear in Section IV.

IV. THE RAC CODE AND ITS PERFORMANCE

A. Code Design

The finite-blocklength RAC code used in the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 is constructed as follows. **Encoder Design:** The common randomness random variable $U = (U(1),\ldots,U(M))$ has distribution

$$P_U \triangleq P_U(1) \times \cdots \times P_U(M),$$

(46)

where $P_{U(w)} = P_{X}^{n_K}$, $w = 1,\ldots,M$, and $P_X$ is a fixed distribution on alphabet $X$. The realization of $U$ defines $M$ i.i.d. vectors $U(1),\ldots,U(M)$ with length $n_K$ (the codebook). Note that the cardinality of the alphabet $U$ is $|X|^{nK}$; however, we use Carathéodory’s Theorem to show that it can be bounded by $K+1$ (Appendix C). As described in Section II, an $(M,\{k_i\}_{k=0}^{K})$ RAC code employs the same encoder $f(\cdot)$ at every transmitter. The encoder $f(U,\cdot)$ depends on $U$ as

$$f(U,w) = U(w) \quad \text{for } w = 1,\ldots,M.$$  

(47)

For brevity, we omit $U$ in the encoding function and write $f(U,w) = f(w)$ for $w = 1,\ldots,M$. For any $w[k] \in [M]^K$, we use $f(w[k])$ to denote the encoded description of $w[k]$, giving $f(w[k]) = (f(w_1),\ldots,f(w_K))$.

**Decoder Design:** Upon receiving $n_0$ i.i.d. samples of the output $Y$, the decoder runs the following composite hypothesis test to decide whether there are any active transmitters:

$$g_0(U,y^{n_0}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } h(y^{n_0}) \leq \gamma_0 \\ \epsilon & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$  

(48)

Here, 0 signifies that the “silence” message has been decoded and an ACK is sent to all transmitters signifying the start of a new coding epoch, while $\epsilon$ means that there are active transmitters, and thus the transmission must continue, and $h: Y^{n_0} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is the statistic used to decide whether any transmitters are active. For each $k \geq 1$, after observing the output $y^{n_k}$, decoder $g_k$ employs a single threshold rule

$$g_k(U,y^{n_k}) = \begin{cases} w[k] & \text{if } g_k(f(w[k]);y^{n_k}) > \log \gamma_k \\ w_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$  

(49)

for some constant $\gamma_k$ chosen before the transmission starts. The transmission stops and an ACK is sent to all transmitters once a non-erasure is decoded in (49). For $k \geq 1$, the decoder $g_k(U,y^{n_k})$ depends on $U$ through its dependence on the encoding function $f(w[k])$; for $k = 0$, $g_0(U,y^{n_0})$ does not depend on $U$. For all $k$, write $g_k(U,y^{n_k}) = g_k(y^{n_k})$ for brevity.

By permutation-invariance (2) and identical encoding, all permutations of the message vector $w[k]$ give the same mutual information density. We use the ordered permutation specified in (49) as a representative of the equivalence class with respect to the binary relation $\equiv$. The choice of a representative is immaterial since decoding is identity-blind.

When there is more than one ordered $w[k]$ that satisfies the threshold condition, decoder $g_k$ chooses among them uniformly at random. All such events are counted as errors in the analysis below.

The proof of Theorem 2 below bounds the error probability of the proposed code.

B. Proof of Theorem 2

In the discussion that follows, we bound the error probability of the code $(f,\{g_k\}_{k=0}^{K})$ defined above. For $k = 0$, the only error event is that the received vector at time $n_0$, $Y^{n_0}$, fails to pass the test given in (48):

$$\epsilon_0 \leq \mathbb{P} \left[ g_0(Y^{n_0}) = \epsilon | W_0 = 0 \right].$$  

(50)

For $k > 0$, the analysis relies on the independence of codewords $f(W_i)$ and $f(W_j)$ from distinct transmitters $i$ and $j$. By the code design given in Section IV-A, this assumption is valid provided that $W_i \neq W_j$; we therefore count events of the form $W_i = W_j$ as errors.

$^9$ Let $p_{\text{rep}}$ denote the probability of such a repetition; then

$$p_{\text{rep}} = 1 - \prod_{i=0}^{K-1} \left( \frac{M-i}{M^K} \right).$$  

(51)

The discussion that follows uses $w^*_k = (1,\ldots,k)$ as an example instance of a message vector $w|w_k$ in which $w_i \neq w_j$ for all $i \neq j$, and $V_s$ as the set of all ordered message vectors that do not intersect with $w^*_k$, i.e. $V_s = \{ w_s \in [M]^K: \tilde{w}_1 > k, \tilde{w}_i < \tilde{w}_j \forall i < j \}$. Note that we need to include only ordered vectors in $V_s$ in view of our identity-blind decoding rule in (49). The resulting error bound proceeds

$^9$ It is interesting to notice that the event $W_i = W_j$ for distinct $i, j$ is not uniformly bad over all channels. For example, in a Gaussian channel, if two transmitters send the same codeword, then the power of the transmission effectively doubles. In contrast, in a channel where interference is modeled as the binary sum of a collection of binary codewords, if two transmitters send the same codeword, then the codewords cancel.
\[ \epsilon_k = \frac{1}{M^k} \sum_{w_{[s]} \in [M]^k} \mathbb{P}(g_0(Y^{n_s}_k) = 0) \cup (\cup_{l=1}^{k-1} g_l(Y^{n_s}_k) \neq e) \cup g_k(Y^{n_s}_k) \neq w_{[k]} | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]} \] (52)

\[ \leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{rep}} + (1 - \mathbb{P}_{\text{rep}}) \mathbb{P}((g_0(Y^{n_s}_k) = 0) \cup (\cup_{l=1}^{k-1} g_l(Y^{n_s}_k) \neq e) \cup g_k(Y^{n_s}_k) \neq w_{[k]} | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^* | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^* \] (53)

\[ \leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{rep}} + \mathbb{P}(g_k(Y^{n_s}_k) = 0 | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) + \mathbb{P}(g_k(Y^{n_s}_k) = e | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{l} \mathbb{P}(g_l(Y^{n_s}_k) \neq w_{[l]}^* | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) \] (54)

\[ + \sum_{t=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{t} \binom{k}{t-s} \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{g_t(Y^{n_s}_k) \neq (\tilde{w}_{[s]}, w_{[s+1:t]})\} | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) \] (55)

\[ \leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{rep}} + \mathbb{P}[h(Y^{n_s}_k) \leq \gamma_0] + \mathbb{P}[\tau_k(X^{n_k}_k, Y^{n_s}_k) \leq \log \gamma_k] + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{l} \mathbb{P}([\tau_l(X^{n_l}_l, Y^{n_s}_k) > \log \gamma_l] \] (56)

\[ + \sum_{l=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{l} \binom{k}{l-s} \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{\tau_l(X^{n_l}_l, (\tilde{w}_{[s]}, X^{n_s}_k)) \neq w_{[s+1:t]} \} | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) \] (57)

as (52)–(57), displayed at the top of the page, where \( X_{[k]} \) is the vector of transmitted codewords and \( \tilde{X}_{[s]}(\tilde{w}_{[s]}) \) represents the codeword for \( \tilde{w}_{[s]} \), which was not transmitted. Line (53) separates the cases where distinct transmitters send the same message from the case where there is no repetition. Lines (54)–(55) enumerate the error events in the no-repetition case; these include all cases where the transmitted codeword passes the binary hypothesis test (48) for “no active transmitters” (54), all cases where the transmitted codeword fails to meet the threshold (54), all cases where a prefix of the transmitted codeword meets the threshold for some \( s < t \) (54), and all cases where a codeword that is wrong in \( s \) dimensions and right in \( t-s \) dimensions meets the threshold for \( t \leq k \) (55). We apply the union bound and the symmetry of the code design to represent the probability of each case by the probability of an example instance times the number of instances. Equations (56)–(57) replace decoders by the threshold rules in their definitions. The delay in applying the union bound in the final line is deliberate. Applying the following observation before applying the union bound yields a tighter bound.

\[ \mathbb{P} \left[ \bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{\tau_t(\tilde{X}^{n_t}_n(\tilde{w}_{[s]}), X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t \neq Y^{n_s}_k) > \log \gamma_t \} \right] \]

\[ = \mathbb{P} \left[ \bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{\tau_t(\tilde{X}^{n_t}_n(\tilde{w}_{[s]}), X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t \neq Y^{n_s}_k) > \log \gamma_t \} \right] \]

\[ \cap \{\tau_t(X^{n_t}_t, Y^{n_{s+1:t}}_s) > n_t \mathbb{E}[\tau_t(X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t, Y_{[t]})] + \lambda_{s,t}^k\} \]

\[ + \mathbb{P} \left[ \bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{\tau_t(\tilde{X}^{n_t}_n(\tilde{w}_{[s]}), X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t \neq Y^{n_s}_k) > \log \gamma_t \} \right] \]

\[ \cap \{\tau_t(X^{n_t}_t, Y^{n_{s+1:t}}_s) \leq n_t \mathbb{E}[\tau_t(X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t, Y_{[t]})] + \lambda_{s,t}^k\} \]

\[ \leq \mathbb{P} \left[ \tau_t(X^{n_t}_t, Y^{n_{s+1:t}}_s) > n_t \mathbb{E}[\tau_t(X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t, Y_{[t]})] + \lambda_{s,t}^k \right] \]

Therefore

\[ \epsilon_k \leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{rep}} + \mathbb{P}[h(Y^{n_s}_k) = P_0, Y^{n_s}_k) \leq \gamma_0] + \mathbb{P}[\tau_k(X^{n_k}_k, Y^{n_s}_k) \leq \log \gamma_k] \]

\[ + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{l} \mathbb{P}([\tau_l(X^{n_l}_l, Y^{n_s}_k) > \log \gamma_l] \]

\[ + \sum_{l=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{l} \binom{k}{l-s} \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{\tau_l(X^{n_l}_l, (\tilde{w}_{[s]}, X^{n_s}_k)) \neq w_{[s+1:t]} \} | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) \]

\[ > n_t \mathbb{E}[\tau_t(X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t, Y_{[t]})] + \lambda_{s,t}^k \]

\[ + \sum_{l=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{l} \binom{k}{l-s} \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{\tau_l(X^{n_l}_l, (\tilde{w}_{[s]}, X^{n_s}_k)) \neq w_{[s+1:t]} \} | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) \]

\[ > \log \gamma_t - n_t \mathbb{E}[\tau_t(X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t, Y_{[t]})] - \lambda_{s,t}^k \],

which gives the desired result.

\[ \square \]

C. Proof of Theorem 1

We begin by enumerating our choice of parameters:

\[ \log \gamma_k = n_k I_k - \tau_k \sqrt{n_k V_k} \] (60)

\[ \lambda_{s,t}^k = \frac{n_t}{2} \left( I_t(X_{[s:t]}; Y_{[s+1:t]}) - \frac{s}{t} I_t(X_{[t]}; Y_t) \right) \] (61)

\[ n_k = \frac{\gamma_k^2}{\tau_k} \left( \frac{e}{M} - k \right) \] (62)

for every \( 1 \leq s \leq t \leq k \).

The definition of \( \gamma_k \) (60) follows the approach established for the point-to-point channel in [31]; here \( \tau_k = Q^{-1} \left( \epsilon_k - B_k \sqrt{n_k} \right) \), \( B_k = 6T_k / (V_k^{1/2}) \) is the Berry-Esseen constant [38, Chapter XVI.5] (which is finite by the moment assumptions (17) and (18)), \( T_k \triangleq \mathbb{E}[|\tau_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k) - J_k|^3] \), and

\[ \epsilon_k \leq \mathbb{P}_{\text{rep}} + \mathbb{P}[h(Y^{n_s}_k) \leq \gamma_0] + \mathbb{P}[\tau_k(X^{n_k}_k, Y^{n_s}_k) \leq \log \gamma_k] \]

\[ + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{l} \mathbb{P}([\tau_l(X^{n_l}_l, Y^{n_s}_k) > \log \gamma_l] \]

\[ + \sum_{l=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{l} \binom{k}{l-s} \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{\tilde{w}_{[s]} \in \tilde{W}_{[s]}} \{\tau_l(X^{n_l}_l, (\tilde{w}_{[s]}, X^{n_s}_k)) \neq w_{[s+1:t]} \} | W_{[k]} = w_{[k]}^*) \]

\[ > n_t \mathbb{E}[\tau_t(X^{n_{s+1:t}}_t, Y_{[t]})] + \lambda_{s,t}^k \],

which gives the desired result.
$C_k$ is a constant to be chosen in (88). The constants $\lambda_{s,t}^k$ used in the error probability bound (40) are set in (61) to ensure $\lambda_{s,t}^k > 0$ when $s < t$ (see Lemma 2) and $\lambda_{s,t}^k = 0$ when $s = t$. The blocklengths $n_k$ in (62) are chosen to ensure that for large enough $M$, $n_1 < \ldots < n_K$ (see Lemma 1).

The choices in (60), (62), and the Taylor series expansion of $Q^{-1}()$ ensure that the size of the codebook admits the following expansion
\[
\log M = \frac{1}{k} \left\{ n_k I_k - \sqrt{n_k V_k} Q^{-1}(\epsilon_k) - \frac{1}{2} \log n_k + O(1) \right\}. \tag{63}
\]

Therefore, to prove Theorem 1, we need to show that the probability of decoding error at time $n_k$ by $\epsilon_k$. Towards that end, we sequentially bound the terms in Theorem 2 using the parameters chosen in (60)–(62).

- **(35):** This is the dominating term. Since $\nu_k(X_{[k]}^n; Y_{[k]}^n)$ is a sum of $n_k$ independent random variables, by the Berry-Esseen theorem [38, Chapter XVI.5]
\[
\Pr \left[ \nu_k(X_{[k]}^n; Y_{[k]}^n) \leq \log \gamma_k \right] \leq \epsilon_k - \frac{C_k}{\sqrt{n_k}}. \tag{64}
\]

- **(36):** The test statistic $h(\cdot)$ and the threshold $\gamma_0$ given in (48) are chosen in Section VI as either (106) or (113) to satisfy
\[
\Pr[h(Y_{[0]}^n) \leq \gamma_0] \leq \frac{E_k}{\sqrt{n_k}}, \tag{65}
\]
\[
\Pr[h(Y_{[0]}^n) > \gamma_0] > \epsilon_0, \tag{66}
\]
for some constant $E_k > 0$. By (109) and (121) in Section VI, for any $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$,
\[
\Pr[h(Y_{[0]}^n) \leq \gamma_0] \leq \exp\{-n_0 C' + o(n_0)\} \tag{67}
\]
for some constant $C' > 0$ depending on the test chosen in Section VI and the output distributions $P_{Y_i}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, K$; thus, since by (63), $n_k = O(n_1)$, $k \geq 1$, to make (67) behave as $O\left(\frac{1}{n_1}\right)$, we need to pick $n_0$ as in (26) with $C = \frac{1}{2K^2}$.

- **(37):** For $k^2 \ll M$, this term expands as
\[
1 - \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{M - i}{M} = \frac{k(k - 1)}{2M} + O\left(\frac{k^2}{M}\right), \tag{68}
\]
which according to (62) decays exponentially with $n_k$.

- **(38):** Define $p$ as
\[
p \triangleq \Pr[\nu(X_{[t]}; Y_k) > -\infty]. \tag{69}
\]
We next analyze (38) separately for $p = 1$ and $p < 1$. Case 1: $p = 1$. By Chebyshev’s inequality,
\[
\Pr[\nu(X_{[t]}^n; Y_{[t]}^n) > \log \gamma_t] \leq \frac{\text{Var}[\nu(X_{[t]}; Y_k)]}{n_t \left(I_t - \mathbb{E}[\nu(X_{[t]}; Y_k)]\right)^2 - \tau_t \sqrt{\frac{V_t}{n_t}}} \tag{70}
\]
By Lemma 3 and moment assumption (19), the right side of (70) behaves as $O\left(\frac{1}{n_t}\right)$.

Case 2: $p < 1$. We have
\[
\Pr[\nu(X_{[t]}^n; Y_{[t]}^n) > \log \gamma_t] \leq \Pr[\nu(X_{[t]}^n; Y_{[t]}^n) > -\infty] \tag{71}
\]
\[
\leq p^n, \tag{72}
\]
where (72) holds because $\nu(X_{[t]}^n; Y_{[t]}^n)$ is the sum of $n_t$ independent random variables distributed the same as $\nu(X_{[t]}; Y_k)$. That sum is greater than $-\infty$ if and only if all the summands satisfy the same inequality. From (70) and (72), (38) contributes $O\left(\frac{1}{n_t}\right)$ to our error bound.

- **(39):** As in the analysis of (38), we define
\[
q \triangleq \Pr[\nu(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k) > -\infty] \tag{73}
\]
and treat the cases $q = 1$ and $q < 1$ separately. Observe that for $q = 1$, by Chebyshev’s inequality we have
\[
\Pr[\nu(X_{[s+1:t]}^n; Y_{[s+1:t]}^n) > n_t \mathbb{E}[\nu(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k)] + \lambda_{s,t}^k] \leq \frac{\text{Var}[\nu(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k)]}{n_t \left(I_t(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k) - \frac{1}{2} I_t\right)^2}, \tag{74}
\]
which is of order $O\left(\frac{1}{n_t}\right)$ by the moment assumption (19) and Lemma 2.

For $q < 1$, we have
\[
\Pr[\nu(X_{[s+1:t]}^n; Y_{[s+1:t]}^n) > n_t \mathbb{E}[\nu(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k)] + \lambda_{s,t}^k] = \exp(-\lambda_{s,t}^k). \tag{75}
\]
Therefore (39) contributes $O\left(\frac{1}{n_t}\right)$ to our error bound.

- **(40):** First, consider the case where $s < t \leq k$. By Lemma 3 and Chernoff’s bound,
\[
\Pr[\nu(X_{[s]}^n; Y_{[s]}^n|X_{[s+1:t]}^n)] > \log \gamma_t - n_t \mathbb{E}[\nu(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k)] - \lambda_{s,t}^k \tag{76}
\]
\[
\leq \Pr[\nu(X_{[s]}^n; Y_{[s]}^n|X_{[s+1:t]}^n)] > \log \gamma_t - n_t I_t(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k) - \lambda_{s,t}^k \tag{77}
\]
\[
\leq \exp\left\{ -\gamma_t - n_t I_t(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k) \right\} \leq \exp\left\{ -\gamma_t - n_t I_t(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k) \right\} \tag{78}
\]
\[
= \exp\left\{ -\gamma_t - n_t I_t(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k) \right\} \tag{79}
\]
Plugging our parameter choices (60)–(62) into (79) and using Stirling’s bound
\[
\left(\frac{n}{k}\right) \leq \left(\frac{en}{k}\right)^k, \tag{80}
\]
we get
\[
\left(\frac{k-M}{s}\right) \Pr[\nu(X_{[s]}^n; Y_{[s]}^n|X_{[s+1:t]}^n)] > \log \gamma_t - n_t I_t(X_{[s+1:t]}; Y_k) - \lambda_{s,t}^k \tag{81}
\]
\[
\leq \exp\left\{ -n_t \frac{1}{2} I_t(X_{[s]}^n; Y_k|X_{[s+1:t]}^n) - \frac{s}{t} I_t \right\} + \left(1 - \frac{s}{t}\right) \tau_t \sqrt{n_t V_t - \frac{s}{2t} \log n_t + s \log \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)}. \tag{82}
\]
Lemma 2 ensures that the exponent in (82) is negative for a large enough \( n_k \).

For \( s = t < k \), substituting the parameter choices (60)–(62) into (79) and using (80), we get

\[
\binom{M-k}{t} P[t_1(X_{1|k}^n; Y_{k+1}^{n_k})] > \log \gamma_t \leq \frac{(M-k)}{\gamma_t} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_t}}.
\]

For \( s = t = k \), following the change of measure technique (e.g. [37]), one can rewrite an expectation with respect to measure \( Q \) as an expectation with respect to measure \( P \):

\[
Q[Z \in A] = E_P \left[ \left( \frac{P[Z]}{Q[Z]} \right)^{-1} \mathbb{1} \{ Z \in A \} \right].
\]

Switching to the measure \( P_{Y_k^n | X_{1|k}^n} P_{X_{1|k}^n} \) in this way, by (80) and the parameter choice (62) we write

\[
\binom{M-k}{k} P[t_k(X_{n_k}^n; Y_{n_k}^n)] > \log \gamma_k
\]

\[
\leq \left( \frac{e}{k} \right)^k \left( \frac{M-k}{k} \right)^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -t_k(X_{n_k}^n; Y_{n_k}^n) \right) \right] \cdot \mathbb{1} \{ t_k(X_{n_k}^n; Y_{n_k}^n) > \log \gamma_k \}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{D_k}{n_k},
\]

where

\[
D_k \equiv 2 \left( \frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi V_k}} + 2B_k \right).
\]

To justify (86), notice that \( t_k(X_{n_k}^n; Y_{n_k}^n) \) is a sum of i.i.d.

random variables; in [31, Lemma 47] Polyanskiy et al. gave a sharp bound on \( \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( -\sum_i Z_i \right) 1 \{ \sum_i Z_i > \gamma \} \right] \), where the \( Z_i \)'s are independent. Direct application of that bound yields (86). Note that \( D_k \) is finite by the moment assumptions (17) and (18). Combining the bounds for the three cases in (82), (83) and (86), we conclude that (40) contributes \( O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_k}} \right) \) to the total error.

Finally, we set the constant \( C_k \) to ensure

\[
(36) + (37) + (38) + (39) + (40) \leq \frac{C_k}{\sqrt{n_k}}.
\]

The existence of such a constant is guaranteed by our analysis above demonstrating that the terms (36)–(40) do not contribute more than \( O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_k}} \right) \) to the total.\(^{10}\)

Due to (64) and (88), the total probability of making an error at time \( n_k \) is bounded by \( \epsilon_k \); in view of (63) the proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

\( \square \)

\(^{10}\)Our bounds on (36)–(40) technically depend on \( \gamma_k \) and therefore on \( C_k \); however it is easy to see that their dependence on \( C_k \) is weak and for large enough \( n_k \) can be eliminated entirely; thus the choice of \( C_k \) satisfying (88) is possible.

V. A RAC CODE THAT DECODES TRANSMITTER IDENTITY

While the use of the same encoder at all transmitters has a number of advantages for practical implementations, the techniques employed in this work are not limited to that case.

We next briefly explore the use of distinct encoders at all transmitters of a RAC. Under permutation-invariance (2) and identical encoding, the decoder cannot distinguish which transmitter sent each of the decoded messages. Maintaining permutation-invariance, but replacing prior identical encoders with a different instance of the same random codebook for each of the encoders, we get a code that achieves the same first- and second-order terms as in Theorem 1 with a decoder that can also associate the corresponding transmitter identity to each decoded message. The following definition formalizes the resulting RAC codes.

**Definition 1**.\( ^{1} \) An \((M, \{(n_k, \epsilon_k)\}_{k=0}^K)\) code with non-identical encoding is a collection of encoding functions

\[
f_k: U \times [M] \to X^{n_k}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, K
\]

and a collection of decoding functions:

\[
g_k: U \times Y^{n_k} \to \left\{ [M]^k \times \left( [K]^k \right) \right\} \cup \epsilon, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, K
\]

where \(|U| \leq K + 1\). At the start of each epoch, a random variable \( U \in U \) with probability distribution \( P_U \) is generated independently of the transmitter activity, and revealed to the transmitters and the receiver to initialize the encoders and the decoder. If \(|A| = k\), i.e. \( k \) transmitters are active, then, with probability at least \( 1 - \epsilon_k \), \( k \) messages and their corresponding transmitter identities are correctly decoded at time \( n_k \), and if no transmitters are active, the unique message in set \([M]^0 = \{ \emptyset \}\) is decoded at time \( n_0 \), with probability at least \( 1 - \epsilon_0 \).

That is, for any \(|A| = k\),

\[
\frac{1}{M} \sum_{L \in [M]^k} P \left\{ \bigcap_{t=0}^{k-1} \left\{ g_t(U, Y_{t+1}^{n_k}) \neq \epsilon \right\} \mid W_A = L \right\} \leq \epsilon_k,
\]

where \( W_A \) are the independent and equiprobable messages of transmitters \( A \), and the given probability is calculated using the conditional distribution \( P_{X_{1|k}^n | X_A^n k} = P_{X_{1|k}^n | X_{1|k}^n} \) where \( X_{1|k}^n \) is the set \( f_t(U, W_e) | \{ n_k \} \), \( s \in 0 \cup A \).

In the discussion that follows, we continue to assume permutation-invariance (2) and to employ the input distribution \( P_X \) at all encoders. Under these assumptions, the channel output statistics depend on the dimension of the channel input but not the identity of the active transmitters. Therefore, we again assume for simplicity in the analysis that the set of active transmitters as \( A = [k] \), when \(|A| = k\).

The following theorem modifies our Theorem 2 so that the transmitters’ identities are also decoded by the decoder.
Theorem 2'. For any RAC \( \left\{ \left( X^k, P_{Y|X} (y_k|x^{[k]}), Y_k \right) \right\}_{k=0}^K \) satisfying (2), (3), any \( K < \infty \), and a fixed input distribution \( P_X \), there exists an \( (M, \left\{ (n_k, \epsilon_k) \right\}_{k=0}^K) \) RAC code given in Definition 1’ with

\[
\epsilon_0 \leq P [ h(Y^n_{\epsilon_0}) > \gamma_0 ]
\]

\[
\epsilon_k \leq P [ t_k(X^n_{\epsilon_k}|Y^n_{\epsilon_k}) \leq \log \gamma_k ]
\]

\[
+ \sum_{t=1}^{k} \left( \frac{k}{t} \right) \left( \sum_{s=1}^{t} \left( \sum_{l=1}^{k} \frac{t-l}{s} M^s \right) \left( 1 - \lambda_k - \frac{1}{t} \right) \right) \leq \gamma_k
\]

\[
| A | = k
\]

\[
\text{for all } k, \text{ where the } \lambda_k \text{ and } \gamma_k \text{ values are constants, and for any } n, (X^n_{\epsilon_k}, X^n_{\epsilon_k}, Y^n_{\epsilon_k}) \text{ represents a random sequence drawn i.i.d. according to } P_X (x^{[k]}), P_X (x^{[k]}), y_k = X^n_{\epsilon_k}(x^{[k]}, y_k).
\]

Proof of Theorem 2’: Encoder Design: We modify the common randomness random variable \( U \) as follows:

\[
P_U = \prod_{k=1}^{K} \prod_{w=1}^{M} P_{U(k,w)},
\]

where \( P_{U(k,w)} = P_{X^n_{\epsilon_k}}, k = 1, \ldots, K, w = 1, \ldots, M \) for a fixed \( P_X \). The realization of \( U \) determines the \( K \) codebooks. For any \( w \in [M] \), we use \( f_k(U, w) \) to denote the encoded description of \( w \) for transmitter \( k \in [K] \). The codewords depend on \( U \) as

\[
f_k(U, w) = f_k(w) = U(k, w)
\]

for every encoder \( e \in [K] \). Let \( f_e (w_A) \equiv \{ f_e (w_{\epsilon}) : a \in A \} \) denote the encoded description of message vector \( w_A \) at the subset of encoders \( A \subset [K] \).

Decoder Design: For \( k = 0 \), we use the same rule \( g_0 (\cdot) \) as given in (48). For each \( k \geq 1 \), after observing the output \( y^n_{\epsilon_k} \), decoder \( g_k \) employs a single threshold rule

\[
g_k(y^n_{\epsilon_k}) = \begin{cases} (w_A, A) \text{ if } t_k(f_k(w_A, y^n_{\epsilon_k}) > \log \gamma_k \text{ for } some } A \subset [K], |A| = k, \text{ otherwise } \end{cases}
\]

for some constant \( \gamma_k \). Recall that the pair \( (w_A, A) \) refers to the set of transmitters \( A \) with individual messages \( w_A \).

To perform the task of decoding transmitter identity at the decoder, the condition of message ordering \( w_i < w_j \forall i < j \) in the decoding rule (49) is removed. Therefore, at time \( n_t \), the decoder has to check the threshold rule for \( (\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_k}) M^t \) (instead of \( (\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_k}) M^t \)) message vectors. Once a message vector with size \( t \) passes the threshold rule, the identity of \( t \) active transmitters and their individual messages are decoded. Note that when \( K \) is finite, \( (\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_k}) M^t \) is a finite constant by assumption; therefore, the increased size of the message set does not affect the second-order term in our achievability result.

In the following analysis, we bound the error probability of the code \( \left\{ (f_k, g_k) \right\}_{k=1}^{K} \) described above. The main difference between the proof of Theorem 2’ and that of Theorem 2 is that in Theorem 2’, we do not declare an error if two or more messages are identical, since every encoder has its own codebook. The error analysis is displayed in (96)–(100) at the top of the next page. We use \( w^*_{[k]} = (1, \ldots, 1) \) as an example instance of a message vector \( w_{[k]} \), and \( A = [k] \). The vector \( w^*_{[k]} \) denotes the messages which were not transmitted. \( X_{[k]} \) and \( X_{S}(w_{[S]}) \) represent the codewords for \( w_{[k]} \) and \( w_{[S]} \), respectively. The error analysis follows similarly to (52)–(57), except that in the case where a decoded codeword is wrong in \( s \) dimensions and right in \( t - s \) dimensions (98), the set of transmitters that are wrongly decoded, denoted by \( S \), can be any \( s \) of the possible \( K - (t - s) \) transmitters; and for any \( S \), \( w_{[S]} \) can be any vector from \( [M]^s \). Applying the argument in (58) to (100) completes the proof.

Observe that while the \( f_k \) inequality in our Theorem 2 does not explicitly depend on \( K \), in that Theorem 2’ does; this is a consequence of the use of \( K \) independent encoders. The last term (40) in Theorem 2, which is \( O(1/\sqrt{M^k}) \) according to Theorem 1, is roughly multiplied by \( (\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_k}) \) in (92). Therefore, in the case where the transmitters’ identities are also handled by the RAC, the first- and second-order terms in the achievability result given in Theorem 1 are preserved.

VI. TESTS FOR NO ACTIVE TRANSMITTERS

In this section, we give an analysis of the error probabilities of the composite binary hypothesis test that we use to decide between \( H_0: \) “no active transmitters”, and \( H_1: \) “\( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \) active transmitters”; that is

\[
H_0 : Y^n_{\epsilon_0} \sim P_{Y_0}^{n_0},
\]

\[
H_1 : Y^n_{\epsilon_0} \sim P_{Y_0}^{n_k} \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq K.
\]

In the context of Theorem 2, the maximal number of transmitters, \( K \), can be infinite. In that case, enumerating all alternative possibilities as in (101) becomes infeasible, and a universal (goodness-of-fit) test is appropriate:

\[
H_0 : Y^n \sim P_{Y_0}^{n_0},
\]

\[
H_1 : Y^n \sim P_{Y_0}^{n_k}.
\]

Following [39], a test statistic \( h_n(Y^n) \) is a function that maps the observed sequence \( Y^n \) to a real number used to measure the correspondence between that sequence and the null hypothesis. A (randomized) test corresponding to the test statistic \( h_n \) is binary random variable that depends only on \( h_n(Y^n) \). The test is deterministic if it outputs \( H_0 \) if \( h_n(Y^n) \leq \gamma_0 \) for some constant \( \gamma_0 \), and \( H_1 \) otherwise.
\[ \epsilon_k = \frac{1}{M^n} \sum_{w'[k]\in[M]^k} \mathbb{P}(\{g_0(Y^n_{k}) = 0\} \cup \{g_k(Y^n_{k}) \neq \epsilon\} \cup g_k(Y^n_{k}) \neq (w'[k], [k]) | W_{[k]} = w'_{[k]} \] (96)

\[ \leq \mathbb{P}(g_0(Y^n_0) = 0) | W_{[k]} = w'_{[k]} | + \mathbb{P}(g_k(Y^n_0) = \epsilon | W_{[k]} = w'_{[k]} | + \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{t} \mathbb{P}(g_k(Y^n_0) = (w'_t, [t]) | W_{[k]} = w'_{[k]} \] (97)

\[ \sum_{t=1}^{k} \sum_{s=1}^{t} \left( \frac{k}{t-s} \right) \mathbb{P}(w_0 \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k) \cup w_{0} \in [M]^k \} \{g_k(Y^n_0) = ((\bar{w}_S, w'_t[s+1:t]), (S, [s + 1 : t])) | W_{[k]} = w'_{[k]} \] (98)

\[ \mathbb{P}(h(Y^n_0) \leq \gamma_0) + \mathbb{P}(\{h_k(X^n_{k}; Y^n_0) \leq \log \gamma_k\} \leq \log \gamma_k) + \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{t} \mathbb{P}(\{h_k(X^n_{k}; Y^n_0) > \log \gamma_t\} + \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{t} \mathbb{P}(\{h_k(X^n_{k}; Y^n_0) > \log \gamma_t\}) \] (99)

Type-I and type-II errors corresponding to a deterministic test with the statistic \( h_n \) are defined as

\[ \alpha(h_n) \triangleq P_{Y_0}[h_n(Y^n) > \gamma_0], \] (103)

\[ \beta(h_n) \triangleq Q[h_n(Y^n) \leq \gamma_0], \] (104)

where \( Q \) is the unknown alternative distribution of \( Y_0 \), and \( \gamma_0 \) is a constant determined by the desired error criterion. For our application, we choose \( \gamma_0 \) to ensure that we meet the zero-transmitters error bound \( \epsilon(h_n) \leq \epsilon_0 \), and then show that \( \beta(h_n) \) decays exponentially with \( n \) for each \( Q \) in \( \{P_{Y_1}, \ldots, P_{Y_K}\} \) to ensure (26) in Theorem 1.

In sections A–B below, we consider Hoeffding’s test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test as possible hypothesis tests for recognizing the zero-transmitter scenario. Both tests are universal in the sense that the test statistics do not vary with the alternative distribution. They both give an exponentially decaying type-II error for a fixed type-I error \( \epsilon_0 \in (0, 1) \). When the channel output alphabet is finite for every \( k \) (as in the adder-erasure RAC in (21)), Hoeffding’s test achieves the same exponent as the Neyman-Pearson Lemma. The Neyman-Pearson Lemma is optimal for alternative distributions \( P_{Y_1}, \ldots, P_{Y_K} \), but is not universal, meaning that a different test statistic is necessary for each choice in \( \{P_{Y_k} : k \in [K]\} \). Unlike the Hoeffding test, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test does not require \( Y \) to be finite; however, when applied to a setting with finite \( Y \), it achieves a type-II error exponent that is inferior to that achieved by Hoeffding’s test. In Section VI-C, we compare the performances of these universal test statistics to that of the log-likelihood ratio (LLR) threshold test, which is third-order optimal in terms of the type-II error exponent for composite hypothesis testing [40] and relies explicitly on all alternative distributions \( P_{Y_1}, \ldots, P_{Y_K} \).

A. Hoeffding’s test

Define the empirical distribution of an observed sequence \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) by

\[ \hat{P}_{y^n}(a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} 1[y_t = a], \quad a \in Y. \] (105)

Hoeffding’s test is based on the relative entropy between \( P_{Y_0} \) and the empirical distribution \( P_{y^n} \) of the sequence \( y^n \) with the test statistic

\[ h_n^H(y^n) = D(\hat{P}_{y^n} \| P_{Y_0}), \] (106)

where \( D(\cdot \| \cdot) \) denotes the Kullback-Leibler divergence. Note that if \( P_{Y_0} \) is a continuous distribution, \( h_n^H(y^n) = +\infty \) trivially.

**Theorem 3** (Hoeffding’s test [41]). Let \( Y \) be a finite set. As long as \( P_{Y_0} \) is absolutely continuous with respect to \( Q \), and \( P_{Y_0} \neq Q \), where \( Q \) is the unknown alternative distribution of \( Y_0 \), type-I and type-II errors of the Hoeffding’s test satisfy

\[ \alpha(h_n^H) \leq \exp\{-n\gamma_0 + O(\log n)\}, \] (107)

\[ \beta(h_n^H) \leq \exp\{-n\inf_{P: D(P \| P_{Y_0}) < \gamma_0} D(P \| Q) + O(\log n)\}. \] (108)

In [41], a more restrictive assumption \( (P_{Y_0}(y) > 0 \text{ and } Q(y) > 0 \text{ for all } y \in Y) \) is used. Absolute continuity is sufficient according to the proofs given in [39] and [42, Th. 2.3], which both use Sanov’s theorem. The error exponents of Hoeffding’s test coincide with the exponents of the optimal (Neyman-Pearson Lemma) binary hypothesis test. Therefore, Hoeffding’s test is asymptotically universally most powerful.

Setting \( \gamma_0 = \frac{|y| \log n}{n} \) achieves type-I error \( \epsilon_0 \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \); therefore, the type-I error condition is satisfied for any \( \epsilon_0 > 0 \) and sufficiently large \( n \). Under this choice, type-II error \( \exp\{-nD(P_{Y_0} \| Q) + o(n)\} \) is achieved (See [42, Th. 2.3]). Therefore, the maximum type-II error decays with exponent

\[ C' = \inf_{k \in [K]} D(P_{Y_0} \| P_{Y_k}) \] (109)

\[ \geq 2 \inf_{k \in [K]} \left\{ \left( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_k(x) - F_0(x)| \right)^2 \right. \] (110)

\[ + \frac{4}{9} \left( \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_k(x) - F_0(x)| \right)^4 \]

\[ \geq 2 \delta_0^2 + \frac{4}{9} \delta_0^4, \] (111)
in (67), where the inequality in (110) is due to [43, eq. (5)-(6)] and Pinsker's inequality [44], and the inequality in (111) follows from (16).

Zeitouni and Gutman [39] extended Hoeffding’s test to continuous distributions. Their test, which also uses the empirical distribution, is based on “δ-smoothing” of the decision regions obtained by a relative entropy comparison, and is optimal under a slightly weaker optimality criterion than the standard first-order type-II error exponent criterion. Using [39, Th. 2], it can be shown that Zeitouni and Gutman’s test also yields the desired exponentially decaying maximum type-II error.

B. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test [45], [46] relies on the empirical cumulative distribution function of the observed sequence \(y_1, \ldots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}\):

\[
\hat{F}^{(n)}(x|y^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1\{y_i \leq x\}, \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

To test whether the observed sequence \(y^n\) is well-explained by \(P_{y_0}\) with the cumulative distribution function \(F_0\), the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test uses the following statistic

\[
h_n^{KS} (y^n) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\hat{F}^{(n)}(x|y^n) - F_0(x)|.
\]

The following theorem bounds the probability that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic exceeds a threshold \(\gamma_0\).

**Theorem 4** (Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz [47], [48]). Let \(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n\) be drawn i.i.d. according to an arbitrary distribution \(P_{y_0}\) with cumulative distribution function \(F_0\) on \(\mathbb{R}\). For any \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(\gamma_0 > 0\), it holds that

\[
\alpha(h_n^{KS}) \leq 2 \exp(-2n\gamma_0^2).
\]

In [47], Dvoretzky et al. proved the theorem with an unspecified multiplicative constant \(C\) in front of the \(\exp\) in the right side of (114). In [48], Massart established that \(C = 2\).

In our operational regime of interest, we set the type-I error to a given constant \(\alpha_0\), which by Theorem 4 corresponds to setting the threshold \(\gamma_0\) to

\[
\gamma_0 = \sqrt{\frac{2\log \frac{2}{\alpha_0}}{2n}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right).
\]

We next bound the type-II errors for every \(k \in [K]\). For each \(k \in \{0, \ldots, K\}\), let \(F_k\) denote the cumulative distribution function of \(P_{y_k}\). The type-II error when \(k \geq 1\) transmitters are active is bounded as

\[
\beta_k(h_n^{KS}) = \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\hat{F}^{(n)}(x|y^n) - F_0(x)| \leq \gamma_0\right]
\]

\[
\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left|F_k(x) - F_0(x)\right|ight.
\]

\[
\left. - |\hat{F}^{(n)}(x|y^n) - F_k(x)| \right| \leq \gamma_0\right]
\]

\[
\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left|\hat{F}^{(n)}(x|y^n) - F_k(x)| - F_0(x)|\right| \leq \gamma_0\right],
\]

(117)

where (117) follows from triangle inequality \(|x + y| \geq |x| - |y|\), and (119) follows from Theorem 4 and (115). Applying (16) to (119), we conclude that the maximum type-II error decays exponentially with \(n\), with exponent

\[
C' = 2 \inf_{k \in [K]} \left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_k(x) - F_0(x)|\right)^2
\]

\[
\geq 2\delta_0^2
\]

in (67). Comparing (120) and (110), from (16), we see that the type-II error exponent achieved by Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is always inferior to that achieved by Hoeffding’s test.

C. The optimal composite hypothesis test

From (111) and (121), we know that there exists a positive constant \(C\) such that

\[
n_0 \geq C \log n + o(\log n)
\]

suffices to meet the error requirements of the composite hypothesis test given in (65) and (66). Since the proposed tests are universal, Theorem 2 allows us to decode any message set of \(k \leq K\) active transmitters without knowing the total number of transmitters \(K\). In this section, we find the smallest first three terms in the right side of (122) that we can achieve when \(K\) is finite and we allow the composite hypothesis test to depend on the alternative distributions \(P_{Y_1}, \ldots, P_{Y_K}\).

Let \(\beta_{n_0}(P_{y_0}, \{P_{y_k}\}_{k=1}^K)\) denote the minimax type-II error among the alternative distributions \(P_{Y_1}, \ldots, P_{Y_K}\) such that type-I error (under \(P_{y_0}\)) does not exceed \(\epsilon_0\); that is

\[
\beta_{n_0}(P_{y_0}, \{P_{y_k}\}_{k=1}^K) = \min_{h_0, n \geq n_0} \max_{k \in [K]} \beta_k(h_n),
\]

where the minimum is over all randomized tests using statistic \(h_n\) and all \(h_n\) on \(Y^n\).

The LLR test statistic \(h_n^{LLR}: Y^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K\) is given by

\[
h_n^{LLR}(y^n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i^{LLR}(y_i),
\]

where

\[
h_i^{LLR}(y) = \begin{cases} \log \frac{P_{y_0}(y)}{P_{y_1}(y)} & \\ \log \frac{P_{y_0}(y)}{P_{y_2}(y)} & \vdots \\ \log \frac{P_{y_0}(y)}{P_{y_K}(y)} \end{cases}
\]

Given a threshold vector \(\tau \in \mathbb{R}^K\), the corresponding LLR test outputs \(H_0\) if \(h_n^{LLR}(y^n) \geq \tau\), and \(H_1\) otherwise.

The gap in the type-II error exponent \((C'\text{ in (67)})\) between the general optimal tests and the LLR tests with the optimal
threshold vector $\tau$ is only $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ [40]; therefore, we only consider minimizing over the LLR tests in (123) for asymptotic optimality.

Denote by $D$ and $V$ the mean and covariance matrix of the random vector $h^{llr}_1(Y_0)$. Respectively. Denote $D_{\min} = \min_{k \in [K]} D(P_{Y_0}, P_{Y_k})$, $T_{\min} = \{k \in [K] : D(P_{Y_0}, P_{Y_k}) = D_{\min}\}$, and

$$V_{\min} = \text{Cov}\left[\left(h^{llr}_1(Y_0)\right)_{T_{\min}}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{T_{\min} \times T_{\min}},$$

(126)
The following theorem gives the asymptotics of the minimax type-II error defined in (123).

**Theorem 5.** Assume that $P_{Y_0}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $P_{Y_k}$, and $0 < D(P_{Y_0}, P_{Y_k}) < \infty$ for $k = 1, \ldots, K$. $V$ is positive definite, and $T = \mathbb{E}[\|h^{llr}_1(Y_0) - D\|_2] < \infty$. Then for any $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$, the minimax type-II error satisfies

$$\beta_{\epsilon_0}(P_{Y_0}, \{P_{Y_k}\}_{k=1}^K) = \exp\left\{-nD_{\min} + \sqrt{nb} - \frac{1}{2}\log n + O(1)\right\},$$

(127)

where $b$ is the solution to

$$\mathbb{P}[Z \leq b_1] = 1 - \epsilon_0,$$

(128)

for $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, V_{\min}) \in \mathbb{R}^{T_{\min}}$. Moreover, the minimax error in (127) is achieved by a LLR test with some threshold vector $\tau$.

**Proof.** Appendix D.

Rewriting (127), from the condition in (65), we see that a reliable decision about whether any of the transmitters is active can be made at time

$$n_0 = \frac{1}{2D_{\min}} \log n_1 + \frac{b}{\sqrt{2D_{\min}}} \sqrt{\log n_1} - \frac{1}{2D_{\min}} \log \log n_1 + O(1).$$

(129)

Theorem 5 implies that the coefficients in front of $\log n_1$, $\sqrt{\log n_1}$ and $\log \log n_1$ in (129) are optimal. Juxtaposing (109) and (129), we see that Hoeffding’s test achieves the optimal first-order error exponent (coefficient in front of $\log n_1$).

**VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

We study the agnostic random access model, in which each transmitter knows nothing about the set of active transmitters beyond what it learns from limited feedback from the receiver, and the receiver knows nothing about the set of active transmitters beyond what it learns from the channel output. In our proposed rateless coding strategy, the decoder attempts to decode only at finitely many decoding times. At each decoding time $n_i$, it sends a single-bit acknowledgment to all transmitters indicating whether or not its estimate for the number of active transmitters is $t$. We prove a non-asymptotic, second-order achievability result for the equal rate point $(R, \ldots, R)$ under the symmetry conditions on the channel (permutation-invariance (2), reducibility (3), friendliness (14) and interference (15)). The main contribution of this paper is that for that nontrivial class of channels, when $k$ transmitters are active, our proposed RAC code design performs as well in terms of capacity and dispersion as the best known code for the $k$-transmitter MAC [21], [23] in which the transmitter activity is known a priori. The assumptions of permutation-invariance (2), reducibility (3), and interference (15) together with identical encoding guarantee (by Lemma 2) that the equal rate point always lies on the sum-rate boundary, rather than in the vicinity of one of the corner points; this ensures that our simplified, single-threshold decoding rule results in no loss in the first two terms compared to schemes with $2^k - 1$ simultaneous rules used in the literature [21]–[24]. Theorem 2’ shows that as long as $K < \infty$, there is no loss in the first two terms even if the decoder is tasked with decoding transmitter identity.

We also provide a tight approximation for the capacity and dispersion of the adder-erasure RAC (21) is an example channel satisfying our symmetry conditions.

In order to decide whether there are any active transmitters without enumerating all $K$ alternative hypotheses, we analyze universal hypothesis tests for the case where the channel output alphabet is finite and the case where the output alphabet is countably or uncountably infinite. Using existing literature, it is possible in both cases to obtain a desired exponentially decaying maximum type-II error under the condition that $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_k(x) - F_0(x)| \geq \delta_0 > 0$ for all $k \in [K]$. We also derive the best third-order asymptotics of the minimax type-II error (Theorem 5).

The existence of a converse result matching our achievability result in Theorem 1 remains an open problem. For discrete memoryless MACs, the best known converse for the average error capacity has a second-order term $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ [33].

**APPENDIX A**

**PROOFS OF LEMMATA 1–4**

We first state and prove Lemma 4, which we then use to prove Lemmas 2, 1, and 3 (in that order).

**Lemma 4.** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k$ be i.i.d., and let the interference (15), permutation-invariance (2), and reducibility (3) assumptions hold. Then, $I_k(X_i; Y_k | X_{i-1})$ is strictly increasing in $i$, i.e. for all $i < j \leq k$,

$$I_k(X_i; Y_k | X_{i-1}) < I_k(X_j; Y_k | X_{j-1}).$$

(130)

**Proof of Lemma 4.** By permutation-invariance (15) and the i.i.d. distribution of $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, we have

$$I_k(X_i; Y_k | X_{i-1}) = I_k(X_j; Y_k | X_{j-1}).$$

(131)

By the chain rule for mutual information, when $U$, $V$ and $T$ are independent,

$$I(U; Y | T) \leq I(U; Y | T, V),$$

(132)

and (130) (with $\leq$ instead of $<$) follows by (131) and substituting $Y \leftarrow Y_k$, $U \leftarrow X_j$, $V \leftarrow X_{[i-1]}$ and $T \leftarrow X_{[i-1]}$ in (132). Equality in (132) is attained if and only if $U$ and $V$
are conditionally independent given $Y$ and $T$. We proceed to show that this is not possible by a contradiction.

Assume that $X_j$ and $X_{[i:j-1]}$ are conditionally independent given $Y_k$ and $X_{[i-1]}$, i.e.,

$$P_{X_{[i:j-1]}|Y_k,X_{[i-1]}} = P_{X_{[i:j-1]}|Y_k,X_{[i-1]}} = P_{X_{[i:j-1]}|Y_k,X_{[i-1]},X_{[i]}},$$

(133)

Setting $X_{[i-1]} = 0^{i-1}$ gives

$$P_{X_{[i:j]}|Y_k,X_{[i-1]}=0^{i-1}} = P_{X_{[j-(i-1)]}|Y_k}$$

(134)

$$P_{X_{[i:j-1]}|Y_k,X_{[i-1]}=0^{i-1}} = P_{X_{[j-(i-1)]}|Y_k}$$

(135)

$$P_{X_{[i]}|Y_k,X_{[i-1]}=0^{i-1}} = P_{X_{[i]}|Y_k}$$

(136)

due to reducibility (2), permutation-invariance (3), and the i.i.d. distribution of $Y$. Therefore, (133) implies that $X_1$ and $X_{[2:j-(i-1)]}$ are conditionally independent given $Y_{k-(i-1)}$, which is not possible by interference assumption (15).

Proof of Lemma 2. Lemma 2 states:

$$\frac{1}{k} I_k(X[k];Y_k) \leq \frac{1}{s} I_k(X[s];Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]}).$$

(137)

By the chain rule for mutual information, the left-hand side of (137) is equal to the average of $k$ terms

$$\frac{1}{k} I_k(X[k];Y_k) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k I_k(X_i;Y_k|X_{[i-1]}).$$

(138)

By permutation-invariance (2) and the chain rule, the right-hand side of (137) is equal to the average of the last $s$ of those terms

$$\frac{1}{s} I_k(X[s];Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]}) = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{i=k-s+1}^k I_k(X_i;Y_k|X_{[i-1]}).$$

Since the terms in these averages are strictly increasing in $i$ by Lemma 4, we have the desired result.

Proof of Lemma 1.

$$I_s = I_k(X[s];Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]} = 0^{k-s})$$

(139)

$$\geq I_k(X[s];Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]})$$

(140)

$$\geq \frac{s}{k} I_k$$

(141)

where (139) is by reducibility (3), (140) is by friendliness (14), and (141) follows by Lemma 2.

Proof of Lemma 3. We write

$$E[l_t(X_t[X];Y_t)] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \frac{P_{Y|X}[X][Y_t]}{P_{Y_t}} \right]$$

(142)

$$= -D(P_{X|Y}||P_{X[X]}|Y_t)$$

(143)

$$+ D(P_{Y_t}||P_{Y_t})$$

$$+ D(P_{X|Y}||P_{X[X]}|Y_t)$$

$$= -D(P_{X|Y}||P_{X[X]}|Y_t)$$

$$+ D(P_{Y_t}||P_{Y_t})$$

(144)

$$\leq I_k(X[X];Y_k)$$

(145)

$$< I_k(X[X];Y_k|X_{[s+1:s+k-t]})$$

(146)

$$= I_k(X[X];Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]})$$

(147)

$$\leq I_k(X[X];Y_k|X_{[s+1:k]} = 0^{k-t})$$

(148)

$$= I_k(X[X];Y_t)$$

(149)

where (145) follows from data processing inequality of relative entropy, (146) follows from the chain rule, permutation-invariance (2), and Lemma 4, (147) follows from permutation-invariance (2), and (148) and (149) follow from friendliness (14) and reducibility (3), respectively.

APPENDIX B

ADDER-ERASURE RAC

Here, we approximate the sum-capacity and dispersion of the adder-erasure RAC for a large number of transmitters $k$.

Theorem 6. The optimal input distribution for the adder-erasure RAC defined in (21) is the equiprobable distribution at all encoders. That input distribution achieves the sum-rate capacity, and

$$I_k(X[s];Y_k) = (1 - \delta) \left( \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\pi e k}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + O(k^{-3}) \text{ nats}$$

(150)

$$V_k(X[s];Y_k) = (1 - \delta) \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta \log \frac{\pi e k}{2}}{12} \right) + O \left( \frac{\log k}{k^3} \right) \text{ nats}^2.$$
Proof of Lemma 5. We apply Stirling’s approximation \[ n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} e^{-n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{12n} + \frac{1}{288n^2} + O(n^{-3})\right), \] and a Taylor series expansion around \( x = 0 \), where \[ k = \frac{n}{2} + \frac{\pi e}{2\sqrt{2\ln n}}, \] to \( P_X(k) = \binom{n}{k} 2^{-n} \) to derive (156). 

Let \( V(X) \) denote the varentropy of \( X \): \[ V(X) = \text{Var} \left[ \ln \frac{1}{P_X(X)} \right]. \] (159)

Lemma 6 (Entropy and varentropy of Binom \((n, \frac{1}{2})\)). For \( X \sim \text{Binom} \((n, \frac{1}{2})\)\),
\[ H(X) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\pi e n}{2} - \frac{1}{12n^2} + O(n^{-3}) \] (160)
\[ V(X) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{12n^2} + O(n^{-3}). \] (161)

Proof of Lemma 6. We write the entropy \( H(X) \) as
\[ H(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} \frac{2^n}{2^n} \ln \left( \frac{2^n}{\binom{n}{k}} \right) \] (162)
\[ = \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{T}(X) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \ln \frac{1}{P_X(X)} - \hat{T}(X) \right] \mathbb{1}\{X \in \mathcal{K} \} + \mathbb{E} \left[ \ln \frac{1}{P_X(X)} - \hat{T}(X) \right] \mathbb{1}\{X \notin \mathcal{K} \}, \] (163)

where \( \hat{T}(k) \) denote the first 3 terms of Taylor series expansion of \( \ln \frac{1}{P_X(k)} \) around \( \frac{n}{2} \), evaluated at \( k \):
\[ \hat{T}(k) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\pi e n}{2} + \frac{(k - \frac{n}{2})^2}{2} - \frac{f(k)}{n} + \frac{g(k) + f^2(k)}{2}. \] (164)

The first term in (163) is computed as
\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \hat{T}(X) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\pi e n}{2} - \frac{1}{12n^2}, \] (165)
by using the moments of \( \text{Binom}(n, \frac{1}{2}) \). By Lemma 5, the second term in (163) is
\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \ln \frac{1}{P_X(X)} - \hat{T}(X) \right] \mathbb{1}\{X \in \mathcal{K} \} = O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right). \] (166)

By Hoeffding’s inequality, we have \[ \mathbb{P} \left[ X \notin \mathcal{K} \right] \leq 2n^{-\frac{A^2}{2}}, \] (167)
where \( A \) is the constant in (155). Since the minimum of \( P_X(k) \) over \( k \) is achieved at \( k = n \), using (167), we get
\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ \ln \frac{1}{P_X(X)} \right] \mathbb{1}\{X \notin \mathcal{K} \} = O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right), \] (168)
for \( A \geq 3 \). Similarly, by taking the derivative of \( \hat{T}(k) \), one can show that \( \hat{T}(k) \leq T(n) \leq n \) for all \( k \in [0, n] \), which gives
\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ T(1) \right] \mathbb{1}\{X \notin \mathcal{K} \} = O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right). \] (169)

Combining (163), (165), (166), (168)–(169), we obtain
\[ H(X) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\pi e n}{2} - \frac{1}{12n^2} + O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right). \] (170)

Via an argument similar to (168) and (169), we can show that for \( A \geq 4 \), the contribution of \( k \notin \mathcal{K} \) to the varentropy is \( O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right) \). Therefore, by using the moments of \( \text{Binom}(n, \frac{1}{2}) \) and Lemma 5, we can approximate the varentropy \( V(X) \) as
\[ V(X) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \ln^2 \frac{1}{P_X(X)} - (H(X))^2 \right] \] (171)
\[ = \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{T}(X))^2 \right] - (H(X))^2 + O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right) \] (172)
\[ = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{12n^2} + O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right). \] (173)

The above analyses use the first 3 terms of the Stirling series (157) to obtain the remainder \( O \left( \frac{\ln^6 n}{n^3} \right) \). Applying the same analyses with 4 terms of the Stirling series improves the remainder to \( O(n^{-3}) \), as claimed in (160) and (161) in the statement of Lemma 6.

We are now equipped to prove Theorem 6.

Proof of Theorem 6. Let \[ E \triangleq \{ Y = e \}. \] (174)
By the chain rule of entropy, we have for the adder-erasure RAC
\[ I_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k) = H(Y_k) - H(Y_k | X_{[k]}) \] (175)
\[ = H(Y_k | E) - H(E) \] (176)
\[ = H(Y_k | E) \] (177)
\[ = (1 - \delta) H(Y_k | E) = 0. \] (178)

Given the independent inputs \( X_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_i) \) for \( i \in [k] \), \( H(Y_k | E = 0) \) is equal to the entropy of sum of \( k \) independent Bernoulli random variables with parameters \( (p_1, \ldots, p_k) \), which is maximized when \( p_i = 1/2 \) for all \( i \) [50]. Therefore, for any \( \delta \in [0, 1] \), the equiprobable input distribution at all encoders, \( X^*_{[k]} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1/2) \), maximizes the mutual information \( I_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k) \) for all \( k \), and
\[ \max_{P_{X_{[k]}, \ldots, P_{X_k}}} I_k(X_{[k]}; Y_k) = (1 - \delta) H(Z), \] (179)
where \( Z \sim \text{Binom}(k, \frac{1}{2}) \), and (150) immediately follows from Lemma 6.

Furthermore,
\[ u_k(X^*_{[k]}; Y_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{w.p. } \delta \\ \ln \frac{2^k}{(\frac{1}{2})^k} & \text{w.p. } (1 - \delta) \frac{1}{2^k}, \ 0 \leq i \leq k, \end{cases} \] (180)
which gives
\[
\text{Var} \left[ t_k(X_k^*; Y_k) \right] = (1 - \delta) \left[ V(Z) + \delta(H(Z))^2 \right],
\]
and (151) immediately follows from Lemma 6.

**APPENDIX C**

**BOUND ON THE CARDINALITY \(|U|\)**

The following theorem shows that although in the analysis in Section IV-B, \(|U| = |X|^{MnK}\) is considered, we can restrict \(|U| \leq K + 1\) without loss of generality. Theorem 7, stated next, improves the cardinality bound on \(|U|\) in [11, Th. 19] from \(K + 2\) to \(K + 1\) by using the connectedness of the set of achievable error vectors defined in (182).

**Theorem 7.** If an \((M, \{(n_k, \epsilon_k)\}_{k=0}^K)\) RAC code exists, then there exists an \((M, \{(n_k, \epsilon_k)\}_{k=0}^K)\) RAC code with \(|U| \leq K + 1\).

**Proof of Theorem 7.** For fixed \(M, n_0, \ldots, n_K, \) let \(G_u\) denote the set of achievable error vectors compatible with message size \(M,\) blocklengths \(n_0, \ldots, n_K,\) and cardinality \(|U| \leq u,\) that is
\[
G_u = \{(\epsilon'_0, \ldots, \epsilon'_K) : \exists (M, \{(n_k, \epsilon'_k)\}_{k=0}^K) \text{ code with } |U| \leq u\},
\]
and \(G\) denotes the set of achievable error vectors compatible with message size \(M\) and blocklengths \(n_0, \ldots, n_K,\) that is
\[
G = \{(\epsilon_0, \ldots, \epsilon_K) : \exists (M, \{(n_k, \epsilon_k)\}_{k=0}^K) \text{ code}\}.
\]
As observed in [11, Proof of Th. 19], \(G = G_{|X|^{MnK}}\) is the convex hull of \(G_1.\) Indeed, every vector \((\epsilon_0, \ldots, \epsilon_K)\) in \(G\) is a convex combination of vectors in \(G_1,\) and the coefficients of the convex combination are determined by the distribution of the common randomness random variable \(U.\)

Furthermore, \(G_1\) is a connected set. To see this, take any \(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in G_1.\) Since for any \(\epsilon' \geq \epsilon\) with \(\epsilon \in G_1,\) the line segments \(L_1 = \{(\lambda \epsilon_2 + (1 - \lambda) \epsilon_1) : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}, \) \(i = 1, 2\) also belong to \(G_1,\) and the path \(L_1 \cup L_2\) connects \(\epsilon_1\) and \(\epsilon_2,\) which implies that \(G_1\) is a connected set. Since \(G = \text{conv}(G_1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{K+1,}\) and \(G_1\) is a connected set, by Fenchel-Eggleton-Carathéodory’s theorem [51, Th. 18 (ii)], \(G = G_{K+1}\) holds. Therefore, \((\epsilon_0, \ldots, \epsilon_K) \in G\) implies that \((\epsilon_0, \ldots, \epsilon_K) \in G_{K+1}.\)

**APPENDIX D**

**COMPOSITE HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

We first give a lemma that is used in the proof of Theorem 5.

**Lemma 7.** Let \(f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}\) be a continuous and nondecreasing function. For any \(a\) in the image of \(f, a \in \text{Im} f,\) it holds that
\[
b^* = \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(b) = a} \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} b_j = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d} : f(x) = a} x.
\]

**Proof.** Since \(a \in \text{Im} f,\) there exists \(b \in \mathbb{R}^d\) such that \(f(b) = a.\) Denote by \(b_{\min}\) and \(b_{\max}\) the minimum and maximum components of \(b,\) respectively. Since \(f\) is nondecreasing,
\[
f(b_{\min}) \leq a = f(b) \leq f(b_{\max}).
\]
Therefore, since the function mapping \(b \to f(b)\) is continuous and nondecreasing, by the intermediate value theorem, there exists some \(b \leq b_{\max}\) such that \(f(b) = a.\) Equation (184) follows.

See Fig. 4 for an illustration of Lemma 7.

![Fig. 4: An example to illustrate Lemma 7: \(f(b) = F_Z(b)\) is the cumulative distribution function of \(Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, V),\) where \(V = [0.4, 0.5, 1].\) The shaded region illustrates the set \(\{b \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(b) \geq a = 0.95\}.\) Lemma 7 says that the minimax on this set is achieved at a point multiple of 1. For this example, the optimizer is \(b^* = (1.69, 1.69).\)

Define the multidimensional counterpart of the \(Q^{-1}(\cdot)\) function
\[
Q_{\text{inv}}(V, \epsilon) \triangleq \left\{ \tau \in \mathbb{R}^K : \mathbb{P}[Z \leq \tau] \geq 1 - \epsilon \right\}.
\]
where \(Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, V).\)

**Proof of Theorem 5.** We first denote the set of achievable type-II error vectors for any composite hypothesis test in the form of (101) with type-I error not exceeding \(\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)\) by \(\mathcal{E}_{\epsilon_0}(P_{Y_0}, \{P_{Y_k}\}_{k=1}^K) \triangleq \left\{ (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_K) : \exists a \text{ (randomized) test such that} \right\}
\[
\mathbb{P}[\text{Decide } H_1| H_0] \leq \epsilon_0,
\]
\[
\mathbb{P}[\text{Decide } H_0| H_1] = \epsilon_k, 1 \leq k \leq K\}
\]
Huang and Moulin [40, Th. 1] show that the asymptotics of the error region defined in (187) is given by
\[
\mathcal{E}_{\epsilon_0}(P_{Y_0}, \{P_{Y_k}\}_{k=1}^K)
\]
\[
= \exp \left\{ -n\mathbf{D} + \sqrt{n}Q_{\text{inv}}(V, \epsilon_0) - \frac{1}{2} \log n + O(1) \right\}.
\]
In the converse part of the proof of [40, Th. 1], Huang and Moulin show that for any LRT with threshold vector \(\tau\) such that the type-I error is bounded by \(\epsilon_0,\) it holds that
\[
\tau = n\mathbf{D} - \sqrt{n}b + O(1) \mathbf{1}
\]
for some $b \in Q_{\text{inv}}(V, \epsilon_0)$. Then, it is assumed that $b = O(1)$, and [40, Lemma 2] is applied. However, according to the definition of $Q_{\text{inv}}(V, \epsilon_0)$ in (186), $b$ can have coordinates growing with $n$, which violates this assumption. Despite this difficulty, we can still confirm that the asymptotic expansion in (188) holds due to a discussion in [52]. In [52, Remark 9], Chen et al. compare the third-order converse results for the Slepian-Wolf rate region obtained using (188) and Han’s converse [52, Th. 9]. Since Han’s converse gives a lower bound for the type-II errors defined in (187), and Han’s converse already yields the third-order expansion in (188), we see that the expansion in (188) must hold.

By the definition of the minimax error (123) and the characterization of the achievable error region asymptotics in (188), we have

$$
\beta_{\epsilon_0}(P_{Y_0}, \{P_{Y_k}\}_{k=1}^K) = \min_{z \in \exp \{-nD + \sqrt{n}Z \leq z\}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} z_k.
$$

Applying Lemma 7 with $f(z) = \mathbb{P}\{-nD + \sqrt{n}Z \leq z\}$ and $a = 1 - \epsilon_0$, where $Z \sim N(0, V)$, we obtain

$$
\beta_{\epsilon_0}(P_{Y_0}, \{P_{Y_k}\}_{k=1}^K) = \min_{z \in \mathbb{R} : f(z) \geq 1 - \epsilon_0} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \log n + O(1) \right\}.
$$

Since $f(z)$ is nondecreasing and continuous,

$$
f(z^* \mathbf{1}) = 1 - \epsilon_0
$$

holds, where $z^*$ achieves the minimum in the right-hand side of (191). By Chernoff bound on $f(z)$, for any $z = nE + o(n)$ with $E > -D_{\text{min}}$, we have $f(z^*) = 1 - o(1)$. Similarly, for $E < -D_{\text{min}}$, we have $f(z^*) = o(1)$, giving

$$
z^* = -nD_{\text{min}} + o(n).
$$

We proceed to show that the minimum in the right-hand side of (191) is achieved at

$$
z^* = -nD_{\text{min}} + \sqrt{n}b + O(1),
$$

which implies (194). Combining (191) and (194) completes the proof.
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