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Abstract—Establishing the sphere packing bound for block codes on the discrete stationary product channels with feedback—which are commonly called the discrete memoryless channels with feedback—was considered to be an open problem until recently, notwithstanding the proof sketch provided by Augustin in 1978. A complete proof following Augustin’s proof sketch is presented, to demonstrate its adequacy and to draw attention to two novel ideas it employs. These novel ideas (i.e., the Augustin’s averaging and the use of subblocks) are likely to be applicable in other communication problems for establishing impossibility results.

Index Terms—Feedback communications, reliability function, error exponent, sphere packing bound/exponent, error analysis.

I. INTRODUCTION
After the founding paper of Shannon [1], establishing the channel capacity as the threshold rate for reliable communications was determining the behavior of the optimum error probability as a function of the block length at rates below the channel capacity. The optimum error probability was shown to decay exponentially with the block length and the exponent of this decay (i.e., the error exponent, or the reliability function) was determined at all rates between the critical rate and the capacity of the channel in [2]–[4] for various channel models. Although it was not always discussed in these terms, [2]–[4] proved the following two distinct results in order determine the error exponent at rates between the critical rate and the capacity of the channel.

(i) The Random Coding Bound (RCB): At all rates less than the capacity, the random coding exponent (RCE) is achievable, i.e., the error exponent is bounded from below by the RCE.

(ii) The Sphere Packing Bound (SPB): At any rate less than the capacity the error exponent is bounded from above by the sphere packing exponent (SPE).

The RCE and the SPE are equal to one another for all rates between the critical rate and the channel capacity. Thus (i) and (ii) determine the error exponent exactly for all rates between the critical rate and the capacity on any channel that they are established.

In [5], Gallager proved (i) not only for all of the models considered in [2]–[4], but also for essentially all memoryless channel models of interest, including the non-stationary ones. The elegance and the simplicity of Gallager’s derivation and the generality of his result make his seminal paper [5] of interest to the contemporary researchers after decades [6], [7].

For the SPB —i.e., for (ii)— the progress did not happen at once as it did for (i). The first two complete proofs of the SPB for arbitrary discrete stationary product channels (DSPCs)1 by Shannon, Gallager, and Berlekamp in [8] and by Haroutunian in [9] both relied on expurgations based on the composition (i.e., the empirical distribution, or the type) of the input codewords. Thus the proofs in [8] and [9] hold only for codes on stationary channels with finite input sets. In [10], Augustin provided the first proof of the SPB on the product channels that does not assume either the stationarity of the channel or the finiteness of its input set. In [11], we have improved the approximation error term of the upper bound on the error exponent given in [10] from $O(n^{-0.5})$ to $O(n^{-1} \ln n)$ for the block length $n$, using the Rényi capacity and center analyzed in [12].

Unlike the proofs in [8] and [10], Haroutunian’s proof in [9] establishes the SPB not only for codes on the product channels but also for codes on the stationary memoryless channels with either composition or cost constraints. However, the finite input set hypothesis of [9] curbs its usefulness for models other than the discrete ones, e.g., [9] does not imply the SPB for the Poisson channels, derived for the first time in [13]. Building upon the techniques he developed in [10] and [14, §31] and employing the information measures he analyzed in [14, §34], Augustin proved the SPB on (possibly non-stationary) cost constrained memoryless channels with bounded cost functions in [14, §36]. Augustin’s SPB given in [14, Thm. 36.6] applies to the Poisson channels, but not to various Gaussian channels analyzed in [2], [15], [16] because the quadratic cost function is not bounded. In [17], we have proved the SPB for codes on the cost constrained memoryless channels —without assuming the cost function to be bounded— using the constrained Augustin capacity and center analyzed in [14, §34] and [18]. The SPB given in [17, Thm. 2] implies the SPB not only for the Poisson channels, but also for various Gaussian channels considered in [2], [15], [16].

Despite their generality, Augustin proofs in [10] and [14] did not have nearly as much impact as the proofs in [8] and [9]. This is partly due to the considerable simplification provided by the application of the composition based expurgations in [8] and [9]. This reliance on the composition based expurgations, however, were making the derivation of the SPB with the techniques in [8] and [9] rather convoluted and tedious —if at all possible—for codes on channels other than the stationary memoryless ones with finite input sets. For codes on DSPCs

1The channels that we call DSPCs are usually called discrete memoryless channels (i.e., DMCs). We use the name DSPC to underline the stationarity of these channels and the non-existence of constraints on their input sets; see §I-B for a more detailed discussion.
with feedback, for example, there is no evident generalization for the concept of composition of an input codeword that can be used in a derivation of the SPB similar to [8] or [9]. Thus establishing the SPB for arbitrary DSPCs with feedback has been a significant challenge. Nevertheless, several partial results have been reported over the years.

For DSPCs with feedback that have certain symmetries, Dobrushin established the SPB in [19]. For arbitrary DSPCs with feedback, Haroutunian [20] derived an upper bound on the error exponent, which is usually called Haroutunian’s bound/exponent. Haroutunian’s exponent is equal to the SPE only for DSPCs with certain symmetries; Haroutunian’s exponent is strictly greater than the SPE even for non-symmetric binary input binary output channels. Sheverdyaev proposed a derivation of the SPB for codes on DSPCs with feedback using Taylor’s expansion in [21]. Sheverdyaev’s proof was, however, supported rather weakly on several critical steps, see [22, A7] for a more detailed discussion. Curtailing the ways feedback link can be used by appropriate assumptions, [22]–[24] derived the SPB for certain families of codes on arbitrary DSPCs with feedback.

Augustin presented a proof sketch establishing the SPB on arbitrary DSPCs with feedback in [14, §41]. Despite the novelty of Augustin’s approach and the importance of his result, Augustin’s proof sketch is not widely known. In fact, until very recently, establishing the SPB on DSPCs with feedback has been considered to be an open problem. In the following, we present a complete proof that is following Augustin’s proof sketch without any significant modification. Our main aim is to make the two main ideas of Augustin’s proof—-the averaging and the use of subblocks—widely accessible via this relatively short article. We believe both ideas are likely to be useful in establishing impossibility results in other communications problems. We assume the channel to be discrete for simplicity and employ concepts that are likely to be useful in establishing impossibility results in other communications problems. W e assume the channel to be discrete for simplicity and employ concepts that are likely to be useful in establishing impossibility results in other communications problems. W e assume the channel to be discrete for simplicity and employ concepts that are likely to be useful in establishing impossibility results in other communications problems.

Elsewhere, in [11, §V], we have proved the SPB for codes on DSPCs with feedback using the averaging and the subblock ideas of Augustin [14] together with the Taylor’s expansion idea of Sheverdyaev [21] and the auxiliary channel idea of Haroutunian [9], [20]. In addition, we have shown in [11, §V-E] that Haroutunian’s bound implies the SPB when considered together with the averaging and the subblock ideas of Augustin. Although proofs in [11, §V] do employ ideas from Augustin’s proof sketch, both proofs also employ other fundamental observations which makes them substantially different from the proof we present in the following.

In the rest of the current section, we first describe our notation and model, then state the main asymptotic result, i.e., Theorem 1. In §II, we recall certain properties of Rényi’s information measures and SPE, derive preliminary results on tilting and stochastic sequences, and state a sufficient condition for constructing a probability measure with a given set of conditional probabilities on a product space. In §III, we prove a non-asymptotic SPB for codes on DSPCs with feedback, which implies Theorem 1. In §IV, we discuss possible generalizations and alternative proofs for the main result of the paper, establishing the sphere packing exponent as an upper bound to the reliability function for channel with feedback.

A. Notation

We denote the set of all real numbers by \( \mathbb{R} \), positive real numbers by \( \mathbb{R}_+ \), non-negative real numbers by \( \mathbb{R}_{\geq} \), and integers by \( \mathbb{Z} \). For any real number \( z \), \( |z| \) is the greatest integer less than or equal to \( z \), \( \lfloor z \rfloor \) is the least integer greater than or equal to \( z \), and \( |z| \) is the absolute value of \( z \). For any set \( A \) the indicator function \( 1_A(\cdot) \) is defined as follows:

\[
1_A(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & x \in A \\
0 & x \notin A 
\end{cases}.
\]

For any finite set \( Y \), we denote the set of all subsets of \( Y \) (i.e., the power set of \( Y \)) by \( 2^Y \) and the set of all probability mass functions (p.m.f.’s) on \( Y \) by \( \mathcal{P}(Y) \). For any \( q \) and \( w \) in \( \mathcal{P}(Y) \) the total variation distance between them is defined as

\[
||q - w|| \triangleq \sum_{y \in Y} |q(y) - w(y)|.
\]

While discussing the continuity of functions, we will assume that the set of real numbers is equipped with its natural topology and the set of all p.m.f.’s is equipped with the total variation topology.

For any two finite sets \( X \) and \( Y \), we denote the Cartesian product of \( X \) and \( Y \) by \( X \times Y \), the set of all functions from \( X \) to \( Y \) by \( Y^X \), and the set of all stochastic matrices from \( X \) to \( Y \) by \( \mathcal{P}(Y|X) \). We interpret stochastic matrices from \( X \) to \( Y \) as functions from \( X \) to \( Y \), as well. Thus we use \( W(x) \) and \( W(\cdot|x) \) interchangeably for \( W \)’s in \( \mathcal{P}(Y|X) \). For any \( p \) in \( \mathcal{P}(X) \) and \( W \) in \( \mathcal{P}(Y|X) \), \( p \circ W \) is the p.m.f. on \( X \times Y \) whose marginal distribution on \( X \) is \( p \) and conditional distribution given \( x \) is \( W(x) \). For any \( p \) in \( \mathcal{P}(X) \) and \( q \) in \( \mathcal{P}(Y) \), we denote their product, which is a p.m.f. on \( X \times Y \), by \( p \otimes q \). We use the symbol \( \otimes \) to denote the product of \( \sigma \)-algebras, as well.

For any interval \( A \) on \( \mathbb{R} \) the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra of \( A \), denoted by \( \mathcal{B}(A) \), is the minimum \( \sigma \)-algebra on the subsets of \( A \) that includes all the open subintervals of \( A \). A pair \((\Omega, \mathcal{F})\) is a measurable space iff \( \mathcal{F} \) is a \( \sigma \)-algebra of subsets of \( \Omega \). If in addition \( \mathcal{P} \) is a probability on \( \mathcal{F} \), then the triple \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})\) form a probability space. A real valued function \( X \) on \( \Omega \) is a random variable in the probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})\) iff \( X \) is \( \mathcal{F} \)-measurable (i.e., the inverse image of every set in \( \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \) is in \( \mathcal{F} \)), [25, p. 170]. A sequence of pairs \( (X_1, F_1), \ldots, (X_n, F_n) \) is a stochastic sequence in \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})\) iff \( F_1, \ldots, F_n \) are \( \sigma \)-algebras satisfying \( F_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq F_n \subseteq \mathcal{F} \) and \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are \( F_n \)-measurable random variables, [25, p. 476]. See [25, Ch. II], for an accessible introduction to the mathematical foundations of the probability theory.

Our notation will be overloaded for certain symbols, but the relations represented by these symbols will be clear from the context. We use the short hand \( G_t^\omega \) for the product of \( \sigma \)-algebras \( G_1^\omega, \ldots, G_n^\omega \) for the Cartesian product of sets \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) for the random vector \( (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \), and \( x_t^\omega \) for the vector \( (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \).
B. The DPCs with Feedback and the Channel Codes

A discrete channel with a finite input set $X$ and a finite output set $Y$, is represented by a stochastic matrix $W$. The product of a sequence of discrete channels $W_1, \ldots, W_n$ with the input sets $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and the output sets $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ is a discrete channel from $X_1 \times \cdots \times X_n$ to $Y_1 \times \cdots \times Y_n$, denoted by $W_{[1,n]}$, satisfying

$$W_{[1,n]}(y^n_t | x^n_t) = \prod_{t=1}^n W_t(y_t | x_t)$$

for all $x^n_t \in X^n_1$ and $y^n_t \in Y^n_1$. $W_{[1,n]}$ is a legitimate discrete channel $W_{[1,n]}$ with the input set $X^n_1$ satisfying both $Z \subset X^n_1$ and $U(z) = W_{[1,n]}(z)$ for all $z \in Z$.

The preceding definition of the memorylessness is wholly consistent with the one used in standard texts [26, p. 185], [27, (4.2.1)], [28, p. 84]. Nevertheless, the discrete product channels that are also stationary are customarily called discrete memoryless channels. Although the conventional name is not wrong, we prefer a more descriptive and accurate name: the discrete stationary product channels (DSPCs).

In discrete product channels (DPCs) probabilistic behavior of the channel outputs depend on the channel inputs, but the channel inputs do not depend on the channel outputs in any way. In DPCs with feedback, on the other hand, the channel input at any time instance may depend on the previous channel outputs, i.e., the channel input at time $t$ can be a function from $Y_{t-1} \times X_t$ rather than an element of $X_t$. We define the DPCs with feedback formally as follows.

**Definition 1.** For any positive integer $n$ and $W_t : X_t \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y_t)$ for $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the length $n$ discrete product channel with feedback $W_{[1,n]} : X^n_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y^n_1)$ is defined via the following relation:

$$W_{[1,n]}(y^n_t | x^n_t) = W_1(y_1 | x_1) \prod_{t=2}^n W_t(y_t | x_t y_{t-1})$$

for all $x^n_t \in X^n_1$ and $y^n_t \in Y^n_1$ where $x^n_t = x^n_{t-1}$ for $t \geq 2$ and $x_1 = x_1$. A DPC with feedback $W_{[1,n]}$ is stationary, i.e., it is a DSPC with feedback, iff all $W_t$’s are identical.

Broadly speaking, a channel code is a strategy to convey from the transmitter at the input of the channel to the receiver at the output of the channel, a random choice from a finite amount of message set. The channel codes are usually described in terms of the amount of information they convey per channel use, i.e., in terms of their rate. In particular, a rate $R$ channel code on a length $n$ DPC with feedback $W_{[1,n]}$ is an ordered pair $(\Psi, \Theta)$ composed of the encoding function $\Psi$ that maps the message set $M = \{1, 2, \ldots, |e^{nR}|\}$ to the input set $X^n_1$ and the decoding function $\Theta$ that maps the output set $Y^n_1$ to the message set $M$.

The average error probability $P_{E\theta}^m$ of a rate $R$ channel code $(\Psi, \Theta)$ on a length $n$ DPC with feedback $W_{[1,n]}$ is

$$P_{E\theta}^m \triangleq \frac{1}{|e^{nR}|} \sum_{m \in M} P_{E\theta}^m,$$

where $P_{E\theta}^m$ is the conditional error probability of the message $m$ given by

$$P_{E\theta}^m = 1 - \sum_{y^n_t \in Y^n_t} \text{I}(e(y^n_t)) (m) W_{[1,n]}(y^n_t | \Psi(m))$$

(4)

C. Main Result

**Definition 2.** For any $\alpha \in (0,1]$, $W \in \mathcal{P}(Y | X)$, and $p \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ the order-$\alpha$ Rényi information for prior $p$ is

$$I_\alpha(p; W) \triangleq \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \sum_{x} \sum_{y} p(x) \left[ W(y|x) \right]^\alpha \right\}^{1/\alpha} \quad (0 < \alpha \leq 1),$$

where $q, p \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$ is defined as $q \circ p(y) \triangleq \sum_x p(x) W(y|x)$.

**Definition 3.** For any $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and $W \in \mathcal{P}(Y | X)$ the order-$\alpha$ Rényi capacity of $W$ is

$$C_{\alpha, W} \triangleq \sup_{p \in \mathcal{P}(X)} I_\alpha(p; W).$$

Both the Rényi information and the Rényi capacity are continuous non-decreasing functions of the order $\alpha$ on $[0,1]$, see [12, Lemmas 5 and 15]. We define the order-0 Rényi capacity as the continuous extension of the Rényi capacity at zero:

$$C_{0, W} \triangleq \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} C_{\alpha, W}.$$  

(5)

**Definition 4.** For any stochastic matrix $W \in \mathcal{P}(Y | X)$ and rate $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the sphere packing exponent (SPE) is

$$E_{sp}(R, W) \triangleq \sup_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \frac{1}{\alpha} \left( C_{\alpha, W} - R \right).$$

Note that if $C_{0, W} = C_1, W$, then $E_{sp}(R, W)$ is infinite for $R$’s in $[0, C_1, W)$ and zero for $R$’s in $[C_1, W, \infty)$. For most stochastic matrices of interest, however, $C_{1, W} > C_{0, W}$ and consequently $E_{sp}(R, W)$ is a convex function of $R$ that is infinite on $[0, C_{0, W})$, monotonically decreasing and continuous in $R$ on $[C_{0, W}, C_1, W]$, and zero on $[C_{1, W}, \infty)$, see [11, Lemma 13].

**Remark 1.** For orders in $(0,1)$ the Rényi information is just a scaled and reparameterized version of the Gallager’s function $E_0(\rho, p)$ introduced in [5]; in particular

$$I_\alpha(p; W) = \frac{E_0(\rho, p)}{\rho \alpha} \bigg|_{\rho \alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha}} \quad \forall \alpha \in (0,1).$$

In [8], the function $E_0(\rho)$ is defined as the maximum of Gallager’s function $E_0(\rho, p)$ over $p$’s in $\mathcal{P}(X)$. Thus

$$C_{\alpha, W} = \frac{E_0(\rho)}{\rho \alpha} \bigg|_{\rho \alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha}} \quad \forall \alpha \in (0,1).$$

Consequently, Definition 4 is merely a reparameterization of the definition used by Shannon, Gallager, and Berlekamp in [8, Thm. 2]. In [9], Haroutunian employed another expression for the SPE, which he proved to be equal to the one in [8]. This expression is commonly known as Haroutunian’s form.

3The order-0 Rényi information is defined in a similar way and the supremum $I_0(p; W)$ over $p$’s in $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is equal to $C_{0, W}$, as defined in (5), see [12, Lemma 15-6)].
**Theorem 1.** For any $W \in \mathcal{P}(y|x)$ satisfying $C_{0,W} \neq C_{1,W}$, and $R_0$, $R_1$ satisfying $C_{0,W} < R_0 < R_1 < C_{1,W}$, for all $n$ large enough

$$P_e^n \geq \exp\left(-n\left[E_{\mathcal{W}}(R - \frac{2\ln n}{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}, W) + \frac{2\ln n}{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}\right]\right)$$

for any rate $R$ channel code on the length $n$ DSPC with feedback $W_{[1,n]}$ satisfying $W_1 = W$ provided $R$ satisfies

$$R_1 > R > R_0 + \frac{2\ln n}{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}.$$  

(6)

Note that $\frac{2\ln n}{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}$ terms in (6) and (7) vanish as $n$ increases; thus Theorem 1 establishes the SPE as an upper bound on the error exponent of any DSPC with feedback at any rate in $(C_{0,W}, C_{1,W})$, provided that $W_1 = W$ for all $t$. In fact this result holds with uniform approximation error terms on every closed interval of rates in $(C_{0,W}, C_{1,W})$, as a result of Theorem 1. For rates less than $C_{0,W}$, SPE is infinite; thus the upper bound holds trivially. For rates larger than $C_{1,W}$, we already know that the optimal error probability of the channel codes converges to one by [21], [29].

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Rényi’s Information Measures and SPE

Rényi’s information measures have been studied explicitly [30]–[32] or implicitly [5], [8] since the sixties. For the finite sample space case, the propositions about them that we borrow from [12] and [33] in the following are relatively easy to prove and well-known, except for Lemma 4 establishing the continuity of the Rényi center as a function of the order. Lemma 5 states an immediate corollary of the monotonicity properties of the Rényi capacity and the definition of the SPE.

**Definition 5.** For any $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and $w, q \in \mathcal{P}(y)$, the order-$\alpha$ Rényi divergence between $w$ and $q$ is

$$D_\alpha(w||q) = \begin{cases} \sum_y w(y) \ln \frac{w(y)}{q(y)} & \alpha = 1, \\ \frac{1}{\alpha - 1} \ln \left( \sum_y (|w(y)|^\alpha - |q(y)|^\alpha) \right) & \alpha \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $w, q \in \mathcal{P}(y)$ we have

$$\frac{\ln (\cdot)}{\alpha} D_\alpha(w||q) = D_1 - \alpha (q||w)$$

by definition. Using the derivatives of $e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(w||q)}$ with respect to $\alpha$, one can show that as a function of its order the Rényi divergence is nondecreasing on $(0, 1)$ and continuous from the left at one. Thus, we get the following proposition.

**Lemma 1** ([33, Thms. 3, 7]). For any $w, q \in \mathcal{P}(y)$, the Rényi divergence $D_\alpha(w||q)$ is nondecreasing and continuous in $\alpha$ on $(0, 1]$.

The Rényi divergence is non-negative as a result of the Jensen’s inequality. This observation has been strengthened by the following inequality relating the Rényi divergence to the total variation distance [34], [35], called the Pinsker’s inequality:

$$D_\alpha(w||q) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|w - q\|^2$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $w, q \in \mathcal{P}(y)$.

**Definition 6.** For any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $W \in \mathcal{P}(y|x)$ the order-$\alpha$ Rényi radius of $W$ is

$$S_{\alpha,W} \triangleq \inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}(y)} \max_{x \in X} D_\alpha(W(x)||q).$$

The order-$\alpha$ Rényi capacity is defined as the supremum of the order-$\alpha$ Rényi information; however, it is also equal to the order-$\alpha$ Rényi radius, [32, Proposition 1]. In addition, there exists a unique order-$\alpha$ Rényi center corresponding to this radius. These observations are stated formally in Lemma 2.

**Lemma 2** ([12, Thm. 1]). For any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $W \in \mathcal{P}(y|x)$

$$C_{\alpha,W} = \inf_{q \in \mathcal{P}(y)} \max_{x \in X} D_\alpha(W(x)||q).$$

Furthermore, there exists a unique $q_{\alpha,W} \in \mathcal{P}(y)$, called the order-$\alpha$ Rényi center of $W$, such that

$$C_{\alpha,W} = \max_{x \in X} D_\alpha(W(x)||q_{\alpha,W}).$$

(11)

The Rényi capacity is nondecreasing in its order on $(0, 1]$ as a result of Lemmas 1 and 2. Furthermore, $\frac{1}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,W}$ is nonincreasing in $\alpha$ on $(0, 1)$, as a result of (8) and Lemmas 1 and 2. This implies the continuity of $C_{\alpha,W}$ in $\alpha$ on $(0, 1)$, which can be extended to $(0, 1]$.

**Lemma 3** ([12, Lemma 15-(a,c))]. For any $W \in \mathcal{P}(y|x), C_{\alpha,W}$ is nondecreasing and continuous in $\alpha$ on $(0, 1]$ and $\frac{1}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,W}$ is nonincreasing in $\alpha$ on $(0, 1)$.

As a result of Lemma 3, we have

$$C_{\alpha,W} \leq \frac{C_{1,W}}{\alpha}$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.  

(12)

The continuity of the Rényi capacity in the order implies the continuity of the Rényi center in the order.

**Lemma 4** ([12, Lemma 20]). The Rényi center is a continuous function of its order on $(0, 1]$, i.e., $\lim_{\alpha \to 0^+} \|q_{\alpha,W} - q_{0,W}\| = 0$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$.

The continuity of the Rényi center in the order allows us to construct a probability measure that plays a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 1.

**Proof of Lemma 4.** The following identity, which is due to Sibson [31, p. 153], can be confirmed by substitution.

$$D_\alpha(p \otimes W || p \otimes q) = I_\alpha(p; W) + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}||q)$$

(13)

where $q_{\alpha,p}$ is the order-$\alpha$ Rényi mean defined as follows

$$q_{\alpha,p}(y) \triangleq \frac{\sum_{x} p(x) W(y|x)^\alpha}{\sum_{x} p(x) W(b|x)^\alpha}.$$  

(14)

There exists a $p_n \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ such that $I_\alpha(p_n; W) = C_{\alpha,W}$ as a result of the extreme value theorem [36, 4.16] because $I_\alpha(p; W)$ is continuous in $p$ on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is compact. Note that $q_{\alpha,p_n} = q_{\alpha,W}$ by (9), (13), and Lemma 2. Applying (13) for $q = q_{\phi,W}$ and for $p = p_n$ we get

$$\max_{\phi} D_\alpha(W(x)||q_{\phi,W}) \geq C_{\alpha,W} + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,W}||q_{\alpha,W}).$$

Then using the monotonicity of Rényi divergence in the order (i.e., Lemma 1) and Lemma 2 we get

$$C_{\phi,W} - C_{\alpha,W} \geq D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,W}||q_{\alpha,W})$$

$\forall \phi \in [\alpha, 1]$. 
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Then the lemma follows from (9) and Lemma 3.

Lemma 5. For any stochastic matrix $W \in \mathcal{P}(Y|X)$ satisfying $C_{0,W} \neq C_{1,W}$ and rate $R$ in $(C_{0,W}, C_{1,W})$ there exists a $\phi \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $C_{0,W} = R$ and an $\eta \in (\phi, 1)$ satisfying $1 - \eta C_{1,W} = E_{sp}(R, W)$.

Proof of Lemma 5. Since $C_{0,W}$ is continuous in the order $\alpha$ by Lemma 3, the existence of the order $\phi$ follows from the intermediate value theorem [36, 4.23].

Lemma 6. Let $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}$ be the second moments, given in Lemma 7, are needed for arguments together with the Chebyshev’s inequality. The bounds on the second moments, given in Lemma 7, are needed for applying the Chebyshev’s inequality.

Lemma 7 ([14, Lemma 16.2-(a)]). If $D_{\alpha}(w||q) < \infty$ for an $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $w, q \in \mathcal{P}(Y)$, then

$$\sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) \ln^{2} \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \leq 4e^{-2} + \frac{4 - \alpha^{2}}{\alpha} [4 + D_{\alpha}(w||q)]^{2}, \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) \ln^{2} \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \leq 4e^{-2} + \frac{4 - \alpha^{2}}{\alpha} [D_{\alpha}(w||q)]^{2}. \quad (17)$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Note that

$$\sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) \ln^{2} \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} = \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}} \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right)^{2} \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}} \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \leq 1.$$ (18)

because $\sup_{x \in \{0, 1\}} \ln^{2} \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} = \ln^{2} \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)}$. Furthermore, let $f: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+}$ be

$$f(\tau) = 4e^{-2} \tau \mathbb{I}_{[0, \infty)}(\tau) + \ln^{2} \mathbb{I}_{[0, \infty)}(\tau).$$

Since $f$ is a non-negative function satisfying $\ln^{2} \tau \leq f(\tau)$ for all $\tau \geq 1$ we have

$$\sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) \ln^{2} \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \leq \frac{1}{e} \sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) f(\frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)}) \leq \frac{1}{e} \sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right)^{2} \ln^{2} \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right)$$

for all $y \in \{0, 1\}$. Thus, the continuity of $f$, the Jensen’s inequality, the definition of tilted p.m.f., and the monotonicity of $f$ imply

$$\sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) f \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{e} \sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right)^{2} \ln^{2} \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y} q(y) e^{D_{\alpha}(w||q)} \leq \frac{1}{2} D_{\alpha}(w||q) \leq \frac{1}{2} D_{\alpha}(w||q). \quad (19)$$

On the other hand, the concavity of $f$, the Jensen’s inequality, the definition of tilted p.m.f., and the monotonicity of $f$ imply

$$\sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) f \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{e} \sum_{y} w_{\alpha}^{q}(y) \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right)^{2} \ln^{2} \left( \frac{w_{\alpha}^{q}(y)}{w(y)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{y} q(y) e^{D_{\alpha}(w||q)} \leq \frac{1}{2} D_{\alpha}(w||q). \quad (20)$$

(16) follows from (18), (19), (20). One can prove (17), following a similar analysis and invoking (8).

One can tilt the channel $W: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y)$ with a $q$ in $\mathcal{P}(Y)$, by tilting the individual $W(x)$’s; the resulting channel is called the tilted channel and denoted by $W_{q}$. If the Rényi center of the channel itself is used for tilting, then we call the resulting channel the self-tilded channel.

Definition 8. For any $W \in \mathcal{P}(Y|X)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, the order-\alpha selftilted channel $W_{\alpha}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Y)$ is

$$W_{\alpha}(y|x) = [W(y|x)]^{\alpha} \mathbb{I}_{[0, \infty)}(\alpha - 1) \mathbb{I}_{[0, \infty)}(\alpha - 1)$$

for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$.

C. Construction of a Probability Measure with the Given Conditional Probabilities

In Definition 1, for describing the p.m.f. induced on the output set $Y^{n}_{x}$ by an element $\mathbb{P}^{n}_{x}$ of the input set $X^{n}_{x}$, it was sufficient to specify the conditional p.m.f. given the past at each time instance. This is true for arbitrary finite sample spaces, as well. When constructing probability measures in a similar fashion for more general sample spaces, however, there are additional technical conditions one needs to ensure. If the conditional probability of events at each time are Borel functions of the past, then the existence of a unique probability measure is guaranteed, as demonstrated by the following lemma.
Lemma 8. Let \((\Omega_1, G_1)\) be an arbitrary measurable space for each \(t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\) and \(\Omega = \Omega_1^\ast, G = G_1^\ast\). Suppose that a probability measure \(P^1\) is given on \((\Omega_1, G_1)\) and that, for every \(\omega_1^t \in \Omega_1^t, t \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}\), probability measures \(P^i(\omega_1^i)\) are given on \((\Omega_1^t, G_1^t)\). Suppose that for every \(B \in G_{t+1}\) the functions \(P(B | \omega_1^t)\) are Borel functions of \(\omega_1^t\) and let

\[
P(D_i) = \int_{A_1} P^1(D_1) \int_{A_2} P^2(D_2 | \omega_1^1) \cdots \int_{A_t} P^t(D_t | \omega_1^{t-1})
\]

for all \(A_i \in G_i, t \in \{2, \ldots, n\}\). Then there is a unique probability measure \(P^0(\Omega, G)\) such that

\[
P^0(\{\omega : \omega_1^1 \in A_1, \omega_1^2 \in A_2, \ldots, \omega_1^n \in A_t\}) = P(D_i)
\]

for every \(t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\).

Lemma 8 for \(n = 2\) case is [37, Thm. 2.6.2]. For arbitrary but finite \(n\), Lemma 8 follows from a recursive application of [37, Thm. 2.6.2]. Lemma 8 is also implied by Ionescu Tulcea’s theorem [25, Ch.II §9 Thm. 2], which establishes a more general result for the infinite horizon (i.e., \(n\) case).

Remark 2. \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel)\) is a Borel function iff the inverse image of every Borel set is in \(G_1^t\), i.e., if \(\omega_1^t \in G_1^t\) then \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel) \in G_1^t\) for every \(\omega_1^t \in G_{t+1}\). If — for example — \((\Omega_1, G_1) = (\mathbb{R}, B(\mathbb{R}))\) for all \(t\), then \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel)\)'s are Borel functions whenever \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel)\) are continuous in \(\omega_1^t\).

Remark 3. Lemma 8 requires \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel)\)'s to be Borel functions of \(\omega_1^t\). This is general enough for our purposes because we work with real valued random variables. More generally, this condition is stated as the measurability of \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel)\) in \(G_1^t\), which makes \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel)\)'s transition probabilities (i.e., Markov kernels or stochastic kernels), see [38, §10.7] for a more complete discussion. The same measurability condition makes \(P(\parallel \omega_1^t\parallel)\)'s conditional distributions in the sense of [39, p. 343], as well.

The proof of Theorem 1 presented in the following section employs Lemma 8 in order to assert the existence of a probability with certain conditional probabilities. It is worth mentioning that we are not asserting that one needs to consider infinite sample spaces in order to calculate the average error probability of a channel code on a DSPC with feedback. The expressions in (3) and (4) determine the value of the average error probability relying solely on a finite sample space model. What we are saying is that Augustin’s approach relies on a probability space with an infinite sample space in order to bound the minimum average error probability of channel codes on a given DSPC with feedback.

D. Chebyshev’s Inequality

Lemma 9. Let \(a_1, \ldots, a_n\) be a sequence of real numbers and \((X_1, F_1), \ldots, (X_n, F_n)\) be a stochastic sequence satisfying \(EX_1 | F_{t-1} \leq a_t\) and \(E[X_1^2] < \infty\) for all \(t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\), and \(\sigma\) satisfy \(\sigma^2 = \sum_{t=1}^{n} E[X_1^2] \leq \gamma^2\). Then

\[
P(\sum_{t=1}^{n} X_t < \gamma + \sum_{t=1}^{n} a_t) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma^2}
\]

for all \(\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+\).

Lemma 9 is essentially a corollary of the Chebyshev’s inequality, a proof is presented in Appendix for completeness. A similar lemma was stated for a particular stochastic sequence and probability space in [14, Lemma 41.4].

III. SPB for Codes on DSPC with Feedback

The main aim of this section is to prove a non-asymptotic SPB, i.e., Lemma 10 given in the following. We use this non-asymptotic SPB to prove the asymptotic one given in Theorem 1 at the end of this section in §III-F. Let us start with stating the aforementioned non-asymptotic SPB.

Lemma 10. For any \(W \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Y} | \mathbb{X})\) satisfying \(C_0, W \neq C_1, W\) and \(R_1, R_2\) satisfying \(C_0, W < R_1 < C_1, W\), let \(\phi \in (0, 1)\) satisfy \(C_0, W = R_0, \eta \in (\phi, 1)\) satisfy \(\delta_1 = \frac{2 - \sqrt{2}}{\eta (1 - \eta)}\), and positive integers \(n, \kappa\) satisfy \(\kappa \leq n\). Then any rate \(R\) channel code on the length \(n\) DSPC with feedback \(W_{[1, n]}\) satisfying \(W_1 = W\) satisfies

\[
P_\phi \geq e^{-n [E_{sp}(R - \kappa, W) + \delta_1]},
\]

provided that

\[
R_1 \geq R \geq R_0 + \delta_1,
\]

where

\[
\delta_1 = \frac{\ln 4}{n} + 8 \frac{C_1, 2 - C_1, W}{(1 - \eta)(1 - \eta/2)} + \frac{\ln \kappa}{\ln n},
\]

\[
\delta_2 = \frac{\ln 4}{n} + 8 \frac{C_1, 2 - C_1, W}{\eta (1 - \eta/2)} + \frac{\ln n}{\ln n} + \frac{2 \eta^2}{\phi^2}.
\]

The proof of Lemma 10 relies on a pigeon hole argument and a measure change argument. In this respect, it is similar to the standard proofs of the SPB. Its principle novelty is in the choice/construction of the probability spaces and measures to apply these arguments. We present this construction and the proof through self contained pieces in §III-A-§III-E.

- In §III-A, we divide the block length into \(\kappa\) subblocks of approximately equal length.
- In §III-B, we extend the natural finite sample space that is used to describe the channel codes by introducing a positive valued random variable at beginning of each subblock and construct probability measures \(P, \varphi, \varphi_n\) for the extended sample space using a sequence of functions \(g_1, \ldots, g_n\) to be determined later. The probability of the error event under \(P\) will be equal to \(P_\phi^{av}\) by construction.
- In §III-C, we describe a choice of the functions \(g_1, \ldots, g_n\) that bounds the order-one Rényi divergence between the conditional p.m.f.’s of the outputs of the subblocks, i.e., \(Y_{1, t-1, \cdot}’s, \) under \(P_\phi\) and \(\varphi_n\) as well as under \(P_n\) and \(\varphi\) - \(\varphi_n\) almost surely.
- In §III-D, we use Chebyshev’s inequality to find an event \(E\) in the extended probability spaces satisfying \(P_\phi(E) \geq 0.5\) for both which both \(P\{\mathbb{E} \cap \mathbb{B}\} \geq e^{-n [E_{sp}(R, W)]} P_\phi(\mathbb{E} \cap \mathbb{B})\) and \(P_\phi(E \cap \mathbb{B}) \geq e^{-n} \varphi_n(E \cap \mathbb{B})\) hold for any event \(\mathbb{B}\) in the extended probability spaces.
- In §III-E, we apply a measure change argument together with a pigeon hole argument to prove Lemma 10.
In the following, we assume without loss of generality that the input and output sets are finite subsets of \( \mathbb{R} \). This will allow us to call the channel input and output at time \( t \) random variables and to denote them by \( X_t \) and \( Y_t \), respectively. Similarly, we assume that \( \mathcal{M} \) is a subset of \( \mathbb{R} \) and denote the random variables associated with the transmitted and decoded messages by \( \mathcal{M} \) and \( \mathcal{M} \), respectively. We denote the realizations of the random variables such as \( \mathcal{M}, Z_t, \mathcal{M} \) or vectors such as \( X_t', \; Y_t' \) by the corresponding lowercase letters such as \( m, \; z_t, \; \tilde{m} \) or \( x_t, \; y_t \). We denote the expected value of a random variable \( Q \) under \( \mathcal{P}_v \) by \( \mathbb{E}_v[Q] \). As it is customary, we denote the expected value of a random variable \( Q \) conditioned on the random variable \( Z \) (i.e., conditioned on the minimum \( \sigma \)-algebra generated by \( Z \)) by \( \mathbb{E}[Q | Z] \). When we are working with \( \mathcal{P}_v \) instead of \( \mathcal{P} \), we use \( \mathbb{E}_v[Q | Z] \) rather than \( \mathbb{E}[Q | Z] \).

A. Division into \( \kappa \) Subblocks

We divide the length \( n \) block into \( \kappa \) subblocks of length either \( \lceil n/k \rceil \) or \( \lfloor n/k \rfloor \). In particular, we set \( \ell_0 = 0 \), and define \( \ell_t \) and \( t_t \) for \( t \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa \} \) as follows:

\[
\ell_t = \lceil n/k \rceil \lfloor (t-1)/k \rfloor + 1 + \lfloor (n-t)/k \rfloor, \\
t_t = t - 1 + \ell_t.
\]

The last time instance of the \( \ell^t \)th subblock is \( t_t \); for brevity, we denote the first time instance by \( \tau_t \), i.e.,

\[
\tau_t \triangleq t_{t-1} + 1.
\]

Figure 1 demonstrates a typical partitioning of the length \( n \) block into \( \kappa \) subblocks.

B. Construction of Auxiliary Probability Measures for a Given Sequence of Functions \( g_1, \ldots, g_\kappa \)

Let the sample space \( \Omega \) and \( \sigma \)-algebra of its subsets \( \mathcal{F} \) be

\[
\Omega \triangleq \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{Z}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_1^{1} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Z}_\kappa \times \mathcal{Y}_\kappa^{1}, \\
\mathcal{F} \triangleq 2^\mathcal{M} \times 2^\mathcal{Z}_1 \times 2^\mathcal{Y}_1^{1} \times \cdots \times 2^\mathcal{Z}_\kappa \times 2^\mathcal{Y}_\kappa^{1},
\]

where \( \mathcal{Z}_t \) is the open interval \( (0, 1) \) and \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_t) \) is the associated \( \sigma \)-algebra for each \( t \) in \( \{1, \ldots, \kappa \} \).

Let the \( \sigma \)-algebras \( \mathcal{F}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_\kappa \) be

\[
\mathcal{F}_0 \triangleq 2^\mathcal{M}, \\
\mathcal{F}_t \triangleq \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_t) \otimes 2^\mathcal{Y}_t^{1}, \quad \forall t \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa \}.
\]

In the following, we construct three probability measures on \((\Omega, \mathcal{F})\) — i.e., \( \mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_v \), and \( \mathcal{P}_q \) — through their marginal distributions on \( \mathcal{M} \) and their conditional distributions using Lemma 8. The marginal distributions of \( \mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_v \), and \( \mathcal{P}_q \) on the message set \( \mathcal{M} \) are all equal to the uniform distribution. We specify the conditional distributions of \( \mathcal{Z}_t \)'s individually and the conditional distributions of \( \mathcal{Y}_t \)'s jointly through the conditional distributions of the vectors of the form \( \mathcal{Y}_t^{1} \). In both cases, however, we demonstrate the conditional distributions to be \( \sigma \)-algebra functions. This allows us to invoke the existence of unique probability measures \( \mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_v \), and \( \mathcal{P}_q \) on \((\Omega, \mathcal{F})\) with the given conditional distributions\(^4\) via Lemma 8.

\(^4\) Those readers who are not already familiar with the technical subtleties about the conditional probabilities might benefit from taking the existence of \( \mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_v \), and \( \mathcal{P}_q \) on \((\Omega, \mathcal{F})\) with the conditional distributions given in (26), (27), (28), and (29) granted, at least in their initial reading.

Let us first describe the conditional distributions of \( \mathcal{Z}_t \)’s. Let \( g_1 \) be a function from \( \mathcal{M} \) to \((0, 1)\) to be determined later. Similarly, for each \( t \in \{2, \ldots, \kappa \} \), let \( g_t : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{Y}_t^{1-1} \rightarrow (0, 1) \) be a function that is to be determined later. The conditional distribution of \( \mathcal{Z}_t \) is the same for \( \mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_v \), and \( \mathcal{P}_q \) and it is determined by the function \( g_t \) as follows:

\[
\mathcal{P}(A | m, z_1^{t-1}, y_1^{t-1}) = \frac{1}{z_t} \int_{(1-z_t)\alpha}^{\alpha+(1-\alpha)} 1_A(z) dz 
\]

for all \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_t) \), where \( \alpha = g_t(m, y_1^{t-1}) \). Since \( \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{Y}_t^{1-1} \) is a finite set, all of the elements of its power set are Borel sets and \( \mathcal{P}(A | m, z_1^{t-1}, y_1^{t-1}) \) is a Borel function for any \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_t) \).

Let us proceed with the description of the conditional probability distributions of \( \mathcal{Y}_t \)’s. For \( \mathcal{P}_0 \) we have

\[
\mathcal{P}(y_1^{t} | m, z_1^{t-1}, y_1^{t-1}) = \prod_{t=1}^{t} w(y_t) 
\]

for all \( y_1^{t} \in \mathcal{Y}_t^{1} \), where \( z_t \) is the channel input at time \( t \), which is nothing but \( W_t(y_1^{t}) \) for \( W_t \) satisfying \( \Psi(m) = \nu_0 \).

Note that \( \mathcal{P}(A | m, z_1^{t}, y_1^{t-1}) \) does not depend on \( z_t \). Thus \( \mathcal{P}(A | m, z_1^{t}, y_1^{t-1}) \) is a Borel function for all \( A \subset \mathcal{Y}_t^{1} \) as a consequence of the finiteness of \( \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{Y}_t^{1-1} \).

For \( \mathcal{P}_v \) we have

\[
\mathcal{P}(y_1^{t} | m, z_1^{t}, y_1^{t-1}) = \prod_{t=1}^{t} w(y_t | \mathcal{P}_v) 
\]

for all \( y_1^{t} \in \mathcal{Y}_t^{1} \). Since \( \mathcal{R}_v \) is continuous in its order by Lemma 4, \( \mathcal{P}(A | m, z_1^{t}, y_1^{t-1}) \) is a continuous and hence a Borel function of \( z_t \) for all \( A \subset \mathcal{Y}_t^{1} \).

For \( \mathcal{P}_q \) we have

\[
\mathcal{P}(y_1^{t} | m, z_1^{t}, y_1^{t-1}) = \prod_{t=1}^{t} w(y_t | \mathcal{P}_q) 
\]

for all \( y_1^{t} \in \mathcal{Y}_t^{1} \) where \( W_{\mathcal{R}_q} \) is the order-\( q \) selftailored channel described in Definition 8 and \( x_t \) is the channel input at time \( t \). Since \( W_{\mathcal{R}_q}(x_t) \) is continuous in \( \alpha \) for any \( x_t \) by Lemmas 4 and 6, \( \mathcal{P}(A | m, z_1^{t}, y_1^{t-1}) \) is a continuous function of \( z_t \) for any \( y_1^{t-1} \), which does not depend on \( z_t \). Since \( y_1^{t-1} \) is a finite set, this will ensure \( \mathcal{P}(A | m, z_1^{t}, y_1^{t-1}) \) to be a Borel function for any \( A \subset \mathcal{Y}_t^{1} \).

C. A Choice of \( g_1, \ldots, g_\kappa \)

The preceding construction works for any choice of the functions \( g_1, \ldots, g_\kappa \). However, only some of the choices are appropriate for our purposes. In the following, we choose \( g_1, \ldots, g_\kappa \) by determining the value of \( g_t(m, y_1^{t-1}) \) for each \( t, \; m, \) and \( y_1^{t-1} \) individually and commit to the resulting \( g_1, \ldots, g_\kappa \)’s for the rest of the paper. In order to find the
aforementioned appropriate choice we analyze the value of certain conditional expectation —i.e., $E_v \left[ H \mid m, y^{-1}_{i-1} \right]$ — as a function of the value of $g_i$ at $(m, y^{-1}_{i-1})$—i.e., as a function of $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1})$— at each $(m, y^{-1}_{i-1})$ individually.

Note that $D_1(1/(W_i(z)))q_{z,w}$ is a random variable that is measurable in the $\sigma$-algebra generated by $X_i$ and $Z_i$, because $D_1(1/(W_i(z)))q_{z,w}$ is continuous in $z$ by Lemmas 4 and 6. For any $i \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$, let the random variable $H_i$ be

$$H_i \triangleq \sum_{t=\tau_i}^{t_i} E_v [ D_1(1/(W_i(z)))q_{z,w} | F_{t_i-1}, Z_i ].$$  \hfill (30)

Note that $H_i$ is a non-negative random variable by (9). Furthermore $D_1(1/(W_i(z)))q_{z,w} \leq D_2(1/(W_i(z)))q_{z,w}$ by (9) and (15) and $D_2(1/(W_i(z)))q_{z,w} \leq C_{Z_i}q_{z,w}$ by Lemma 2. Thus for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$, the random variables $H_i$ and $C_{Z_i}q_{z,w}$ satisfy

$$0 \leq H_i \leq \ell_i C_{Z_i}q_{z,w}$$ \hfill (31)

for all realizations of $F_{t_i-1}$ and $Z_i$. Then for all realizations of $F_{t_i-1}$, the conditional expectation $E_v [ H_i | F_{t_i-1} ]$ is a continuous function of the value of $g_i$ at $(m, y^{-1}_{i-1})$ — i.e., $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1})$ — as a result of (26) defining the conditional distribution of $Z_i$ for $P_i, P_{\alpha_i}$, and $P_{\nu_i}$, because $C_{Z_i}q_{z,w}$ is nondecreasing in $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ by Lemma 3. Thus we can tune the value of $E_v [ H_i | F_{t_i-1} ]$ by changing the value of the function $g_i$ for different realizations of $M$ and $Y_i^{-1}$.

On the other hand as a result of the construction, we have

$$E_v [ H_i | F_{t_i-1} ] = E_v [ H_i | M, Y_i^{-1} ].$$ \hfill (32)

We use the following rule to choose the value $g_i$ at each $(m, y^{-1}_{i-1})$ depending on the rate $R$ and the positive constant $\delta_i$ defined in (24).

- If $E_v [ H_i | m, y^{-1}_{i-1} ] \leq \ell_i (R - \delta_i)$ for $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1}) = n/\nu$, then $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1}) = n/\nu$.
- If $E_v [ H_i | m, y^{-1}_{i-1} ] > \ell_i (R - \delta_i)$ for $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1}) = n/\nu$, then $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1}) = \alpha$ for an $\alpha$ in $(\frac{n}{\nu}, \frac{n}{\nu})$ satisfying $E_v [ H_i | m, y^{-1}_{i-1} ] = \ell_i (R - \delta_i)$. The existence of such an $\alpha$ follows from the continuity of $E_v [ H_i | m, y^{-1}_{i-1} ]$ in the value of $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1})$, the intermediate value theorem [36, 4.23], and the inequality $E_v [ H_i | m, y^{-1}_{i-1} ] \leq \ell_i (R - \delta_i)$ for $g_i(m, y^{-1}_{i-1}) = \frac{n}{\nu}$ in order to see why the inequality at $\frac{n}{\nu}$ holds, first note that (26) and (31) imply

$$E_v [ H_i | m, y^{-1}_{i-1} ] \leq \frac{\ell_i}{1 - \phi - \epsilon} C_{Z_i}q_{z,w} \int_{\phi - \epsilon}^{\phi} dz.$$ \hfill (33)

Then the inequality follows from (23), $R_0 = C_{\phi, q_{z,w}}$, and the monotonicity of the Rényi capacity in its order. The choice of $g_i$ described above ensures not only

$$0 \leq E_v [ H_i | F_{t_i-1} ] \leq \ell_i (R - \delta_i)$$ \hfill (34)

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$, but also

$$\frac{\phi - \epsilon}{\max} \leq G_i \leq \frac{n}{\nu}$$ \hfill (35)

for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$, where $G_i$ is the random variable defined as $G_i \triangleq g_i(M, Y_i^{-1})$.

\section*{D. Application of Chebyshev's Inequality to Find an Event with Substantial Probability under the Auxiliary Measure}

The preceding choice of the functions $q_1, \ldots, q_\kappa$, bounds the expected value of random variables that are used in the measure change argument. In order to apply the measure change argument, we first prove — using Lemma 9 — that these random variables take values that are close to their means with substantial probability under $P_0$.

Let $F_{t_i}$-measurable random variable $Q_i$ be

$$Q_i \triangleq \ln \frac{P_i(\cdot | Y_i | m, Z_i, \gamma^{-1})}{P_{\nu_i}(\cdot | Y_i | m, Z_i, \gamma^{-1})} \quad \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}.$$ \hfill (36)

Note that (28), (29), (30), and the definition of order-one Rényi divergence imply

$$E_v [ Q_i | F_{t_i-1}, Z_i ] = H_i.$$ \hfill (37)

Then (33) implies

$$0 \leq E_v [ Q_i | F_{t_i-1} ] \leq \ell_i (R - \delta_i) \quad \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}.$$ \hfill (38)

Let us proceed with bounding the second moments of $Q_i$’s from above. The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality implies

$$E_v [ (Q_i)^2 ] \leq \sum_{t=\tau_i}^{t_i} \sum_{j=\tau_j}^{t_j} E_v [ D_i D_j ] \leq \sum_{t=\tau_i}^{t_i} \sum_{j=\tau_j}^{t_j} E_v [ D_i ] E_v [ D_j ]$$ \hfill (39)

where $D_i \triangleq \ln \frac{P_i(\cdot | Y_i | m, Z_i, \gamma^{-1})}{P_{\nu_i}(\cdot | Y_i | m, Z_i, \gamma^{-1})}$ for all $i \in \{t_i, \ldots, t_i\}$.

On the other hand using the definition of the order-one Rényi divergence and (17) of Lemma 7 we get

$$E_v [ (D_i)^2 ] = E_v [ E_v [ (D_i)^2 | F_{t_i-1}, Z_i, \gamma^{-1} ] ] \leq E_v \left[ 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \phi \right]^{\ell_i (R - \delta_i)} \frac{C_{\phi, w}}{1 - \phi}$$ \hfill (40)

First invoking (11) and (12) to bound $E_v [ (D_i)^2 | q_{z,w}, w \in Z_i ]$, and then using the identity $1 - Z_i > n/\nu$, which follows from (35) and the hypothesis $\epsilon < \frac{\Delta(1-\kappa)}{2}$, we get

$$E_v [ (D_i)^2 ] \leq E_v \left[ \frac{4+(C_{\phi}w)^2}{1-(\phi)^2} \right] \leq \frac{4+(C_{\phi}w)^2}{1-(\phi)^2}$$ \hfill (41)

Thus using $\ell_i \leq 2n/\nu$ we get

$$E_v [ (Q_i)^2 ] \leq \ell_i^2 \frac{4+(C_{\phi}w)^2}{1-(\phi)^2} < \frac{16+(C_{\phi}w)^2}{n^2/\nu^2}. $$ \hfill (42)

Applying Lemma 9, for $a_i = \ell_i (R - \delta_i)$ to the stochastic sequence $(Q_1, F_1), \ldots, (Q_\kappa, F_\kappa)$ via (37) we get

$$P_r(\leq n(R - \delta_i) + \gamma) \geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} E_v [ Q_i^2 ]$$ \hfill (43)

where $Q$ is defined as

$$Q \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} Q_i.$$ \hfill (44)

Note that $F_i$’s are not defined as $\sigma$-algebras on $\Omega$ and hence they are not sub-$\sigma$-algebras of $F$. Nevertheless, for each $F_i$ there is a corresponding $F_r \subset F$ that uniquely determines $F_i$ and that is uniquely determined by $F_i$. When applying Lemma 9 we are in fact considering $(Q_1, F_1), \ldots, (Q_\kappa, F_\kappa)$ rather than $(Q_1, F_1), \ldots, (Q_\kappa, F_\kappa)$.
Setting $\gamma = 8(2^t+6_1^t)\frac{n}{\eps}$ and invoking (24) and (38) we get

$$P_r(E_q) \leq \frac{3}{t}, \quad (40)$$

where $E_q$ is defined as

$$E_q \triangleq \{ \omega \in \Omega : (\omega) \leq nR - \ln (n + \frac{1}{\eps}) \}. \quad (41)$$

Recall that for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$ the conditional distributions of $P_o$ and $P_q$ for $Z_1$ given $F_{t-1}$ are identical because of (26). Thus $Q(\omega) = \ln \frac{dp}{dp'}(\omega)$ and consequently

$$P_q(B \cap \{ Q \leq \lambda \}) \geq e^{-\lambda}P_q(B \cap \{ Q \leq \lambda \}) \quad (42)$$

for any $B \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

We need identities analogous to (40) and (42) for $P_o$ and $P_q$, as well. The random variables $V_1, \ldots, V_\kappa$ are used to obtain those identities. For any $t \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$, let $F_t$-measurable random variable $V_t$ be

$$V_t \triangleq \ln \frac{P(V_t^\gamma | M, Z_1, V_{t-1}^\gamma)}{P(V_t^\gamma | M, Z_1, V_{t-1}^\gamma - \gamma)} \quad (43)$$

Then as a result of (27), (29), and the definition of order-one Rényi divergence

$$E_u[V_t | F_{t-1}, Z_t] = \sum_{r=1}^{t-1} E_u[D_r(W_{Z_t}(X_r) || W(X_r)) | F_{t-1}, Z_t]. \quad (44)$$

On the other hand as a result of (15) and Lemma 2, we have

$$D_r(W_{Z_t}(X_r) || W(X_r)) \leq \frac{1}{2^{t-1}} (C_2 - D_r(W_{Z_t}(X_r) || q_{Z_t}^r, W))$$

for all $t \in \{t_\tau, \ldots, t_\ell\}$.

Then the non-negativity of the Rényi divergence and the definition of $H_t$ given in (30) imply

$$0 \leq E_u[V_t | F_{t-1}] = \leq E_u \left[ \frac{1}{2^{t-1}} (\ell_t C_{Z_t}, W - H_t) | F_{t-1} \right]. \quad (45)$$

We bound the expression on the right hand side of (44) through a case by case analysis based on the value of $G_t$.

- If $G_t = \frac{n}{\eps}$, then $Z_t \geq \eta$ by construction. On the other hand $\frac{1}{\eps} C_{o_t, W} = E_{P_o}(R_t, W)$ by the hypothesis and $\frac{1}{\eps} C_{o_t, W}$ is nonincreasing in $\theta$ by Lemma 3. Thus $E_u[V_t | F_{t-1}] \leq E_{P_o}(R_t, W)$ as a result of the non-negativity of $H_t$ established by (31). Since $E_{P_o}(R, W)$ is nonincreasing in $R$ by definition we get

$$E_u \left[ \ln \frac{1}{2^{t-1}} (\ell_t C_{Z_t}, W - H_t) | F_{t-1} \right] \leq \ell_t E_{P_o}(R - \delta_t, W). \quad (46)$$

- If $G_t \neq \frac{n}{\eps}$, then $E_u[H_t | F_{t-1}] = \ell_t(R - \delta_t)$ by construction. Hence $H_t \geq 0$ established in (31)— and (26) imply

$$E_u \left[ \ln \frac{1}{2^{t-1}} (\ell_t(R - \delta_t) - H_t) | F_{t-1} \right] \leq 1 - (1 - \eps)^{G_t} \ell_t(R - \delta_t) - \frac{(1 - \eps)(1 - G_t)}{(G_t + \eps - G_t)} E_u[H_t | F_{t-1}]$$

$$= \ell_t(R - \delta_t)^{G_t} \frac{(G_t + \eps - G_t)}{(G_t + \eps - G_t)} = E_{P_o}(R, W)$$

On the other hand $G_t \geq \frac{n}{\eps}$ by (34), $\eps \leq \frac{2}{t}$ by hypothesis and $\frac{1}{2^{t-1}} (C_{Z_t}, W - (R - \delta_t)) \leq E_{P_o}(R - \delta_t, W)$ by the definition of $E_{P_o}(R, W)$ given in Definition 4. Thus

$$E_u \left[ \ln \frac{1}{2^{t-1}} (\ell_t C_{Z_t}, W - H_t) | F_{t-1} \right] \leq \ell_t E_{P_o}(R - \delta_t, W) + \ell_t^2 R - \frac{1}{2^{t-1}} \quad (46)$$

Using (44), (45), and (46) we get

$$0 \leq E_v[V_t | F_{t-1}] \leq \ell_t E_{P_o}(R - \delta_t, W) + \ell_t^2 R - \frac{1}{2^{t-1}} \quad (47)$$

for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$.

The analysis for bounding the conditional second moments of $V_t$’s is analogous to the one for bounding the conditional second moments of $Q_t$’s. We invoke $Z_t \geq \phi - \eps$ instead of $Z_t \leq \eta + \eps$.

$$E_v[(V_t)^2 | F_{t-1}] \leq 16 \frac{(2^t + 6_1^t \frac{n}{\eps})^2 n^2}{(\theta)^{\kappa^2}} \quad (48)$$

Applying Lemma 9, for $a_t = \ell_t E_{P_o}(R - \delta_t, W) + \ell_t^2 R - \frac{1}{2^{t-1}}$ to the stochastic sequence $(V_t, F_1), \ldots, (V_\kappa, F_\kappa)$ via (47) we get

$$P_t \left( V \leq n(E_{P_o}(R - \delta_t, W) + \ell_t^2 R + \gamma) \right) \geq 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{\kappa} E_v[V_t]}{\gamma} \quad (49)$$

where $V$ is defined as

$$V \triangleq \sum_{t=1}^{\kappa} V_t. \quad (50)$$

Setting $\gamma = 8(2^t + 6_1^t \frac{n}{\eps})^2 n^2$ and invoking (25) and (48) we get

$$P_t(E_v \cap E_{v}) \geq \frac{3}{t}. \quad (51)$$

where $E_v$ and $\gamma$ are defined as in (41) and (51), respectively.

Remark 4. If we could show $P_t(M \neq \hat{M}) \approx e^{-\eta R}$, then we would use (42), (52), and (53), to bound the error probability under $P_t$— i.e., to bound $P_{t}^{w_r}$— from below. However, the distribution of $Y_t^\gamma$ depends on $M$ not only under $P$ but also under $P_t$, because of $Z$’s. We cope with this issue using a pigeon hole argument.

E. A Change of Measure Argument together with a Pigeon Hole Argument

Let us consider the random variables $G_1, \ldots, G_\kappa$. Let us divide the interval $[0, 1]$ into $n$ intervals of length $1/n$. Thus for each $t \in \{1, \ldots, \kappa\}$, the value of the random variable $G_t$ will be in one of only $n$ intervals for each sample point $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus we get $n^\kappa$ disjoint $\kappa$-cubes whose union is $[0, 1]^\kappa$ for the vector $G_\kappa^\gamma$. For each $\kappa$-cube $G_t^\gamma$, let us define the event $E_{\zeta} \in \mathcal{F}$ as

$$E_{\zeta} \triangleq \{ \omega \in \Omega : G_t^\gamma(\omega) \in \zeta \}. \quad (53)$$

As a result of (53) there exists at least one $\kappa$-cube $\zeta^*$ satisfying

$$P_t(E_q \cap E_v \cap E_{\zeta^*}) \geq \frac{1}{n^\kappa}. \quad (54)$$
Let us assume without loss of generality that
\[ \zeta^* = \left( \beta_1 - \frac{\beta_1}{n} \right) \times \cdots \times \left( \beta_k - \frac{\beta_k}{n} \right) \]
for some \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k \). Let us define the probability measure \( P_u \) on \((\Omega, \mathcal{F})\) by setting its marginal on \( \mathcal{M} \) to the uniform distribution and defining its conditional distributions as follows:
\[ P_u(A|m, z_1^{-1}, y_1^{n-1}) = \frac{1}{(1-\epsilon)\beta_1} \mathbb{I}_A(z)dz \]
(55)
for all \( A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Z}_n) \), where \( \epsilon = \frac{\epsilon}{nR} \) and
\[ P_u(y_1^n|m, z_1^n, y_1^{n-1}) = \prod_{i=1}^n q_{\alpha_i} W(y_i) \]
(56)
for all \( y_1^n \in \mathcal{Y}_n^0 \).

Comparing (55) and (56) describing the conditional distributions of \( P_u \) with (26) and (28) describing the conditional distributions of \( P_q \), we can conclude that
\[ P_q(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_c^*) \leq \left( \frac{\epsilon}{nR} \right)^{\kappa} P_u(\mathcal{B}) \]
(57)
for any \( \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{F} \).

Since the distribution of \( Y_1^n \) does not depend on \( \mathcal{M} \) under \( P_u \), we have
\[ P_u(\mathcal{M} = \tilde{M}) \leq \frac{1}{n^\epsilon n^\kappa} \]
(58)
Invoking (57) for \( \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{E}_c \cap \mathcal{E}_v \cap \{ \mathcal{M} = \tilde{M} \} \) we get
\[ P_q(\mathcal{E}_c \cap \mathcal{E}_v \cap \mathcal{E}_c^* \cap \{ \mathcal{M} = \tilde{M} \}) \leq \left( \frac{\epsilon}{nR} \right)^{\kappa} e^{-nR} \]
If we use (41) and (42) for \( \lambda = nR - \ln 4 - \kappa \ln(n + \frac{1}{n}) \) and recall \( \epsilon = \frac{\epsilon}{nR} + \frac{1}{nR} \) we get
\[ P_q(\mathcal{E}_c \cap \mathcal{E}_v \cap \mathcal{E}_c^* \cap \{ \mathcal{M} = \tilde{M} \}) \leq \frac{e^{-nR}}{4^{-\kappa}} \left( \frac{n + \frac{1}{n}}{n} \right)^{-\kappa} e^{-nR} \]
\[ = \frac{1}{4^{\kappa}} \left( \frac{n + \frac{1}{n}}{n} \right)^{-\kappa} e^{-nR} \]
Then as a result of (54),
\[ P_u(\mathcal{E}_c \cap \mathcal{E}_v \cap \mathcal{E}_c^* \cap \{ \mathcal{M} = \tilde{M} \}) \geq \frac{1}{4^\kappa} \]
If we use (51) and (52) for \( \lambda = n(\text{E}_{\alpha}(R-\delta_1, W)+\delta_2) + \ln \frac{1}{n^R} \), then we get
\[ P(\mathcal{E}_c \cap \mathcal{E}_v \cap \mathcal{E}_c^* \cap \{ \mathcal{M} = \tilde{M} \}) \geq e^{-n[\text{E}_{\alpha}(R-\delta_1, W)+\delta_2]} \]
Then (22) holds because \( P_{\alpha}^N = P(\mathcal{M} \neq \tilde{M}) \).
**APPENDIX**

**Proof of Lemma 9.** For all $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let $Z_t$ be

$$Z_t \triangleq X_t - E[X_t \mid F_{t-1}].$$

Then $Z_t$ is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable random variable. Furthermore, $E[Z_t Z_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = E[Z_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] Z_t = 0$ for any $t$ and $\tau$ satisfying $1 \leq \tau < t \leq n$. Thus

$$E \left( \sum_{t=1}^{n} Z_t^2 \right) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} E \left[ (X_t - E[X_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}])^2 \right] = \sum_{t=1}^{n} E \left[ (X_t - E[X_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}])^2 \right] = \sigma^2.$$

Then the Chebyshev’s inequality implies

$$P \left( \sum_{t=1}^{n} Z_t < \gamma \right) \geq 1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma^2}. \quad (59)$$

On the other hand, $\sum_{t=1}^{n} Z_t \geq \sum_{t=1}^{n} (X_t - a_t)$ holds with probability one because $E[X_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq a_t$ with probability one by the hypothesis. Thus

$$P \left( \sum_{t=1}^{n} Z_t < \gamma \right) \leq P \left( \sum_{t=1}^{n} (X_t - a_t) < \gamma \right). \quad (60)$$

(21) follows from (59) and (60).
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