

Finite Blocklength Analysis of Gaussian Random coding in AWGN Channels under Covert constraint II: Viewpoints of Total Variation Distance

Xinchun Yu, Shuangqin Wei, Yuan Luo and Chenhao Ying

Abstract—This paper investigates covert communication over an additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel in finite block length regime with Gaussian codebooks. We first provide the formal definitions on the achievability and converse bounds of the throughput over the AWGN covert channel. By reviewing the bounds over the AWGN channel under maximal power constraint, we re-investigate the converse bounds under covert constraint, which expands our previous results on the bounds of Gaussian random coding. From these bounds and the analysis of the total variation distance (TVD) at the adversary, the first and second order of asymptotics of covert communication are investigated with the help of divergence inequalities. Furthermore, the analytic solution for TVD, and approximation expansions which can be easily evaluated with given snr (signal noise ratio) are presented. In this way, the proper power level for covert communication can be approximated for a given covert constraint of TVD, which leads to more accurate estimation of the power compared with preceding bounds. Moreover, the connection between Square Root Law and TVD is shown by using numerical properties of incomplete gamma functions. Finally, the convergence rates of TVD for $snr = n^{-\tau}$ with $\tau > 0.5$ and $\tau < 0.5$ are studied when the block length tends to infinity, which extends the previous extensively focused work on $\tau = 0.5$. Further elaboration on the effect of such asymptotic characteristics on the primary channel's throughput in finite block regime is also provided.

Index Terms—Covert communication, finite block length, metric of discrimination, total variation distance, convergence rate.

I. INTRODUCTION

Security is a very important aspect of wireless communication. Covert communication or communication with low probability of detection (LPD), where it is required that the adversary should not learn whether the legitimate parties are communicating nor not, has been studied in many recent works. Typical scenarios arise in underwater acoustic communication [1] and dynamic spectrum access in wireless channels, where secondary users attempt to communicate without being detected by primary users or users wish to avoid the attention of regulatory entities [2]. The information theory for covert communication was first characterized on AWGN channels in

[3] and DMCs in [2][4], and later in [5] and [6] on BSC and MIMO AWGN channels, respectively. It has been shown that the throughput of covert communication follows the following square root law (SRL) [3].

Square Root Law. *In covert communication, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the transmitter is able to transmit $O(\sqrt{n})$ information bits to the legitimate receiver by n channel uses while lower bounding the adversary's sum of probability of detection errors $\alpha + \beta \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ if she knows a lower bound of the adversary's noise level (α and β are error probabilities of type I and type II in the adversary's hypothesis test). The number of information bits will be $o(\sqrt{n})$ if she doesn't know the lower bound.*

If θ_n is denoted to be the snr of the main channel, then the maximal number of information bits that can be transmitted by n channel uses is $\frac{1}{2}n \log(1 + \theta_n)$ over AWGN channels when the input distribution is Gaussian. From the Square Root Law, the maximal number of information bits by n channel uses is $O(\sqrt{n})$ if a lower bound of the adversary's noise is known. Thus, we have $n\theta_n = \omega(1)$, that is: there exists a constant $n_0 > 0$ such that $1 < n\theta_n$ for any $n \geq n_0$. Furthermore, we have $1 \leq \frac{1}{2}n \log(1 + \theta_n) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}n \ln(1 + \theta_n)}{\ln 2} \sim \frac{n\theta_n}{2 \ln 2} \sim O(\sqrt{n})$. The first inequality is ensured by the feasibility of covert communication. If we assume that

$$\theta_n = n^{-\tau}, \quad 0 < \tau < 1, \quad (1)$$

Square Root Law implies that the appropriate power level is $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for covert communication in the asymptotic regime. In that case, Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between two Gaussian distributions, subject to presence or absence of a Gaussian codeword from Alice, will be upper bounded as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, the asymptotic capacity is zero.

A number of works focused on improving the communication efficiency by various means, such as using channel uncertainty in [7][8][9], using jammers in [10][11] and other methods in [12][13]. These methods are discussed in the asymptotic regime. However, in practical communication, we are more concerned about the behaviors in finite blocklength regime. For example, given a finite block length n , how many information bits can be transmitted with a given covert criterion and maximal probability of error ϵ , under which the adversary is not able to determine whether or not the transmitter is communicating effectively. When the channels are discrete memoryless, this question has been addressed by [14][15], where the exact second-order asymptotics of the maximal number of reliable and covert bits are characterized

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61871264.

Xinchun Yu, Yuan Luo and Chenhao Ying are with the School of Electronic Information and Electrical Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China. Luo is the corresponding author. (e-mail: moonyuyu@sjtu.edu.cn; yuanluo@sjtu.edu.cn; yingchh1565@sjtu.edu.cn).

Shuangqing Wei is with the Division of Electrical and Computer Engineering School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA (e-mail: swei@lsu.edu).

when the discrimination metrics are relative entropy, total variation distance (TVD) and missed detection probability, respectively. In [16] and [17], one-shot achievability and converse bounds of Gaussian random coding under maximal power constraint are presented, and the TVD at the adversary is also roughly estimated using Pinsker's inequality. There are several reasons for us to adopt Gaussian random codes. First, Gaussian distribution is optimal in both maximizing the mutual information between the input and output ends of the legitimate receiver over AWGN channels in the asymptotic regime and minimizing KL divergence between the output and the background noise at the adversary (Theorem 5 in [4]). It has found applications in secure chaotic spread spectrum communication systems [19][20]. Second, TVD at the adversary is relatively easy to analyze when the codewords are Gaussian generated (or nearly Gaussian generated) compared to a determined codebook. In most of previous works, KL divergence is adopted as the discrimination metric in asymptotic situation because KL divergence is convenient to analyze and compute compared to TVD. However, it is TVD that is directly related to the optimal hypothesis test. Moreover, it does not increase with the blocklength and has a range of $[0, 1]$, hence is a normalized metric of discrimination for two probability measures. In most cases, TVD does not have an easily analyzed functional form. However, the TVD between Gaussian distributions without memory can be approximated and even analyzed quite effectively, as shown in this work. Such analytical insights can further allow us to investigate finite block length performances of covert communication over AWGN channels with Gaussian codewords. Though our previous results [16][17] provide some characterization of covert communication over AWGN channels, a thorough understanding of it requires further investigation. On one hand, an accurate characterization of the throughput in the finite block length regime under a covert constraint highly depends on an accurate evaluation of TVD at the adversary, thereby establishing a direct relationship between the two metrics, which was not established in [16][17]. Nevertheless, the full characterization of covertness over AWGN channels remains unknown when transmission power scales following $n^{-\tau}$, for any $\tau \in (0, 1)$.

In this work, we will precede with our previous results on Gaussian random coding to characterize the first and second order asymptotics of the throughput. This result will establish the direct relationship between the covert constraint and the throughput. Moreover, the TVD at the adversary is directly evaluated and approximated. Based on that, we further consider the problem in the opposite direction: given a finite block length n and snr in scaling law of $n^{-\tau}$ with different $\tau \in (0, 1)$ at the main channel, how much discrimination power will it entail to the adversary to detection presence of active transmission against background noise and what is the consequent asymptotic as the block length n goes to infinity.

More specifically, the contributions of our work are listed as follows:

- **The converse bound** of covert communication over AWGN channel is formally defined and investigated, which extends our previous work on achievability bound

in [17].

- With a given TVD upper bound $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we derive the sufficient condition and necessary condition for the sending power level. As the counterpart of [15], **the first and second order of asymptotics** are further shown to be $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$, respectively.
- Assuming a moderate blocklength, **the analytic formula of the TVD** at the adversary is obtained, which leads to more accurate approximation of TVD, and further leads to more accurate evaluation of both achievability and converse bounds of the primary throughput, as illustrated by numerical results. From the analytic formula, it is shown that there is close connection between SRL and the asymptotic behavior of incomplete gamma functions. We also present its series expansions with different snr for convenient evaluation. Numerical results show that they approximate the total variation distance accurately.
- When $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, **the convergence rate** at which TVD at the adversary approaches 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, is proved to be $O(e^{-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}})$. When $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, the rate that TVD goes to 0, is proved to be between $O(n^{1-2\tau})$ and $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2\tau)})$. These convergence rates could be quite useful for not only understanding the behavior of TVD as a metric of discrimination in probability theory, but also the practical design of covert communication.

The rest of this paper is arranged as follows. In Section II, we describe the model for covert communication over AWGN channels. In Section III, the hypothesis test at the adversary is introduced. The main results are presented in Section IV, Section V and Section VI. We then provide numerical results in Section VII. Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. THE CHANNEL MODEL

The channel model is illustrated in Fig.1, in which a legitimate transmitter Alice communicates with a legitimate receiver Bob over an AWGN channel in the presence of an adversary Willie. With input codeword $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, the output vectors $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$, $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ at Bob and Willie have expressions:

$$y_i = x_i + N_{B_i}, i = 1, \dots, n \quad (2)$$

$$z_i = x_i + N_{W_i}, i = 1, \dots, n \quad (3)$$

where $N_{B_i}, N_{W_i}, i = 1, \dots, n$ are independent identically distributed (i.i.d) according to Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_b^2)$ and $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_w^2)$, respectively. In this work, we let $\sigma_b = \sigma_w = 1$ for convenience, and it will not affect the main results. The distribution of the output vector at Willie is \mathbb{P}_1 , which will be clarified later. The distribution of noise vector N_W is \mathbb{P}_0 , i.e., $\mathbb{P}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$. Bob wants to decode the received vector \mathbf{y} reliably. The adversary Willie tries to determine whether Alice is communicating ($h_n = 1$) or not ($h_n = 0$) by statistical hypothesis test between \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_0 ¹.

Definition 1. An $(n, M, P, \epsilon)_m$ code $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_M\}$ for an AWGN channel consists of a message set $W \in \mathcal{W} = \{1, \dots, M\}$, an encoder at the transmitter Alice $f_n : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow$

¹It is assumed that the adversary knows its noise level




Fig. 1. The channel model of Gaussian LPD communication in Section II

$\mathcal{C}, w \mapsto \mathbf{x}$, and a decoder at the legitimate user Bob $g_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{W}, \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \hat{w}$ with the condition that the encoder and decoder pair satisfies

$$1) \quad P_{err} \triangleq \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbb{P}[\hat{w} \neq w | W = w] \leq \epsilon. \quad (4)$$

2) maximal power constraint: each codeword c_i satisfies $\|c_i\|^2 \leq nP$.

If the maximal power constraint is substituted by average power constraint: the codebook satisfies $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \|c_i\|^2 \leq nP$, then it is an $(n, M, \epsilon, P)_a$ code.

There are two types of error probability α (missed detection probability) and β (false alarm probability) for the adversary's hypothesis testing. The error probabilities of the optimal testing is related to the total variation distance (TVD) $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ as [26]

$$1 - (\alpha + \beta) = V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0), \quad (5)$$

where the total variation distance between two probability measures P_1 and Q_1 on a sigma-algebra \mathcal{F} of subsets of the sample space Ω is defined as

$$V_T(P_1, Q_1) = \sup_{A \in \Omega} |P_1(A) - Q_1(A)|. \quad (6)$$

When $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ is close to 0, it is generally believed that any detector at Willie can not discriminate the induced output distribution and the distribution of noise effectively, hence can not distinguish whether or not Alice is communicating with Bob. Hence, it is natural to put the following constraint as the requirement of a code in covert communication:

$$V_T(\mathbb{P}_z, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta \quad (7)$$

where \mathbf{z} is the average output vector induced by the codebook. Based on the preceding analysis, the following definitions of codes over AWGN covert channels are presented.

Definition 2.

- An $(n, M, P, \epsilon)_m$ code is an $(n, M, \epsilon, P, \delta)_m$ if it also satisfies (7);
- An $(n, M, P, \epsilon)_a$ code is an $(n, M, \epsilon, P, \delta)_a$ if it also satisfies (7).

The maximal code size of an $(n, M, \epsilon, P)_m$, $(n, M, \epsilon, P)_a$, $(n, M, \epsilon, P, \delta)_m$, $(n, M, \epsilon, P, \delta)_a$ code is denoted by $M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P)$, $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P)$, $M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$ and $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$, respectively.

These quantities have the following obvious relationship:

$$M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) \leq M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P) \leq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P), \quad (8)$$

$$M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) \leq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) \leq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P). \quad (9)$$

In general, the covert constraint will give rise to another average power constraint, which will make the power constraint redundant. Nevertheless, the power constraint P is present for sake of completeness in the following discussions.

III. ON THE THROUGHPUT OVER THE AWGN COVERT CHANNEL

In this section, the main purpose is seeking the bounds of the maximal throughput on the primary channel under a covert constraint in the regime of finite blocklength. Formally, we have the following definitions of the bounds.

- 1) Achievability: a lower bound on the maximal throughput satisfying covert constraint (7) that can be guaranteed to exist with given blocklength, maximal (or average) power constraint P , and error probability.
- 2) Converse: an upper bound on the maximal throughput satisfying covert constraint (7) with given blocklength, maximal (or average) power constraint P , and error probability.

Note that the coding and decoding scheme should be specific in the achievability bound, while the converse bound is irrelevant with any specific coding scheme.

A. Previous Results on the Bounds under Maximal Power Constraint

In this section, we first present a coding scheme and corresponding achievability bound from the resulting codebook. The coding scheme will be applied in next subsection in derive the achievability bound under both covert and power constraint. At first, some notions are introduced as follows.

- μ is a parameter to constrain the codewords candidates, which may depend on n .
- $P(n)$ is a decreasing function of n , which stands for the maximal power constraint.
- For each n , $\bar{F}_n \triangleq \{x^n : \mu^2 \cdot nP(n) \leq \|x\|_2^2 \leq nP(n)\}$.

The generation of our codebook is described as follows.

- 1) Firstly, a set of candidates are generated. Each coordinate of these candidates is drawn from i.i.d normal distribution with zero mean and variance $\mu P(n)$.
- 2) Secondly, each codeword is randomly chosen from a subset \bar{F}_n .

The decoding procedure will be sequential threshold decoding, the details of which can be found in [17]. For this randomly generated codebook, we have the following normal approximation as lower bound of its size.

Theorem 1. (Theorem 6 in [17]) For the AWGN channel with noise $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists an (n, M, ϵ) code (maximal probability of error) chosen from a set \bar{F}_n of codewords whose coordinates are i.i.d $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mu P(n))$, $0 < \mu < 1$ and satisfy:

- 1) $\mu^2 nP(n) \leq \|x\|_2^2 \leq nP(n)$
- 2) $\tau_0 \leq \tau_n(R) \leq \frac{n}{n+1} \epsilon$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= [\sqrt{R}, \dots, \sqrt{R}], \quad C_\mu(n) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \mu P(n)), \\ \tau_n^\mu(R) &= \frac{B_\mu(P, R)}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad B_\mu(P, R) = \frac{6T_\mu(P, R)}{\hat{V}_\mu(P, R)^{3/2}}, \\ T_\mu(P, R) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\log e}{2(1 + \mu P)} [\mu P + 2\sqrt{R}Z_i - \mu P Z_i^2] \right|^3 \right], \\ \hat{V}_\mu(P, R) &= \left(\frac{\log e}{2(1 + P)} \right)^2 (4R + 2P^2) = V_\mu(n) \cdot \left(\frac{2R + P^2}{2P + P^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have (maximal probability of error)

$$\begin{aligned} \log M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P(n)) &\geq \sup_{0 < \tau_0 < \epsilon} \left\{ nC_\mu(n) + \frac{n(R^* - \mu P(n)) \log e}{2(1 + \mu P(n))} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{n\hat{V}_\mu(P(n), R^*)} Q^{-1} \left(1 - \epsilon + \frac{2B_\mu(P(n), R^*)}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \log \tau_0 + \frac{1}{2} \log n - \log \left[\frac{2 \log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi\hat{V}_\mu(P, R^*)}} + 4B_\mu(P, R^*) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The quantity R^* satisfies $x_0^n = [\sqrt{R^*}, \dots, \sqrt{R^*}] \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_n$ and maximizes

$$\begin{aligned} &nC_\mu(n) + \frac{n(R - \mu P(n)) \log e}{2(1 + \mu P(n))} + \frac{1}{2} \log n + \log \tau_0 \\ &+ \sqrt{n\hat{V}_\mu(P(n), R)} Q^{-1} \left(1 - \epsilon + \frac{2B_\mu(P(n), R)}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ &- \log \left[\frac{2 \log 2}{\sqrt{2\pi\hat{V}_\mu(P, R)}} + 4B_\mu(P, R) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

When n is sufficiently large, there exists some τ_0 that $\epsilon > \tau_n(R) > \tau_0$ holds. We further have

$$\begin{aligned} \log M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P(n)) &\geq nC_\mu(n) - \sqrt{nV_\mu(n)} Q^{-1}(\epsilon) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \log n + \log \tau_0 + O(1) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

holds for some τ_0 . The following theorem (Formula (42) in [17]) provides normal approximation of the converse bound for the throughput with blocklength n under maximal power constraint $P(n)$.

Theorem 2. For the AWGN channel with $P(n)$ which is a decreasing function of n , and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and maximal power constraint under a given n : each codeword $\mathbf{c}_i \in X^n$ satisfies $\|\mathbf{c}_i\|^2 \leq nP(n)$, we have (maximal probability of error)

$$\begin{aligned} &\log M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P(n)) \\ &\leq nC(n) - \sqrt{nV(n)} Q^{-1}(\epsilon) + \frac{1}{2} \log n + O(1) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $C(n) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + P(n))$ and $V(n) = \frac{P(n)(P(n)+2)}{2(1+P(n))^2} \log^2 e$.

B. Choosing Parameters Leading to the Achievability Bound

Let \mathbb{P}_0 be the n -dimensional noise distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$, \mathbb{P}_1 be the output distribution induced by the n -dimensional Gaussian distribution $P_{X^n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mu P(n) \mathbf{I}_n)$ and let $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_1$ be

the output distribution of the truncated Gaussian distribution \bar{P}_{X^n} . For the random code in Theorem 1, TVD at the adversary is written as

$$V_T(\bar{\mathbb{P}}_1, \mathbb{P}_0). \quad (14)$$

For this quantity, we have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} |V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) - V_T(\bar{\mathbb{P}}_1, \mathbb{P}_1)| &\leq V_T(\bar{\mathbb{P}}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \\ &\leq V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) + V_T(\bar{\mathbb{P}}_1, \mathbb{P}_1), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$$V_T(\bar{\mathbb{P}}_1, \mathbb{P}_1) \leq V_T(\bar{P}_{X^n}, P_{X^n}). \quad (16)$$

The derivation of (15) and (16) refer to [17]. Consequently, if we let $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) + V_T(\bar{\mathbb{P}}_1, \mathbb{P}_1) \leq \delta$ by choosing a proper parameter μ and power level $P^*(n) \leq P$, it will satisfy both the power constraint P and covert constraint.² The resulting codebook is an $(n, M, \epsilon, P, \delta)_m$ code. From (8), it is also a $(n, M, \epsilon, P, \delta)_a$ code.

Under the conditions of $\mu \in [0.7, 0.85]$ and $n \geq 400$, $V_T(\bar{P}_{X^n}, P_{X^n})$ will be very small for most applications and the effect of truncation is regarded to be negligible due to sphere hardening effect. We can even regard that the TVD constraint as satisfied if $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$ when μ and n are chosen as stated so that the effect of truncation is negligible. In this case, each coordinate of the code is nearly subject to $\mathcal{N}(0, \mu P(n))$ and the code satisfies both the average power constraint $\mu P(n)$ and maximal power constraint $P(n)$ and it is denoted as Gaussian random codes. Since the quantity $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ depends only on the power level of Gaussian random codes, it will relate the throughput and the covert constraint directly, which will be illustrated later.

C. On the Converse Bound of Throughput

For the converse bound of covert communication over the AWGN channel, as $M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) \leq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$, we will consider an upper bound of $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$.

For the definition of $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$, we are considering an upper bound of the maximal throughput of all coding schemes satisfying covert constraint (7) and average power constraint. It is natural to define the distribution of any code as $P_{\mathbf{x}}$ to incorporate all random coding schemes (including deterministic coding as a special case), and regard each codeword as a vector generated by $P_{\mathbf{x}}$. The average power of the code can then be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x})) \quad (17)$$

where $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x})$ is the covariance matrix of the random codeword \mathbf{x} and Tr denotes its trace. For example, when we consider Gaussian random codes with average power $nP(n)$, we have $P_{\mathbf{x}} = P_{X^n} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mu P(n) \mathbf{I}_n)$ and the covariance matrix is $\mu P(n) \mathbf{I}_n$.

²For each n , let μ and $P(n)$ be chosen to satisfy the covert constraint. We compare P and $P(n)$ and let $P^*(n)$ be the smaller one, then both the covert constraint and the maximal power constraint are satisfied. A code under maximal power constraint P will naturally satisfy the average power constraint P . In general, P will be larger than $P(n)$, which means the average power constraint can be regarded as redundant under covert constraint. However, we put it here for completeness.

Below we define some distributions, which are the distributions of the codes for covert communication over the AWGN channel.

- Let \mathbb{P}_{in}^n be any distribution under given average power constraint

$$\frac{1}{n}Tr(Cov(\mathbf{x})) = P_a \quad (18)$$

and the induced output distribution of the AWGN channel (with background noise $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$) is denoted as \mathbb{Q}_{in}^n .

- Let \mathbb{P}_G^n be the n dimensional Gaussian distribution with i.i.d coordinates, and each coordinate has zero mean and variance P_a . The induced output distribution of the AWGN channel (with background noise $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$) is \mathbb{Q}_G^n .
- Let $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_G^n$ be any n dimensional Gaussian distribution which satisfies $\frac{1}{n}Tr(Cov(\mathbf{x})) = P_a$. The induced output distribution of the AWGN channel is $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_G^n$.

For these distributions with the same parameter P_a , we consider the particular discrimination - TVD between pairs of them. Intuitively, TVD between two probability distributions belonging to the same class is expected to be smaller than that from two different classes. A trivial case would be the TVD being zero for two identical distributions. As TVD is essentially a L_1 norm, $V_T(\mathbb{Q}_G^n, \mathbb{P}_0)$ is intuitively smaller than those when \mathbb{Q}_{in}^n deviates from this type. In addition, the average output distribution over n -channel use of an AWGN channel actually follows a mixture Gaussian distribution, where the mixture is over M (the size of the codebook) given codewords which are the M mean vectors. \mathbb{P}_0 can be deemed as a particular case of mixture Gaussian and the class of mixtures has their axis aligned. The TVD from \mathbb{P}_0 and the class of mixtures whose covariance matrices are axis-aligned is minimized if the mixture can get close to the feature of the \mathbb{P}_0 [18]. Moreover, it has been shown that KL divergence $D(\mathbb{Q}_{in}^n || \mathbb{P}_0)$ is minimized when \mathbb{Q}_{in}^n is white Gaussian [4]. From Pinsker's inequality

$$V_T(P_1, Q_1) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}D(P_1 || Q_1)}, \quad (19)$$

We then have the following inequalities from the precedent reasoning:

$$\forall n, \quad V_T(\mathbb{Q}_{in}^n, \mathbb{P}_0) \geq V_T(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_G^n, \mathbb{P}_0) \geq V_T(\mathbb{Q}_G^n, \mathbb{P}_0). \quad (20)$$

which suggests that: for any randomly generated code with fixed average power P_a , Gaussian random codes minimize the TVD between the output and noise at the adversary.

Let $V_T(\mathbb{Q}_G^n, \mathbb{P}_0) = \delta$, we get the average power P^* of \mathbb{Q}_G^n , then for any other distribution with average power P_a , we must have $P_a \leq P^*$ to satisfy the covert constraint δ . In other words, Gaussian random code will have largest average power among all random codes under covert constraint. As P^* is the average power of Gaussian random code which leads to $V_T(\mathbb{Q}_G^n, \mathbb{P}_0) = \delta$, we have $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P^*) \geq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P_a)$. Let's consider $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$, where P is a given power constraint for the input signal. We discuss the problem in two different cases:

- 1) $P^* \leq P$: It represents a general situation. Since any other distribution of the codewords satisfying the covert

constraint must have average power less than P^* , the average power constraint is redundant. Hence, we have

$$M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) \leq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P^*, \delta) \quad (21)$$

where the inequality follows from P^* being the largest power under covert constraint and dropping the covert constraint. Notice that the following relationship (Lemma 39 in [29])

$$M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P^*) \leq \frac{1}{1 - P^*/P'} M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P') \quad (22)$$

holds for any $P' > P^*$. In general, P^* is not easy to resolve in the equation $V_T(\mathbb{Q}_G^n, \mathbb{P}_0) = \delta$. Instead, an upper bound P_{NEC} of the average power P^* is relatively easy to obtain. Further details can be found in the coming subsections. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) &\leq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P^*, \delta) \\ &\leq M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P_{NEC}, \delta) \leq \frac{1}{1 - P_{NEC}/P'} M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P') \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

for $P' > P_{NEC}$.

- 2) $P^* > P$: In this case, the covert constraint is naturally satisfied under average power constraint P . We have

$$M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) = M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P). \quad (24)$$

Similar to the argument as above, we further have

$$M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) < \frac{1}{1 - P_{NEC}/P'} M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P') \quad (25)$$

for $P' > P$.

To this end, we have derived a converse bound under both covert and average power constraint from a converse bound on maximal power constraint.

$$M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) < \frac{1}{1 - P_{NEC}/P'} M_m^*(n, \epsilon, P') \quad (26)$$

where P' depends on the relationship between P and P^* . The derivation of the bound depends on two ingredients: using upper bounds of the maximal value of the average power of Gaussian random codes and the relationship between the maximal power constraint and average power constraint.

D. Power Constraint and Divergence Inequalities

In this section, we derive sufficient condition and necessary condition on the average power of Gaussian random code to satisfy the covert constraint. The results in this part, together with Subsection A-C, will further lead to the analysis of the first and second-order asymptotics of covert communication over AWGN channels.

First, we introduce some well known bounds for the total variation distance.

- 1) KL divergence bound. KL divergence is used as an upper bound of the total variation distance by Pinsker's inequality (19). Since KL divergence is asymmetric, $D(P_1, Q_1)$ and $D(Q_1, P_1)$ are different, and both are upper bounds of the total variation distance $V_T(P_1, Q_1)$. Let \mathbb{P}_1 be the

output distribution induced by Gaussian random codes, then we have

$$D(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) = \frac{n}{2} [\theta_n - \ln(1 + \theta_n)] \log e, \quad (27)$$

$$D(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) = \frac{n}{2} \left[\ln(1 + \theta_n) + \frac{1}{1 + \theta_n} - 1 \right] \log e \quad (28)$$

where θ_n denotes *snr* at the adversary. In [25], it is proved that the latter is smaller than the first, which is always used as a constraint for covert communication in the form of $D(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$ under the premise of Gaussian codebooks. From now on, we denote $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}D(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)}$ as KL bound.

2) Hellinger distance. For probability distributions P_1 and Q_1 , the square of the Hellinger distance between them is defined as,

$$H^2(P_1, Q_1) = \frac{1}{2} \int (\sqrt{dP_1} - \sqrt{dQ_1})^2. \quad (29)$$

For Gaussian random codes, the square of the Hellinger distance is expressed as [27]

$$H^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) = 1 - \left(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1 + \sigma_1^2} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \quad (30)$$

where $\sigma_1^2 = 1 + \theta_n$. The Hellinger distance $H(P_1, Q_1)$ and the total variation distance (or statistical distance) $V_T(P_1, Q_1)$ are related as follows

$$H^2(P_1, Q_1) \leq V_T(P_1, Q_1) \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot H(P_1, Q_1). \quad (31)$$

Recently, Igal Sason gave an improved bound on the Hellinger distance, see Proposition 2 in [28]:

$$1 - \sqrt{1 - V_T(P_1, Q_1)^2} \leq H^2(P_1, Q_1). \quad (32)$$

From (32), we have

$$V_T(P_1, Q_1) \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - H^2(P_1, Q_1))^2}. \quad (33)$$

The right side of the inequality is a sharper upper bound for the total variation distance than the upper bound in (31) and it is also sharper than the KL bound, as shown in our numerical results section. We denote it as Hellinger upper bound. Thus, we have

$$H^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - H^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0))^2}. \quad (34)$$

As we have lower bound and upper-bound on $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ as $B_L = H^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$, and $B_U = \sqrt{1 - (1 - H^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0))^2}$, i.e. $B_L \leq V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq B_U$, we can get sufficient condition and necessary condition on the average power of Gaussian random code to satisfy the covert constraint of TVD: $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$.

1) Let $B_L = \delta$, from which we get a power P_{NEC} (i.e. necessary condition for the power). If $P > P_{NEC}$, it is impossible to achieve $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$. However, if $P \leq P_{NEC}$, we don't necessarily achieve $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$. From (30) we get

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) &= \delta \\ \iff \frac{4(1 + \theta_n)}{4 + 4\theta_n + \theta_n^2} &= (1 - \delta)^{\frac{4}{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Denote $\eta_n = 1 + \theta_n$ and $y = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \delta)^{\frac{4}{n}}$, we have

$$\frac{\eta_n}{(1 + \eta_n)^2} = y. \quad (36)$$

Solving the above equation, we get

$$P_{NEC} = \frac{1 - 2y + \sqrt{1 - 4y}}{2y} - 1. \quad (37)$$

2) Let $B_U = \delta$, from which we solve and find P_{SUF} , which suggests: if $P \leq P_{SUF}$, then $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$ can definitely be achieved. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{1 - (1 - H^2(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0))^2} &= \delta^2 \\ \iff \frac{4(1 + \theta_n)}{4 + 4\theta_n + \theta_n^2} &= (1 - \delta)^{\frac{4}{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Denote $\eta_n = 1 + \theta_n$ as above and $y_0 = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \delta^2)^{\frac{2}{n}}$, and we have

$$P_{SUF} = \frac{1 - 2y_0 + \sqrt{1 - 4y_0}}{2y_0} - 1. \quad (39)$$

Note that it is obvious that $P_{SUF} < P_{NEC}$, and P_n^* as the solution $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) = \delta$ lies between these two bounds, i.e. $P_{SUF} \leq P_n^* \leq P_{NEC}$. If the average power of the sending signal is smaller than P_{SUF} , it is certain that $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$ will be satisfied. If the average power of the sending signal is larger than P_{NEC} , it is certain that $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \geq \delta$.

E. First and Second Order Asymptotics of the Throughput Under Covert Constraint

Based on the previous analysis and assumption, it is time to establish the main results of this part: the first and second-order asymptotics of covert communication over the AWGN channel.

- 1) For the achievability bound, it is assumed that the average power constraint $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \|c_i\|^2 \leq nP$ is redundant, which is reasonable as the covert constraint will always leads to a stringent power constraint. We use (12) by choosing $\mu P(n) = P_{SUF}$ in (39) to get a lower bound of $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$, i.e., the achievability bound is obtained by Gaussian random coding scheme in Theorem 1 on mild conditions of μ and n . Note that the resulting bound is irrelevant to P for the redundancy assumption.
- 2) For the converse bound, we use (26) by choosing P_{NEC} in (37) and $P' = c \cdot P_{NEC}$ with any $c > 1$ to get an upper bound of $M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$.

The details are presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 3. For covert communication over AWGN channel with average decoding error probability ϵ and total variation

distance constraint $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$ at the adversary, the maximal throughput should satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \log M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) &\leq \frac{c-1}{c} \left\{ \frac{n}{2} \log \left[1 - c + c \cdot \frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sqrt{\frac{n \log^2 e}{2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\left[1 - c + c \cdot \frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y} \right]^2} \right]} \right\} Q^{-1}(\epsilon) \\ &\quad + O(\log n) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where c is any constant larger than 1;

$$\begin{aligned} \log M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta) &\geq \frac{n}{2} \log \left[\frac{1-2y_0+\sqrt{1-4y_0}}{2y_0} \right] \\ &\quad - \sqrt{\frac{n \log^2 e}{2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\left[\frac{1-2y_0+\sqrt{1-4y_0}}{2y_0} \right]^2} \right]} Q^{-1}(\epsilon) + O(\log n) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where $y = \frac{1}{4}(1-\delta)^{\frac{4}{n}}$ and $y_0 = \frac{1}{4}(1-\delta^2)^{\frac{2}{n}}$. Moreover, the first term of the maximal throughput under TVD constraint δ : $\log M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$ is of $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$, and the second term is of $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$.

Proof. The derivation of the bounds has been explained. We now focus on the order of the asymptotics. The following quantities are significant for our analysis.

- The quantity $\frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y}$.

Denote $\lambda = \sqrt{1-4y}$, then $\lambda = \left[1 - (1-\delta)^{\frac{4}{n}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$. If we further denote $t = -\ln(1-\delta)^{\frac{4}{n}}$, we have $(1-\delta)^{\frac{4}{n}} = e^{-t}$ and $-t = O(\frac{1}{n})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= (1 - e^{-t})^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= (1 - 1 + t - \frac{t^2}{2} + \frac{t^3}{6} + \dots)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Since

$$\frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y} = 1 + \frac{2\lambda(1+\lambda)}{1-\lambda^2}, \quad (43)$$

and

$$1 - c + c \frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y} = 1 + \frac{2c\lambda(1+\lambda)}{1-\lambda^2}, \quad (44)$$

we have

$$\frac{c-1}{c} \cdot \frac{n}{2} \cdot \log \left(1 - c + c \frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y} \right) = O(\sqrt{n}), \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - \frac{1}{\left[1 - c + c \frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y} \right]^2} \\ &= 1 - \left[\frac{1-\lambda^2}{1+2c\lambda+(2c-1)\lambda^2} \right]^2 \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{n \log^2 e}{2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\left[1 - c + c \cdot \frac{1-2y+\sqrt{1-4y}}{2y} \right]^2} \right]} = O(n^{\frac{1}{4}}). \quad (47)$$

- The quantity $\frac{1-2y_0+\sqrt{1-4y_0}}{2y_0}$.

Denote $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{1-4y_0} = \sqrt{1 - (1-\delta^2)^{\frac{2}{n}}}$ and $s = -\frac{2}{n} \ln(1-\delta^2)$, we have $s = O(\frac{1}{n})$ and $(1-\delta^2)^{\frac{2}{n}} = e^{-s}$. Moreover,

$$\lambda_1 = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \quad (48)$$

$$\frac{1-2y_0+\sqrt{1-4y_0}}{2y_0} = 1 + \frac{2\lambda_1(1+\lambda_1)}{1-\lambda_1^2}, \quad (49)$$

and

$$\frac{n}{2} \cdot \log \frac{1-2y_0+\sqrt{1-4y_0}}{2y_0} = O(n \cdot \lambda_1) = O(\sqrt{n}). \quad (50)$$

In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - \frac{1}{\left[\frac{1-2y_0+\sqrt{1-4y_0}}{2y_0} \right]^2} \\ &= 1 - \left[\frac{1-\lambda_1^2}{1+2\lambda_1+\lambda_1^2} \right]^2 \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{n \log^2 e}{2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\left[\frac{1-2y_0+\sqrt{1-4y_0}}{2y_0} \right]^2} \right]} = O(n^{\frac{1}{4}}). \quad (52)$$

Now we analyze the first and the second term of the bounds of $\log M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$.

- For the converse bound (40), from (45) and (47), the first term is of order $O(\sqrt{n})$, and the second term is of order $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$.
- For the achievability bound (41), from (51) and (52), the first term is of order $O(\sqrt{n})$, and the second term is of order $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$.

Consequently, the first order asymptotics of $\log M_a^*(n, \epsilon, P, \delta)$ is of $O(\sqrt{n})$, and the second order asymptotics is of $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$. \square

IV. ANALYSIS OF TOTAL VARIATION DISTANCE IN COVERT COMMUNICATION OVER AWGN CHANNELS

In this section, we pay attention to the TVD at the adversary of Gaussian random codes. In other words, we assume that μ is properly chosen and the blocklength n is at least moderately large ($n \geq 500$). In this case, the discrimination between the truncated Gaussian distribution and Gaussian distribution is negligible ($V_T(P_{X^n}, P_{X^n}) \approx 0$), and we can regard that each coordinate of the codewords as subject to normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \mu P(n))$. In this case, TVD at the adversary can be approximated by $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ and it is directly related to the average power level. Our investigation will lead to more thorough understanding on Square Root Law.

A. Analytic Formula of $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$

Although we have gotten upper and lower bounds of the maximal throughput, the power we use is based on divergence inequalities, which will impair the accuracy of the power and hence the throughput when the interest is on the behavior with finite n . In this section, we will get analytic formula of $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ with $\text{snr} = \theta_n$. The formula will permit us to accurately evaluate TVD with a given power level.

Theorem 4. *With fixed block length n and Gaussian signal with power p_n , the total variation distance at Willie is formulated as*

$$V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \left[\gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)\right) - \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)\right) \right]. \quad (53)$$

In the above formula, n is the blocklength, $\theta_n = \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2} = p_n$ is the snr , $\Gamma(x)$ is the well known Gamma function and $\gamma(a, x)$ is the incomplete gamma function. Moreover, $f(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{2}n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta_n}\right) \ln(1 + \theta_n)$ and $g(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{2}n \frac{\ln(1 + \theta_n)}{\theta_n}$.

The proof can be found in Appendix A, and it can also be obtained by geometric integration methods from [30].

Remark. *The incomplete gamma functions*

$$\gamma(a, z) = \int_0^z e^{-t} t^{a-1} dt, \quad (54)$$

$$\Gamma(a, z) = \int_z^\infty e^{-t} t^{a-1} dt \quad (55)$$

are related as follows:

$$\gamma(a, z) + \Gamma(a, z) = \Gamma(a);$$

Theorem 4 provides an accurate quantitative measure of the discrimination with respect to the noise level at the adversary, whose input variables are the block length n and snr . It will help us understand the discrimination of two i.i.d. Gaussian PDFs with different variances.

There are several interesting facts about the total variation distance at the adversary from the conclusion of Theorem 4.

- The numerator is the difference of two incomplete gamma functions, the first variables of which are the same, i.e., half of the blocklength.
- The second variables lie on the left and right of $n/2$, and the difference of which is $\frac{1}{2}n \ln(1 + \theta_n)$, i.e., the capacity multiplied by the blocklength n .

B. Numerical Approximation for $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$

Since the analytic formula for the total variation distance at the adversary involves the Gamma function and incomplete gamma functions, it is not convenient to evaluate them in general. Therefore, it is necessary to give relatively simple formulae to evaluate these gamma functions. For the Gamma function, we have String formula [35] as asymptotic approximation,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n!}{e^{-n} n^n \sqrt{2\pi n}} = 1. \quad (56)$$

For the incomplete gamma functions $\gamma(a, z)$ and $\Gamma(a, z)$, we have the following expansions for approximate evaluation:

- In the case of $\Re(a) > -1$ and $\Re(a) > \Re(z)$, if z is away from the transition point a ([34], Section 3),

$$\gamma(a+1, z) = e^{-z} z^{a+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(a) \Phi_k(z-a), \quad (57)$$

where $c_k(a)$ is expressed as

$$c_k(a) = \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-a)_j}{j!} \frac{a^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \quad (58)$$

with $(-a)_j = (-a) \cdot (-a+1) \cdots (-a+j-1)$ and has recurrence

$$c_{k+1}(a) = \frac{1}{k+1} [k c_k(a) - a c_{k-1}(a)]. \quad (59)$$

In addition,

$$c_k(a) = O(a^{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor}), \quad |a| \rightarrow \infty. \quad (60)$$

The function $\Phi_k(z-a)$ has recurrence

$$\Phi_k(z-a) = \frac{1}{z-a} [e^{z-a} - k \Phi_{k-1}(z-a)] \quad (61)$$

and satisfies the following equation

$$\Phi_k(z-a) = \frac{k!}{(a-z)^{k+1}} - e^{z-a} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{k!}{(k-j)!(a-z)^{j+1}}$$

with e^{z-a} exponentially small for $\Re(a) > \Re(z)$. We also have

$$\Phi_k(z-a) = O((z-a)^{-k-1}), \quad |z-a| \rightarrow \infty.$$

The expansion in (57) is convergent, and also asymptotic for large $a-z = O(a^{1/2+\epsilon})$, $\epsilon > 0$.

- In the case of $\Re(a) > -1$ and $\Re(a) < \Re(z)$, if z is away from the transition point a ([34], Section 4),

$$\Gamma(a+1, z) \sim e^{-z} z^{a+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k^*(a)}{(z-a)^{k+1}}, \quad (62)$$

where $c_k^*(a)$ is expressed as

$$c_k^*(a) = (-1)^k \sum_{j=0}^k k! \frac{(-a)_j}{j!} \frac{a^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \quad (63)$$

and has recurrence

$$c_{k+1}^*(a) = -k [c_k^*(a) - a c_{k-1}^*(a)]. \quad (64)$$

The expansion in (62) is not convergent, nevertheless, it is asymptotic for large $a-z = O(a^{1/2+\epsilon})$ with $\epsilon > 0$.

From the expressions of c_k and c_k^* , we have

$$c_k^*(a) = (-1)^k k! c_k(a) \quad (65)$$

for case (1) and case (2).

- For large a and z such that $a-z = o(a^{2/3})$, if $\|\text{Arg}(z)\| < \pi$, there is asymptotic expansion

$$\Gamma(a+1, z) \sim e^{-a} a^{a+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(a) \Phi_k(a, z) \quad (66)$$

with

$$c_0(a) = 1, \quad c_1(a) = c_2(a) = 0,$$

$$\Phi_0(a, z) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2a}} \operatorname{erfc}\left(\frac{z-a}{\sqrt{2a}}\right), \quad \Phi_1(a, z) = \frac{e^{-(z-a)^2/(2a)}}{a}$$

and for $k \geq 2$,³

$$c_{k+1}(a) = \frac{1}{k+1} [a \cdot c_{k-2}(a) - k \cdot c_k(a)], \quad (67)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_k(a, z) &= \frac{1}{a} [(k-1)\Phi_{k-2}(a, z) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{z-a}{a}\right)^{k-1} \cdot e^{-\frac{(z-a)^2}{2a}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Remark. [35] We say that, a power series expansion $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(z-z_0)^n$ is **convergent** for $|z-z_0| < r$ with some $r \geq 0$, provided

$$R_n(x) = \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} a_n(z-z_0)^n \rightarrow 0,$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for each fixed z satisfying $|z-z_0| < r$. We say that, a function $f(z)$ has an **asymptotic series expansion** of $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(z-z_0)^n$ as $z \rightarrow z_0$, i.e.

$$f(z) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(z-z_0)^n,$$

provided

$$R_n(x) = o((z-z_0)^N),$$

as $z \rightarrow z_0$ for each fixed N . Note that, in practical terms, an asymptotic expansion can be of more value than a slowly converging expansion.

We have the following theorem by utilization of the above conclusions properly, and the details of which can be found in the Appendix B.

Theorem 5. when $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}$, $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ could be approximated by

$$\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\pi} \cdot 2^{\frac{5}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) \left[\Phi_k\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1, g(\theta)\right) - \Phi_k\left(\frac{n}{2} - 1, f(\theta)\right) \right] \quad (69)$$

When $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ could be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - e^{-f(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{f(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} n^{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k k! c_k \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right)}{(f(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2})^{k+1}} \\ &+ e^{-g(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{g(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} n^{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1} k! c_k \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right)}{(g(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2})^{k+1}} \\ &+ e^{-g(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{g(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} n^{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) e^{g(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2}} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j k!}{(k-j)! (g(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2})^{j+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Though we can get some bounds and second order asymptotic on the maximal throughput of covert communication

³ erfc is the complementary error function, which is defined as $\operatorname{erfc}(x) = 1 - \operatorname{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_x^{\infty} e^{-t^2} dt$.

over AWGN channels by some bounds on TVD, they are usually rather rough in the finite blocklength regime. From the equations (69) and (70), the approximation of the total variation distance when $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$ can be obtained. They are easy to evaluate, and numerical results show that they are good approximations for the total variation distance. From the evaluations of TVD with given values of the power level, we can approximate the proper power with given TVD constraints directly, which will lead to more accurate evaluation of the maximal throughput with different TVD constraint. Hence, Theorem 5 provides us a tool for this approach and its importance will be more clear in Section V.

C. Analysis of the Convergence Rate of $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ with respect to n

Although the approximation numerical formulae for TVD were derived in the last section, we also wish to get its convergence rates when $n \rightarrow \infty$, which seems difficult to get from these expansions. In the follow-up analysis, we will discuss the rates by the lower and upper bounds of $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ when $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, respectively.

The following lemma is from the definition of Hellinger distance (29).

Lemma 1. When $p_n \sim n^{-\tau} \cdot \sigma^2$ with $0 < \tau < \frac{1}{2}$, the square of the Hellinger distance $H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ will approach to 1 when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. For our case, the distributions \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 follow from multivariate normal distributions $N(0, \Sigma)$ and $N(0, \Sigma_1)$ with $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}_n$ and $\Sigma_1 = (1 + p_n) \cdot \mathbf{I}_n$, respectively. The square of the Hellinger distance of \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 is expressed as

$$H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) = 1 - \left(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1 + \sigma_1^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \quad (71)$$

where $\sigma_1^2 = 1 + p_n$. From the formula (71), we just need to prove that $\left(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1 + \sigma_1^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$ approaches 0 when the conditions are satisfied. Denote $\theta = p_n = c \cdot n^{-\tau}$ with c as a constant, and the logarithm of $\left(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1 + \sigma_1^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$ can then be formulated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} n \ln \frac{2\sigma_1}{1 + \sigma_1^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} n \ln \frac{2(1 + \theta)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2 + \theta)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} n \left[\ln 2(1 + \theta)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \ln(2 + \theta) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} n \ln \frac{4 + 4cn^{-\tau}}{c^2 n^{-2\tau} + 4cn^{-\tau} + 4} \\ &\sim -\frac{1}{4} n \cdot \frac{c^2 n^{-2\tau}}{4cn^{-\tau} + 4}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

When $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, $1 - 2 \cdot \tau > 0$ and the above logarithm will approach $-\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, $\left(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1 + \sigma_1^2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$ approaches 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the conclusion is obtained. \square

Proposition 1. The total variation distance between \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 will approach 1 at the rate of

$$O(e^{-\frac{1}{4} n^{1-2\tau}})$$

when $0 < \tau < \frac{1}{2}$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$

Proof. If we denote $(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1+\sigma_1^2})^{\frac{n}{2}}$ as t in (71), then $H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) = 1 - t$, and $\ln t = -\frac{1}{4}n \cdot \frac{c^2 n^{-2\tau}}{4cn^{-\tau} + 4} \sim -\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}$. Thus, we have

$$t \sim e^{-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}}.$$

When $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, we have $-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau} \rightarrow -\infty$ and $e^{-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, hence the rate that $H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ approaches 1 is the same as that of $1 - e^{-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}}$. Furthermore,

$$H(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) = \sqrt{1-t} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}t + o(t) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, $H(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ approaches 1 at the same rate. Consequently, from (31), the rate that $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ approaches 1 when $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$ is $c \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}}$, where c is a constant. \square

Next, we consider the situation where $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$.

Proposition 2. *The total variation distance between \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 will approach 0 at a rate between $O(n^{1-2\tau})$ and $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2\tau)})$ if $p_n \sim n^{-\tau} \cdot \sigma^2$ with $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. From (72), the logarithm of $(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1+\sigma_1^2})^{\frac{n}{2}}$ will approach 0 from the left as $n \rightarrow \infty$, hence $(\frac{2\sigma_1}{1+\sigma_1^2})^{\frac{n}{2}}$ will approach 1 from the left. Therefore, $H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ will approach 0. From (31), $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ will approach 0. When $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, $-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}$ will approach 0 from the negative axis. From Taylor expansion, $e^x = 1 + x + o(x)$, we have

$$t \sim e^{-\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}} = 1 - \frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau} + o(\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}). \quad (73)$$

The rate that e^x approaches 1 is almost determined by the rate that x goes 0. Therefore, t approaches 1 at the rate of $\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}$, i.e., $H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ approaches 0 at the rate of $\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau}$ when $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$.

$$H(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) = \sqrt{1-t} \sim \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau} + o(\frac{1}{4}n^{1-2\tau})} \sim \frac{1}{2}n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2\tau)}.$$

Thus, the rate that $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ approaches 0 is between $O(n^{1-2\tau})$ and $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2\tau)})$. \square

The convergence rates of TVD provide a lot of information for covert communication over AWGN channels in finite blocklength regime, which are listed as follows.

Remarks. • With given $\epsilon > 0$, we can only talk about finite blocklength n . The blocklength n and the power level (τ) should be chosen carefully to satisfy bounds on given decoding error probability ϵ and TVD δ .

- Under any given $0 < \delta < 1$, and a fixed $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, as n increases it will definitely satisfy the requirement on the upper-bound imposed on TVD.
- If $\tau < 1/2$, increasing n will eventually violate any given upper bound $0 < \delta < 1$ on TVD.
- With given δ , if $p_n = C \cdot n^{-\tau}$ with proper constant C and $\tau = 1/2$, we can increase n to satisfy any small decoding error probability ϵ without worrying about the violation of TVD bound δ since the total variation distance will be stationary. Moreover we can also provide the second order asymptotics in this case for $\log(M_n)$.

- The rate can be also testified by using (32). In our case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{1 - (1 - H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1))^2} \\ &= \sqrt{1 - t^2} \\ &\sim \sqrt{1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2}n^{1-2\tau}}} \\ &\sim \sqrt{1 - \left[1 - \frac{1}{2}n^{1-2\tau} + \frac{1}{8}n^{2-4\tau} + \dots\right]} \\ &\sim \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2\tau)}. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Hence, we have the same rate upper bound as Proposition 2.

- The rate bound in the last proposition can also be testified from the bound of total variation distance in terms of KL divergence. From (22) in [28],

$$D(P_1 \| Q_1) \geq \log \left(\frac{1}{1 - V_T(P_1, Q_1)^2} \right). \quad (75)$$

We have

$$V_T(P_1 \| Q_1) \leq \sqrt{1 - e^{-D(P_1 \| Q_1)}}. \quad (76)$$

From (34) in [28],

$$V_T(P_1, Q_1) \geq \left(\frac{1 - \beta}{\log \frac{1}{\beta}} \right) D(P_1, Q_1). \quad (77)$$

The KL divergence in our case can be reformulated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) &= \frac{n}{2} \left[\ln(1 + \theta_n) + \frac{1}{1 + \theta_n} - 1 \right] \log e \\ &= \frac{n}{2 \ln 2} \left[\theta_n - \frac{1}{2}\theta_n^2 + 1 - \theta_n + \theta_n^2 - 1 + o(\theta_n^2) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{2 \ln 2} \left[\frac{1}{2}\theta_n^2 + o(\theta_n^2) \right] \\ &\sim \frac{1}{4 \ln 2} n^{1-2\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

When $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, it goes to 0 at rate $O(n^{1-2\tau})$. Hence, from (77), the lower bound goes to 0 at the rate of $O(n^{1-2\tau})$. For the upper bound, from (76),

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{1 - e^{-D(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)}} &= \sqrt{1 - [1 - D(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) + o(n^{1-2\tau})]} \\ &\sim \sqrt{\frac{1}{4 \ln 2} n^{1-2\tau} + o(n^{1-2\tau})}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Hence, the upper bound of the total variation distance goes to 0 at the rate of $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2\tau)})$. In summary, we also get that the rate that the total variation distance goes to 0 is between $O(n^{1-2\tau})$ and $O(n^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2\tau)})$.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, the numerical results are presented. The main results in Section III and Section IV are testified. When the blocklength is small (less than 500), the effect of truncation

is considered. When the blocklength is larger than 500, the codewords can be regarded as Gaussian generated and the TVD at the adversary is approximated as $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$.

In Fig.2, the necessary condition P_{NEC} and sufficient condition P_{SUF} of the power for $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$ at different blocklength n are plotted when δ is fixed as 0.1. They are compared with the power computed directly from analytical formula (53) of TVD. We can see that the sufficient condition of the power for covert constraint is quite close to the approximation with $\delta = 0.1$. The maximal value of power proper for covert constraint $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \delta$ will always be in the zone between two curves of sufficient and necessary conditions with $\delta = 0.1$. In Fig.3, we compare the analytic value of power with P_{NEC} , P_{SUF} for different values of threshold δ with fixed blocklength $n = 2000$. It is also obvious that the analytic power will be in the zone between the curves of P_{SUF} and P_{NEC} . From Figure 3, we can see if δ is large, the lower bound is tight, whereas the upper bound becomes tight for small δ , under the relative large block length of $n = 2000$.

From the analytic solution in Theorem 4, the behavior of $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ when the power scaling law follows $snr = \theta_n = n^{-\tau}$ with $0 < \tau < 1$ at the main channel can be found in Fig.4. As n tends to infinity, we can see that $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ approaches 1 exponentially if $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, and the rate it approaches 0 is polynomial if $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$. When $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$, $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ remains nearly constant.

We plot TVD $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ from (53), the square of the Hellinger distance from (71), Hellinger upper bound from (32) and the approximation expansion from (70) when $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$ in Fig.5. It is obvious that the approximation from (70) is quite accurate and can be used in practical performance analysis of Gaussian random codes in covert communication. Moreover, the validity of the rate that $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ goes to 1 is demonstrated again. Notice that there are notable differences between two bounds and the actual value of the TVD. Thus, using the bounds will either overestimate or underestimate the throughput.

These quantities $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$, $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}D(\mathbb{P}_0\|\mathbb{P}_1)}$ (KL bound), Hellinger upper bound (32) and the approximation of $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ in (69) with $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$ are plotted in Fig.6. The accuracy of the approximation (69) is obvious. It is also clear that the rates that they approach 0 are polynomial. Although these bounds have the same tendency, there are still some gaps between KL bound, Hellinger upper bound and TVD. In particular, for τ approaching one, the gap is much smaller than for those close to 0.5, which suggests the range of τ where our approximate becomes more critical in evaluation of the bounds on throughputs under covert constraints.

In Fig.7 and Fig.8, we plot the bounds of the throughput by different power computation methods. The achievability bound and converse bound labeled ‘‘TVD’’ are from the analytical formula of TVD. The second pair labeled ‘‘Hellinger’’ is from P_{SUF} and P_{NEC} as they are both from bounds of TVD in terms of Hellinger distance. The last pair is from the KL upper bound, which is used to evaluate the throughput of Gaussian random codes in our last work [17]. We can see the following facts. Firstly, the bounds from TVD are close to each other as




Fig. 2. The sufficient condition P_{SUF} , the necessary condition P_{NEC} and the power θ_n for $\delta = 0.1$.

well as the bounds from KL divergence. Secondly, the bounds from Hellinger distance have large gaps between each other and all of the other bounds are within the zones of the bounds from Hellinger distance. Thirdly, the bounds from KL bound are less than their correspondences from TVD. We will explain as follows. For the bounds labeled ‘‘TVD’’ and ‘‘KL’’, their values of power are the same for them. Moreover, as KL bound is an upper bound of TVD, it will lead to a smaller value of power than that of TVD from the same δ . In addition, the achievability and converse bounds labeled ‘‘Hellinger’’ are from lower and upper bounds of TVD, which lead to smaller achievability bound and larger converse bound. These facts illustrated the necessity of the derivation for the analytical formula of TVD and its numerical expansions.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work we considered covert communication over AWGN channels in finite block length regime. The maximal throughput with TVD constraint is investigated and the first and second asymptotics are obtained, which extends the Square Root Law for covert communication. We also got the analytical functional solution of TVD between the distributions of the noise and the signal plus the noise at the adversary with Gaussian random codes. The numerical approximation expressions for TVD with different signal noise ratio levels were further discussed, which are helpful for practical design and analysis of covert communication. Furthermore, our investigation about the convergence rates of TVD when $n \rightarrow \infty$ are important to gain understanding the total variation distance as a metric of discrimination between Gaussian distributions with different variances.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF THEOREM 4

We have $1 - (\tau + \beta) = V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{P}_0(\mathbf{x})\|_1$, \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 are n -product Gaussian distributions with zero mean




Fig. 3. The sufficient condition P_{SUF} , the necessary condition P_{NEC} and the power θ_n for covert communication over AWGN channel for varying δ with fixed blocklength $n = 2000$.




Fig. 5. Comparison between $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$, $H^2(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$, Hellinger upper bound and the approximation (70) by the expansions with the length of the code n with $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$.




Fig. 4. Comparison of different total variation distances with the code length n and different τ .




Fig. 6. Comparison between $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$, $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}D(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)}$ (KL bound), Hellinger upper bound and the approximation (69) by the expansions with the length of the code n with $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$. Since the square of Hellinger distance is too loose as a lower bound of the total variation distance when $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$, it is not plotted here.

and variance σ^2 and $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma^2 + p_n$, respectively. p_n is the average power per symbol. We derive from (132) and get (133) by integrating the variable in the n dimension ball.

In the derivation, the equation (a) follows from the following

inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} \geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & 1 - \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_1^2}\right)^{n/2} e^{-\frac{\sum_i x_i^2}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)} \geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{\sum_i x_i^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right) \geq \frac{n}{2} (\ln \sigma^2 - \ln \sigma_1^2) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \sum_i x_i^2 \leq \frac{n(\sigma_1\sigma)^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}. \end{aligned}$$

(134)




Fig. 7. The achievability and converse bounds by different power computation methods with varying blocklength n for $\delta = 0.1$ and $\epsilon = 0.01$.




Fig. 8. The achievability and converse bounds by different power computation methods with varying δ for $n = 500$ and $\epsilon = 0.01$.

The equation (b) follows from the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \geq \frac{n(\sigma_1 \sigma)^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
 = & 1 - \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \leq \frac{n(\sigma_1 \sigma)^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
 & \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \geq \frac{n(\sigma_1 \sigma)^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
 = & 1 - \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \leq \frac{n(\sigma_1 \sigma)^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} dx_1 \cdots dx_n. \tag{135}
 \end{aligned}$$

Denote $R^2 = \frac{n(\sigma_1 \sigma)^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}$; to calculate the integration

of (133), we need to calculate the following integration,

$$\iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \leq R^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx_1 \cdots dx_n. \tag{136}$$

By the following variable substitution,

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = r \cos \theta_1 \\ x_2 = r \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 \\ \dots \\ x_{n-1} = r \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 \sin \theta_3 \cdots \cos \theta_{n-1} \\ x_n = r \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 \sin \theta_3 \cdots \sin \theta_{n-1} \end{cases}$$

$$0 \leq r \leq R, 0 < \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{n-2} < \pi, 0 < \theta_{n-1} < 2\pi,$$

the integration can be rewritten as (137).

In (137), the function $B(x, y)$ denotes the well known Beta function. If $x_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ follow i.i.d Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance σ^2 , denote $X = x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2$, then the random variable X follows central χ distribution. The pdf of X is written as

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2^{n/2} \Gamma(n/2) \sigma^n} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}}, & x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The cdf of X is following when $n = 2m$ is even:

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}\right)^k, & x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that $X = x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2$, and we have the following equation from (137),

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \int_0^R \frac{2}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} r^{n-1} dr \\
 \xrightarrow{r^2=x} & \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \frac{2}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} \int_0^{R^2} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} x^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} x^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx \tag{138} \\
 = & \frac{1}{2^{n/2} \Gamma(n/2) \sigma^n} \int_0^{R^2} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the integration in (136) can be reformulated as

$$P\{X < R^2\} = \frac{1}{2^{n/2} \Gamma(n/2) \sigma^n} \int_0^{R^2} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} dx. \tag{139}$$

Denote Y and X as the random variables corresponding to sums of i.i.d Gaussian random variable with variance σ_1 and σ , respectively, then the equation (133) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) \\
 = & \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{P}_0(\mathbf{x})\|_1 \\
 = & P\{X < R^2\} - P\{Y < R^2\} \\
 = & \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}} \Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^{R^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^n} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^n} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma_1^2}} \right) dx \\
 = & \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}} \Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^{R^2} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^n} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^n} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma_1^2}} \right) dx. \tag{140}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbb{P}_0(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{P}_1(\mathbf{x})\|_1 \\
&= \iint \cdots \int_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n} \left| \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} \right| dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
&= \iint \cdots \int_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} \left| 1 - \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_1^2}\right)^{n/2} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right)} \right| dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \leq \frac{n(\sigma_1\sigma)^2 \ln(1+\frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
&+ \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \geq \frac{n(\sigma_1\sigma)^2 \ln(1+\frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} 2 \cdot \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \leq \frac{n(\sigma_1\sigma)^2 \ln(1+\frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\
V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) &= \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \leq \frac{n(\sigma_1\sigma)^2 \ln(1+\frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}} \left(\frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} - \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma_1^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_n. \tag{132}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \iint \cdots \int_{\sum_i x_i^2 \leq R^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} dx_i \cdots dx_n \\
&= \iint \cdots \int_{0 < r^2 \leq R^2, 0 < \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{n-2} < \pi, 0 < \theta_{n-1} < 2\pi} \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} r^{n-1} \sin^{n-2} \theta_1 \sin^{n-3} \theta_2 \cdots \sin \theta_{n-2} dr d\theta_1 \cdots d\theta_{n-1}. \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta_{n-1} \int_0^\pi d\theta_{n-2} \cdots \int_0^\pi d\theta_1 \int_0^R \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} r^{n-1} \sin^{n-2} \theta_1 \sin^{n-3} \theta_2 \cdots \sin \theta_{n-2} dr \\
&= \int_0^R \frac{2\pi}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} r^{n-1} dr \int_0^\pi \sin^{n-2} \theta_1 d\theta_1 \int_0^\pi \sin^{n-3} \theta_2 d\theta_2 \cdots \int_0^\pi \sin \theta_{n-2} d\theta_{n-2} \\
&= \int_0^R \frac{2\pi}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} r^{n-1} dr \cdot B\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2}\right) B\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n-2}{2}\right) \cdots B\left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right) \\
&= \frac{[\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})]^{n-2}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \int_0^R \frac{2\pi}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} r^{n-1} dr \\
&= \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \int_0^R \frac{2}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} r^{n-1} dr. \tag{137}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the integration

$$\int_0^{R^2} \frac{1}{\sigma^n} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} dx. \tag{141}$$

Denote $\frac{x}{2\sigma^2} = t$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{R^2} \frac{1}{\sigma^n} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma^2}} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^n} \int_0^{R^2} (2\sigma^2 t)^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-t} dt \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^n} \int_0^{R^2/2\sigma^2} 2^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \sigma^{n-2} t^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-t} 2\sigma^2 dt \\
&= 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{R^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{142}$$

where $\gamma(a, z) = \int_0^z e^{-t} t^{a-1} dt$ is the incomplete gamma function.

By the same reasoning, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{R^2} \frac{1}{\sigma_1^n} x^{\frac{n}{2}-1} e^{-\frac{x}{2\sigma_1^2}} dx \\
&= 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{R^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right). \tag{143}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the integration in (140) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{P}_0(\mathbf{x})\|_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}} \Gamma(n/2)} 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \left[\gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{R^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) - \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{R^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \left[\gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{R^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) - \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{R^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_{\frac{1}{2}n\sigma^2 \ln(1+\frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})/p_n}^{\frac{1}{2}n\sigma_1^2 \ln(1+\frac{p_n}{\sigma_1^2})/p_n} e^{-t} t^{n/2-1} dt \quad (144) \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \left[\gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)\right) - \gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)\right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the Gamma function is related to the incomplete gamma function by $\Gamma(n/2) = \gamma(n/2, \infty) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} t^{n/2-1} dt$. As $R^2 = \frac{n(\sigma_1\sigma)^2 \ln(1+\frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})}{p_n}$, if we denote $\theta_n = \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2}$, i.e., **snr**, $f(\theta_n) = \frac{R^2}{2\sigma^2}$ and $g(\theta_n) = \frac{R^2}{2\sigma_1^2}$, we have the following relationships between these variables,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\theta_n) &= \frac{1}{2}n\sigma^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})/p_n \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n \frac{p_n + \sigma^2}{p_n} \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2}) \quad (145) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta_n}\right) \ln(1 + \theta_n),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\theta_n) &= \frac{R^2}{2\sigma_1^2} = \frac{1}{2}n\sigma^2 \ln(1 + \frac{p_n}{\sigma^2})/p_n \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n \frac{\ln(1 + \theta_n)}{\theta_n}, \quad (146)
\end{aligned}$$

$$f(\theta_n) - g(\theta_n) = \theta_n g(\theta_n), \quad (147)$$

$$\frac{f(\theta_n)}{g(\theta_n)} = 1 + \theta_n. \quad (148)$$

APPENDIX B PROOF OF THEOREM 5

This proof consists of three steps.

- 1) First, the numerical relationship between $f(\theta_n)$ and $g(\theta_n)$ is discussed, and then clarify their roles in the expansions of the incomplete gamma functions. Finally, we get different expansions for TVD in different cases. From the equations (53), (145) and (146),

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\theta_n) &\sim \frac{1}{2}n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta_n}\right) \left(\theta_n - \frac{\theta_n^2}{2} + \frac{\theta_n^3}{3} + O(\theta_n^4)\right) \\
&\sim \frac{1}{2}n \left[1 + \frac{\theta_n}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\theta_n^2 + O(\theta_n^3)\right] > \frac{1}{2}n, \quad (149)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\theta_n) &\sim \frac{1}{2}n \frac{\theta_n - \frac{\theta_n^2}{2} + \frac{1}{3}\theta_n^3 + O(\theta_n^4)}{\theta_n} \\
&\sim \frac{1}{2}n \left[1 - \frac{\theta_n}{2} + \frac{1}{3}\theta_n^2 + O(\theta_n^3)\right] < \frac{1}{2}n. \quad (150)
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, the following equations are obvious,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\theta_n) - \frac{n}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta_n}\right) \ln(1 + \theta_n) - \frac{n}{2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n \left[\frac{\theta_n}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\theta_n^2 + \frac{1}{12}\theta_n^3 + \dots \right] \quad (151) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n \times x
\end{aligned}$$

where $x = \frac{\theta_n}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\theta_n^2 + \frac{1}{12}\theta_n^3 + \dots = \sum_{j=1}^\infty (-1)^{j+1} \left(\frac{1}{j} - \frac{1}{j+1}\right) \theta_n^j \rightarrow 0$ with $n \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\theta_n) - \frac{n}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}n \frac{\ln(1 + \theta_n)}{\theta_n} - \frac{n}{2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n \left[-\frac{\theta_n}{2} + \frac{1}{3}\theta_n^2 - \frac{1}{4}\theta_n^3 + \dots \right] \quad (152) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}n \times y
\end{aligned}$$

where $y = \frac{\theta_n}{2} - \frac{1}{3}\theta_n^2 + \frac{1}{4}\theta_n^3 + \dots = \sum_{j=1}^\infty (-1)^{j+1} \frac{1}{j+1} \theta_n^j \rightarrow 0$ with $n \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} &= \frac{1}{2}n \left(1 + \frac{1}{\theta_n}\right) \ln(1 + \theta_n) / \frac{n}{2} \\
&= 1 + \frac{\theta_n}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\theta_n^2 + \frac{1}{12}\theta_n^3 + \dots \quad (153) \\
&= 1 + x
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{g(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} &= \frac{\frac{1}{2}n \frac{\ln(1+\theta_n)}{\theta_n}}{\frac{n}{2}} \\
&= 1 - \frac{\theta_n}{2} + \frac{1}{3}\theta_n^2 - \frac{1}{4}\theta_n^3 + \dots \quad (154) \\
&= 1 - y.
\end{aligned}$$

From the above analysis, we have

$$-\frac{1}{2}n(x+y) = g(\theta_n) - f(\theta_n) = -\frac{1}{2}n \ln(1 + \theta_n), \quad (155)$$

$$\frac{1+x}{1-y} = \frac{f(\theta_n)}{g(\theta_n)} = 1 + \theta_n. \quad (156)$$

- 2) let $a = \frac{n}{2} - 1$, and z equals $f(\theta_n)$ and $g(\theta_n)$, respectively. We have the following facts,

- a) $f(\theta_n)$ and $g(\theta_n)$ are on the right and left side of $a = \frac{n}{2} - 1$ on \mathcal{R} , respectively.
- b) Given θ_n , $f(\theta_n) - (\frac{n}{2} - 1)$ and $g(\theta_n) - (\frac{n}{2} - 1)$ tend to $-\infty$ and ∞ , respectively if $n \rightarrow \infty$, which implies that we can approximate them by (57) and (62) when n is large in case 1 and case 2 respectively. The premise condition for the above two expansions is that $|a - z| = O(a^{1/2+\epsilon})$, which implies the exponent of $n\theta$ should satisfy

$$1 - \tau \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

that is

$$\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

- c) When θ_n is small with a given n , from (149) and (150), $f(\theta_n)$ and $g(\theta_n)$ will be very close to $\frac{n}{2} - 1$, which implies that we can approximate them by (66). Note that the premise condition is that $a - z = o(a^{2/3})$, which implies the exponent of $n\theta$ should satisfy

$$1 - \tau \leq \frac{2}{3},$$

that is

$$\alpha \geq \frac{1}{3}.$$

Hence, $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ could be approximated by the expansions from (66) if $\tau > \frac{1}{2}$.

3) we consider the expansions for $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ when $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, respectively.

a) First, from (56),

$$n! \sim e^{-n} n^n \sqrt{2\pi n} \quad (157)$$

By Legendre's duplication formula,

$$\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(2z) = 2^{2z-1} \Gamma(z) \Gamma(z + \frac{1}{2}) \quad (158)$$

In our setting, z is a integer n , hence

$$\Gamma(n + \frac{1}{2}) = \binom{n - \frac{1}{2}}{n} \Gamma(n) \sqrt{\pi} \sim \sqrt{\pi} \cdot \Gamma(n).$$

Therefore from (158)

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{n-1} \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(\frac{n}{2})^2 &\sim e^{-n} n^n \sqrt{2\pi n} \cdot \sqrt{\pi} \\ \Rightarrow \Gamma(\frac{n}{2}) &\sim e^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\pi} \cdot 2^{\frac{5}{4}}, \end{aligned} \quad (159)$$

the detailed expansion for our approximation of $V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1)$ when $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is expressed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} V_T(\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1) &= \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \left[\gamma(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)) - \gamma(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \left[\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)) - \Gamma(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)) \right] \\ &\sim \frac{e^{-a} a^{a+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(a) [\Phi_k(a, g(\theta)) - \Phi_k(a, f(\theta))]}{\Gamma(a+1)} \\ &\stackrel{b}{\sim} \frac{e \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{a+1})^{a+1}}{(2a+2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\pi} \cdot 2^{\frac{5}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(a) [\Phi_k(a, g(\theta)) - \Phi_k(a, f(\theta))] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\sim} \frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\pi} \cdot 2^{\frac{5}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(\frac{n}{2} - 1) \\ &\times \left[\Phi_k(\frac{n}{2} - 1, g(\theta)) - \Phi_k(\frac{n}{2} - 1, f(\theta)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

where (a) is from $\Gamma(a, z) = \Gamma(a) - \gamma(a, z)$, (b) is from (159), $\Gamma(a+1) = \Gamma(\frac{n}{2}) \sim e^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\pi} \cdot 2^{\frac{5}{4}} = e^{-a-1} (a+1)^{a+1} (2a+2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\pi} \cdot 2^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and (c) is from $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \frac{1}{a+1})^{a+1} = e^{-1}$.

b) When $\tau < \frac{1}{2}$, $V_T(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_0)$ could be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \left[\gamma(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)) - \gamma(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \left[\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}) - \Gamma(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)) - \gamma(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)) \right] \quad (161) \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \left[\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)) + \gamma(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following asymptotic expansion for $\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)) + \gamma(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n))$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \left[\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}, f(\theta_n)) + \gamma(\frac{n}{2}, g(\theta_n)) \right] \\ &\sim e^{-f(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{f(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} n^{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k k! c_k(\frac{n}{2} - 1)}{(f(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2})^{k+1}} \\ &+ e^{-g(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{g(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} n^{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1} k! c_k(\frac{n}{2} - 1)}{(g(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2})^{k+1}} \\ &+ e^{-g(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{g(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} n^{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k(\frac{n}{2} - 1) e^{g(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2}} \\ &\times \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j k!}{(k-j)! (g(\theta_n) + 1 - \frac{n}{2})^{j+1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (162)$$

For the terms $e^{-f(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{f(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$ and $e^{-g(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{g(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$, with the help of (151) - (156), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{e^{-f(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{f(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}}{e^{-g(\theta_n) + \frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{g(\theta_n)}{\frac{n}{2}} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}nx} (1+x)^{\frac{n}{2}}}{e^{\frac{1}{2}ny} (1-y)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \quad (163) \\ &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}n(x+y)} \left(\frac{1+x}{1-y} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Diamant, L. Lampe and E. Gamroth, "Bounds for Low probability of Detection for Underwater Acoustic Communication," *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 143-155, Jan. 2017.
- [2] M. R. Bloch, "Covert Communication Over Noisy Channels: A Resolvability Perspective," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Vol. 62, No. 5, pp. 2334-2354, May 2016.
- [3] B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel and D. Towsley, "Limits of Reliable Communication with Low Probability of Detection on AWGN Channels," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 1921-1930, Sep. 2013.
- [4] L. Wang, G. W. Wornell and L. Zheng, "Fundamental Limits of Communication With Low Probability of Detection," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Vol. 62, No. 6, pp. 3493-3503, May 2016.
- [5] P. H. Che, M. Bakshi, S. Jaggi, "Reliable Deniable Communication: Hiding Messages in Noise," *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT2013)*, Istanbul, Turkey, pp. 2945-2949, Jul. 2013.
- [6] A. Abdelaziz and C. E. Koksal, "Fundamental limits of covert communication over MIMO AWGN channel," *2017 IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*, pp. 1-9, Las Vegas, NV, 2017.
- [7] S. Lee, R. J. Baxley, M. A. Weitnauer and B. Walkenhorst, "Achieving Undetectable Communication," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, Vol. 9, No. 7, pp. 1195-1205, Oct. 2015.
- [8] B. He, S. H. Yan, X. Y. Zhou, V. K. N. Lau, "On Covert Communication With Noise Uncertainty," *IEEE Trans. Communications Letters*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 941-944, Apr. 2016.
- [9] K. Shahzad, X. Zhou and S. Yan, "Covert Communication in Fading Channels under Channel Uncertainty," *IEEE 85th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring)*, pp 1-5, Sydney, Australia, Jun. 2017.

- [10] T. V. Sobers, B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel, S. Guha and D. Towsley, "Covert Communication with the Help of an Uninformed Jammer Achieves Positive Rate," *2015 49th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, Pacific Grove, CA, USA, pp.625-629, Nov. 2015.
- [11] T. V. Sobers, B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel, S. Guha and D. Towsley, "Covert Communication with the Help of an Uninformed Jammer Achieves Positive Rate," *2015 49th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, Pacific Grove, CA, USA, pp. 625 - 629, Nov. 2015.
- [12] B. A. Bash, D. Goeckel and D. Towsley, "Covert Communication Gains from Adversary's Ignorance of Transmission Time," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, Vol. 15, No. 12, pp. 8394 - 8405, Dec. 2016.
- [13] R. Soltani, D. Goeckel, D. Towsley, B. A. Bash and S. Guha, "Covert wireless communication with artificial noise generation," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, Vol. 17, No. 11, pp. 7252 - 7267, Nov. 2018.
- [14] M. Tahmasbi and M. R. Bloch, "Second-Order Asymptotics of Covert Communications over Noisy Channels," in *IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT2016)*, Barcelona, Spain, pp. 2224-2228, Jul. 2016.
- [15] M. Tahmasbi and M. R. Bloch, "First and Second Order Asymptotics in Covert Communications," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp. 2190-2212, Apr. 2019.
- [16] X. Yu, S. Wei and Y. Luo, "One-shot achievability and converse bounds of Gaussian random coding in AWGN channels under covert constraint," in *Proc. 57th Annu. Allerton Conf. Commun., Control Comput.*, Monticello, IL., USA, Sep. 24-27, 2019.
- [17] X. Yu, S. Wei and Y. Luo, "Finite Blocklength Analysis of Gaussian Random Coding in AWGN Channels under Covert Constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics & Security*. DOI:10.1109/TIFS.2020.3032292, online Oct. 2020.
- [18] H. Ashtiani, S. B. David and A. Mehrabian, "Sample-Efficient Learning of Mixtures," *The Thirty-second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-18)*, pp. 2679-2686.
- [19] A. J. Michaels and C. Lau, "Performance of Percent Gaussian Orthogonal Signaling Waveforms," *IEEE Military Communications Conference (MILCOM)*, pp. 338-343, 2014.
- [20] A. J. Michaels, "Digital Chaotic Communications," Ph.D. Dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology, Aug. 2009.
- [21] S. Yan, B. He, Y. Cong and X. Zhou, "Covert communication with finite blocklength in AWGN channels," *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pp. 1-6, Paris, France, May. 2017,
- [22] H. Tang, J. Wang and Y. R. Zheng "Covert Communication with Extremely Low Power under Finite Block Length over Slow Fading," *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHOPS); WCNEE 2018, Wireless Communications and Networking in Extreme Environments*, pp. 657-661, Honolulu, HI, USA, Apr. 2018.
- [23] A. N. Shiryaev, *Probability*, 2nd ed. Springer, 1996.
- [24] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2006.
- [25] S. Yan, Y. C. S. V. Hanly and X. Zhou, "Gaussian Signalling for Covert Communication," <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.00719>.
- [26] E. Lehmann and J. Romano, *Testing Statistical Hypotheses*, 3rd ed. New York: Springer, 2005.
- [27] L. Pardo *Statistical inference based on divergence measures*, Taylor & Francis Group, LLC. 2005.
- [28] I. Sason, "On Improved Bounds for Probability Metrics and f-Divergence," *Center For Communication and Information Technologies Report*, #855, Mar. 2014.
- [29] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor and S. Verdú, "Channel Coding Rate in the Finite Blocklength Regime," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Vol. 56, No. 5, pp. 2307-2358, Apr. 2010.
- [30] Harold Ruben, "Probability content of regions under spherical normal distributions I". *The annals of Mathematical Statistics*. 1960.
- [31] J. Hamkins and K. Zeger "Gaussian Source Coding With Spherical Codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, Vol. 48, No. 11, pp. 2980-2989, Nov 2002.
- [32] W. Rudin *Real and Complex Analysis*. Third Edition. McGraw-Hill Press. 2004.
- [33] A. B. Tsybakov *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2009.
- [34] C. Ferreira, J. L. Lopez and E. P. Sinusia, "Incomplete gamma functions for large values of their variables," *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 34, pp. 467-485, 2005.
- [35] Simon J. A. Malham *An introduction to asymptotic analysis. University lectures*. academia.edu. 2005.