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Abstract—In this work, we study the information theoretic converse for the index coding problem. We generalize the definition for the alignment chain, introduced by Maleki et al., to capture more flexible relations among interfering messages at each receiver. Based on this, we derive improved converse results for the single-server centralized index coding problem. The new bounds uniformly outperform the maximum acyclic induced subgraph bound, and can be useful for large problems, for which the generally tighter polymatroidal bound becomes computationally impractical. We then extend these new bounds to the multi-server distributed index coding problem. We also present a separate, but related result where we identify a smaller centralized index coding instance compared to those identified in the literature, for which non-Shannon-type inequalities are necessary to give a tighter converse.

I. INTRODUCTION

Index coding, introduced by Birk and Kol in [1], investigates the noiseless broadcast rate of $n$ messages from a server to multiple receivers. Each receiver wants to decode a unique message and has prior knowledge of some other messages as its side information. During the past two decades, there has been substantial progress in theory and applications of index coding. See [2] and the references therein. However, in general, the index coding problem remains open.

In contrast to the classic single-server centralized index coding (CIC) problem, the more general distributed index coding (DIC) problem different subsets of the $n$ messages are stored at multiple servers. Such communication model has clear applications for practical circumstances where the information is geographically distributed over multiple locations. See [3]–[5] and references therein.

In this paper we focus on deriving information theoretic converse results for both CIC and DIC problems. For the CIC problem, the maximum acyclic induced subgraph (MAIS) bound was proposed in [6], and the polymatroidal (PM) bound based on the polymatroidal axioms of the entropy function was presented in [7], [8]. Both bounds have been extended to the DIC problem [4], [5]. The PM bound is generally tighter than the MAIS bound. However, the computational complexity of the PM bound is much higher than that of the MAIS bound, which can be prohibitively high for problems with a large number of messages.

Therefore, it is imperative to find a middle ground between the easily computable yet looser MAIS bound and the high-complexity yet tighter PM bound. The internal conflict bound for the CIC problem, introduced in [9], [10] based on the alignment chain model, can sometimes be useful. However, it does not subsume the MAIS bound and these two bounds can outperform each other for different instances of the problem.

In this paper we first generalize the internal conflict bound for the CIC problem by extending the alignment chain model. The new converse results (Thms. 1–3 in Section IV-A) are of closed-form given the generalized alignment chains, uniformly outperform the internal conflict bound and the MAIS bound. We show by examples that such relationships are sometimes strict. We then generalize these results to the DIC problem (Thms. 4–6 in Section IV-B), and show their efficacy via another example. Finally in Section IV-C we present a separate result. That is, we identify a 9-message CIC problem, which is, to the best of our knowledge, the smallest CIC problem in terms of the number of messages ever identified, for which non-Shannon-type inequalities are necessary to derive a tighter converse on the capacity region.

Notation: For non-negative integers $a, b, [a]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, a\}$, and $[a : b]$ denotes the set $\{a, a + 1, \ldots, b\}$. If $a > b$, $[a : b] = \emptyset$. For a set $S$, $|S|$ denotes its cardinality.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

Assume that there are $n$ messages, $x_i \in \{0, 1\}^{u_i}, i \in [n]$. For brevity, when we say message $i$, we mean message $x_i$. Let $X_i$ be the random variable corresponding to $x_i$. We assume that $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are independent and uniformly distributed. For any $S \subseteq [n]$, let $S^c = \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus S$, $x_S = (x_i, i \in S)$, and $X_S = (X_i, i \in S)$. By convention $x_\emptyset = X_\emptyset = \emptyset$. There are $n$ receivers, where receiver $i \in [n]$ wishes to obtain $x_i$ and knows $x_{A_i}$, as side information for some $A_i \subseteq [n] \setminus \{i\}$. The set of the interfering messages at receiver $i$ (i.e., neither wanted nor known) is denoted by $B_i = (A_i \cup \{i\})^c$.

To avoid redundancy, in the rest of this section, we focus on describing the remaining system model for the DIC problem, in which there are $2^n - 1$ servers, each of which contains a unique nonempty subset of the $n$ messages. The server indexed by $J \in N$ contains messages $x_J$, where $N = \{J \subseteq [n] : J \neq \emptyset\}$. Every server is connected to all receivers via its own noiseless broadcast channel with finite link capacity $C_J \geq 0$. Let $y_J \in \{0, 1\}^{r_J}$ be the output of server $J$ to be broadcast, which is a function of $x_J$, and $Y_J$ be the random variable corresponding to $y_J$.

For any DIC problem, we define a $(u, r) = ((u_i, i \in [n]), (r_J, J \in N))$ distributed index code by

\[ \text{\textbf{Reference}} \]
• $2^n - 1$ encoders, one for each server $J \in \mathcal{N}$, such that
\[ \phi_J : \prod_{j \in J} \{0, 1\}^{u_j} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{r_J} \] maps the messages $x_J$ in server $J$ to an $r_J$-bit sequence $y_J$, and
• $n$ decoders, one for each receiver $i \in [n]$, such that
\[ \psi_i : \prod_{J \in \mathcal{N}} \{0, 1\}^{r_J} \times \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}_i} \{0, 1\}^{u_k} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{u_i} \] maps the received sequences $(y_J, J \in \mathcal{N})$ and the side information $x_{A_i}$ to $\hat{x}_i$.
We say that a rate–capacity tuple $(R, C) = ((R_i, i \in [n]), (C_J, J \in \mathcal{N}))$ is achievable if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist a $(u, r)$ code and a positive integer $r$ such that the message rates $\frac{u_i}{r}$, $i \in [n]$ and broadcast rates $\frac{r_J}{r}$, $J \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfy
\[ R_i \leq \frac{u_i}{r}, \quad i \in [n], \quad C_J \geq \frac{r_J}{r}, \quad J \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{1} \]
and that $P\left(\{\hat{X}_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_n\} \neq (X_1, \ldots, X_n)\right) \leq \epsilon$. For a given link capacity tuple $C$, the capacity region $\mathcal{C}(C)$ is the closure of the set of all rate tuples $R$ such that $(R, C)$ is achievable. The symmetric capacity is defined as
\[ C_{\text{sym}}(C) = \max \{R_{\text{sym}} : (R_{\text{sym}}, \ldots, R_{\text{sym}}) \in \mathcal{C}(C)\}. \tag{2} \]
Clearly, the CIC problem can be seen as a special case of the DIC problem with $C_J = 1$ (normalized) for $J = [n]$ and $C_J = 0$ otherwise, and hence the centralized index code, the achievable rate tuple $R$, the capacity region $\mathcal{C}$, and the symmetric capacity $C_{\text{sym}}$ can be defined accordingly.

Any CIC or DIC problem can be represented by a sequence $(i|J \in \mathcal{A}_i)$, $i \in [n]$. For example, for $A_1 = \emptyset$, $A_2 = \{3\}$, and $A_3 = \{2\}$, we write $(1\rightarrow)$, $(2\rightarrow)$, $(3\rightarrow)$. Any problem can also be represented by a side information graph $G$ with $n$ vertices, in which vertex $i$ represents message $i$, and a directed edge $(i, j)$ represents that $i \in J_i$. For any nonempty group of messages $S \subseteq [n]$, $G|_S$ denotes the subgraph of $G$ induced by $S$. If $G|_S$ is acyclic, we simply say that the message group $S$ forms an acyclic structure.

III. PRELIMINARIES

We briefly review the MAIS bound \cite{4} and the internal conflict bound \cite{5, 6}. The former is stated below.

**Proposition 1 (MAIS bound, \cite{5}):** Given an arbitrary CIC problem $(i|A_i)$, $i \in [n]$, if $R_{\text{sym}}$ is achievable, then
\[ R_{\text{sym}} \leq \min_{S \subseteq [n]: \mathcal{G}|_S \text{ is acyclic}} \frac{1}{|S|} \]
For the internal conflict bound, we first re-state the definition of the alignment chain \cite{9} in our notation as follows.

**Definition 1 (Alignment Chain, \cite{9}):** For any CIC problem $(i|A_i)$, $i \in [n]$, messages $i(1), i(2), \ldots, i(m), i(m+1)$ and $k_1, \ldots, k_m$ constitute an alignment chain of length $m$ denoted as
\[ i(1) \xleftarrow{k_1} i(2) \xleftarrow{k_2} i(3) \cdots \xleftarrow{k_m} i(m+1), \tag{3} \]
if the conditions listed below are satisfied,
1. $i(1) \in B_{i(m+1)}$ or $i(m+1) \in B_{i(1)}$;
2. for any $j \in [m]$, we have $\{i(j), i(j+1)\} \subseteq B_{k_j}$.

For any alignment chain or any weighted alignment chains to be proposed later, we call the edge between $i(j)$ and $i(j+1)$ edge $j$.

For any CIC problem, if such an alignment chain of length $m$ exists, then we say that there is an internal conflict between messages $i_0$ and $i_m$, leading to an upper bound \cite{9} on the achievable symmetric rate as $R_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{m}{1+2m}$. It has been shown in \cite{9} that a given CIC problem is half-rate-infeasible, i.e. $C_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, if and only if there exists at least one alignment chain. We state the internal conflict bound as follows.

**Proposition 2 (Internal conflict bound, \cite{10}):** Given an arbitrary half-rate-infeasible CIC problem $(i|A_i)$, $i \in [n]$, if $R_{\text{sym}}$ is achievable, then $R_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{\Delta}{1+2\Delta}$, where $\Delta$ denotes the minimum length of the problem’s alignment chains.

**Definition 1** depends on neither the number of the servers, nor the message distribution among the servers, and thus also works for the DIC problem. However, the internal conflict bound has never been extended to the multi-server scenario. Also, the symmetric capacity for the DIC problems with no alignment chains remains unclear. In the rest of this paper, whenever we say a CIC or DIC problem, we assume that the problem is internally conflicted, which means that there exists at least one alignment chain.

IV. MAIN RESULTS

A. Improved Necessary Conditions for CIC

We start by introducing a basic structure which will play a crucial role as the basic building block in the generalized alignment chains to be developed henceforth.

**Definition 2 (Basic Tower):** For any CIC problem $(i|A_i)$, $i \in [n]$, messages $i(1), i(2) \in [n]$ and $k(1), k(2), \ldots, k(h) \in [n]$ constitute the following basic tower
\[ k(h) \xleftarrow{k(2)} \xleftarrow{k(1)} i(1) \rightarrow_s i(2), \]
denoted as $B$, if for any $\ell \in [h]$, $\{i(1), i(2), k(1), \ldots, k(\ell - 1)\} \subseteq B_{k(\ell)}$.

A visualization of the above definition is given in Figure 1(a). In the basic tower $B$, messages $i(1)$ and $i(2)$ are placed horizontally at the ground level of the tower, and message $k(\ell)$ is placed on the $\ell$-th floor of the tower for any $\ell \in [h]$, where $h$ is called the height or the weight of the tower. The receiver $k(\ell)$ who wants message $k(\ell)$ on the $\ell$-th floor cannot know any of the $k$-labeled messages on the lower floors nor the two $i$-labeled messages at the ground level as its side information. As a result, message groups $\{i(1), k(1), k(2), \ldots, k(h)\}$ and $\{i(2), k(1), k(2), \ldots, k(h)\}$ each form an acyclic structure.

Now we propose the first generalization of the alignment chain, namely, the singleton weighted alignment chain.

**Definition 3 (Singleton Weighted Alignment Chain):** For any CIC problem $(i|A_i)$, $i \in [n]$, we have the following singleton weighted alignment chain,
\[ k_1(b_1) \xleftarrow{k_2(b_2)} \xleftarrow{k_m(b_m)} i(1) \xrightarrow{\cdots} \rightarrow_s i(2) \xrightarrow{\cdots} \rightarrow_s i(m+1), \]
denoted compactly as $i(1) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K}} i(m+1)$, where $\mathcal{I} = \{i(j) : j \in [m+1]\}$, and $\mathcal{K} = \{k_j(\ell) : j \in [m], \ell \in [h_j]\}$, if the conditions listed below are satisfied:

1) $i(1) \in B_{i(m+1)}$ or $i(m+1) \in B_{i(1)}$;
2) For any $j \in [m]$, message group $\{i(j), i(j+1), k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(h_j)\}$ constitutes a basic tower $B_j$, i.e., $\{i(j), i(j+1), k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(\ell-1)\} \subseteq B_{k_j(\ell)}$ for any $\ell \in [h_j]$.

The singleton weighted alignment chain can be seen as a horizontal concatenation of $m$ basic towers, $B_1, \ldots, B_m$, where the basic tower $B_j, j \in [m]$ corresponding to edge $j$ is of weight $h_j$ and is constructed by messages $i(j), i(j+1)$, and $k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(h_j)$, such that the two terminals of the chain, $i(1)$ and $i(m+1)$, form an acyclic structure. See Figure 1(b) for visualization.

We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1:** Given an arbitrary CIC problem $(i, A_i), i \in [n]$, if $R_{\text{sym}}$ is achievable, then for any singleton weighted alignment chain $i(1) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{K}} i(m+1)$ we have

$$R_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{m}{|\mathcal{I}| + |\mathcal{K}|} = \frac{m}{1 + m + \sum_{j \in [m]} h_j}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

The proof is presented in Section V-A.

The original alignment chain of Definition 1 can be viewed as a special case of singleton weighted alignment chain with $h_j = 1$ for any $j \in [m]$.

Also, any message group that forms an acyclic structure can be viewed as a singleton weighted alignment chain with only one edge, or equivalently, as a special basic tower whose two horizontal terminals form an acyclic structure. Therefore, the MAIS bound is strictly subsumed by Theorem 1.

Intuitively, for every basic tower $B_j$ message sets $\{i(j), k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(h_j)\}$ and $\{i(j+1), k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(h_j)\}$ each form an acyclic structure, leading to a constraint on the symmetric rate, which can all be captured by the MAIS bound. Yet the singleton weighted alignment chain can further capture the concatenated relationship among these acyclic structures, which is not possible in the original MAIS bound.

To further generalize the model of alignment chain, we first introduce the following structure, which is defined based on the basic tower.

**Definition 4 (Crossing Tower):** For any CIC problem $(i, A_i), i \in [n]$, we have the following crossing tower,

$$i(1) \xrightarrow{a} i(s_1) \xrightarrow{b} i(2) \xrightarrow{c} i(3) \xrightarrow{d} \cdots \xrightarrow{e} i(t) \xrightarrow{f} i(t+1),$$

denoted as $\mathcal{X}_j$, if the conditions listed below are satisfied:

1) For any $j' \in [t] \setminus j$, message group $\{i(j'), i(j'+1), k_{j'}(1), \ldots, k_{j'}(h_{j'})\}$ constitutes a basic tower $B_{j'}$;
2) $\{k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(\ell-1)\} \subseteq B_{k_j(\ell)}$ for any $\ell \in [h_j]$;
3) there exist two integers $s_j, t \in [j+1 : t + 1]$ for every $\ell \in [h_j]$, such that
   a) $i(s_j, t) \in B_{k_j(\ell)}$, and $i(t, t) \in B_{k_j(\ell)}$;
   b) for any $\ell_1 < \ell_2 \in [h_j]$, we have $j = s_j, t_1 \geq s_j, t_2 \geq s_j, h_j = 1$, and $j + 1 = t_j, t_1 \leq t_j, t_2 \leq t_j, h_j = t + 1$.

The crossing tower defined above has $t = t_j, h_j - s_j, h_j$ edges. We call edge $j$ the central edge of the crossing tower, and the message group $\{i(j), i(j+1), k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(h_j)\}$ the core of the crossing tower. Except for edge $j$, every other edge $j'$ corresponds to a basic tower $B_{j'}$. Note that we use different subscripts in the horizontal chain in the definition above to distinguish the two different types of edges. Also note that any basic tower $B_{j'}$ can be seen as a special crossing tower with only the central edge and the core, for which $s_{j'}, t_{j'} = j'$, $t_{j'}, t_{j'} = j' + 1$ for any $\ell \in [h_{j'}]$. In the rest of the paper and unless otherwise stated, when we say a crossing tower we assume that it is not a basic tower.

Condition 3a in Definition 4 is described as follows. Message $k_j(1)$ on the first floor of the central edge has message $i(j)$ to start its coverage and message $i(j+1)$ to terminate its coverage. Message $k_j(\ell)$ on floor $\ell > 1$ has messages $i(s_j, \ell)$ and $i(t_j, \ell)$ to start and terminate its coverage, respectively. Condition 3b ensures that in core, the coverage of a message on a lower floor is within the range of the coverage of any other message on a higher floor. For any tower with central edge $j$, set $G_j = [s_j, h_j : t_j, h_j - 1]$ denotes the total coverage of the tower. Then for any basic tower $B_j$, $|G_j| = 1$, and for any crossing tower $\mathcal{X}_j$, $|G_j| \geq 2$.

For visualization of Definition 4 see Figure 2. To avoid clutter, we only draw the leftmost basic tower of edge 1 and the core with central edge $j$. Dashed arrows outgoing from the $k_j(\ell)$ messages in the core to their corresponding $s_j, t_\ell$ messages in the horizontal chain are color-coded as purple, while all other dashed arrows are blue.

Now we are ready to present a further generalization of the singleton weighted alignment chain, namely, disjoint weighted alignment chain.

**Definition 5 (Disjoint Weighted Alignment Chain):** For any CIC problem $(i, A_i), i \in [n]$, we have the following disjoint weighted alignment chain,

$$i(1) \xrightarrow{a} i(2) \xrightarrow{b} i(3) \xrightarrow{c} \cdots \xrightarrow{e} i(m+1),$$

where $\{k_j(1), k_j(2), \ldots, k_j(h_j)\}$ constitutes a basic tower $B_j$, and $\{i(j), i(j+1), k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(h_j)\}$ form a disjoint weighted alignment chain.
denoted as \( i(1) \xrightarrow{\ell} i(m + 1) \), if the conditions listed below are satisfied,

1) \( i(1) \in B_{i(m + 1)} \) or \( i(m + 1) \in B_{i(1)} \);
2) For every \( j \in [m] \), message group \( \{i(j), i(j + 1), k_j(1), \ldots, k_j(h_j)\} \) constitutes either a basic tower \( B_j \) or the core of a crossing tower \( X_j \);
3) Set \( M = \{j \in [m]: |G_j| \geq 2\} \) denote the set of central edges of crossing towers, then for any \( j_1 \neq j_2 \in M \), \( G_{j_1} \cap G_{j_2} = \emptyset \), i.e., the total coverage of different crossing towers must be disjoint.

As the positions of the basic and crossing towers are flexible in general disjoint weighted alignment chain, we remove any subscripts for the edges in the horizontal chain in Definition 5.

To visualize Definition 5, see Figure 3. To avoid clutter, only dashed arrows from \( k_j(\ell) \) of some edges to their corresponding \( i(s_{j,\ell}) \) and \( i(t_{j,\ell}) \) are drawn. The dashed arrow is purple if the edge \( j \) is in set \( M \), i.e., the edge is a central edge of a crossing tower, and blue otherwise. Condition 3 in Definition 4 and Condition 3 in Definition 5 jointly ensure that the two purple dashed arrows can never criss-cross.

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 2: Given an arbitrary CIC problem \((i, A_i), \ i \in [n]\), if \( R_{\text{sym}} \) is achievable, then for any disjoint weighted alignment chain \( i(1) \xrightarrow{\ell} i(m + 1) \) we have

\[
R_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{m}{|I| + |K|} = \frac{m}{1 + m + \sum_{j \in [m]} h_j}.
\]

The proof is presented in Section VB.

For any CIC problem \((i, A_i), \ i \in [n]\), let \( R_{\text{DW}}, R_{\text{SW}}, R_{\Delta}, \) and \( R_{\text{MAIS}} \) denote the upper bounds given by Theorem 1, the internal conflict bound in Proposition 2 and the MAIS bound in Proposition 3 respectively. In the following proposition, we formalize the relationships between these upper bounds, which were alluded to earlier in this subsection.

Proposition 3: \( R_{\text{DW}} \leq R_{\text{SW}} \leq R_{\Delta}, \) and \( R_{\text{SW}} \leq R_{\text{MAIS}}. \)

Proof: Any alignment chain can be seen as a singleton weighted alignment chain and any singleton weighted alignment chain can be seen as a disjoint weighted alignment chain. Therefore, it is clear that \( R_{\text{DW}} \leq R_{\text{SW}} \leq R_{\Delta}. \)

Set \( s = \frac{1}{R_{\text{MAIS}}} \), then there exist \( s \) messages that forms an acyclic graph. In other words, there must exist an ordering of these \( s \) messages, simply denoted as \( \{i(1), i(2), \ldots, i(s)\} \), such that

\[
\{i(1), \cdots, i(\ell - 1)\} \subseteq B_i(\ell), \quad \forall \ell \in [s].
\]

Therefore, we have the following one-edge singleton weighted alignment chain,

\[
i(s) \leftarrow i(1) \xrightarrow{\ell} i(2),
\]

and thus by Theorem 1 we have \( R_{\text{SW}} \leq \frac{1}{s} = R_{\text{MAIS}}. \)

The relationships in Proposition 3 can be strict sometimes.

Example 1: Consider the 6-message CIC problem

\[
(1|2, 3, 4, 6), \quad (2|4, 5, 6), \quad (3|1, 2, 4, 5, 6) \quad (4|1, 2, 6), \quad (5|2, 3, 4, 6), \quad (6|-).
\]

For this problem, \( R_{\Delta} = R_{\text{MAIS}} = \frac{1}{3} \). However, we have the following singleton weighted alignment chain,

\[
\frac{1}{3} \xleftarrow{\frac{6}{9}} \frac{2}{3} \xrightarrow{\frac{4}{9}} \frac{2}{9},
\]

and thus by Theorem 2 we have \( R_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{2}{\frac{6}{1}} = \frac{2}{7} \), which matches the composite coding lower bound \( \frac{3}{8} \) on the symmetric capacity. Therefore, for this problem we have

\[
C_{\text{sym}} = R_{\text{DW}} = R_{\text{SW}} = \frac{2}{7} < R_{\Delta} = R_{\text{MAIS}} = \frac{1}{3}.
\]

Example 2: Consider the 10-message CIC problem

\[
(1|3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10), \quad (2|3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) \quad (3|1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10), \quad (4|1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10), \quad (5|1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10), \quad (6|2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10), \quad (7|1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10), \quad (8|1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10), \quad (9|2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10), \quad (10|1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10).
\]

For this problem, \( R_{\Delta} = R_{\text{MAIS}} = R_{\text{SW}} = \frac{1}{3} \). However, we have the following disjoint weighted alignment chain,

\[
\frac{1}{3} \xleftarrow{\frac{9}{10}} \frac{3}{4} \xrightarrow{\frac{8}{9}} \frac{4}{5},
\]

and thus by Theorem 2 we have \( R_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{2}{\frac{9}{10}} = \frac{2}{9} \), which matches the composite coding lower bound on the symmetric capacity. Therefore, for this problem we have

\[
C_{\text{sym}} = R_{\text{DW}} = \frac{3}{10} < R_{\text{SW}} = R_{\Delta} = R_{\text{MAIS}} = \frac{1}{3}.
\]

Note that the above disjoint weighted alignment chain is not a singleton weighted alignment chain according to Definition 3 as \( B_\emptyset = \{1, 4, 6\} \not\subseteq \{1, 3, 6\} \).
The new bounds can also be useful for some problems with large $n$, for which the more general PM bound is computationally infeasible in practice due to its forbidding complexity.

**Example 3:** Consider the 17-message CIC problem as follows, denoted by $(i_iB_i)$, $i \in [n]$ rather than $(i_iA_i)$, $i \in [n]$ for limited space,

\[ (1|6), (2|7, 8), (3|8, 11, 17), (4|-), (5|-), (6|1), (7|1, 2),
(8|1, 2, 3, 4, 7), (9|2, 3), (10|1, 4, 9), (11|3, 4, 8), (12|5, 6),
(13|4, 5), (14|4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 17), (15|-), (16|5, 6, 12), (17|8). \]

For this problem, $R_\Delta = R_{MAIS} = R_{SW} = \frac{1}{3}$. However, we have the following disjoint weighted alignment chain,

\[ \frac{1}{\frac{8}{3}} \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow \frac{10}{9} \rightarrow _s c \rightarrow \frac{11}{8} \rightarrow _s c \rightarrow \frac{13}{16} \rightarrow _c 5 \rightarrow \frac{15}{12} \rightarrow _c 6, \]

and thus by Theorem 2 we have $R_{sym} \leq R_{DW} \leq \frac{5}{6+15} = \frac{5}{6}$, which matches the composite coding lower bound on $C_{sym}$. Note that the above chain is not a singleton weighted alignment chain. For example, $B_{10} = \{1, 4, 9\} \not\subseteq \{2, 3, 9\}$.

**B. Improved Necessary Conditions for DIC**

Definitions [15] also work for the DIC problem, and hence Theorems 1 and 2 can be extended to Theorems 3 and 4, respectively, in the following. For simpler notation, for any weighted alignment chain, we use $K_{j,L}$ to denote the message sequence $k_{j,L}$, $L \subseteq \{L \}$, e.g. \{K_{j,[h_j]} = \{k_{j,1}, k_{j,2}, \ldots , k_{j,[h_j]} \}.

**Theorem 3:** Given any DIC problem $(i_A_i), i \in [n]$, if $R_{sym}$ is achievable, then for any singleton weighted alignment chain $i(1) \rightarrow_{K} i(m+1)$ we have

\[ R_{sym} \leq \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{\ell \in [2|m+1]} \frac{\ell}{\sum_{i \in [n]} C_{j, i \in [n]} \not\subseteq \{L \}} \left( \sum_{j \in [n]} C_{j, i \in [n]} \not\subseteq \{L \} \right) \]

Recall that $G_{j} = \{s, j, h_{j} - 1\}$ and $M = \{j \in [n] : \left| G_{j} \right| \geq 2\}$. Also define $M' = [n] \setminus \bigcup_{j \in M} G_{j}$.

**Theorem 4:** Given any DIC problem $(i_A_i), i \in [n]$, if $R_{sym}$ is achievable, then for any disjoint weighted alignment chain $i(1) \rightarrow_{K} i(m+1)$ we have

\[ R_{sym} \leq \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{j \in [n]} \sum_{\ell \in [2|m+1]} \left( \sum_{j \in [n]} C_{j, i \in [n]} \not\subseteq \{L \} \right) \]

where

\[ T_1 = \{i(s_j, h_j), i(t_j, h_j), K_{j, [h_j]} \},
T_2 = \{i(s_j, h_j), i(m+1), K_{j, [h_j]} \},
T_3 = \{i(j'), i(j'+1), K_{j', [h_j]} \},
T_4 = \{i(s_j, j), i(j'+1), K_{j, [h_j]} \},
T_5 = \{i(t_j, j), i(j'), K_{j', [h_j]} \}. \]

The proofs for Theorems 3 and 4 are omitted, which are similar but more complicated compared to the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, respectively.

**Example 4:** Consider the following DIC problem with $n = 5$ messages and equal link capacities $C_j = 1, j \in N$,

\[ (1|2, 3, 4, 5), (2|1, 3, 4, 5), (3|2, 4, 5), (4|3, 5), (5|1, 4). \]

For this problem, there exists a singleton weighted alignment chain as $1 \rightarrow \frac{4}{5} \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow \frac{5}{3} \rightarrow \frac{6}{5} \rightarrow c_3$, and thus by Theorem 3

\[ R_{sym} \leq \frac{1}{3} \sum_{j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}} \left( \sum_{j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}} 1 \right) = \frac{54}{5}, \]

which achieves the symmetric capacity of the problem.

**C. A 9-Message CIC Problem Where Non-Shannon-Type Inequalities Are Necessary**

Here we identify a 9-message CIC problem, which is the CIC problem with the smallest number of messages $n$ identified so far, for which non-Shannon-type inequalities are necessary to derive a tighter converse on the capacity region.

**Example 5:** Consider the following 9-message CIC problem, denoted by $(i_iB_i)$, $i \in [n]$,

\[ (1|2), (2|1, 5, 8), (3|-), (4|-), (5|2, 4, 8),
(6|1, 3), (7|3, 4), (8|2, 3, 5), (9|1, 4, 6). \]

The PM bound[6] gives $\sum_{i \in [n]} R_i \leq 19/6$. However, applying Zhang-Yeung non-Shannon-type inequalities [13] to the problem, the upper bound can be further tightened to

\[ \sum_{i \in [n]} R_i \leq \frac{25}{8}. \]

Note that for this problem we are focusing on the achievable sum-rate, rather than the symmetric rate for which Shannon-type inequalities are capable of giving tight upper bounds. Detailed proof for (9) is presented in Section V-C.

**V. PROOFS**

For any CIC problem $(i_A_i), i \in [n]$, set $g(S) = \frac{1}{H(Y_n | X_{S^n})}, S \subseteq [n]$. It can be verified that the set function $g(S)$ is non-decreasing and submodular. It can also be verified that $g(\emptyset) = 0$, and that $g(S) \leq 1, \forall S \subseteq [n]$. For simpler notation, we sometimes use $g(i, i \in S)$ to denote $g(S)$. According to the additional decoding constraints from [12], we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 1:** For any $i \in [n]$, we have

\[ R_i + g(B) = g(B \cup \{i\}), \quad \forall B \subseteq B_i. \]

Particularly, when $B = \emptyset$, $g(B) = 0$, and thus $R_i = g(i)$.

Recall that for simpler notation, given an arbitrary weighted alignment chain, we use $K_{j,L}$ to denote the message sequence $k_{j,L}$, $L \subseteq \{h_j\}$.

\[ \text{It is shown in [12] that the PM bound, including the additional decoding constraints, is as tight as the bound utilizing all Shannon-type inequalities.} \]
A. Proof of Theorem 1

We first present the following lemma for any basic tower.

**Lemma 2**: Given an arbitrary CIC problem \((i \mid A_i), i \in [n]\) with any basic tower \(B_j\) as shown below,

\[
\begin{align*}
& k_j(h_j) \\
& k_j(2) \\
& k_j(1) \\
& i(j) \xrightarrow{s} i(j + 1),
\end{align*}
\]

we have

\[
g(i(j), i(j + 1)) = \sum_{\ell \in [h_j]} R_{k_j(\ell)} \leq 1. \tag{11}
\]

**Proof**: For the basic tower \(B_j\), we have

\[
1 \geq g(i(j), i(j + 1), K_j, [h_j]) = g(i(j), i(j + 1), K_j, [h_j - 1]) + R_{k_j(1)}
\]

\[
\Rightarrow g(i(j), i(j + 1), K_j, [h_j - 2]) + R_{k_j(1)} \geq g(i(j), i(j + 1), K_j, [h_j - 3]) + R_{k_j(1)}
\]

\[
\vdots
\]

\[
g(i(j), i(j + 1), K_j, [h_j - (h_j - 1)]) \geq g(i(j), i(j + 1), K_j, [h_j - (h_j - h_j)]) + R_{k_j(1)}
\]

\[
\Rightarrow g(i(j), i(j + 1)) + \sum_{\ell \in [h_j]} R_{k_j(\ell)} \leq 1. \tag{12}
\]

where the inequality is due to the fact that \(g(S) \leq 1, \forall S \subseteq [n]\), and the equalities follow from Lemma 2 with \(\{i(j), i(j + 1), K_j, [h_j - 1]\} \subseteq B_k(\ell), \forall \ell \in [h_j] \) by Definition 2.

Now we are ready to present the proof for Theorem 1.

**Proof**: Consider any singleton weighted alignment chain \(i(1) \xrightarrow{t, K} \cdots \xrightarrow{s} i(m + 1)\) as follows,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
k_1(h_1) \cdots k_{h_2}(h_2) \cdots k_{m}(h_m) \\
k_1(2) \cdots k_{h_2}(2) \cdots k_{m}(2) \\
k_1(1) \cdots k_{h_2}(1) \cdots k_{m}(1)
\end{array}
\]

The chain can be seen as a concatenation of \(m\) basic towers \(B_j, j \in [m]\), where \(B_j\) is formed by the message group \(\{i(j), i(j + 1), k_j(1), \cdots, k_j(h_j)\}\).

According to the Condition 1 of Definition 3 as well as Lemma 1 we have

\[
R_{i(1)} + R_{i(m + 1)} = g(i(1), i(m + 1)). \tag{13}
\]

For basic tower \(B_j, j \in [m]\), by Lemma 2 we have

\[
1 \geq g(i(j), i(j + 1)) + \sum_{\ell \in [h_j]} R_{k_j(\ell)}. \tag{14}
\]

Summing up (14) for all \(j \in [m]\), we obtain

\[
m \geq \sum_{j \in [m]} g(i(j), i(j + 1)) + \sum_{j \in [m]} \sum_{\ell \in [h_j]} R_{k_j(\ell)}
\]

\[
= \sum_{j \in [m]} g(i(j), i(j + 1)) + |K|R_{sym}. \tag{15}
\]

We can further bound \(\sum_{j \in [m]} g(i(j), i(j + 1))\) as

\[
\sum_{j \in [m]} g(i(j), i(j + 1))
\]

\[
= g(i(1), i(2)) + g(i(2), i(3)) + g(i(3), i(4)) + g(i(4), i(5)) + \cdots + g(i(m), i(m + 1))
\]

\[
\geq R_{i(2)} + g(i(1), i(2), i(3)) + g(i(3), i(4)) + g(i(4), i(5)) + \cdots + g(i(m), i(m + 1))
\]

\[
\geq R_{i(2)} + R_{i(3)} + g(i(1), i(2), i(3), i(4)) + g(i(4), i(5)) + \cdots + g(i(m), i(m + 1))
\]

\[
\geq \cdots
\]

\[
\geq R_{i(2)} + R_{i(3)} + \cdots + R_{i(m - 1)} + R_{i(m)} + g(i(1), i(2), i(3), \cdots, i(m), i(m + 1))
\]

\[
\geq R_{i(2)} + R_{i(3)} + \cdots + R_{i(m - 1)} + R_{i(m)} + R_{i(m + 1)} = |I|R_{sym}. \tag{16}
\]

where all the inequalities except for the last one are due to the submodularity of \(g(S)\) and Lemma 1 and the last inequality is due to the monotonicity of \(g(S)\) and (13).

Combining (15) and (16) yields

\[
R_{sym} \leq \frac{m}{|I| + |K|} = \frac{m}{1 + m + \sum_{j \in [m]} h_j},
\]

which completes the proof. \qed

B. Proof of Theorem 2

We first present the following lemma for any crossing tower.

**Lemma 3**: Given an arbitrary CIC problem \((i \mid A_i), i \in [n]\) with any crossing tower \(A_j\), whose central edge is edge \(j\), as shown below,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
k_{x_j}(1), k_{x_j}(2), \cdots, k_{x_j}(h_{x_j}) \rightarrow i(s_j, h_j) \rightarrow i(j) + 1 \rightarrow i(t_j, h_j) \\
k_{x_j}(1), k_{x_j}(2), \cdots, k_{x_j}(h_{x_j}) \rightarrow i(s_j, h_j) \rightarrow i(j) + 1 \rightarrow i(t_j, h_j)
\end{array}
\]

we have

\[
\sum_{j' \in \{j \in [x_j, h_j] : t_j, h_j - 1 \})} \sum_{\ell \in [h_{x_j}]} R_{k_{x_j}(\ell)} + \sum_{j' \in \{j \in [x_j, h_j] : t_j, h_j - 1 \})} R_{i(j')}
\]

\[
+ g(i(s_j, h_j), i(t_j, h_j)) \leq t_j, h_j - s_j, h_j. \tag{17}
\]

**Proof**: According to the Condition 1 in Definition 3 for any \(j' \in \{s_j, h_j : t_j, h_j - 1 \} \setminus \{j\}\), we know that message group \(\{i(j'), i(j' + 1), R_{i', [h_{x_j}]}\}\) forms a basic tower \(B_{j'}\). Hence by Lemma 2 we have

\[
\sum_{j' \in \{j \in [x_j, h_j] : t_j, h_j - 1 \})} \sum_{\ell \in [h_{x_j}]} R_{k_{x_j}(\ell)} + g(i(j'), i(j' + 1))
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{j' \in \{j \in [x_j, h_j] : t_j, h_j - 1 \})} 1 = t_j, h_j - s_j, h_j - 1. \tag{18}
\]
For the core of $X_j$ constituted by the message group \(\{i(j), i(j+1), K_{i,j}\}\), consider any $\ell \in [2 : h_j]$, we have
\[
g(K_{j,\ell-1}, i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell})) + g(i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell}), i(s_{j,\ell-1}), i(t_{j,\ell-1})) - g(i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell})) \geq g(K_{j,\ell-1}, i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell-1}))
\]
where the inequality follows from the submodularity and the monotonicity of $g(S)$, and the equality follows from Lemma \[1\] with \(\{K_{j,\ell-1}, i(s_{j,\ell-1}), i(t_{j,\ell-1})\} \subseteq B_{k_{i,\ell}}\) by the Conditions \[2\] and \[3a\] in Definition \[4\]. Summing up (19) for all $\ell \in [2 : h_j]$ yields
\[
g(K_{j,\ell-1}, i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell})) + \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} g(i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell}), i(s_{j,\ell-1}), i(t_{j,\ell-1})) - \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} g(i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell})) \geq \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}}.\tag{20}
\]
Thus, we have
\[
\sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} g(i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell})) + \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}} \leq g(K_{j,\ell-1}, i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell}), i(s_{j,\ell-1}), i(t_{j,\ell-1}))
\]
where the first inequality follows from (20) and the last inequality follows from Lemma \[1\] with \(\{K_{j,\ell-1}, i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell})\} \subseteq B_{k_{i,\ell}}\) and that $g(S) \leq 1$, $VS \subseteq \{1\}$.

Again consider any $\ell \in [2 : h_j]$, we have
\[
\sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} g(i(j'), i(j'+1)) + g(i(s_{j,\ell-1}), i(t_{j,\ell-1}))
\]
where the first inequality follows from the submodularity of $g(S)$ and Lemma \[1\] and the second inequality is due to the monotonicity of $g(S)$.

The Condition \[3b\] in Definition \[4\] indicates that for any $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2 \in [2 : h_j]$, sets $\{s_{j,\ell_1}, : s_{j,\ell_1-1}\}$, $\{s_{j,\ell_2}, : s_{j,\ell_2-1}\}$, $\{t_{j,\ell_1}, : t_{j,\ell_1-1}\}$, and $\{t_{j,\ell_2}, : t_{j,\ell_2-1}\}$ are mutually disjoint. Similarly, sets $\{s_{j,\ell_1+1}, s_{j,\ell_1-1}\}$, $\{s_{j,\ell_2+1}, s_{j,\ell_2-1}\}$, $\{t_{j,\ell_1+1}, t_{j,\ell_1-1}\}$, and $\{t_{j,\ell_2+1}, t_{j,\ell_2-1}\}$ are also mutually disjoint. Hence, summing up (22) for all $\ell \in [2 : h_j]$ gives
\[
\sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} g(i(j'), i(j'+1)) + \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}} \leq g(i(j'), i(j'+1)) + \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}} \leq R_{i(j')} + \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}}.
\tag{23}
\]
Recall that $s_{j,1} = j$, and $t_{j,1} = j + 1$. Simplifying and rearranging (23), we have
\[
\sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}} + \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}} = \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} g(i(j'), i(j'+1)) \leq \sum_{\ell \in [2 : h_j]} g(i(s_{j,\ell}), i(t_{j,\ell})),\tag{24}
\]
Finally, summing up (18), (21), and (24) yields (17), which completes the proof.

With the help of Lemmas \[2\] and \[3\] we can prove Theorem \[2\] in the following.

Proof: Given any disjoint weighted alignment chain $i(1) \leftrightarrow i(m+1)$ according to Definition \[5\] divide the $m$ edges into two groups, $M = \{j \in [m] : G_j \geq 2\}$ and $[m] \setminus M = \{j \in [m] : G_j = 1\}$. Then we know that for every $j \in M$ there is a crossing tower $X_j$, and for every $j' \in [m] \setminus M$, there is a basic tower $B_{j'}$.

According to the Condition \[1\] in Definition \[5\] by Lemma \[1\] we have
\[
R_{i(1)} + R_{i(m+1)} = g(i(1), i(m+1)).\tag{25}
\]
Considering any basic tower $B_{j'}$, $j' \in [m] \setminus M$, according to Lemma \[2\] we have
\[
\sum_{\ell \in [h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}} + g(i(j'), i(j'+1)) \leq 1.\tag{26}
\]
Considering any crossing tower $X_j$, $j \in M$, according to Lemma \[3\] we have
\[
\sum_{\ell \in [h_j]} R_{k_{i,\ell}} + g(i(j'), i(j'+1)) \leq 1.\tag{27}
\]
Recall that $M' = [m] \setminus \bigcup_{j \in M} G_j$ defined in Section \[1V-B\]. Set $M'$ denotes the collection of the edges of the basic towers in the chain that are not covered by the total coverage $G_j$ of any crossing tower $X_j$, $j \in M$. Summing up (27) for
all \( j \in M \) and (26) for all \( j' \in M' = [m] \setminus (\bigcup_{j \in M} G_j) \), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{j \in M} \left( \sum_{j' \in [s_j,h_j]} \sum_{t_j \in [h_j]} R_{k_j}(t) \right) + \sum_{j \in M} \left( \sum_{j' \in [s_j,h_j] + 1} \sum_{t_j \in [h_j]} R_{i(j')} + g(i(s_j,h_j), i(t_j,h_j)) \right) \\
+ \sum_{j \in M} \left( \sum_{j' \in M'} \sum_{t_j \in [h_j]} R_{k_j}(t) + g(i(j'), i(j' + 1)) \right) \\
\leq \sum_{j \in M} (t_{j,h_j} - s_{j,h_j}) + \sum_{j \in M'} 1.
\end{align*}
\] (28)

The LHS of (28) can be further bounded in the following. Recall that any basic tower is a special crossing tower, and thus for any \( j' \in M' \), \( s_{j',h_{j'}} = j', t_{j',h_{j'}} = j' + 1 \). With the fact that the disjoint weighted alignment chain can be seen as a concatenation of all the crossing towers \( X_j, j \in M \) and the basic towers \( B_{j'}, j' \in M' \) in mind, which is according to the Condition in Definition as well as the definition of \( M' \), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{j \in M} g(i(s_{j,h_j}), i(t_{j,h_j})) + \sum_{j' \in M'} g(i(j'), i(j' + 1)) \\
= \sum_{j \in M \cup M'} g(i(s_{j,h_j}), i(t_{j,h_j})) \\
\geq \sum_{j \in (\bigcup_{j \in M \cup M'} \bigl\{s_{j,h_j}, t_{j,h_j}\bigr\}) \setminus \{1, m + 1\}} R_{i(j')} \\
+ g( \bigcup_{j \in M \cup M'} \bigl\{s_{j,h_j}, t_{j,h_j}\bigr\}) \\
\geq \sum_{j \in \bigcup_{j \in M \cup M'} \bigl\{s_{j,h_j}, t_{j,h_j}\bigr\}} R_{i(j')}.
\end{align*}
\] (29)

where the first inequality follows from the submodularity of \( g(S) \), and Lemma and the second inequality follows from the monotonicity of \( g(S) \), and (25), and the fact that there must exist some \( j_1, j_2 \in M \cup M' \) such that \( s_{j_1,h_{j_1}} = 1, t_{j_2,h_{j_2}} = m + 1 \). Note that the proof for (29) is similar to the proof for (16) in Section V-A.

By (29), the LHS of (28) can be bounded as,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{LHS} \\
\geq \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{j' \in [s_j,h_j]} \sum_{t_j \in [h_j]} R_{k_j}(t) + \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{j' \in [s_j,h_j] + 1} R_{k_j}(t) \\
+ \sum_{j \in M} \sum_{j' \in [s_j,h_j]} R_{i(j')} \\
+ \sum_{j \in \bigcup_{j \in M \cup M'} \bigl\{s_{j,h_j}, t_{j,h_j}\bigr\}} R_{i(j')} \\
= \sum_{j \in [m]} \sum_{t_j \in [h_j]} R_{k_j}(t) + \sum_{j \in [m + 1]} R_{i(j)} \\
= (|K| + |L|) R_{\text{sym}}.
\end{align*}
\] (30)

For the RHS of (28), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RHS} \\
= \sum_{j \in M} (t_{j,h_j} - s_{j,h_j}) + \sum_{j \in M} \left( \bigcup_{j \in M} \{s_{j,h_j} : t_{j,h_j} - 1\} \right) \\
= m.
\end{align*}
\] (31)

Given (28), (30), and (31), we can conclude that

\[
R_{\text{sym}} \leq \frac{m}{|I| + |K|} = \frac{m}{1 + m + \sum_{j \in [m]} h_j}.
\] (32)

C. Proof of (9)

For the problem described in Example 5, we show that (9) holds by showing that

\[
\begin{align*}
11 + g(1, 2, 3) + g(1, 2, 4) \\
&\geq 6R_1 + 6R_2 + 3R_3 + 3R_4 + 4R_5 + 4R_6 \\
&\quad + 2R_7 + 4R_8 + 4R_9.
\end{align*}
\] (33)

and that

\[
\begin{align*}
14 - g(1, 2, 3) - g(1, 2, 4) \\
&\geq 2R_1 + 2R_2 + 5R_3 + 5R_4 + 4R_5 + 4R_6 \\
&\quad + 6R_7 + 4R_8 + 4R_9.
\end{align*}
\] (34)

in the following.

We first show that (33) holds as follows.

First of all, it can be verified the following inequalities hold

\[
\begin{align*}
g(1, 3, 4) &\geq g(1, 4) + g(1, 3) + R_6 + R_9 - 1, \\
g(2, 3, 4) &\geq g(2, 4) + g(2, 3) + R_5 + R_9 - 1, \\
g(1, 3, 5) &\geq g(3, 5) + g(1, 5) + R_2 + R_8 - 1, \\
g(1, 4, 8) &\geq g(4, 8) + g(1, 8) + R_2 + R_5 - 1, \\
g(1, 2, 3) &\geq g(2, 3) + g(1, 5) + R_2 + R_8 - 1, \\
g(1, 2, 4) &\geq g(2, 4) + g(1, 8) + R_2 + R_5 - 1,
\end{align*}
\] (35)

among which we only give detailed derivations for the first one, (35), as shown in the following, while all the others can be obtained via similar steps. Consider

\[
\begin{align*}
g(1, 3, 4) + 1 - R_0 &\geq g(1, 3, 4) + g(1, 4, 6, 9) - R_9 \\
&\geq g(1, 3, 4) + g(1, 4, 6) \\
&\geq g(1, 4) + g(1, 3, 6) \\
&= g(1, 4) + g(1, 3) + R_6,
\end{align*}
\] (41)

where the first step follows from the fact that \( g(S) \leq 1, \forall S \subseteq [n] \), and the third step follows from the monotonicity and the submodularity of \( g(S) \), and the second and the fourth steps follow from Lemma with \( \{1, 4, 6\} \subset B_9 \) and \( \{1, 3\} \subset B_6 \), respectively. The inequality (41) directly leads to (35).
Next, it can be verified that according to Lemma \[1\], as well as the submodularity and the monotonicity of \(g(S)\), we have the following inequalities,
\[
\begin{align*}
g(2, 3) + g(1, 3) + g(2, 4) + g(1, 4) & \geq R_3 + R_4 + g(1, 2, 3, 4) + R_1 + R_2, \\
g(1, 2, 3, 4) + g(1, 3, 4, 5) & \geq g(1, 3, 4) + R_2 + R_5 + R_8, \\
g(1, 3, 4, 5) + g(1, 3, 4) & \geq g(1, 3, 4) + g(1, 3, 4, 5), \\
2g(3, 4) + g(3, 5) + g(4, 8) & \geq R_3 + R_4 + g(3, 4, 5) + g(3, 4, 8), \\
g(3, 4, 5) + g(1, 4, 5) + g(3, 4, 8) + g(1, 3, 8) & \geq R_4 + R_5 + g(1, 3, 4, 5) + R_3 + R_8 + g(1, 3, 4, 8), \\
g(1, 3) + g(1, 5) + g(1, 4) + g(1, 8) & \geq g(1, 3, 5) + g(1, 4, 8) + 2R_1, \\
3 & \geq R_1 + 2R_6 + 2R_9 + g(1, 3) + g(1, 4), \\
2 & \geq 2R_7 + 2g(3, 4).
\end{align*}
\]
By \[37\] and \[38\], and the submodularity of \(g(S)\), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
g(1, 3, 5) + g(1, 4) + g(1, 4, 8) + g(1, 3) & \geq g(3, 5) + g(1, 4, 5) + g(4, 8) + g(1, 3, 8) + 2R_1 + 2R_2 + R_5 + R_8 - 2.
\end{align*}
\]
By \[35\], we have
\[
2 + 2g(1, 3, 4) \geq 2(g(1, 4) + g(1, 3) + R_6 + R_9). \tag{51}
\]
Summing up \[42\]-\[51\], we have
\[
\begin{align*}
9 + g(2, 3) + g(2, 4) + g(1, 5) + g(1, 8) & \geq 6R_1 + 4R_2 + 3R_3 + 3R_4 + 3R_5 + 4R_6 + 2R_7 + 3R_8 + 4R_9.
\end{align*}
\]
Then, adding \[52\], \[39\] and \[40\], we obtain \[53\].

It remains to show that \[34\] holds, and for that purpose we will use the Zhang-Yeung non-Shannon-type information inequality \[1\] stated as follows,
\[
3H(A, C) + 3H(A, D) + 3H(C, D) + H(B, C) + H(B, D) \geq 2H(C) + 2H(D) + H(A, B) + H(A) + H(B, C, D) + 4H(A, C, D), \tag{53}
\]
where \(A, B, C, D\) each denotes an arbitrary subset of the set of all random variables for the problem, \(\{Y_{[n]}, X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n\}\). Set
\[
A = Y_{[n]} \cup X_{[1,2,4]}, \quad B = Y_{[n]} \cup X_{[1,2,3]}, \\
C = Y_{[n]} \cup X_{[2,3,4]}, \quad D = Y_{[n]} \cup X_{[1,3,4]},
\]
By \[53\] and message independence, as well as the definition of the set function \(g(S)\), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
3g(2, 4) + 3g(1, 4) + 3g(3, 4) + g(2, 3) + g(1, 3) & \geq 2g(2, 3, 4) + 2g(1, 3, 4) + g(1, 2) + g(1, 2, 4) + g(3) + 4g(4).
\end{align*}
\]
Switch the value of \(A\) and \(B\) in \[53\], while keep \(C\) and \(D\) unchanged. By \[53\] and message independence, as well as the definition of the set function \(g(S)\), we have
\[
3g(2, 3) + 3g(1, 3) + 3g(3, 4) + g(2, 4) + g(1, 4) \geq 2g(2, 3, 4) + 2g(1, 3, 4) + g(1, 2) + g(1, 2, 4) + g(4) + 4g(3). \tag{56}
\]
Adding \[55\] and \[56\], we obtain
\[
4g(2, 3) + 4g(1, 3) + 6g(3, 4) + 4g(2, 4) + 4g(1, 4) \geq 4g(2, 3, 4) + 4g(1, 3, 4) + 2g(1, 2) + 5g(3) + 5g(4) + g(1, 2, 3) + g(1, 2, 4)
\]
\[
\geq 4g(2, 3, 4) + 4g(1, 3, 4) + 2R_1 + 2R_2 + 5R_3 + 5R_4 + g(1, 2, 3) + g(1, 2, 4),
\]
where the second inequality follows from Lemma \[1\] with \(\{1\} \subseteq B_2\).

Therefore, we have
\[
6 \geq 6g(3, 4, 7)
\]
\[
= 6R_7 + 6g(3, 4)
\]
\[
\geq 6R_7 + 2R_1 + 2R_2 + 5R_3 + 5R_4 + 4g(2, 3, 4) - g(2, 4) - g(2, 3) + 4g(1, 3, 4) - g(1, 4) - g(1, 3) + g(1, 2, 3) + g(1, 2, 4)
\]
\[
\geq 6R_7 + 2R_1 + 2R_2 + 5R_3 + 5R_4 + 4R_6 + 4R_5 + 3R_8 - 1 + 4R_6 + R_9 - 1 + g(1, 2, 3) + g(1, 2, 4).
\]
where the first step follows from that \(g(S) \leq 1, \forall S \subseteq [n]\), and the second step follows from Lemma \[1\] with \(\{3, 4\} \subseteq B_7\), and the third step follows from \[55\] and \[56\].

We can see that \[58\] directly leads to \[43\].

Now that both \[33\] and \[34\] have been shown, by adding them together and dividing by 8 on both sides, we can conclude that
\[
\sum_{i \in [n]} R_i \leq \frac{25}{8}, \tag{59}
\]
which completes the proof.
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