

On Finite Blocklength Lossy Source Coding

Lin Zhou

School of Cyber Science and Technology
Beihang University
lzhou@buaa.edu.cn

Mehul Motani

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
National University of Singapore
motani@nus.edu.sg

January 20, 2023

Contents

Abstract	5
I Basics	6
1 Introduction	7
1.1 Motivation	7
1.2 Organization	9
1.3 Preliminaries	11
1.3.1 Notation	11
1.3.2 Basic Definitions	13
1.3.3 The Method of Types	14
1.3.4 Mathematical Tools	15
2 Lossless Compression	18
2.1 Problem Formulation and Shannon's Result	18
2.2 Non-Asymptotic Bounds	19
2.3 Second-Order Asymptotics	22
2.4 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics	24
2.4.1 Achievability	24
2.4.2 Converse	24
2.5 Other Refined Asymptotic Analyses	25
II Point-to-Point Setting	28
3 Rate Distortion	29
3.1 Problem Formulation and Shannon's Result	30
3.1.1 Problem Formulation	30
3.1.2 Shannon's First-Order Asymptotic Result	30
3.2 Distortion-Tilted Information Density	32
3.2.1 Definition and An Example	32
3.2.2 Properties	34
3.3 Non-Asymptotic Bounds	35

3.4	Second-Order Asymptotics	37
3.4.1	Result and Discussions	37
3.4.2	Achievability Proof	39
3.4.3	Converse Proof	40
3.5	Alternative Proof Using the Method of Types	41
3.5.1	Achievability	41
3.5.2	Converse	43
4	Noisy Source	46
4.1	Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	46
4.2	Noisy Distortion-Tilted Information Density	48
4.3	Non-Asymptotic Bounds	49
4.3.1	Achievability	49
4.3.2	Converse	51
4.4	Second-Order Asymptotics	53
4.4.1	Result and Discussions	53
4.4.2	A Numerical Example	54
5	Noisy Channel	56
5.1	Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	57
5.1.1	Problem Formulation	57
5.1.2	Asymptotic Result	58
5.2	Non-Asymptotic Bounds	58
5.2.1	Achievability	58
5.2.2	Converse	60
5.3	Second-Order Asymptotics	62
6	Mismatch	66
6.1	Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	66
6.2	Second-Order Asymptotics	69
6.3	Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics	70
6.3.1	Preliminaries for the Spherical Codebook	70
6.3.2	Achievability Proof for the Spherical Codebook	71
6.3.3	Ensemble Converse for the Spherical Codebook	73
6.3.4	Preliminaries for the i.i.d. Gaussian Codebook	75
6.3.5	Achievability Proof for the I.I.D. Gaussian Codebook	76
6.3.6	Ensemble Converse for the i.i.d. Gaussian Codebook	77
7	The Gauss-Markov Source	78
7.1	Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	79
7.2	Second-Order Asymptotics	80
7.3	Proof Sketch	81
7.3.1	Decorrelation of the Gauss-Markov source	82
7.3.2	Preliminaries	83
7.3.3	Achievability	84
7.3.4	Converse	87

8	Variable Length Compression	88
8.1	Problem Formulation and Existing Results	89
8.2	Properties of Optimal Codes	90
8.2.1	Zero Excess-Distortion Probability	90
8.2.2	Non-Zero Excess-Distortion Probability	91
8.2.3	Deterministic and Stochastic Codes	92
8.3	Non-Asymptotic Bounds	93
8.4	Second-Order Asymptotics	95
8.4.1	Result and Discussions	95
8.4.2	Proof Sketch	96
III	Multiterminal Setting	99
9	Kaspi Problem	100
9.1	Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	101
9.2	Properties of the Rate-Distortion Function	103
9.3	Distortions-Tilted Information Density	104
9.4	A Non-Asymptotic Converse Bound	105
9.5	Second-Order Asymptotics	107
9.5.1	Definition, Main Result and Discussions	107
9.5.2	Numerical Examples	108
9.6	Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics	111
9.6.1	Achievability	111
9.6.2	Converse	114
10	Successive Refinement	115
10.1	Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	116
10.1.1	Problem Formulation	116
10.1.2	Rimoldi's Rate-Distortion Region	117
10.1.3	Successive Refinability	118
10.2	Rate-Distortions-Tilted Information Density	119
10.3	Second-Order Asymptotics	121
10.3.1	Definitions and Discussions	121
10.3.2	A General DMS	122
10.3.3	A Successively Refinable DMS	125
10.3.4	Numerical Examples	126
10.4	Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics	129
10.4.1	Achievability	129
10.4.2	Converse	133
10.4.3	Proof of a Special Case	134
10.4.4	Alternative Converse Proof	135

11 Fu-Yeung Problem	136
11.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	136
11.1.1 Problem Formulation	136
11.1.2 Rate-Distortion Region	138
11.1.3 Boundary Rate Pairs	139
11.2 Minimal Sum Rate Function and Its Properties	140
11.2.1 Definitions	140
11.2.2 Properties	141
11.3 Rate-Distortions-Tilted Information Density	143
11.4 A Non-Asymptotic Converse Bound	143
11.5 Second-Order Asymptotics	145
11.5.1 Preliminaries	145
11.5.2 Main Result and Discussions	146
11.5.3 An Numerical Example	147
11.6 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics	148
11.6.1 Achievability	148
11.6.2 Converse	154
12 Gray-Wyner Problem	156
12.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result	157
12.1.1 Problem Formulation	157
12.1.2 Rate-Distortion Region	158
12.2 Rates-Distortions-Tilted Information Density	159
12.3 Second-Order Asymptotics	162
12.3.1 Result	162
12.3.2 Specialization to the Pangloss Plane	163
12.3.3 A Numerical Example for the Pangloss Plane	165
12.4 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics	166
12.4.1 Achievability	166
12.4.2 Converse	170
13 Reflections, Other Results and Future Directions	173
13.1 Reflections	173
13.2 Other Results	174
13.3 Future Directions	175
13.3.1 Higher-Order Asymptotics	175
13.3.2 Multiterminal Compression of a GMS	176
13.3.3 Mismatched Multiterminal Compression	176
13.3.4 Variable-Length Multiterminal Compression	176
13.3.5 Decoder Side Information Problems	177
13.3.6 Rate-Distortion-Perception Tradeoff	177

Abstract

Shannon propounded a theoretical framework (collectively called information theory) that uses mathematical tools to understand, model and analyze modern mobile wireless communication systems. A key component of such a system is source coding, which compresses the data to be transmitted by eliminating redundancy and allows reliable recovery of the information from the compressed version. In modern 5G networks and beyond, finite blocklength lossy source coding is essential to provide ultra-reliable and low-latency communications. The analysis of point-to-point and multiterminal settings from the perspective of finite blocklength lossy source coding is therefore of great interest to 5G system designers and is also related to other long-standing problems in information theory.

In this monograph, we review recent advances in second-order asymptotics for lossy source coding, which provides approximations to the finite blocklength performance of optimal codes. The monograph is divided into three parts. In part I, we motivate the monograph, present basic definitions, introduce mathematical tools and illustrate the motivation of non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotics via the example of lossless source coding. In part II, we first present existing results for the rate-distortion problem with proof sketches. Subsequently, we present five generations of the rate-distortion problem to tackle various aspects of practical quantization tasks: noisy source, noisy channel, mismatched code, Gauss-Markov source and fixed-to-variable length compression. By presenting theoretical bounds for these settings, we illustrate the effect of noisy observation of the source, the influence of noisy transmission of the compressed information, the effect of using a fixed coding scheme for an arbitrary source and the roles of source memory and variable rate. In part III, we present four multiterminal generalizations of the rate-distortion problem to consider multiple encoders, decoders or source sequences: the Kaspi problem, the successive refinement problem, the Fu-Yeung problem and the Gray-Wyner problem. By presenting theoretical bounds for these multiterminal problems, we illustrate the role of side information, the optimality of stop and transmit, the effect of simultaneous lossless and lossy compression, and the tradeoff between encoders' rates in compressing correlated sources. Finally, we conclude the monograph, mention related results and discuss future directions.

Part I

Basics

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Shannon [1] developed a theoretical framework (collectively called information theory) that uses mathematical tools to understand, model and analyze digital communication systems over noisy channels. A basic digital communication system includes blocks for source and channel encoding at the transmitter and blocks for source and channel decoding at the receiver. Source coding, also known as data compression, aims to remove the redundancy of information and allows reliable recovery of the information from its compressed version. In contrast, channel coding aims to counter the noise in the transmission channel between the transmitter and the receiver and allows reliable recovery of a message.

For a discrete memoryless source (DMS), Shannon showed that the asymptotic minimal compression rate that ensures accurate recovery with vanishing error probability is the entropy of the source, provided that the blocklength of the source sequence to be compressed tends to infinity. However, lossless source coding does not apply to continuous sources since it requires an infinite number of bits to describe a real number. Furthermore, practical image and video compression systems usually tolerate some imperfection. To resolve these issues, Shannon studied the lossy source coding problem [2] (also known as the rate-distortion problem) and derived the asymptotic minimal achievable rate.

For a discrete memoryless channel (DMC), Shannon showed that the maximal asymptotic message rate to ensure reliable recovery with vanishing error probability at the receiver is the capacity of the noisy channel, provided that the blocklength (the number of channel uses) tends to infinity. In other words, Shannon showed that, at rates below the channel capacity, there exist good channel coding strategies with arbitrarily low probability of error. The above results for source coding and channel coding are collectively known as Shannon's coding theorems [3]. These results are very insightful and set benchmarks for practical code design in the last seventy years.

In practical communication systems, especially in 5G and beyond, low-latency is desired and dictates the use of short blocklength codes. However, Shannon’s coding theorems cannot provide exact theoretical benchmarks for low-latency communication since these theorems hold under the assumption that the blocklength tends to infinity, which leads to undesired arbitrarily large latency. To tackle this problem, information theorists developed the theory of finite blocklength analysis and second-order asymptotic approximation, starting with the seminal work of Strassen [4] in 1962. The finite blocklength analysis for channel coding has been revived by Hayashi [5] and by Polyanskiy, Poor and Verdú [6]. In particular, the authors of [6] derived upper and lower bounds for any finite blocklength and showed that the bounds match the dispersion type Gaussian approximation for blocklength of hundreds for various types of point-to-point channels. The Gaussian approximation is coined second-order asymptotics by Hayashi [5]. The results of [5] and [6] have been generalized to various channel models. Readers can refer to [7] for a systematic review of such advances.

Finite blocklength analyses and second-order asymptotics have also been derived for source coding. The simplest such example is the lossless source coding problem. In this problem, one aims to recover a random source sequence X^n exactly from its compressed version that takes values in a finite set of M elements. The performance metric is the error probability in reproducing the source sequence and the rate is defined as $R_n := \frac{\log M}{n}$, where the unit is bits per source symbol when the logarithm is base 2. In second-order asymptotics, one is interested in characterizing the backoff of the non-asymptotic coding rate R_n from the minimum achievable rate — the entropy of the source $H(P_X)$, while tolerating a non-vanishing error probability. Such a result was first shown by Yushkevich for sources with Markovian memory [8]. Strassen [4], and later Hayashi [9], showed that the backoff is in the order of the reciprocal of the square root of the blocklength. Such a result is simple and elegant and parallels the finite blocklength results of channel coding.

As noted by Shannon [2], lossless source coding is not possible for continuous sources and lossy source coding with imperfect recovery is thus important. Shannon’s rate-distortion theory [2] forms a core part of modern quantization theory and is usually known as vector quantization. For a complete survey of various aspects of quantization, readers may refer to the seminal paper by Gray and Neuhoff [10]. For the rate-distortion problem that deals with point-to-point lossy data compression, the second-order asymptotics for a DMS were derived by Ingber and Kochman [11], and both finite blocklength bounds and second-order asymptotics were derived by Kostina and Verdú [12] for a DMS and a Gaussian memoryless source (GMS). The results in [11, 12] were further generalized to various scenarios in the point-to-point case [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18] and to problems in network information theory [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24], usually for a DMS.

However, despite the undeniable importance of lossy source coding and its diverse applications beyond low-latency communications in various domains including privacy utility tradeoff [25], machine learning [26] and image/video

compression [27, 28, 29], there is no single source that systematically summarizes recent advances for finite blocklength analyses and second-order asymptotics of lossy source coding problems, especially the multiterminal cases. One might argue that [7] covers these topics. Specifically, [7, Chapter 3] focuses on the point-to-point setting by presenting non-asymptotic and refined asymptotics bounds for both lossless and lossy source coding problems, [7, Chapter 4.5] briefly presents the results for joint source-channel coding without proof sketches while [7, Chapter 6] studies a lossless multiterminal source coding problem named the Slepian-Wolf problem [30]. It is important to note that recent advances of lossy source coding (e.g., [13, 18, 16, 24]) and the multiterminal cases [19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24] are not included in [7]. Our monograph aims to fill the missing piece of finite blocklength analyses by summarizing recent theoretical advances for finite blocklength lossy source coding problems. Furthermore, for point-to-point lossless and lossy source coding problems, we present proof techniques different from those covered in [7, Chapter 3].

1.2 Organization

The rest of this monograph is organized as follows. In the rest of this chapter, we present the notation used throughout the monograph and recall critical mathematical theorems on sums of i.i.d. random variables including the Berry-Esseen theorem [31, 32]. In Chapter 2, we illustrate the meaning of finite blocklength analysis, first-order asymptotics, and second-order asymptotics via the example of lossless source coding. We also recall other refined asymptotics including large and moderate deviations and explain why we focus on second-order asymptotics.

Part II of this monograph is devoted to the rate-distortion problem and its five generalizations to consider various aspects of practical quantization tasks. In Chapter 3, we review existing results on the rate-distortion problem. Specifically, we formulate the problem of finite blocklength analysis of the rate-distortion problem, define the distortion-tilted information density, present non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic theorems, and finally provide detailed proof sketches. This chapter is mainly based on [12, 11].

In Chapter 4, we present results for the noisy lossy source coding problem, where the encoder can only access a noisy version of the source sequence. This problem is also known as quantizing noisy sources and is motivated by practical compression of speech signals distorted by environmental noise or images corrupted by camera imperfections. The non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic results for this problem reveal the role of noisy observations in the finite blocklength regime, which is not apparent in asymptotic analyses [33, 34, 35]. This chapter is based on [13].

In Chapter 5, we present results for the lossy joint source-channel coding problem, where the output of the encoder is passed through a noisy channel and then provided to the decoder. This problem is also known as quantization for a noisy channel. The classical separation theorem of Shannon establishes that it is asymptotically optimal to separate lossy source coding and channel coding.

However, non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic results suggest that, at finite blocklengths, separate source-channel coding is strictly suboptimal. This chapter is based on [14, 15].

In Chapter 6, we present results for the mismatched code of Lapidot [36, Theorem 3], where a fixed code with an i.i.d. Gaussian codebook and minimum Euclidean distance encoding is used to compress an arbitrary memoryless source. This problem is motivated by the fact that the distribution of the source to be compressed is usually unknown and thus the matched coding scheme where the source distribution is assumed perfectly known is impractical. Theoretical results demonstrate that both i.i.d. Gaussian and spherical codebooks achieve the same finite blocklength performance. This chapter is based on [16].

In Chapter 7, we present results for the Gauss-Markov source, where the source sequence forms a first-order Markov chain and thus has memory. This problem is motivated by practical applications where the source sequence, such as sensor data, is usually not memoryless. The non-asymptotic and second-order results for the Gauss-Markov source is the first for a source with memory and reveal the role of memory on the finite blocklength performance of optimal codes. This chapter is based on [17].

In Chapter 8, we present results for fixed-to-variable length compression, where the encoder's output to each source sequence is a binary string with potentially different lengths. The motivation is to further reduce the average coding rate based on the intuition that more frequent symbols should be assigned codewords with fewer bits, an idea captured in the Huffman code. The theoretical results reveal the role of flexible rates on the finite blocklength performance and demonstrate a stark difference with the fixed-length counterpart. This chapter is based on [18].

Part III deals with four multiterminal extensions of the rate-distortion problem with increasing complexity and also includes a conclusion chapter. In Chapter 9, we present results for the Kaspi problem [37], which is a lossy source coding problem with one encoder and two decoders. This problem generalizes the rate-distortion problem by providing side information at the encoder and adding one additional decoder that accesses the same side information. Both decoders share the same compressed information of the source sequence and the decoder with side information is required to produce a finer estimate of the source sequence. Through the lens of this problem, we reveal the impact of side information on the finite blocklength performance of optimal codes. This chapter is mainly based on the first part of [19].

In Chapter 10, we present results for the successive refinement problem [38]. This problem generalizes the rate-distortion problem by having one additional encoder and decoder pair. The additional encoder further compresses the source sequence and the additional decoder uses compressed information from both encoders to produce a finer estimate of the source sequence than the other decoder that only has access to the original encoder. We present results under two performance criteria: the joint excess-distortion probability (JEP) and the separate excess-distortion probabilities (SEP). Under JEP, we reveal the tradeoff between the coding rate of the two encoders and, under SEP, we revisit the

successively refinability property, from a second-order asymptotic perspective. A key message from this chapter is that considering a joint excess-distortion probability enables us to characterize the tradeoff of rates of different encoders in second-order asymptotics. This chapter is mainly based on [22, 21].

In Chapter 11, we present results for the multiple description problem with one deterministic decoder [39]. In this problem, two encoders compress the source sequence and three decoders aim to recover the source sequence with different criteria: two decoders aim to recover the source sequence in a lossy manner with different distortion levels and the other decoder aims to perfectly reproduce a function of the source sequence. This problem generalizes the successive refinement problem by having one additional lossless decoder. Under the joint excess-distortion and error probability criterion, we reveal the tradeoff among encoders and decoders in simultaneous lossless and lossy compression in second-order asymptotics. This chapter is mainly based on the second part of [19].

In Chapter 12, we present results for the lossy Gray-Wyner problem [40]. In this problem, three encoders compress two correlated source sequences and each of the two decoders aims to recover one source sequence. This is a fully multi-terminal lossy compression problem with multiple encoders, multiple decoders and multiple correlated source sequences. It significantly generalizes the rate-distortion problem by having one more source sequence, two more encoders and one more decoder. Under the joint excess-distortion probability criterion, we reveal the tradeoff among the coding rates of the three encoders in second-order asymptotics. This chapter is mainly based on [24].

Finally, in Chapter 13, we conclude the monograph and discuss future research directions. The relationship among chapters of this monograph is illustrated in Fig. 1.1.

1.3 Preliminaries

In this section, we set up the mathematical notation used throughout the monograph and review definitions of basic information theoretical quantities, key properties in method of types and mathematical theorems central to our analyses.

1.3.1 Notation

The set of real numbers, non-negative real numbers, and natural numbers are denoted by \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+ , and \mathbb{N} , respectively. For any two natural numbers $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we use $[a : b]$ to denote the set of all natural numbers between a and b (inclusive) and use $[a]$ to denote $[1 : a]$. For any $(m_1, m_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we use $\mathbf{0}_{m_1}$ to denote the length- m_1 vector of all zeroes and use $\mathbf{1}_{m_1, m_2}$ to denote the $m_1 \times m_2$ matrix of all ones. For any real number $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we use $|a|^+$ to denote $\max\{a, 0\}$.

Random variables and their realizations are in capital (e.g., X) and lower case (e.g., x) respectively. All sets (e.g., alphabets of random variables) are




Figure 1.1: Relationship among chapters of this monograph.

denoted in calligraphic font (e.g., \mathcal{X}). We use \mathcal{X}^c to denote the complement of \mathcal{X} . Let $X^n := (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be a random vector of length- n and $x^n = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a particular realization. We use $\|x^n\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n]} x_i^2}$ to denote the ℓ_2 norm of a vector $x^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Given two sequences x^n and y^n , the quadratic distortion measure (squared Euclidean norm) is defined as $d(x^n, y^n) := \frac{1}{n} \|x^n - y^n\|^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (x_i - y_i)^2$.

The set of all probability distributions on an alphabet \mathcal{X} is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and the set of all conditional probability distribution from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} is denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$. Given $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, we use $\text{supp}(P)$ to denote the support of distribution P , i.e., $\text{supp}(P) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : P(x) > 0\}$. Given a conditional distribution $P_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we use $P_{Y|x}$ to denote the conditional distribution $P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)$. Given $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $V \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$, we use $P \times V$ to denote the joint distribution induced by P and V . Given a joint probability distribution $P_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, let $m = |\text{supp}(P_{XY})|$ and let $\Gamma(P_{XY})$ be the sorted distribution such that for each $i \in [m]$, $\Gamma_i(P_{XY}) = P_{XY}(x_i, y_i)$ is the i -th largest value of $\{P_{XY}(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$.

We use standard asymptotic notations such as $\Theta(\cdot)$, $O(\cdot)$ and $o(\cdot)$ (cf. [41]). We use $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ as the indicator function and we use $\log(\cdot)$ with base e unless otherwise stated. We let $Q(t) := \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-u^2/2} du$ be the complementary cu-

mulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian. Let Q^{-1} be the inverse of Q . We use $\Psi_k(x_1, \dots, x_k; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ to denote the multivariate generalization of the Gaussian cumulative distribution function (cdf), i.e., $\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_k; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \int_{-\infty}^{x_1} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{x_k} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}; \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) d\mathbf{x}$, where $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}; \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ is the probability density function (PDF) of a k -variate Gaussian with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$.

1.3.2 Basic Definitions

To smoothly present the results in this monograph, we recall necessary information theoretical definitions. Given any distribution $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ defined on a finite alphabet \mathcal{X} , the entropy is defined as

$$H(X) = H(P_X) := \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} -P_X(x) \log P_X(x). \quad (1.1)$$

Note that the notation $H(X)$ is used in classical textbooks as [3] and the notation $H(P_X)$ that clarifies the dependence of the entropy on the distribution is used in [42]. We use both notations for the entropy and other information theoretical quantities interchangeably. Specifically, when we need to specify the distribution of a random variable, we use the distribution dependence version $H(P_X)$; when the distribution of the random variable is clear, we use $H(X)$ for its simplicity. Analogously, given a joint probability mass function (PMF) $P_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ defined on a finite alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the joint entropy is defined as

$$H(X, Y) = H(P_{XY}) = \sum_{(x, y) \in \text{supp}(P_{XY})} -P_{XY}(x, y) \log P_{XY}(x, y), \quad (1.2)$$

and the conditional entropy of Y given X is defined as

$$H(Y|X) = H(P_{Y|X}|P_X) = \sum_{(x, y) \in \text{supp}(P_{XY})} -P_{XY}(x, y) \log P_{Y|X}(x, y), \quad (1.3)$$

where $(P_{Y|X}, P_X)$ are the induced conditional and marginal distributions of P_{XY} . The conditional entropy $H(P_{Y|X}|P_X)$ of X given Y is defined similarly.

Furthermore, the mutual information that measures dependence of two random variables (X, Y) with distribution P_{XY} is defined as

$$I(X; Y) = I(P_X, P_{X|Y}) = H(P_X) - H(P_{X|Y}|P_Y), \quad (1.4)$$

where $P_{X|Y}$ is also induced by P_{XY} . Note that mutual information $I(X; Y)$ is symmetric so that $I(X; Y) = I(Y; X)$. Similar to the definition of entropy, we use $I(X; Y)$ and the distribution dependence version $I(P_X, P_{X|Y})$ interchangeably. Analogously, given the joint distribution P_{XYZ} of three random variables (X, Y, Z) defined on a finite alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$, define the conditional mutual information $I(X; Y|Z)$ as

$$I(X; Y|Z) = I(P_{X|Z}, P_{X|YZ}|P_Z) = H(P_{X|Z}|P_Z) - H(P_{X|YZ}|P_{YZ}), \quad (1.5)$$

where all distributions are induced by the joint distribution P_{XYZ} .

Another critical quantity that we use frequently is the Kullback-Leiber (KL) divergence, also known as the relative entropy. Given any two distributions (P_X, Q_X) defined on the finite alphabet \mathcal{X} , the KL divergence $D(P_X \| Q_X)$ is defined as

$$D(P_X \| Q_X) = \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} P_X(x) \log \frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)}. \quad (1.6)$$

Note that $D(P_X \| Q_X)$ measures closeness of two distributions P_X and Q_X and equals zero if and only if $P_X = Q_X$. For any two distributions P_{XY} and Q_{XY} defined on a finite alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the KL divergence $D(P_{XY} \| Q_{XY})$ is defined similarly; when the marginal distributions $P_X = Q_X$, the conditional KL divergence is defined as

$$D(P_{Y|X} \| Q_{Y|X} | P_X) = \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} P_X(x) D(P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x) \| Q_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)). \quad (1.7)$$

1.3.3 The Method of Types

Since we focus on DMSes, the method of types plays a critical role in our analyses. Thus, we also recall definitions and results in this domain [43] (see also [3, Chapter 11] and [42, Chapter 2]). Given a length- n discrete sequence $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$, the empirical distribution \hat{T}_{x^n} is defined as

$$\hat{T}_{x^n}(a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} 1\{x_i = a\}, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (1.8)$$

The set of types formed from length- n sequences in \mathcal{X} is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$. Given a type $P_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, the set of all sequences of length- n with type P_X is the type class denoted by \mathcal{T}_{P_X} . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of types satisfies

$$|\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})| \leq (n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}. \quad (1.9)$$

For any type $P_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, the size of type class $\mathcal{T}_{P_X}^n$ satisfies

$$(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}|} \exp(nH(P_X)) \leq |\mathcal{T}_{P_X}^n| \leq \exp(nH(P_X)). \quad (1.10)$$

For any sequence x^n that is generated i.i.d. from a distribution $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, its probability satisfies

$$P_X^n(x^n) = \exp(-n(D(\hat{T}_{x^n} \| P_X) + H(\hat{T}_{x^n}))). \quad (1.11)$$

Thus, for any type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, the probability of the type class $\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n$ satisfies

$$(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}|} \leq \frac{P_X^n(\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n)}{\exp(-nD(Q_X \| P_X))} \leq 1. \quad (1.12)$$

Given any two sequences $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$, the joint empirical distribution $\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}$ is defined as

$$\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}(a, b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} 1\{(x, y_i) = (a, b)\}. \quad (1.13)$$

Given any $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and conditional distribution $V_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$, the set of all sequences $y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ such that $\hat{T}_{x^n y^n} = \mathcal{T}_{x^n} \times V_{Y|X}$ is the conditional type class denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n)$. For any $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{P_X}^n$, the set of all conditional distributions $V_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$ such that the conditional type class $\mathcal{T}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n)$ is not empty is the set of conditional types given the marginal type P_X and is denoted by $\mathcal{V}^n(\mathcal{Y}; P_X)$.

The following results hold. For any $P_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, the number of conditional types is upper bounded by

$$|\mathcal{V}^n(\mathcal{Y}; P_X)| \leq (n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}. \quad (1.14)$$

For any $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{P_X}^n$, the size of the conditional type class $\mathcal{T}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n)$ satisfies

$$(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|} \exp(nH(V_{Y|X})|P_X) \leq |\mathcal{T}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n)| \leq \exp(nH(V_{Y|X})|P_X). \quad (1.15)$$

Given any $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{P_X}^n$, $W_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$ and $V_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{V}^n(\mathcal{Y}; P_X)$, for any $y^n \in \mathcal{T}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n)$,

$$W_{Y|X}^n(y^n|x^n) = \exp(-n(H(V_{Y|X}) + D(V_{Y|X}||W_{Y|X})|P_X)). \quad (1.16)$$

Thus, it follows from (1.15) and (1.16) that

$$(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|} \leq \frac{W_{Y|X}^n(\mathcal{T}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n))}{\exp(-nD(V_{Y|X}||W_{Y|X})|P_X)} \leq 1 \quad (1.17)$$

1.3.4 Mathematical Tools

In this section, we present the mathematical tools used to prove second-order asymptotics, which are essentially the generalization of central limit theorems. Let $X^n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be a collection of n i.i.d. random variables with zero mean and variance σ^2 and let the normalized sum of these n random variables be

$$S_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} X_i. \quad (1.18)$$

We first recall the weak law of large numbers [44], which states that the normalized sum S_n converges in probability to its mean.

Theorem 1 (The Weak Law of Large Numbers). *For any positive real number $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr\{S_n > \delta\} = 0. \quad (1.19)$$

In the proofs of many theorems, the Markov's inequality is used.

Theorem 2 (The Markov's Inequality). *For any non-negative real number $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and any positive real number t ,*

$$\Pr\{S_n > t\} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\exp(\theta S_n)]}{\exp(t\theta)}. \quad (1.20)$$

The Berry-Esseen Theorem for i.i.d. random variables [31, 32] is critical in deriving second-order asymptotics.

Theorem 3 (The Berry-Esseen Theorem). *Assume that the third absolute moment of X_1 is finite, i.e., $T := \mathbb{E}|X_1|^3 < \infty$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \Pr \left\{ S_n \geq t \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n}} \right\} - Q(t) \right| \leq \frac{T}{\sigma^3 \sqrt{n}}. \quad (1.21)$$

The Berry-Esseen theorem states that the probability that the normalized sum S_n deviates from its mean by a sequence which scales as $\Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ is well approximated by the same probability for a standard normal variable, with the difference in the order of $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ that depends on the variance σ^2 and the third absolute moment T . The assumption that T is finite is satisfied by any DMS. It is the mathematical theorem that one applies in the analysis of second-order asymptotics for source and channel coding problems that involve a single encoder.

To tackle certain problems, we need to consider independent but not identically distributed (i.n.i.d.) random variables. Let $X^n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be a sequence of random variables, where each random variable X_i has zero mean, variance $\sigma_i^2 := \mathbb{E}[X_i^2] > 0$ and finite third-absolute moment $T_i := \mathbb{E}[|X_i|^3]$. Define the average variance and third-absolute moment as follows:

$$\sigma^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \sigma_i^2, \quad (1.22)$$

$$T := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} T_i \quad (1.23)$$

The Berry-Esseen theorem for i.n.i.d. random variables states as follows.

Theorem 4. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \Pr \left\{ S_n \geq t \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{n}} \right\} - Q(t) \right| \leq \frac{6T}{\sigma^3 \sqrt{n}}. \quad (1.24)$$

To derive results for multiterminal lossy source coding problems with multiple encoders, we need the following multivariate generalization of the Berry-Esseen theorem [45]. Given $d \in \mathbb{N}$, for each $i \in [n]$, let $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,k})$ be a k -dimensional random vector with zero mean vector and covariance matrix Σ . Let the normalized sum vector be $\mathbf{S}_n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{X}_i$.

Theorem 5 (Vector Version of the Berry-Esseen Theorem). *Let the third absolute moment of \mathbf{X}_1 be $T := \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}_1\|^3]$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\sup_{(t_1, \dots, t_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left| \Pr\{\mathbf{S}_n \leq \mathbf{t}\} - \Psi_k(t_1, \dots, t_d; \mathbf{0}_k, \mathbf{\Sigma}) \right| \leq \frac{K(d)T}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (1.25)$$

where $>$ refers to elementwise comparison and $K(d)$ is a constant depending on the dimension d only (see [46, 47] for explicit bounds).

Chapter 2

Lossless Compression

This chapter focuses on lossless source coding, the notably simplest problem in vector quantization. In his seminal 1948 paper [1], Shannon showed that the minimal compression rate for reliable lossless source coding is the entropy of the discrete memoryless source, assuming that the blocklength of the source to be compressed tends to infinity. Inspired by the low-latency requirement of practical communications systems, one wonders what the performance degradation is if one operates at a finite blocklength. This question was answered by Yushkevich [8] and by Strassen [4] who derived the second-order asymptotic approximation to the finite blocklength performance, revived by Hayashi [5] who rediscovered the result using the information spectrum method and further refined by Kontoyiannis and Verdú [48] and by Chen, Effros and Kostina [49] who improved the previous bounds.

In this chapter, we present finite blocklength and second-order asymptotic bounds for lossless source coding, demonstrate the tightness of the second-order asymptotics and discuss the relationship of second-order asymptotics and other refined asymptotic analyses. This chapter is largely based on [5, 4].

2.1 Problem Formulation and Shannon's Result

Consider any length- n source sequence X^n that is generated i.i.d. from a probability mass function (PMF) $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. In lossless source coding, one is interested in perfectly recovering the source sequence X^n from its compressed version. Formally, a code is defined as follows.

Definition 1. *Given any $(n, M) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, an (n, M) -code for source coding consists of*

- *an encoder $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M} := [1 : M]$,*
- *a decoder $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^n$.*

For simplicity, we use \hat{X}^n to denote the reproduced source sequence at the decoder, i.e., $\hat{X}^n = \phi(f(X^n))$. The performance metric for lossless source coding is the error probability, i.e.,

$$P_{e,n} := \Pr\{\phi(f(X^n)) \neq X^n\} \quad (2.1)$$

$$= \Pr\{\hat{X}^n \neq X^n\}. \quad (2.2)$$

In the above definition, n is the blocklength of the source sequence and M is the number of codewords that encoder can use.

To achieve zero error, M should be chosen such that $M \geq |\mathcal{X}|^n$ to allow one to one mapping. However, this means no compression is done. Thus, to compress the source, we need to tolerate a non-zero error probability. For efficient compression, one hopes M is as small as possible given any blocklength n and error probability $P_{e,n}$. To capture the fundamental limit of lossless source coding, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $M^*(n, \varepsilon)$ be the minimum number of codewords such that there exists an (n, M) -code satisfying $P_{e,n} \leq \varepsilon$, i.e.,

$$M^*(n, \varepsilon) := \inf \{M : \exists \text{ an } (n, M)\text{-code s.t. } P_{e,n} \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Ideally, one would like to exactly characterize $M^*(n, \varepsilon)$ for each finite $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any tolerable error probability $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. But this is very challenging and information theorists instead derived approximations to $M^*(n, \varepsilon)$.

The most famous such approximation for lossless source coding was provided by Shannon [1], which states that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, \varepsilon) = H(P_X). \quad (2.4)$$

The above result means that to achieve vanishing error probability with respect to the blocklength n , the average minimal number of bits that one should use to compress a source symbol equals the entropy $H(P_X)$ of the source. The above result is also known as the first-order asymptotics since it characterizes the first dominant term in the expansion of the non-asymptotic rate $R(n, \varepsilon) := \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, \varepsilon)$ of an optimal code when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In fact, the above result holds for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, which is known as strong converse and implied by second-order asymptotics.

2.2 Non-Asymptotic Bounds

Second-order asymptotics provides approximation to the finite blocklength performance $M^*(n, \varepsilon)$, which demonstrates a deeper understanding for the interplay among the blocklength, the error probability and the coding rate. Usually, to obtain second-order asymptotics, one first derives non-asymptotic achievability and converse bounds for any finite blocklength n and next apply the Berry-Esseen theorem to the derived bounds appropriately.

In [7, Sections 3.1-3.2], the non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds by Strassen [4] were presented and in [7, Section 3.3], an alternative

proof of second-order asymptotic using the method of types [43, 42] was given. In this section, we present the non-asymptotic bounds of Han [50] based on the information spectrum method and provide an alternative proof of second-order asymptotics using Han's results.

For ease of notation, given any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, define the entropy density $\imath(x|P_X)$ as

$$\imath(x|P_X) := -\log P_X(x). \quad (2.5)$$

We first recall a finite blocklength achievability bound [50, Lemma 1.3.1].

Theorem 6. *For any $(n, M) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, there exists an (n, M) -code whose error probability is upper bounded by*

$$P_{e,n} \leq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \imath(X_i|P_X) \geq \log M \right\}. \quad (2.6)$$

The proof of Theorem 6 is simple and elegant. For completeness, we present the proof here.

Proof. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define a set

$$\mathcal{A}_n := \left\{ x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n : \sum_{i \in [n]} \imath(x_i|P_X) < \log M \right\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Note that if $x^n \in \mathcal{A}_n$, we have

$$P_X^n(x^n) = \prod_{i \in [n]} P_X(x_i) \quad (2.8)$$

$$= \prod_{i \in [n]} \exp(-\imath(x_i|P_X)) \quad (2.9)$$

$$= \exp \left(- \sum_{i \in [n]} \imath(x_i|P_X) \right) \quad (2.10)$$

$$> \frac{1}{M}. \quad (2.11)$$

It follows that

$$1 \geq \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{A}_n} P_X^n(x^n) \quad (2.12)$$

$$\geq \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{A}_n} \frac{1}{M} \quad (2.13)$$

$$= \frac{|\mathcal{A}_n|}{M}. \quad (2.14)$$

Thus, $|\mathcal{A}_n| \leq M$. Then we can construct an (n, M) -code where the encoder f encodes each element of \mathcal{A}_n to a unique number in $[|\mathcal{A}_n|]$ and declares an error otherwise. This way, the number of codewords required is $|\mathcal{A}_n| \leq M$ and the error probability satisfies (2.6). \square

We next recall the finite blocklength converse bound [50, Lemma 1.3.2], which presents a lower bound on the error probability of any (n, M) -code.

Theorem 7. *For any $(n, M) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, any (n, M) -code satisfies*

$$P_{e,n} \geq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \iota(X_i | P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma \right\} - \exp(-n\gamma). \quad (2.15)$$

The proof of Theorem 7 is similar to that of Theorem 6 and is also recalled here.

Proof. Analogously to \mathcal{A}^n in (2.7), for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, define a set

$$\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) := \left\{ x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n : \sum_{i \in [n]} \iota(x_i | P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma \right\}. \quad (2.16)$$

Furthermore, define the set of correctly decoded source sequences as

$$\mathcal{C}_n := \{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n : \phi(f(x^n)) = x^n\}. \quad (2.17)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{X^n \in \mathcal{B}_n(\gamma)\} \\ &= \Pr\{X^n \in (\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_n^c)\} + \Pr\{X^n \in (\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_n)\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

$$\leq \Pr\{X^n \in \mathcal{C}_n^c\} + \Pr\{X^n \in (\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_n)\} \quad (2.19)$$

$$\leq P_{e,n} + \Pr\{X^n \in (\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_n)\}, \quad (2.20)$$

where (2.20) follows from the definition of the error probability $P_{e,n}$. Similarly to (2.11), if $x^n \in \mathcal{B}_n(\gamma)$,

$$P_X(x^n) = \exp \left(- \sum_{i \in [n]} \iota(x_i | P_X) \right) \quad (2.21)$$

$$\leq \frac{\exp(-n\gamma)}{M}. \quad (2.22)$$

It follows that

$$\Pr\{X^n \in (\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_n)\} = \sum_{x^n \in (\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_n)} P_X^n(x^n) \quad (2.23)$$

$$\leq \sum_{x^n \in (\mathcal{B}_n(\gamma) \cap \mathcal{C}_n)} \frac{\exp(-n\gamma)}{M} \quad (2.24)$$

$$\leq \frac{|\mathcal{C}_n| \exp(-n\gamma)}{M} \quad (2.25)$$

$$\leq \exp(-n\gamma), \quad (2.26)$$

where (2.26) follows since for any (n, M) -code, the number of corrected decoded source sequences is no greater than M . \square

In subsequent chapters, the proofs of Theorems 6 and 7 are generalized to obtain finite blocklength bounds for lossy source coding problems, which are also known as lossy vector quantization [10].

2.3 Second-Order Asymptotics

Applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the finite blocklength bounds in Theorems 6 and 7, one can obtain the second-order asymptotics, which provides a finer characterization of $M^*(n, \varepsilon)$ in (2.3) beyond Shannon's classical first-order asymptotic result. To present the result, define the dispersion of the source P_X as

$$V(P_X) := \text{Var}[-\log P_X(X)]. \quad (2.27)$$

Theorem 8. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\log M^*(n, \varepsilon) = nH(P_X) + \sqrt{nV(P_X)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (2.28)$$

We remark that Theorem 8 was first obtained by Yushkevich [8] for a Markov source and by Strassen [4] for DMSes. Hayashi [9] rediscovered Theorem 8. The $O(\log n)$ term was found to be $-\frac{1}{2} \log n + O(1)$ by Kontoyiannis and Verdú [48] and was recently further refined by Chen, Effros and Kostina [49, Theorem 5] with explicit lower and upper bounds on the $O(1)$ term. In this monograph, we focus on the second-order asymptotics and further refined analyses for the remainder term as in [48, 49] are worthwhile future research directions but challenging for lossy source coding problems to be discussed in the result of this monograph.

Furthermore, the achievability part of Theorem 8 can also be proved using the method of types [3, Chapter 11], as demonstrated in [7, Chapter 3.3]. The achievability proof of second-order asymptotics based on the method of types finds applications in many other problems, including the point-to-point and multiterminal settings of lossy source coding problems to be discussed in this monograph.

To illustrate the tightness of the second-order asymptotic bound in Theorem 8, in Figure 2.1, we plot the second-order asymptotic approximation in Theorem 8 and compare the approximation with finite blocklength bounds in Theorems 6 and 7 for a Bernoulli source with parameter 0.2 with the target error probability of $\varepsilon = 0.01$. As observed from Figure 2.1, for n moderately large, the second-order asymptotic bound provides rather tight approximation to the finite blocklength performance. Furthermore, the gap between the second-order asymptotic result and the first-order asymptotic result of Shannon is significant unless $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that Theorem 8 is known as the second-order asymptotic result because it characterizes the second dominant term in the expansion of $\log M^*(n, \varepsilon)$. An equivalent presentation of Theorem 8 is to characterize the so called second-order coding rate coined by Hayashi [9, 5]. For lossless source coding, the second-order coding rate is defined as follows.

Definition 2. *Given any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, a real number $L \in \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a second-*




Figure 2.1: Plots of the second-order asymptotic bound in Theorem 8 and non-asymptotic bounds in Theorems 6 and 7 for a Bernoulli source with parameter 0.2 and a target error probability of $\varepsilon = 0.01$.

order achievable rate if there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\log M - nH(P_X)) \leq L, \quad (2.29)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (2.30)$$

For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, the infimum of all second-order achievable rates is called the optimal second-order coding rate and denoted by $L^*(\varepsilon)$.

We remark that $L^*(\varepsilon)$ has the unit of nats per square root number of source symbols. With this definition, Theorem 8 is equivalent to the following statement.

Theorem 9. For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, the optimal second-order rate coding is

$$L^*(\varepsilon) = \sqrt{V(P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon). \quad (2.31)$$

In second-order asymptotics, by allowing a non-vanishing error probability $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we observe that the backoff of the non-asymptotic coding rate $R^*(n, \varepsilon) := \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, \varepsilon)$ from Shannon's asymptotic rate $H(P_X)$ is in the order of $\Theta\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ with the coefficient determined by a function of the tolerable error probability and the source dispersion.

2.4 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics

We next present the proof of Theorem 8 by illustrating how one can apply the Berry-Esseen theorem (cf. Theorem 3) to the non-asymptotic bounds in Theorems 6 and 7,

For the smooth presentation of the proof steps, let

$$T(P_X) := \mathbb{E}[|\iota(X|P_X) - H(P_X)|^3]. \quad (2.32)$$

2.4.1 Achievability

Given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let

$$\varepsilon_n = \varepsilon - \frac{T(P_X)}{(\mathbb{V}(P_X))^3 \sqrt{n}}, \quad (2.33)$$

$$\log M = nH(P_X) + \sqrt{n\mathbb{V}}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n). \quad (2.34)$$

It follows from Theorem 6 that the error probability of the code satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}_{e,n} \leq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} (\iota(X_i|P_X) - H(P_X)) \geq \sqrt{n\mathbb{V}}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\} \quad (2.35)$$

$$= \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\iota(X_i|P_X) - H(P_X)) \geq \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{V}}{n}}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\} \quad (2.36)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon_n + \frac{T(P_X)}{(\mathbb{V}(P_X))^3 \sqrt{n}} \quad (2.37)$$

$$= \varepsilon, \quad (2.38)$$

where (2.37) follows from the Berry-Esseen theorem for i.i.d. random variables in Theorem 3 since the random variables $\{\iota(X_i|P_X) - H(P_X)\}_{i \in [n]}$ are a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with mean 0 and the identical variance $\mathbb{V}(P_X)$.

Thus, using the Taylor expansion of $Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n)$ around ε that states $Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n) = Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_n)$, we have

$$\log M^*(n, \varepsilon) \leq nH(P_X) + \sqrt{n\mathbb{V}}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(1). \quad (2.39)$$

2.4.2 Converse

For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let

$$\varepsilon'_n = \varepsilon + \frac{T(P_X)}{(\mathbb{V}(P_X))^3 \sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n}, \quad (2.40)$$

$$\log M = nH(P_X) + \sqrt{n\mathbb{V}}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon'_n) - \log n. \quad (2.41)$$

Invoking Theorem 7 with $\gamma = \log n$ and using the Berry-Esseen theorem, the error probability of any (n, M) -code satisfies

$$P_{e,n} \geq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} (\iota(X_i|P_X) - H(P_X)) \geq \sqrt{nV(P_X)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon'_n) \right\} - \frac{1}{n} \quad (2.42)$$

$$\geq \varepsilon. \quad (2.43)$$

Therefore,

$$\log M^*(n, \varepsilon) \geq nH(P_X) + \sqrt{nV}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon'_n) - \frac{1}{2} \log n + O(1) \quad (2.44)$$

$$= nH(P_X) + \sqrt{nV}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (2.45)$$

The converse proof is now completed.

2.5 Other Refined Asymptotic Analyses

Besides second-order asymptotics, there are also other refined asymptotic analyses beyond Shannon's source coding theorem. Two examples are the large and moderate deviations analyses.

In large deviations, one characterizes the decay rate of the error probability $P_{e,n}$ for any asymptotic rate greater than $H(P_X)$.

Definition 3. A non-negative number E is said to be a rate- R achievable error exponent if there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M \leq R, \quad (2.46)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_{e,n} \geq E. \quad (2.47)$$

The supremum of all rate- R achievable error exponents is called the optimal error exponent and denoted by $E^*(R)$.

The exact characterization of $E^*(R)$ was given by Gallager [51] and by Csiszár and Longo [52].

Theorem 10. The optimal error exponent for the lossless source coding problem is

$$E^*(R) = \max_{\rho \geq 0} \left(\rho R - (1 + \rho) \log \left(\sum_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} P_X^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}(x) \right) \right) \quad (2.48)$$

$$= \min_{Q_X: H(Q_X) \geq R} D(Q_X \| P_X). \quad (2.49)$$

As a result of Theorem 10, we conclude that the error probability decays exponentially fast for any rate above the first-order coding rate, i.e., $R > H(P_X)$.

The characterization in (2.48) was proved by Gallager using the maximum likelihood decoding with the ρ trick and the characterization in (2.49) was proved by Csiszár and Longo [52] using the method of types. The equivalence of the two characterizations is hinted in [42, Problem 2.14].

The moderate deviations regime interpolates between the large deviations and second-order asymptotic regimes. In this regime, one is interested in a sequence of (n, M) -codes whose rates approach $H(P_X)$ and whose error probabilities decay to zero simultaneously.

Definition 4. Consider any sequence $\{\xi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\xi_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{n\xi_n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. A non-negative number ν is said to be an achievable moderate deviations constant if there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M - nH(P_X)}{n\xi_n} \leq 1, \quad (2.50)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n\xi_n^2} \log P_{e,n} \geq \nu. \quad (2.51)$$

The supremum of all moderate deviations constants is called the optimal moderate deviations constant and is denoted by ν^* .

Note that in moderate deviations, the speed of the rate approaching $H(P_X)$ is in the order of ξ_n , which is slower than $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ in second-order asymptotics and the decay rate of the error probability is subexponential, which is slower than the exponential decay in large deviations. This is precisely the reason why moderate deviations is said to interpolate second-order and large deviations asymptotics.

The optimal moderate deviations constant for the lossless source coding problem was obtained by Altug, Wagner and Kontoyiannis in [53].

Theorem 11. The optimal moderate deviations constant is

$$\nu^* = \frac{1}{2V(P_X)}. \quad (2.52)$$

Theorem 11 states that the sequence of optimal codes approaches $H(P_X)$ at the speed of ξ_n with the error probability decaying subexponentially fast, which can be proved by applying the moderate deviations theorem [54, 3.7.1] to the non-asymptotic bounds in Theorems 6 and 7.

To illustrate the relationship between second-order, large and moderate deviations to the non-asymptotic bounds, we plot the relationship between the error probability and coding rate for different blocklengths for a binary memoryless source distributed according to a Bernoulli distribution with parameter 0.3 in Figure 2.2, using the second-order asymptotic bound in Theorem 8 as the approximation. Note that both large and moderate deviations theorems are tight for sufficiently large blocklength and thus violate the low-latency requirement of practical communication systems. In this monograph, for all lossy source coding problems to be covered, we focus on the second-order asymptotics




Figure 2.2: Illustration of refined asymptotics for lossless source coding of a binary memoryless source. Note that both large and moderate deviations asymptotics provide tight characterization when n is sufficiently large and violates the low latency requirement of practical communication systems. In contrast, second-order asymptotics provides approximations to the performance of optimal codes with finite blocklength.

that provide good approximations to the performance of optimal codes at finite blocklengths (cf. [49, Fig. 1]), and we also present non-asymptotic bounds from which the second-order asymptotics are derived.

Part II

Point-to-Point Setting

Chapter 3

Rate Distortion

In this chapter, we study the rate-distortion problem of lossy source coding and present non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds for optimal codes [2, 12, 11]. The rate-distortion problem has several motivations. Firstly, it is impossible to compress a continuous memoryless source and recover it losslessly with any finite rate. This is because an infinite number of bits is needed to perfectly represent a real number. Secondly, in image and video compression, imperfection is usually tolerable. For example, a 720P video can convey the same episodes as a 1080P or 2K video and cannot be easily distinguished on a phone or tablet. Thirdly, in rate limited scenarios, a smaller compression rate is preferred and lossy data compression achieves rates smaller than the lossless counterpart.

Shannon [2] proposed the system model of the rate-distortion problem and derived the first-order asymptotic optimal rate to ensure reliable compression in a lossy manner as the blocklength tends to infinity. A distortion measure is introduced to evaluate the difference of the source sequence and its reproduced version. Reliable lossy data compression is achieved if the distortion between the source X^n and its reproduced version \hat{X}^n is smaller than a tolerable distortion level D . For example, one can think of the source X^n as a high quality 2K video and set the distortion level D so that the reproduced version \hat{X}^n is acceptable as long as it is at least a 720P video.

Shannon's asymptotic results were refined by Ingber and Kochman [11] and by Kostina and Verdú [12] independently, where both papers defined the distortion-tilted information density that generalizes the entropy density and derived second-order asymptotics. Furthermore, Kostina and Verdú derived non-asymptotic achievability and converse bounds. This chapter is largely based on [11, 12].

3.1 Problem Formulation and Shannon's Result

3.1.1 Problem Formulation

Consider a memoryless source X^n generated i.i.d. from a distribution P_X defined on an alphabet \mathcal{X} . Let $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ be the reproduced alphabet and let the distortion function be $d : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Given any two sequences $(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$, the distortion function $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n)$ is assumed additive and defined as the average symbolwise distortion, i.e., $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} d(x_i, \hat{x}_i)$.

Some examples of the distortion functions are as follows.

Definition 5. A distortion function d is said to be the Hamming distortion measure if $\mathcal{X} = \hat{\mathcal{X}} = \{0, 1\}$ and for any $(x, \hat{x}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}$,

$$d(x, \hat{x}) = \mathbb{1}\{x \neq \hat{x}\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Definition 6. A distortion function d is said to be the quadratic distortion measure if $\mathcal{X} = \hat{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{R}$ and for any $(x, \hat{x}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}$,

$$d(x, \hat{x}) = (x - \hat{x})^2. \quad (3.2)$$

A code for the rate-distortion problem is defined as follows.

Definition 7. Given any $(n, M) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, an (n, M) -code for the rate-distortion problem consists of

- an encoder $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M} = [M]$,
- a decoder $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$.

Let \hat{X}^n denote the reproduced source sequence, i.e., $\hat{X}^n = \phi(f(X^n))$. Throughout the chapter, let $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be the target distortion level. The performance metric for the rate-distortion problem that we consider is the excess-distortion probability with respect to $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$, i.e.,

$$P_{e,n}(D) := \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Given any blocklength $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the distortion level D and tolerable excess-distortion probability ε , let $M^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$ denote the minimum number M such that one can construct an (n, M) -code with excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D)$ no greater than ε , i.e.,

$$M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) := \inf \{M : \exists \text{ an } (n, M)\text{-code s.t. } P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (3.4)$$

In this chapter, we present non-asymptotic and asymptotic bounds on $M^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$.

3.1.2 Shannon's First-Order Asymptotic Result

In this subsection, we recall Shannon's characterization of the first-order asymptotic coding rate, which is defined as follows.

Definition 8. A rate $R \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be achievable for the rate-distortion problem with respect to distortion level D if there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M \geq R, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \leq D. \quad (3.6)$$

The minimal achievable rate is denoted as $R^*(D)$.

Shannon [2] proved the following theorem.

Theorem 12. The minimal achievable rate $R^*(D)$ satisfies

$$R^*(D) = \min_{P_{\hat{X}|X}: \mathbb{E}[d(X, \hat{X})] \leq D} I(X; \hat{X}) =: R(P_X, D). \quad (3.7)$$

Note that $R(P_X, D)$ is known as the rate-distortion function. Although Shannon's coding theorem is derived for the average distortion criterion in (3.6), for bounded distortion measure where $\bar{d} := \max_{x, \hat{x}} d(x, \hat{x}) < \infty$, the same result holds also when (3.6) is replaced by the vanishing excess-distortion probability criterion¹, i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D) = 0$. Specifically, using the notation $M^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$, it follows that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) = R(P_X, D). \quad (3.8)$$

In other words, Shannon characterized the asymptotic minimal compression rate of any code for the rate-distortion problem as the blocklength tends to infinity to ensure that the joint excess-distortion probability with respect to D vanishes or to ensure that the average distortion between the source sequence X^n and the reproduced version \hat{X}^n no greater than D . In fact, (3.8) holds for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ [42, Theorem 7.3].

We then explain why (3.8) holds using Theorem 12 for bounded distortion measures with maximal distortion \bar{d} . Suppose that there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M \geq R, \quad (3.9)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D) = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \\ &= \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\}D + \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D\}\bar{d} \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

$$\leq D + P_{e,n}(D)\bar{d}, \quad (3.12)$$

¹The comment holds for any lossy source coding problem.

it follows from (3.10) that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \leq D. \quad (3.13)$$

Thus, any rate R that ensures vanishing excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D) \rightarrow 0$ also ensures that the average distortion criterion (3.6) is satisfied, which leads to $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) \leq R^*(D)$. On the other hand, if a rate R is not achievable under the average distortion criterion, i.e.,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] > D, \quad (3.14)$$

it follows from the weak law of large numbers (cf. Theorem 1) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D) = 1. \quad (3.15)$$

Thus, the rate R is also not achievable under the excess-distortion probability criterion, which implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) \geq R^*(D)$. The justification is thus completed.

3.2 Distortion-Tilted Information Density

We next introduce the definition and present properties of the distortion-tilted information density that generalizes the entropy density in lossless source coding. Of particular interest is that the distortion-tilted information density is closely related to the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D)$ and it is essential in characterizing the second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion problem.

3.2.1 Definition and An Example

Consider any source distribution P_X , distortion measure $d(\cdot)$ and distortion level D such that i) $R(P_X, D)$ is finite and ii) $(Q_X, D') \rightarrow R(Q_X, D')$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (P_X, D) and the derivatives are bounded. Note that $R(P_X, D)$ in (3.7) is the optimal value of a convex optimization problem. Assume that the conditional distribution $P_{\hat{X}|X}^*$ achieves $R(P_X, D)$. Let $P_{\hat{X}}^*$ be induced by the source distribution P_X and $P_{\hat{X}|X}^*$. Furthermore, let λ^* be the first derivative of $R(P_X, D')$ with respect to D' at $D' = D$, i.e.,

$$\lambda^* = - \frac{\partial R(P_X, D')}{\partial D'} \Big|_{D'=D}. \quad (3.16)$$

Note that λ^* is well defined due to the above two assumptions and $\lambda^* \geq 0$ since $R(P_X, D)$ is non-increasing in D .

The distortion-tilted information density is then defined as follows.

Definition 9. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the D -tilted information density is defined as

$$j(x|D, P_X) := -\log \mathbb{E}_{P_X^*}[\exp(\lambda^* D - \lambda^* d(x, \hat{X}))]. \quad (3.17)$$

Definition 9 first appeared in [11, Proposition 7] for discrete memoryless sources and was generalized to arbitrary memoryless sources in [12, Definition 6]. One might find the definition of $j(x, D)$ difficult to understand. To illustrate, an example is given for a binary memoryless source with distribution $P_X = \text{Bern}(p)$ with $p < 0.5$ under the Hamming distortion measure. Note that $P_X(1) = p$ and $P_X(0) = 1 - p$. It follows from [3, Theorem 10.3.1] that the rate-distortion function for this case is

$$R(P_X, D) = \begin{cases} H_b(p) - H_b(D) & \text{if } D < p, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

where $H_b(p) = H(\text{Bern}(p)) = -p \log p - (1 - p) \log(1 - p)$ denotes the binary entropy function. Furthermore, the induced marginal distribution $P_{\hat{X}^*} = \text{Bern}(\frac{p-D}{1-2D})$ when $D < p$, i.e., $P_{\hat{X}^*}(1) = \frac{p-D}{1-2D}$ and $P_{\hat{X}^*}(0) = \frac{1-p-D}{1-2D}$. Thus, when $D \geq p$, $\lambda^* = 0$ and $j(x|D, P_X) = -\log 1 = 0$. We then consider the non-degenerate case of $D < p$. The derivative λ^* satisfies

$$\lambda^* = \frac{\partial H_b(D)}{\partial D} = \log \frac{1-D}{D}. \quad (3.19)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}}^*}[\exp(\lambda^* D - \lambda^* d(0, \hat{X}))] \\ &= \exp(\lambda^* D) \left(P_{\hat{X}}^*(0) + P_{\hat{X}}^*(1) \exp(-\lambda^*) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

$$= \exp(\lambda^* D) \left(\frac{1-p-D}{1-2D} + \frac{(p-D)}{1-2D} \frac{D}{1-D} \right) \quad (3.21)$$

$$= \exp(\lambda^* D) \frac{1-p}{1-D}. \quad (3.22)$$

Thus,

$$j(0|D, P_X) = -\log \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}}^*}[\exp(\lambda^* D - \lambda^* d(0, \hat{X}))] \quad (3.23)$$

$$= -\lambda^* D - \log \frac{1-p}{1-D} \quad (3.24)$$

$$= -D \log \frac{1-D}{D} - \log(1-p) + \log(1-D) \quad (3.25)$$

$$= -\log(1-p) - H_b(D). \quad (3.26)$$

Similarly,

$$j(1|D, P_X) = -\log p - H_b(D). \quad (3.27)$$

Using the definition of the entropy density $\iota_X(\cdot)$ in (2.5), for a Bernoulli memoryless source with parameter $p < D$, under the Hamming distortion measure, the D -tilted information density satisfies

$$j(x|D, P_X) = \iota(x|P_X) - H_b(D). \quad (3.28)$$

3.2.2 Properties

The distortion-tilted information density possess several interesting properties that connect it to the rate-distortion function and also pave the way for the proof of non-asymptotic converse bound. To present the properties of the distortion-tilted information density, we need the following definition of the mutual information density

$$\imath_{X;\hat{X}^*}(x; \hat{x}) := \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}|X}^*(\hat{x}|x)}{P_{\hat{X}}^*(\hat{x})}. \quad (3.29)$$

Lemma 1. *The following claims hold.*

1. For $\hat{x} \in \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}^*}(x))$.

$$j(x|D, P_X) = \imath_{X;\hat{X}^*}(x; \hat{x}) + \lambda^* d(x, \hat{x}) - \lambda^* D. \quad (3.30)$$

2. The rate-distortion function is the expectation of the distortion-tilted information density, i.e.,

$$R(P_X, D) = \mathbb{E}_{P_X}[j(X|D, P_X)]. \quad (3.31)$$

3. For any $\hat{x} \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_X}[\exp(\lambda^* D - \lambda^* d(X, \hat{x}) + j(X|D, P_X))] \leq 1, \quad (3.32)$$

where the inequality holds for $\hat{x} \in \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}^*}(x))$.

4. Suppose that for all Q_X in some neighborhood of P_X , $\text{supp}(Q_X^*) \subset \text{supp}(P_X^*)$. For any $x \in \text{supp}(P_X)$,

$$\left. \frac{\partial R(Q_X, D)}{\partial Q_X(x)} \right|_{Q_X=P_X} = j(x|D, P_X) - 1, \quad (3.33)$$

where $Q_{\hat{X}|X}^*$ is the optimal conditional distribution that achieves $R(Q_X, D)$, $\Gamma(Q_X)$ is the distribution on \mathcal{X} that orders elements of Q_X in a decreasing order and $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ is the element that has i -th largest probability under the distribution Q_X .

Lemma 1 was derived by Csiszár [55] and is also available in [56, Chapter 2]. Claim (i) provides an alternative expression for the distortion-tilted information density [57]. Claim (ii) shows that the distortion-tilted information density shares the property similar to the entropy density $\imath_X(\cdot)$ and the entropy function $H(P_X)$ and it is the reason why $j(x|D, P_X)$ is named an information density. Claim (iii) is critical in deriving a non-asymptotic converse bound for the rate-distortion problem. Claim (iv) enables the proof of second-order asymptotics using the method of types, specifically Taylor expansions of the rate-distortion function of empirical distributions around the source distribution P_X (cf. (3.93)).

3.3 Non-Asymptotic Bounds

In this section, we present non-asymptotic achievability and converse bounds for the rate-distortion problem [12].

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$, define the distortion ball $\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)$ as

$$\mathcal{B}_D(x^n) := \{\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n : d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D\}. \quad (3.34)$$

The following achievability holds.

Theorem 13. *For any $P_{\hat{X}}$, there exists an (n, M) -code such that the excess-distortion probability satisfies*

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}}^n}[(1 - P_{\hat{X}}^n(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n)))^M]. \quad (3.35)$$

Proof. The proof of Theorem 13 follows from the random coding idea and the minimum distance encoding. Specifically, let $\hat{X}^n(1), \dots, \hat{X}^n(M)$ be a sequence of independent codewords, each generated i.i.d. from a distribution $P_{\hat{X}}$ define on the alphabet \mathcal{X} . Consider the following (n, M) -code with encoder $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow [M]$ such that

$$f(X^n) = \arg \min_{i \in [M]} d(X^n, \hat{X}^n(i)), \quad (3.36)$$

and decoder $\phi : [M] \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$ such that $\hat{X}^n = \phi(f(X^n)) = \hat{X}^n(f(X^n))$.

The excess-distortion probability of the above code satisfies

$$P_{e,n}(D) = \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D\} \quad (3.37)$$

$$= \Pr\{\forall i \in [M] : d(X^n, \hat{X}^n(i)) > D\} \quad (3.38)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \left[\prod_{i \in [M]} \Pr_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n(i)) > D | X^n\} \right] \quad (3.39)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \left[(\Pr_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n(i)) > D | X^n\})^M \right] \quad (3.40)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \left[(1 - P_{\hat{X}}^n(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n)))^M \right] \quad (3.41)$$

where (3.39) since all codewords are generated independently of each other, (3.40) follows since each codeword is generated from the same distribution $P_{\hat{X}^n}$ and (3.41) follows from the definition of the distortion ball that implies $\Pr_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \{d(x^n, \hat{X}^n(i)) > D\} = 1 - P_{\hat{X}}^n(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n))$ for any $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$. The existence of a deterministic code follows from the simple fact that $\mathbb{E}[X] < a$ implies that there exists an element $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $x \leq a$ for any random variable X with alphabet \mathcal{X} and for any real number a . \square

Conversely, the excess-distortion probability of any (n, M) -code is lower bounded as follows.

Theorem 14. *Given any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, any (n, M) -code satisfies that*

$$P_{e,n}(D) \geq \Pr_{P_X^n} \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma \right\} - \exp(-n\gamma). \quad (3.42)$$

Note that Theorem 14 generalizes non-asymptotic converse bound in Theorem 7 to the lossy setting with the entropy density $\iota_X(\cdot)$ replaced by the distortion-tilted information density $j(\cdot)$. The proof of Theorem 14 requires novel ideas beyond Theorem 7, such as Claim (iii) of Lemma 1.

Proof. Let $P_{W|X^n}$ and $P_{\hat{X}^n|W}$ be the conditional distributions induced by the encoder f and the decoder ϕ respectively with W being a random variable taking values in $[M]$. Specifically, for each $w \in [M]$, $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$, $P_{W|X^n}(w|x^n) = \mathbb{1}(w = f(X^n))$ and $P_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) = \mathbb{1}(\hat{x}^n = \phi(w))$. Furthermore, let Q_W be the uniform distribution over $[M]$ and let $Q_{\hat{X}^n}$ be induced by Q_W and $P_{\hat{X}^n|W}$. In subsequent analyses, for simplicity, we drop the subscript of the probability terms when it is clear. For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma \right\} \\ &= \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

$$+ \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D \right\} \quad (3.44)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D \right\} \\ & + P_{e,n}(D). \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Denote the second term in (3.45) as $f(\gamma, D)$, which can be further upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & f(\gamma, D) \\ &= \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} \sum_{w \in [M]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)} P_X^n(x^n) P_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} \sum_{w \in [M]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)} P_X^n(x^n) P_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) \\ & \quad \times \frac{\exp(-n\gamma) \exp(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X))}{M} \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

$$\leq \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_X^n(x^n) \exp \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \right) Q_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) \quad (3.48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_X^n(x^n) \exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X)\right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\hat{X}^n}}[\exp(n\lambda^* D - n\lambda^* d(x^n, \hat{X}^n))] \end{aligned} \quad (3.49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n} Q_{\hat{X}^n}(\hat{x}^n) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E}_{P_X^n} \left[\exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (\lambda^* D - \lambda^* d(X_i, \hat{x}_i) + j(X_i|D, P_X))\right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.50)$$

$$= \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n} Q_{\hat{X}^n}(\hat{x}^n) \prod_{i \in [n]} \quad (3.51)$$

$$\times \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\exp\left(\lambda^* D - \lambda^* d(X_i, \hat{x}_i) + j(X_i|D, P_X)\right) \right] \quad (3.52)$$

$$\leq \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n} Q_{\hat{X}^n}(\hat{x}^n) \quad (3.53)$$

$$\leq \exp(-n\gamma), \quad (3.54)$$

where (3.47) follows since

$$P_{W|X^n}(w|x^n) \leq 1, \quad (3.55)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{1}\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + n\gamma\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) - \log M - n\gamma\right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.56)$$

$$= \frac{\exp(-n\gamma) \exp(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X))}{M}, \quad (3.57)$$

(3.48) follows from the definition of the distortion ball $\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)$ in (3.34) and the definition of $Q_{\hat{X}^n}$, (3.49) follows since it follows from the definition of $\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)$ and the Markov inequality (cf. Theorem 2) that

$$Q_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) = \Pr_{Q_{\hat{X}^n}}(d(x^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D) \quad (3.58)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\hat{X}^n}}[\exp(n\lambda^* D - n\lambda^* d(x^n, \hat{X}^n))]. \quad (3.59)$$

and (3.53) follows from Claim (iii) of Lemma 1.

The proof of Theorem 14 is completed by combining (3.45) and (3.53). \square

3.4 Second-Order Asymptotics

3.4.1 Result and Discussions

Define the following the distortion-dispersion function

$$V(P_X, D) := \text{Var}_{P_X}[j(X|D, P_X)]. \quad (3.60)$$

In addition to the assumptions in Section 3.2.1, we need the following further assumptions.

1. The distortion level $D \in (D_{\min}, D_{\max})$ where

$$D_{\min} := \inf\{D : R(P_X, D) < \infty\}, \quad (3.61)$$

$$D_{\max} := \inf_{\hat{x} \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}} \mathbb{E}_{P_X}[d(X, \hat{x})]. \quad (3.62)$$

2. The average $\mathbb{E}_{P_X \times P_{\hat{X}}^*}[d(X, \hat{X})^9] < \infty$, where $P_{\hat{X}^*}$ is induced by the optimal test channel $P_{\hat{X}|X}^*$ of $R(P_X, D)$.
3. The dispersion $V(P_X, D)$ is positive and finite.

Note that any bounded distortion measure satisfies assumption (ii).

Theorem 15. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) = nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (3.63)$$

Theorem 15 characterizes the second dominant term in the expansion of $\log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$. Upper and lower bounds on the remainder term $O(\log n)$ is available in [12, Theorem 12]. However, the bounds on $O(\log n)$ term do not match even in the sign. The higher order terms than the second-order for the lossy source coding problems remain open. Novel ideas are required to derive matched bounds for the $O(\log n)$ term, generalizing the results for lossless source coding in [48, 49].

The result in Theorem 15 holds for any memoryless source and distortion function under mild conditions in [12, Theorem 12] beyond a discrete memoryless source under the bounded distortion measure that is considered in this monograph. For example, Theorem 15 holds for a Gaussian memoryless source under the quadratic distortion measure [12, Theorem 40].

An equivalent presentation of Theorem 15 is to characterize the second-order coding rate. Similarly to the lossless source coding problem, the second-order coding rate for the rate-distortion problem is defined as follows.

Definition 10. *Given any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, a real number $L \in \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a second-order (D, ε) -achievable rate if there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\log M - nR(P_X, D)) \leq L, \quad (3.64)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (3.65)$$

For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$, the infimum of all second-order (D, ε) -achievable rates is called the optimal second-order coding rate and denoted by $L^(D, \varepsilon)$.*

An alternative presentation of Theorem 15 is

$$L^*(D, \varepsilon) = \sqrt{V(P_X, D)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (3.66)$$

which ignores the unmatched higher order terms. For subsequent chapters on multiterminal lossy source coding problems, we usually present the results in the form of (3.66).

In the next two subsections, we present a proof sketch of Theorem 15 of Kostina and Verdú [12], which follows by properly applying the Berry-Esseen theorem (cf. Theorem 3) to the non-asymptotic bounds in Theorems 13 and 14.

3.4.2 Achievability Proof

The following non-asymptotic refinement of asymptotic equipartition property (AEP) for lossy source coding [12, Lemma 2] is critical.

Lemma 2. *There exists constants $(n_0, c, K) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left\{ -\log(P_X^*)^n(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n)) \leq \sum_{j \in [n]} j(X_j|D, P_X) + C \log n + c \right\} \\ \geq 1 - \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

where C is a constant.

We remark that an early version of Lemma 2 appeared in the analysis of the redundancy of fixed-to-variable length lossy source coding [58].

For ease of notation, given any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$G_n := \log M - \sum_{j \in [n]} j(X_j|D, P_X) - C \log n - c. \quad (3.68)$$

Invoking Theorem 13 with P_X^* and using the inequality $(1-x)^M \leq \exp(-Mx)$, we conclude that there exists an (n, M) -code such that

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-M(P_X^*)^n(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n)) \right) \right] \quad (3.69)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\exp(G_n) \right) \right] + \frac{K}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (3.70)$$

where (3.70) follows from Lemma 2. The first term in (3.70) can be further upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\exp(G_n) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\exp(G_n) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(G_n < \log \frac{\log n}{2} \right) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\exp(G_n) \right) \mathbb{1} \left(G_n \geq \log \frac{\log n}{2} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.71)$$

$$\leq \Pr \left\{ G_n < \log \frac{\log n}{2} \right\} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (3.72)$$

It remains to bound the first term in (3.72). Note that for each $i \in [n]$, $j(X_i|D, P_X)$ has the same mean $R(P_X, D)$ and variance $V(P_X, D)$ since the source X^n is memoryless and generated i.i.d. from P_X . Let $T(P_X, D)$ be the third absolute moment of $j(X_1|D, P_X)$, i.e.,

$$T(P_X, D) := \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\left| j(X_1|D, P_X) - R(P_X, D) \right|^3 \right]. \quad (3.73)$$

Furthermore, given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let

$$B_n := \frac{6T(P_X, D)}{(\sqrt{V(P_X, D)})^3}, \quad (3.74)$$

$$\varepsilon_n := \varepsilon - \frac{B_n + K + 1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (3.75)$$

Choose M such that

$$\begin{aligned} \log M &= nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n) \\ &\quad + C \log n + \log \frac{\log n}{2} + c. \end{aligned} \quad (3.76)$$

Applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to bound the first term in (3.72) and combining (3.70) and (3.72), it follows that

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (3.77)$$

Therefore, using the Taylor expansion of $Q^{-1}(\cdot)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) &\leq nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n) \\ &\quad + C \log n + \log \frac{\log n}{2} + c \end{aligned} \quad (3.78)$$

$$= nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (3.79)$$

3.4.3 Converse Proof

Invoking Theorem 14 with $\gamma = \log n$, we conclude that the excess-distortion probability of any (n, M) -code satisfies

$$P_{e,n}(D) \geq \Pr_{P_X^n} \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) \geq \log M + \log n \right\} - \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.80)$$

Given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let

$$\varepsilon'_n := \varepsilon + \frac{B_n}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n}, \quad (3.81)$$

$$\log M := nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon'_n) - \log n. \quad (3.82)$$

Applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the first term in (3.80) leads to

$$P_{e,n}(D) \geq \varepsilon. \quad (3.83)$$

Therefore, it follows from Taylor expansion of $Q^{-1}(\cdot)$ that

$$\log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) \geq nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon'_n) - \log n \quad (3.84)$$

$$= nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (3.85)$$

3.5 Alternative Proof Using the Method of Types

We next present an alternative proof of Theorem 15 using the method of types. The achievability part follows from the derivation of Ingber and Kochman [11, Theorem 1] that uses the type covering lemma for the rate-distortion problem [59, Lemma 3]. In the converse part, instead of presenting the converse proof of [11, Theorem 1], we present an alternative proof inspired by [60] that uses the perturbation approach [61] to prove a type-based strong converse and then lower bound the excess-distortion probability as desired. In our subsequent analyses of multiterminal lossy source coding problems, we mainly use the presented proof based on the method of types in this subsection to derive second-order asymptotics. Thus, the proof of second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion problem in this subsection provides a solid foundation for further generalizations to more complicated multiterminal cases.

3.5.1 Achievability

Define the following constant

$$c_1 = 4|\mathcal{X}||\hat{\mathcal{X}}| + 9. \quad (3.86)$$

The following type covering lemma is crucial.

Lemma 3. *Given any type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, for all $R_1 \geq R(Q_X, D_1)$, there exists a codebook $\mathcal{C} = \{\hat{x}^n(1), \dots, \hat{x}^n(M)\} \in (\mathcal{X}^n)^M$ with M codewords such that*

$$\log M \leq nR_1 + c_1 \log n, \quad (3.87)$$

and the type class $\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n$ is D -covered by the codebook \mathcal{C} , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n \subseteq \bigcup_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{C}} \{x^n : d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D\}. \quad (3.88)$$

Using Lemma 3, we can derive an upper bound of the excess-distortion probability of the (n, M) -code that uses the codebook \mathcal{C} . Consider the following coding scheme. Given a source sequence x^n , the encoder f first calculates the type \mathcal{T}_{x^n} and sends it to the decoder ϕ using at most $|\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1)$ nats. This is because the number of n -length types is upper bounded by $(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ (cf. (1.9)).

The encoder f then calculates $R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D)$ and checks whether $nR(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D) + (c_1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log n > \log M$ or not. If the inequality holds, the system declares an error. Otherwise, encoder f sends the index of the codeword from the codebook \mathcal{C} that minimizes the distortion measure, i.e., $f(x^n) = \arg \min_{i \in [M]} d(x^n, \hat{x}^n(i))$ and the decoder could successfully recover the source sequence as $\hat{x}^n(i)$, which is then within distortion level D with the source sequence x^n as a result of Theorem 3. Thus, we have constructed an (n, M) -code such that the excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D)$ satisfies

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \Pr \{nR(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D) + (c_1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log n > \log M\}. \quad (3.89)$$

For subsequent analysis, define the typical set

$$\mathcal{A}_n(P_X) := \left\{ Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}) : \|Q_X - P_X\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right\}. \quad (3.90)$$

It follows from [62, Lemma 22] that

$$\Pr\{\hat{T}_{X^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)\} \leq \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \quad (3.91)$$

Since $(Q_X, D') \rightarrow R(Q_X, D')$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (P_X, D) and the derivatives are bounded, using Claim (iv) of Lemma 1, for any x^n such that $\hat{T}_{x^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$, it follows from Taylor's expansion $R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D)$ around $\hat{T}_{x^n} = P_X$ (cf. [11, Eq. (30)]) that

$$R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D) = R(P_X, D) + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (\hat{T}_{x^n}(x) - P_X(x)) j(x|D, P_X) + c_2 \frac{\log n}{n} \quad (3.92)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i|D, P_X) + c_2 \frac{\log n}{n}, \quad (3.93)$$

where c_2 is a bounded constant that accounts for the second derivative of $R(Q_X, D)$ with respect to Q_X around P_X and (3.93) follows from Claim (ii) of Lemma 1 and definition of the type \mathcal{T}_{x^n} . Thus, using (3.89), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(D) &\leq \Pr \{nR(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D) + (c_1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log n > \log M, \hat{T}_{X^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)\} \\ &\quad + \Pr \{\hat{T}_{X^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.94)$$

$$\leq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) > \log M - (c_1 + c_2 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log n \right\} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \quad (3.95)$$

For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let

$$\delta_n := -\frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2} + \frac{B_n}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (3.96)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \log M &= nR(P_X, D) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon - \delta_n) \\ &\quad + (c_1 + c_2 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.97)$$

Applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the first term in (3.95), we conclude that $P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon$ and the achievability proof is completed by using the Taylor expansion of $Q^{-1}(\cdot)$ around ε .

3.5.2 Converse

We first prove a type-based strong converse. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\vartheta_n := |\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1) + 2 \log n, \quad (3.98)$$

$$D_n := D + \frac{\bar{d}}{n}. \quad (3.99)$$

Lemma 4. *Given any $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, if the non-excess-distortion probability of an (n, M) -code satisfies*

$$\Pr \{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D | X^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n\} \geq \frac{1}{n}, \quad (3.100)$$

then

$$\log M \geq nR(Q_X, D_n) - \vartheta_n. \quad (3.101)$$

The proof of Lemma 4 is inspired by [60, Lemma 6] and uses the perturbation approach of Gu and Effros [61]. Lemma 4 implies that for any (n, M) -code such that $\log M < nR(Q_X, D) + \vartheta_n$, the conditional excess-resolution probability when the type of the source sequence is Q_X is at least $\frac{n-1}{n}$. Such a result is known as the type-based strong converse theorem since it states that if the rate of any code is not large enough, the type-based excess-distortion probability diverges to one asymptotically, which is analogous to the usual strong converse theorem [61].

Proof. Given any type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, define the set

$$\mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n := \{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n : d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D\}, \quad (3.102)$$

where $\hat{x}^n = \phi(f(x^n))$ is the reproduced version of source sequence x^n at the coder side. Let $U_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n}$ denote the uniform distribution over the type class $\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n$, let $\beta = \frac{\log n}{n}$ and define

$$c(Q_X) := n^2 U_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n}(\mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n) + (1 - U_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n}(\mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n)). \quad (3.103)$$

Define the distribution $S_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n}(x^n)$ on the type class $\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n$ such that

$$S_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n}(x^n) = \begin{cases} \frac{n^2 U_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n}(x^n)}{c(Q_X)} & \text{if } x^n \in \mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n \\ \frac{U_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n}(x^n)}{c(Q_X)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.104)$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{U}_{T_{Q_X}^n} \{\mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n\} = \Pr \{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D | X^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n\}. \quad (3.105)$$

It follows from (3.100) that

$$S_{T_{Q_X}^n}(\mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n) = \frac{n^2}{c(Q_X)} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.106)$$

Thus, using the (n, M) -code satisfying (3.100), the excess-distortion probability under the source distribution $S_{T_{Q_X}^n}$ satisfies

$$S_{T_{Q_X}^n}((\mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n)^c) \leq \frac{1}{n}, \quad (3.107)$$

and the expected distortion satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] &= \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_X}^n} S_{T_{Q_X}^n}(x^n) d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \end{aligned} \quad (3.108)$$

$$= \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n} S_{T_{Q_X}^n}(x^n) d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) + \sum_{x^n \notin \mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n} S_{T_{Q_X}^n}(x^n) d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \quad (3.109)$$

$$\leq D + \bar{d} S_{T_{Q_X}^n}((\mathcal{D}_{Q_X}^n)^c) \quad (3.110)$$

$$= D + \frac{\bar{d}}{n} = D_n. \quad (3.111)$$

Following the same steps as the weak converse (cf. [3]) and similarly to [21, Eq. (274)-(283)], it follows that

$$\log M \geq H(f(X^n)) \quad (3.112)$$

$$\geq I(X^n; f(X^n)) \quad (3.113)$$

$$\geq I(X^n; \hat{X}^n) \quad (3.114)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i \in [n]} I(X_i; \hat{X}_i) - \sum_{i \in [n]} H(X_i) + H(X^n). \quad (3.115)$$

Let J be the uniform random variable defined over the set $[n]$ independent of all other random variables. Similarly to [60, Proof of Lemma 6], we conclude that the distribution of X_J is the type Q_X and there exists a conditional distribution $Q_{\hat{X}|X}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_X \times Q_{\hat{X}|X}}[d(X; \hat{X})] = \mathbb{E}[d(X_J, \hat{X}_J)] \quad (3.116)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \quad (3.117)$$

$$\leq D_n, \quad (3.118)$$

and

$$I(Q_X, Q_{X|\hat{X}}) = I(X_J; \hat{X}_J, J) \quad (3.119)$$

$$= \sum_{i \in [n]} I(X_i; \hat{X}_i). \quad (3.120)$$

The proof of Lemma 4 is completed by recalling the definition of $R(Q_X, D_n)$ and noting that

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} I(X_i; \hat{X}_i) = I(X_J; \hat{X}_J, J), \quad (3.121)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] = \mathbb{E}[d(X_J, \hat{X}_J)], \quad (3.122)$$

$$\left| \sum_{i \in [n]} H(X_i) - H(X^n) \right| \leq \frac{|\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1)}{n} + \alpha + \beta, \quad (3.123)$$

where (3.123) follows similarly to [60, Eq. (34)-(36)] using the method of types. \square

Invoking Lemma 4, we obtain the following lower bound on the excess-distortion probability of any (n, M) -code.

Theorem 16. *Given $(n, M) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, any (n, M) -code satisfies*

$$P_{e,n}(D) \geq \Pr\{\log M + \vartheta_n < nR(\hat{X}_{X^n}, D_n)\} - \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.124)$$

Note that Theorem 16 is dual to the achievability result in (3.89). Recall that $(Q_X, D') \rightarrow R(Q_X, D')$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (P_X, D) and the derivatives are bounded. Similarly to (3.93), applying Taylor expansion of $R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D_n)$ around (P_X, D) for $x^n \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$, we conclude that there exists some constant c_3 such that

$$R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i | D, P_X) + c_3 \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (3.125)$$

The rest of the converse proof is analogous to the achievability part from (3.95) and is omitted for simplicity.

Chapter 4

Noisy Source

This chapter focuses on noisy lossy source coding, in which the source to be compressed is indirectly available over a noisy channel instead of a lossless channel as in the rate-distortion problem. Dobrushin and Tsybakov [33] initialized the study of this problem by showing that the first-order asymptotic minimal achievable rate is similar to the rate-distortion function in the noiseless setting with the conditional average distortion measure [63, Chapter 3]. This problem finds applications in compression of data collecting from measurements, such as speech in noisy environments and is also known as quantization of noisy sources [10, Section V.G].

The optimal encoder and decoder structure was proposed by Wolf and Ziv [64]. The large deviations asymptotics for the problem was studied by Weissman [65] who derived the universal achievable decay rate of the excess-distortion probability for lossy compression of a discrete memoryless source that is corrupted by a discrete noise. The results in [33] were generalized to several other settings with names of indirect source coding or compression of remote sources [35, 66, 67].

However, all above results were established in the asymptotic limit of large blocklength, which violates the low-latency requirement of practical communication systems. To resolve this issue, Kostina and Verdú [13] generalized the finite blocklength analysis of the rate-distortion problem to noisy lossy source coding by deriving non-asymptotic bounds and the second-order asymptotic approximation. In particular, it was shown that the second-order rate for the noisy lossy source coding problem is not equal to that of the rate-distortion problem under the conditional average distortion measure. This chapter is largely based on [13].

4.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

The problem formulation of noisy lossy source coding is identical to the rate-distortion problem except that the input to the encoder is a noisy version of

the source sequence. Consider a memoryless source X^n generated i.i.d. from a distribution P_X define on the alphabet \mathcal{X} . Let $P_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X})$ be a noisy channel mapping from the set \mathcal{X} to another set \mathcal{Y} and let Y^n be the noisy output of passing X^n through the memoryless channel $P_{Y|X}$. Furthermore, let $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ be the reproduction alphabet and let $d : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the distortion measure. Given any two sequences x^n and \hat{x}^n , the distortion $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n)$ is assumed additive such that $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} d(x_i, \hat{x}_i)$.

A code for the noisy lossy source coding problem is defined as follows.

Definition 11. *Given any $(n, M) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, an (n, M) -code consists of*

- an encoder $f : \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M} = [M]$,
- a decoder $\phi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$.

The performance metric that we consider is the excess-distortion probability with respect to a distortion level $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$, i.e.,

$$P_{e,n}(D) := \Pr\{d(X^n, \phi(f(Y^n))) > D\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Note that the probability term in (4.1) is calculated with respect to the distributions of the source sequence and the noisy channel. Given any blocklength $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the distortion level D and tolerable excess-distortion probability ε , let $M^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$ denote the minimum number M such that one can construct an (n, M) -code with excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D)$ no greater than ε , i.e.,

$$M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) := \inf \{M : \exists \text{ an } (n, M)\text{-code s.t. } P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (4.2)$$

The studies of noisy lossy source coding concern characterization of $M^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$. The first-order asymptotics was derived by Dobrushin and Tsybakov [33]. To present their result, define the following noisy rate-distortion function:

$$R(P_{XY}, D) := \min_{\substack{P_{\hat{X}|Y} : \mathbb{E}[d(X, \hat{X})] \leq D \\ X - Y - \hat{X}}} I(Y; \hat{X}) \quad (4.3)$$

$$= \min_{P_{\hat{X}|Y} : \mathbb{E}[\bar{d}(Y, \hat{X})] \leq D} I(Y; \hat{X}), \quad (4.4)$$

where $\bar{d}(y, \hat{x}) := \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}}[d(X, \hat{x})|Y = y]$ denotes the conditional average distortion measure and $(P_{XY}, P_{X|Y})$ are induced by P_X and $P_{Y|X}$. When $P_{Y|X}$ is the identity mapping, $Y = X$, $P_Y = P_X$ and the noisy rate-distortion function reduces to the rate-distortion function (3.7) for the noiseless setting.

Dobrushin and Tsybakov [33] showed that $R(P_{XY}, D)$ is the first-order asymptotic coding rate, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) = R(P_{XY}, D). \quad (4.5)$$

This result implies that asymptotically compressing a noisy source is equivalent to compressing the original source with a surrogate conditional average distortion measure. One might wonder whether the same conclusion holds in the finite blocklength regime. Kostina and Verdú [13] answered this question negatively.

4.2 Noisy Distortion-Tilted Information Density

Similar to the rate-distortion problem, the distortion-tilted information density plays a critical role in the presentation and proof of both non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds. We will present its definition and properties in this section.

Assume that the noisy rate-distortion function $R(P_{XY}, D)$ is finite for some distortion level D and let

$$D_{\min} := \inf\{D \in \mathbb{R}_+ : R(P_{XY}, D) < \infty\}. \quad (4.6)$$

Furthermore, assume that there exists a test channel $P_{\hat{X}|Y}^*$ that achieves $R(P_{XY}, D)$ such that the constraint is satisfied with equality. With this definition, we define the following derivative of the noisy rate-distortion function:

$$\lambda^* := -\frac{\partial R(P_{XY}, D)}{\partial D}. \quad (4.7)$$

Definition 12. For any $(x, y, \hat{x}) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}$, for any $D > D_{\min}$, the noisy distortion-tilted information density for noisy lossy source coding is defined as follows:

$$j(x, y, \hat{x}|D, P_{XY}) := \iota_{Y; \hat{X}}(y; \hat{x}) + \lambda^*(d(x, \hat{x}) - D), \quad (4.8)$$

where the mutual information density $\iota_{X; \hat{X}}(x; \hat{x})$ is defined as follows

$$\iota_{Y; \hat{X}}(y; \hat{x}) = \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}|Y}^*(\hat{x}|y)}{P_{\hat{X}}^*(\hat{x})}, \quad (4.9)$$

and the marginal distribution $P_{\hat{X}}^*$ is induced by the optimal test channel $P_{\hat{X}|Y}^*$, the source distribution P_X and the noisy observation channel $P_{Y|X}$.

Taking expectation over $P_{X|Y}$ on the right hand side of (4.8), we obtain the surrogate distortion-tilted information density

$$\bar{j}(y, D|P_Y) := \iota_{Y; \hat{X}}(y; \hat{x}) + \lambda^*(\bar{d}(y, \hat{x}) - D). \quad (4.10)$$

The noisy rate-distortion function is the expectation of the noisy distortion-tilted information density, i.e.,

$$R(P_{XY}, D) = \mathbb{E}[j(X, Y, \hat{X}|D, P_{XY})], \quad (4.11)$$

where the expectation is over $(X, Y, \hat{X}) \sim P_{XY\hat{X}} := P_X \times P_{Y|X} \times P_{\hat{X}|Y}^*$. Other properties of the noisy distortion-tilted information density $j(X, Y, \hat{X}|D, P_{XY})$ follow analogously to that of the distortion-tilted information density $j(X|P_X, D)$ for the rate-distortion problem in (3.17) and are omitted for simplicity.

4.3 Non-Asymptotic Bounds

4.3.1 Achievability

We first present the non-asymptotic achievability bound in [13, Theorem 3], which generalizes Theorem 13 for the rate-distortion problem.

Theorem 17. *For any $P_{\hat{X}}$ defined on \mathcal{X} , there exists an (M, D) -code such that the excess-distortion probability satisfies*

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{P}_{P_{\hat{X}}}^n \{\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n) > t\})^M] dt, \quad (4.12)$$

where the expectation is calculated according to $(Y^n, \hat{X}^n) \sim P_Y^n \times P_{\hat{X}}^n$, P_Y is induced by P_X and $P_{Y|X}$ and the function $\pi : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as follows:

$$\pi(y^n, \hat{x}^n) := \Pr_{P_{X|Y}^n} \{d(X^n, \hat{x}^n) > D | Y^n = y^n\}, \quad (4.13)$$

and $P_{X|Y}$ is induced by P_X and $P_{Y|X}$.

Note that Theorem 17 reduces to Theorem 13 for the noiseless case since $\pi(y^n, \hat{x}^n) = 1\{d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) > D\}$ almost surely when $x^n = y^n$ and $P_{Y|X}$ is the identity matrix.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 17 parallels Theorem 13 for the noiseless case and uses the random coding argument. Let $(\hat{X}^n(1), \dots, \hat{X}^n(M)) \in (\hat{\mathcal{X}}^n)^M$ be a sequence of M codewords, each of which is generated i.i.d. from $P_{\hat{X}}$. Upon observing the noisy sequence y^n , the encoder f chooses index i^* if

$$i^* = \arg \min_{i \in [M]} \pi(y^n, \hat{X}^n(i)). \quad (4.14)$$

If there are multiple such minimizers, i^* is chosen arbitrarily among them. The decoder ϕ simply outputs $\hat{X}^n(i^*)$ as the estimation of the source sequence X^n .

We next derive an upper bound on the excess-distortion probability of the coding scheme using the encoder f and the decoder ϕ described above. Note

that

$$P_{e,n}(D) := \Pr\{d(X^n, f(\phi(Y^n))) > D\} \quad (4.15)$$

$$= \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n(i^*)) > D\} \quad (4.16)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n(i^*))] \quad (4.17)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \Pr\{\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n(i^*)) > t\} dt \quad (4.18)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[\Pr\{\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n(i^*)) > t | Y^n\}] dt \quad (4.19)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i \in [M]} \Pr\{\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n(i)) > t | Y^n\}\right] dt \quad (4.20)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[(\Pr\{\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n) > t | Y^n\})^M\right] dt \quad (4.21)$$

where (4.17) follows since $\mathbb{E}[f(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f(X, Y) | X]]$ for any two random variables (X, Y) , (4.18) follows from the definition of the expectation and the fact that $\phi(\cdot) \in [0, 1]$, (4.20) follows since each codeword $\hat{X}^n(i)$ is generated independently and $\phi(y^n, \hat{x}^n(i^*)) > t$ implies that $\phi(y^n, \hat{x}^n(i)) > t$ for all $i \in [M]$ and (4.21) follows since each codeword $\hat{X}^n(i)$ is generated from the same distribution.

The proof of Theorem 17 is completed by noting that $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq a$ implies that there exists $x \leq a$ for any random variable X and real number a . \square

To derive a tight second-order approximation to the finite blocklength performance, we need the following corollary of Theorem 17 [13, Theorem 4].

Corollary 1. *For any $P_{\hat{X}}$, there exists an (n, M) -code such that*

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{M}{\gamma}\right) + \int_0^1 \Pr\{g(Y^n, t | P_{\hat{X}}) \geq \log \gamma\} dt, \quad (4.22)$$

where the function $g : \mathcal{Y}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as

$$g(y^n, t | P_{\hat{X}}) := \inf_{\substack{\bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n} : \pi(y^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq t \\ \forall \hat{x}^n \in \text{supp}(\bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n})}} D(\bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n} \| P_{\hat{X}}^n). \quad (4.23)$$

Proof. It follows from [68, Eq. (26.18) on page 278] that for any $(p, \gamma, M) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$(1 - p)^M \leq \exp(-Mp) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{M}{\gamma}\right) + |1 - \gamma p|^+. \quad (4.24)$$

Combining (4.24) and Theorem 17, we conclude that there exists an (n, M) -code

such that

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Pr\{\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq t | Y^n\})^M \right] dt \quad (4.25)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(-\frac{M}{\gamma}\right) + \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[|1 - \gamma \Pr\{\pi(Y^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq t | Y^n\}|^+ \right] dt. \quad (4.26)$$

We next bound the second term in (4.26). For any y^n and t , given any $\bar{P}_{\hat{X}}$ such that $\pi(y^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq t$ a.s, let $\iota(\hat{x}^n | P_{\hat{X}}, \bar{P}_{\hat{X}}) := \sum_{i \in [n]} \log \frac{\bar{P}_{\hat{X}}(\hat{x}_i)}{P_{\hat{X}}(\hat{x}_i)}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & |1 - \gamma \Pr_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \{\pi(y^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq t | Y^n\}|^+ \\ & \leq \left| 1 - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\bar{P}_{\hat{X}}^n} \left[\exp(-\iota(\hat{X}^n | P_{\hat{X}}, \bar{P}_{\hat{X}})) \mathbb{1}(\pi(y^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq t) \right] \right|^+ \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

$$\leq \left| 1 - \gamma \mathbb{E}_{\bar{P}_{\hat{X}}^n} \left[\exp(-\iota(\hat{X}^n | P_{\hat{X}}, \bar{P}_{\hat{X}})) \right] \right|^+ \quad (4.28)$$

$$\leq \left| 1 - \gamma \exp(-D(\bar{P}_{\hat{X}}^n \| P_{\hat{X}}^n)) \right|^+ \quad (4.29)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{1}(D(\bar{P}_{\hat{X}}^n \| P_{\hat{X}}^n) \geq \log \gamma), \quad (4.30)$$

where (4.27) follows from the change-of-measure technique [42], (4.29) follows from Jensen's inequality and the fact that $\exp(-x)$ is convex in x , and (4.30) follows from simple algebra.

Note that (4.30) holds for any $\bar{P}_{\hat{X}}$ such that $\pi(y^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq t$. The tightness upper bound would be for any y^n and t

$$|1 - \gamma \Pr_{P_{\hat{X}}^n} \{\pi(y^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq t | Y^n\}|^+ \leq \mathbb{1}(g(y^n, t | P_{\hat{X}}) \geq \log \gamma). \quad (4.31)$$

The proof of Corollary 1 is completed by combining (4.26) and (4.31). \square

4.3.2 Converse

We next present a non-asymptotic converse bound [13, Theorem 2], using which the optimality of the coding scheme in Theorem 17 is proved in the second-order asymptotic sense. To do so, we need the following definition. For any distribution P_Y and any conditional distribution $\bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}$, given any (x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n) , let

$$\iota(y^n, \hat{x}^n | P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) := \log \frac{\bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}^n(y^n | \hat{x}^n)}{P_Y^n(y^n)}, \quad (4.32)$$

and define the following function

$$\begin{aligned} & \iota(x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n | P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \\ & := \iota(y^n, \hat{x}^n | P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) + \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \lambda(d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) - D) - \log M. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

The next theorem generalizes Theorem 14 for the noiseless setting.

Theorem 18. Any (n, M) -code satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(D) \geq \inf_{P_{\hat{X}^n|Y^n}} \sup_{\bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ \Pr\{\iota(X^n, Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \gamma\} \right. \\ \left. - \exp(-\gamma) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

where $(X^n, Y^n, \hat{X}^n) \sim P_X^n \times P_{Y|X}^n \times P_{\hat{X}^n|Y^n}$.

Proof. Let S be a random variable on \mathcal{M} that denotes the output of the encoder. Let $P_{S|Y^n}$ and $P_{\hat{X}^n|S}$ be the stochastic mapping of the encoder f and decoder ϕ respectively. Furthermore, let $P_{\hat{X}^n|Y^n}$ be the conditional distribution induced by P_X , $P_{Y|X}$, $P_{S|Y^n}$ and $P_{\hat{X}^n|S}$, i.e.,

$$P_{\hat{X}^n|Y^n}(\hat{x}^n|y^n) = \frac{\sum_{x^n, s} P_X^n(x^n) P_{Y|X}^n(y|x^n) P_{S|Y^n}(s|y^n) P_{\hat{X}^n|S}(\hat{x}^n|s)}{P_Y^n(y^n)} \quad (4.35)$$

$$= \frac{\sum_s P_Y^n(y^n) P_{S|Y^n}(s|y^n) P_{\hat{X}^n|S}(\hat{x}^n|s)}{P_Y^n(y^n)}. \quad (4.36)$$

For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{\iota(X^n, Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \gamma\} \\ &= \Pr\{\iota(X^n, Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\} \\ & \quad + \Pr\{\iota(X^n, Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

$$\leq \Pr\{\iota(X^n, Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\} + P_{e,n}(D). \quad (4.38)$$

We next further upper bound the second term in (4.38) as follows:

second term of (4.38)

$$= \Pr\{\iota(Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \log M + \gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\} \quad (4.39)$$

$$\leq \Pr\{\iota(Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \log M + \gamma\} \quad (4.40)$$

$$\leq \frac{\exp(-\gamma)}{M} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\iota(Y^n, \hat{X}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}))] \quad (4.41)$$

$$= \frac{\exp(-\gamma)}{M} \sum_{(y^n, \hat{x}^n)} \sum_{s \in [M]} P_Y^n(y^n) P_{S|Y^n}(s|y^n) P_{\hat{X}^n|S}(\hat{x}^n|s) \frac{\bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}^n(y^n|\hat{x}^n)}{P_Y^n(y^n)} \quad (4.42)$$

$$\leq \frac{\exp(-\gamma)}{M} \sum_{(y^n, \hat{x}^n)} \sum_{s \in [M]} P_{\hat{X}^n|S}(\hat{x}^n|s) \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}^n(y^n|\hat{x}^n) \quad (4.43)$$

$$\leq \exp(-\gamma), \quad (4.44)$$

where (4.39) follows since when $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D$,

$$\iota(x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) = \iota(y^n, \hat{x}^n|P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) - \log M, \quad (4.45)$$

(4.41) follows from the Markov inequality (cf. Theorem 2), (4.42) follows from the distribution in (4.36), and (4.43) follow since $P_{S|Y^n}(s|y^n) \leq 1$.

Combining (4.38) and (4.44), we conclude that

$$P_{e,n}(D) \geq \Pr\{\iota(X^n, Y^n, \hat{X}^n | P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \gamma\} - \exp(-\gamma). \quad (4.46)$$

The proof is completed by optimizing over parameters $(\bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}, \gamma)$ for the tightest bound and by optimizing over $P_{\hat{X}^n|Y^n}$ to yield a code-independent bound. \square

Note that the optimization over $P_{\hat{X}^n|Y^n}$ is intractable for large n . To derive tight second-order asymptotics, the following relaxation was proposed [13, Corollary 1].

Corollary 2. *Any (n, M) -code satisfies*

$$P_{e,n}(D) \geq \sup_{\bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ \inf_{\hat{x}^n} \mathbb{E} \left[\Pr\{\iota(X^n, Y^n, \hat{x}^n | P_Y, \bar{P}_{Y|\hat{X}}) \geq \gamma | Y^n\} \right] - \exp(-\gamma) \right\}. \quad (4.47)$$

Corollary 2 follows by lower bounding the minimax bound in Theorem 18 with a maximin lower bound and applying the law of iterative expectation with simple algebra.

The infimum over \hat{x}^n could still be challenging. However, as shown in [13, Remark 2], the inner probability term is a constant function of \hat{x}^n under certain choice of $\bar{P}_{Y|X}$ for a GMS corrupted by an AWGN channel under the quadratic distortion measure and for a uniform discrete source corrupted by a symmetric channel under the Hamming distortion measure. An example for the latter case will be presented to illustrate the result.

4.4 Second-Order Asymptotics

4.4.1 Result and Discussions

In this section, we present a second-order approximation to the finite blocklength performance [13, Theorem 5]. To present the result, several assumptions are needed.

1. Let the distortion level $D \in (D_{\min}, D_{\max})$, where D_{\min} was defined in (4.6) and $D_{\max} := \inf_{\hat{x} \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}} \mathbb{E}_{P_X}[d(X, \hat{x})]$.
2. Given any Q_Y , let $Q_{XY} = P_{X|Y}Q_Y$. Suppose that for all Q_Y in the neighborhood of P_Y , $R(Q_{XY}, D)$ is twice continuously differentiable with respect to Q_Y and $\text{supp}(Q_{\hat{X}}^*) = \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}}^*)$, where $Q_{\hat{X}}^*$ is induced by Q_Y and the optimal test channel $Q_{\hat{X}|Y}^*$ for $R(Q_{XY}, D)$.

Define the following dispersion function for noisy lossy source coding.

$$\tilde{V}(P_{XY}, D) := \text{Var}[g(X, Y, \hat{X}|D, P_{XY})]. \quad (4.48)$$

The second-order asymptotics states as follows.

Theorem 19. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon) = nR(P_{XY}, D) + \sqrt{n\tilde{V}(P_{XY}, D)Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)} + O(\log n). \quad (4.49)$$

The proof of Theorem 19 is omitted since it follows similarly to the rate-distortion problem by applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the non-asymptotic bounds. Readers could refer to [13, Appendices C-D] or [56, Appendix D] for details. Note that Theorem 19 was only proved for discrete memoryless sources using non-asymptotic bounds in Corollaries 1 and 2 involving the distortion-tilted information density in both directions. It would be interesting to provide an alternative proof using method of types for a DMS and to generalize the results to a GMS.

A critical remark is that the dispersion function has the following equivalent form

$$\tilde{V}(P_{XY}, D) = \text{Var}[\tilde{g}(Y, D|P_Y)] + (\lambda^*)^2 \text{Var}_{P_{XY\hat{X}}^*}[d(X, \hat{X})|Y, \hat{X}], \quad (4.50)$$

where the conditional variance for any two variables (U, V) with joint distribution P_{UV} is $\text{Var}_{P_{UV}}[U|V] = \mathbb{E}_{P_U}[(U - \mathbb{E}_{P_{U|V}}[U|V])^2]$ and the joint distribution $P_{XY\hat{X}}^*$ is induced by P_X , $P_{Y|X}$ and the optimal test channel $P_{\hat{X}|Y}$ for $R(P_{XY}, D)$. This implies that unlike the first-order asymptotics, the second-order coding rate for noisy lossy source coding is not equivalent to the noiseless case with the surrogate conditional average distortion measure since the additional second term in (4.50) is non-zero unless $P_{Y|X}$ is the identity matrix.

4.4.2 A Numerical Example

We next present a numerical example to illustrate Theorem 19 [13, Section VI]. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, e\}$, $P_X(0) = P_X(1) = 0.5$ and let $P_{Y|X}$ be a binary erasure channel with erasure probability $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, i.e., for any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$,

$$P_{Y|X}(y = x) = (1 - \delta)\mathbb{1}(y = x) + \delta\mathbb{1}(y = e). \quad (4.51)$$

Let P_{XY} be the induced joint distribution. For any $D \in (0.5\delta, 0.5)$, under the Hamming distortion measure, the noisy rate-distortion function is

$$R(P_{XY}, D) = (1 - \delta) \left(\log 2 - H_b\left(\frac{D - 0.5\delta}{1 - \delta}\right) \right), \quad (4.52)$$

where $H_b(\cdot)$ is the binary entropy function and the optimal test channel $P_{\hat{X}|Y}^*$ satisfies that the marginal distribution $P_{\hat{X}}^*(0) = P_{\hat{X}}^*(1) = 0.5$ and

$$P_{Y|\hat{X}}^*(y|\hat{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 - D - 0.5\delta & \text{if } \hat{x} = y \\ D - 0.5\delta & \text{if } \hat{x} \neq y, y \neq e \\ \delta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.53)$$

The derivative λ^* satisfies

$$\lambda^* = \log \frac{1 - D - 0.5\delta}{D - 0.5\delta} \quad (4.54)$$

and the noisy distortion-tilted information density satisfies

$$j(x, y, \hat{x}|P_{XY}, D) = -\lambda^* D + \begin{cases} \log \frac{2}{1+\exp(-\lambda^*)} & \text{if } x = y, \\ \lambda^* & \text{if } \hat{x} \neq y, y \neq e, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.55)$$

Thus, the noisy dispersion is

$$\tilde{V}(P_{XY}, D) = \delta(1 - \delta) \left(\log \cosh \left(\frac{\lambda^*}{2 \log e} \right) \right)^2 + \frac{\delta \lambda^*}{4}. \quad (4.56)$$

We next calculate the rate-distortion function and the dispersion function under the surrogate conditional average distortion measure. From the definition of $\bar{d}(\cdot)$, we find

$$\bar{d}(y, \hat{x}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \hat{x} = y, \\ 1 & \text{if } \hat{x} \neq y, y \neq e, \\ 0.5 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.57)$$

By taking expectation of $j(x, y, \hat{x}|P_{XY}, D)$ over $P_{X|Y}$, we obtain the surrogate distortion-tilted information density as follows:

$$\bar{j}(y|P_Y, D) = \begin{cases} 0.5\lambda^* D & \text{if } y = e, \\ -\lambda^* D + \log \frac{2}{1+\exp(-\lambda^*)} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4.58)$$

and its dispersion satisfies

$$\text{Var}[\bar{j}(Y|P_Y, D)] = \delta(1 - \delta) \left(\log \cosh \left(\frac{\lambda^*}{2 \log e} \right) \right)^2 \quad (4.59)$$

$$= \tilde{V}(P_{XY}, D) - \frac{\delta \lambda^*}{4} \quad (4.60)$$

$$< \tilde{V}(P_{XY}, D). \quad (4.61)$$

Chapter 5

Noisy Channel

This chapter concerns lossy joint source channel coding, where one aims to transmit an information source over a noisy channel and recover it in a lossy manner. Such a problem generalizes the rate-distortion problem by having a noisy channel to convey the encoded source information instead of a lossless channel. It is also known as vector quantization for noisy channels [10, Section V.G].

Asymptotically, Shannon [2] proved that it is optimal to use separate source and channel coding (SSCC) to achieve the optimal rate if one targets for vanishing error probability. That is, at the transmitter side, one first compresses the source using a source encoder and subsequently encodes the output of the source encoder using a channel encoder. Analogously, at the receiver side, one first decodes the output of the source encoder using a channel decoder and subsequently produces a source estimate using a source decoder. Optimal performance could be achieved when optimal codes are used for both source and channel coding.

However, one might wonder whether this claim holds in the refined asymptotic analysis or in the finite blocklength regime. Csiszár [69] answered this question negatively in the large deviations regime by showing that joint source channel coding (JSCC) achieves a larger error exponent than SSCC. Wang, Ingber and Kochman [15] provided further evidence in second-order asymptotics, which provides an approximation to the finite blocklength performance. Kostina and Verdú derived non-asymptotic bounds valid for any blocklength and recovered the result in [15] by applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to their non-asymptotic bounds for moderately large blocklengths. To reveal the impact of a noisy channel on the rate-distortion problem, we present the non-asymptotic bounds in [14] and the second-order asymptotics in [15, 14].

5.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

5.1.1 Problem Formulation

Consider a discrete memoryless source P_X defined on the finite alphabet \mathcal{X} and a discrete memoryless channel with transition probability matrix $P_{Z|Y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}|\mathcal{Y})$ where \mathcal{Y} is the input alphabet and \mathcal{Z} is the output alphabet of the channel. Furthermore, similarly to the rate-distortion problem, let $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ be the reproduction alphabet and let $d : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a bounded distortion measure. Given any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let the distortion between x^n and \hat{x}^n be defined as $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} d(x_i, \hat{x}_i)$.

In the joint source channel coding problem, one wishes to transmit a source sequence X^n reliably over the DMC $P_{Z|Y}$ reliably over k channel uses in a lossy manner. Formally, a code is defined as follows.

Definition 13. An (n, k) -code for the lossy joint source channel coding problem consists of

- an encoder $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^k$
- a decoder $\phi : \mathcal{Z}^k \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$.

For simplicity, we let $Y^k := f(X^n)$ be the output of the encoder and \hat{X}^n be the output of the decoder. From problem formulation, the Markov chain $X^n - Y^k - Z^k - \hat{X}^n$ holds. Similarly to the rate-distortion problem, the performance criterion is the excess-distortion probability with respect to a target distortion level D :

$$P_{e,n,k}(D) := \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D\}, \quad (5.1)$$

where the probability is calculated with respect to the joint distribution of $(X^n, Y^k, Z^k, \hat{X}^n)$ that are induced by the source distribution P_X , the noisy channel $P_{Z|Y}$ and the (n, k) -code.

The fundamental limit of lossy JSCC is the maximum number of symbols that can be reliably transmitted over k channel uses with excess-distortion probability no greater than $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, i.e.,

$$n^*(k, D, \varepsilon) := \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \exists \text{ an } (n, k)\text{-code s.t. } P_{e,n,k}(D) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (5.2)$$

In case there is a cost constraint on the channel input Y^k , let $c : \mathcal{Y}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the cost function. We can define an (n, k, α) -code similarly to Definition 13 except that a cost constraint $c(Y^k) \leq \alpha$ should be added. Analogously, we can define the corresponding fundamental limit $n^*(k, D, \alpha, \varepsilon)$. In this chapter, for simplicity, we focus on the case without a cost constraint on the channel input.

When the noisy channel $P_{Z|Y}$ is the identity matrix and when $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{M} := [M]$ for some $M \in \mathbb{N}$, the lossy JSCC problem reduces to the rate-distortion problem. When the distortion measure is the Hamming distortion

measure and when $D = 0$, the lossy JSCC problem reduces to the lossless case where one wishes to transmit X^n in an almost perfect manner.

Note that the problem formulation here is slightly different from [15, 14] where they use S^k to denote the source sequence of length k and use $P_{Y|X}^n$ to denote the noisy channel with n channel uses. However, to be consistent with other chapters, we keep X^n as the source sequence of length n and use $P_{Z|Y}^k$ to denote the noisy channel with k channel uses.

5.1.2 Asymptotic Result

We next present Shannon's first-order asymptotic characterization of $n^*(k, D, \varepsilon)$. Recall the definition of the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D)$ in (3.7). Furthermore, define the following capacity function:

$$C(P_{Z|Y}) := \max_{P_Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})} I(P_Y, P_{Y|Z}), \quad (5.3)$$

where $P_{Y|Z}$ is induced by P_Y and $P_{Z|Y}$.

With these definitions, Shannon [2] proved the following result.

Theorem 20. *For any target distortion D such that $R(P_X, D) < \infty$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^*(k, D, \varepsilon)}{k} = \frac{C(P_{Z|Y})}{R(P_X, D)} =: \rho(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D). \quad (5.4)$$

Theorem 20 implies that asymptotically, the maximum number of source symbols $n^*(k, D, \varepsilon)$ that can be transmitted reliably in a lossy manner, scales in the same order as the number of channel uses k and the optimal ratio is $\rho(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D)$. Intuitively, one can concatenate an optimal lossy source coding with an optimal channel code to achieve this goal. That is, one can first compress X^n into $nR(P_X, D)$ nats reliably in a lossy manner and then transmit the $nR(P_X, D)$ nats reliably over the noisy memoryless channel $P_{Z|Y}$ supposed that $nR(P_X, D) \leq kC(P_{Z|Y})$. However, as we shall show, such a separation based coding scheme is suboptimal in the second-order asymptotics.

5.2 Non-Asymptotic Bounds

In this section, we present non-asymptotic achievability and converse bound that hold for any $(n, k) \in \mathbb{N}^2$.

5.2.1 Achievability

We first present an achievability bound. Recall the definition of the distortion ball $\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)$ in (3.34). Furthermore, given any input distribution $P_Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ and any channel $P_{Z|Y}$, for each $(y, z) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$, define the following information density

$$i(y^k, z^k | P_Y, P_{Z|Y}) := \sum_{i \in [k]} \log \frac{P_{Z|Y}(z_i | y_i)}{P_Z(z_i)}, \quad (5.5)$$

where P_Z is induced by P_Y and $P_{Z|Y}$.

Kostina and Verdú prove the following theorem [14, Theorem 7].

Theorem 21. *There exists an (n, k) -code such that*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n,k}(D) \leq \inf_{P_{Y^k}, P_{\hat{X}^n}, P_{W|X^n}} & \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(- |i(Y^k; Z^k|P_Y, P_{Z|Y}) - \log W|^+ \right) \right] \right. \\ & \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n))^W \right] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

where the random variable W takes values in \mathbb{N} and random variables distribute as $(X^n, Y^k, Z^k, \hat{X}^n, W) \sim P_X^n P_{Y^k} P_{Z^k|Y^k} P_{\hat{X}^n} P_{W|X^n}$.

The proof of Theorem 21 follows by analyzing a careful concatenation of a source and channel code. In particular, the second expectation term corresponds to the non-asymptotic achievability bound in Theorem 13 for the rate-distortion problem and the first expectation term corresponds to the error probability of a channel code. Note that the two codes are connected via the critical random variable W which depends only on the source sequence X^n . Such a design is analogous to the JSCC coding scheme based on the unequal error protection idea by Wang, Ingber and Kochman [15].

Proof. For simplicity, we only present the code used to prove Theorem 3 since the analysis of the code is similar to that of the rate-distortion problem in Theorem 13 and its noisy version in Theorem 17. Readers could refer to [14, Eq. (89)-106] for details.

To present the code, let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary and let $W \in [M]$ be a random variable that depends only on the source sequence X^n . Let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^n = (\hat{x}^n(1), \dots, \hat{x}^n(M))$ be a sequence of source codewords and let $y^k(1), \dots, y^k(M)$ be a sequence of channel codewords. The encoder f is a concatenation of a source encoder $f_s : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow [M]$ and a channel encoder $f_c : [M] \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^k$. Specifically, given the source sequence x^n , the source encoder f_s generates a random variable W using a stochastic mapping $P_{W|X^n=x^n}$, outputs the index m if it is the smallest index from $[W]$ such that $(x^n, \hat{x}^n(i)) \leq D$ and outputs W if there is no such index. The channel encoder then outputs $y^k(m)$. Thus, given x^n , the encoder f outputs $y^k(f_s(x^n))$.

The decoder is also a concatenation of a source decoder $\phi_s : [M] \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$ and a channel decoder $\phi_c : \mathcal{Z}^k \rightarrow [M]$. Let $U \in [M+1]$ be a random variable that depends on X^n, W and the source codebook such that $U = f_s(X^n)$ if $d(X^n, f_s(X^n)) \leq D$ and $U = M+1$ otherwise. Given the channel output z^k that is the output of passing $y^k(m)$ over the memoryless channel $P_{Z^k|Y^k}^k$, the channel decoder outputs \hat{m} if

$$\hat{m} := \arg \max_{j \in [M]} P_{U|\hat{\mathbf{x}}^n}(j|\hat{\mathbf{x}}^n) P_{Z^k|Y^k}(z^k|y^k(j)). \quad (5.7)$$

Subsequently, the source decoder outputs $\hat{x}^n(\hat{m})$ as the source estimate. \square

To derive second-order asymptotics, we need the following weakening version of Theorem 21.

Corollary 3. *There exists an (n, k) -code such that*

$$P_{e,n} \leq \inf_{P_{Y^k}, P_{\hat{X}^n}} \inf_{\gamma > 0} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(- \left| \imath(Y^k; Z^k | P_Y, P_{Z|Y}) - \log \frac{\gamma}{P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n))} \right|^+ \right) \right] + \exp(1 - \gamma) \right\}. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. Let $\gamma > 0$ be arbitrary, $\tau(x^n) := P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n))$ and choose $W = \left\lfloor \frac{\gamma}{\tau(x^n)} \right\rfloor$. It follows that for any x^n .

$$(1 - \tau(x^n))^{\lfloor \frac{\gamma}{\tau(x^n)} \rfloor} \leq (1 - \tau(x^n))^{\frac{\gamma}{\tau(x^n)} - 1} \quad (5.9)$$

$$\leq \exp(1 - \gamma). \quad (5.10)$$

The proof of Corollary 3 follows by invoking Theorem 21 and the result (5.10). \square

5.2.2 Converse

We next present the non-asymptotic converse bound [14, Theorem 3]. Recall the definition of the distortion-tilted information density $j(x|D, P_X)$ in (3.17).

Theorem 22. *Given any $(\gamma, T) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}$, any (n, k) -code satisfies that*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n,k}(D) &\geq \inf_{P_{Y^k|X^n}} \left\{ -T \exp(-\gamma) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sup_{\bar{P}_{Z^k|W}} \sup_{\substack{W \in [T]: \\ X^n - (Y^k, W) - Z^k}} \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) - \imath(Y^k; Z^k|W) \geq \gamma \right\} \right\} \quad (5.11) \\ &\geq -T \exp(-\gamma) \\ &\quad + \sup_{\bar{P}_{Z^k|W}} \sup_{\substack{W \in [T]: \\ X^n - (Y^k, W) - Z^k}} \mathbb{E} \left[\inf_{y^k} \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) - \imath(y^k; Z^k|W) \geq \gamma | X^n \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

where the information density function $\imath(y^k; z^k|w)$ is defined as

$$\imath(y^k; z^k|w) := \log \frac{P_{Z^k|Y^k W}(z^k|y^k, w)}{\bar{P}_{Z^k|W}(z^k|t)} \quad (5.13)$$

and the distribution $P_{Z^k|Y^k W}$ is induced by the joint distribution of $(X^n, Y^k, W, Z^k) \sim P_X^n P_{W|X^n} P_{Y^k|X^n W} P_{Z^k|Y^k W}$ for some distributions $(P_{W|X^n}, P_{Y^k|X^n W}, P_{Z^k|Y^k W})$ such that the marginal conditional distribution satisfies $P_{Z^k|Y^k} = P_{Z^k|Y^k}^k$.

We remark that Kostina and Verdú derived several other non-asymptotic converse bounds in [14, Section III.B] using list decoding and hypothesis testing. However, Theorem 22 and its weakened versions suffice to derive a second-order asymptotic converse bound. Furthermore, Theorem 22 reduces to the non-asymptotic converse bound in Theorem 14 for the rate-distortion problem when $T = 1$, $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{M} := [M]$, P_Y is the uniform distribution over $[M]$ and $P_{Z|Y}$ is the identity matrix.

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary. Consider any potentially stochastic encoder $P_{Y^k|X^n}$ and decoder $P_{\hat{X}^n|Z^k}$. Let $W \in [T]$ be an auxiliary random variable such that $X^n - (Y^k, W) - Z^k$ forms a Markov chain so that the joint distribution of (X^n, Y^k, W, Z^k) satisfies $P_{X^n Y^k W Z^k} = P_X^n P_{W|X^n} P_{Y^k|X^n W} P_{Z^k|Y^k W}$ for some distributions $(P_{W|X^n}, P_{Y^k|X^n W}, P_{Z^k|Y^k W})$ induced by the encoder $P_{Y^k|S}$ and the noisy channel $P_{Z|Y}^k$. Furthermore, let $\bar{P}_{Z^k|W}$ be a conditional distribution and let $\bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}$ be induced by $\bar{P}_{Y^k|W}$ and $P_{\hat{X}^n|Z^k}$, i.e., for each $w \in [T]$ and $\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$,

$$\bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) = \sum_{z^k} P_{\hat{X}^n|Z^k}(\hat{x}^n|z^k) \bar{P}_{Z^k|W}(z^k|w). \quad (5.14)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) - \imath(Y^k; Z^k|W) \geq \gamma \right\} \\ &= \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) - \imath(Y^k; Z^k|W) \geq \gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D \right\} \\ & \quad + \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) - \imath(Y^k; Z^k|W) \geq \gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D \right\} \quad (5.15) \\ &\leq P_{e,n,k}(D) + \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i|D, P_X) - \imath(Y^k; Z^k|W) \geq \gamma, d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

The second term in (5.16) can be further upper bounded as follows:

second term in (5.16)

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{x^n, y^k, w, z^k} \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)} P_{X^n Y^k W Z^k}(x^n, y^k, w, z^k) P_{\hat{X}^n|Z^k}(\hat{x}^n|z^k) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i|D, P_X) - \gamma \geq \imath(y^k; z^k|w) \right) \quad (5.17) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \exp(-\gamma) \sum_{x^n, y^k, z^k} \sum_{w \in [T]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)} P_X^n(x^n) \exp \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i|D, P_X) \right) \\ &\quad \times P_{W|X^n}(w|x^n) P_{Y^k|W X^n}(y^k|w, x^n) \bar{P}_{Z^k|W}(z^k|w) P_{\hat{X}^n|Z^k}(\hat{x}^n|z^k) \quad (5.18) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \exp(-\gamma) \sum_{x^n, z^k} \sum_{w \in [T]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)} P_X^n(x^n) \exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i | D, P_X)\right) \times \bar{P}_{Z^k|W}(z^k|w) P_{\hat{X}^n|Z^k}(\hat{x}^n|z^k) \quad (5.19)$$

$$= \exp(-\gamma) \sum_{x^n} \sum_{w \in [T]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)} P_X^n(x^n) \bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) \exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i | D, P_X)\right) \quad (5.20)$$

$$\leq \exp(-\gamma) \sum_{x^n} \sum_{w \in [T]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)} P_X^n(x^n) \bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) \times \exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i | D, P_X) + n\lambda^*(D - d(x^n, \hat{x}^n))\right) \quad (5.21)$$

$$\leq \exp(-\gamma) \sum_{x^n} \sum_{w \in [T]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n} P_X^n(x^n) \bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) \times \exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i | D, P_X) + n\lambda^*(D - d(x^n, \hat{x}^n))\right) \quad (5.22)$$

$$= \exp(-\gamma) \sum_{\hat{x}^n, w} \bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) \mathbb{E}_{P_X^n} \left[\exp\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (j(X_i | D, P_X) + \lambda^*(D - d(X_i, \hat{x}_i)))\right) \right] \quad (5.23)$$

$$\leq \exp(-\gamma) \sum_{w \in [T]} \sum_{\hat{x}^n} \bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}(\hat{x}^n|w) \quad (5.24)$$

$$\leq T \exp(-\gamma), \quad (5.25)$$

where (5.18) follows from the definition of $\iota(y^k; z^k|w)$ in (5.13) which implies an upper bound on $P_{Z^k|Y^k W}(z^k|y^k, w)$, (5.19) follows since $P_{W|X^n}(w|x^n) \leq 1$ and $\sum_{y^k} P_{Y^k|W X^n}(y^k|w, x^n) = 1$, (5.20) follows from the definition of $\bar{P}_{\hat{X}^n|W}$ in (5.14), (5.21) follows since $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D$ for $\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_D(x^n)$ and λ^* defined in (3.16) is non-negative and (5.24) follows from Claim (iii) of Lemma 1 similarly to (3.53) for the rate-distortion problem.

The proof of (5.11) is completed by combining (5.16) and (5.25) and optimize over different parameters to obtain the tightest bound that does not depend on the code design. The proof of (5.12) follows from (5.11) by changing the order of infimum and supremum and applying the algebra in [14, Eq. (48)-(50)]. \square

5.3 Second-Order Asymptotics

Applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the non-asymptotic bounds in Corollary 3 and Theorem 22, we obtain second-order asymptotic approximation to the finite blocklength performance of optimal codes.

Recall the definition of the dispersion function $V(P_X, D)$ for the rate-distortion problem. Furthermore, for any $P_{Z|Y}$, let \mathcal{P}_Y^* be the input distribution that

achieves $C(P_{Y|X})$ and define the channel dispersion function

$$V_c(P_{Z|Y}) := \text{Var} \left[\log \frac{P_{Z|Y}(Z|Y)}{P_Y^*(Y)} \right]. \quad (5.26)$$

Under the same condition above Theorem 15 for the rate-distortion problem, the following theorem holds [14, Theorem 10].

Theorem 23. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the optimal (n, k) -code satisfies*

$$kC(P_{Z|Y}) - nR(P_X, D) = \sqrt{kV_c(P_{Z|Y}) + nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log k). \quad (5.27)$$

As discussed in [14, Remark 9], an equivalent form of Theorem 23 is

$$\frac{n^*(k, D, \varepsilon)}{k} = \rho(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D) + \frac{L(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{k}} + O(\log k), \quad (5.28)$$

where the second-order coding rate $L(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\varepsilon)$ for the lossy JSCC is

$$L(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\varepsilon) := -\frac{\sqrt{V_c(P_{Z|Y}) + \rho(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D)V(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)}{R(P_X, D)}. \quad (5.29)$$

In this monograph, we only consider the discrete memoryless source and the discrete memoryless channel with no cost constraint. The proof of Theorem 23 is omitted due to its similarity to the rate-distortion problem, readers could refer to [14, Appendix D-B] for the achievability proof using Corollary 3 and [14, Appendix C] for the converse proof using the non-asymptotic bound in Theorem 22. An independent proof of Theorem 23 was provided by Wang, Ingber and Kochman using the method of types and the idea of unequal error protection [15]. For other types of source and channels, e.g., a Gaussian source and an AWGN channel, one could refer to [14, Section V] for details. Generally speaking, the same conclusion holds but the dispersion function and the remainder $O(\log n)$ term differ.

A critical question is the cost of separation in the second-order asymptotics. As discussed in [14, Remark 8], combining the second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion problem in [12] (see also Theorem 15) and the channel coding problem in [6, Theorem 49], the achievable performance of separate source-channel coding satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & kC(P_{Z|Y}) - nR(P_X, D) \\ & \leq \min_{\substack{(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0, 1)^2: \\ \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon}} \left\{ \sqrt{kV_c(P_{Z|Y})}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_1) + \sqrt{nV(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_2) \right\} \\ & \quad + O(\log k). \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

In other words,

$$\frac{n_{\text{sscc}}^*(k, D, \varepsilon)}{k} \leq \frac{C(P_{Z|Y})}{R(P_X, D)} + \frac{L_{\text{sscc}}(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{k}} + O(\log k), \quad (5.31)$$

where the achievable second-order coding rate $V_{\text{sscc}}(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D, \varepsilon)$ for SSCC is

$$L_{\text{sscc}}(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\varepsilon) := \max_{\substack{(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0,1)^2: \\ \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon}} \left(\frac{-\sqrt{\rho(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D)V(P_X, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_1)}{R(P_X, D)} - \frac{\sqrt{V_c(P_{Z|Y})}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_2)}{R(P_X, D)} \right). \quad (5.32)$$

Note that $L_{\text{sscc}}(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\varepsilon) \leq L(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\varepsilon)$ unless the source dispersion function $V(P_X, D) = 0$ or the channel dispersion function $V(P_{Z|Y}) = 0$. To illustrate this point, in Fig. 5.1, we plot the second-order coding rates for a Bernoulli source with parameter p , the Hamming distortion measure and a distortion level $D = 0.05$ and a binary symmetric channel $P_{Z|Y}$ with parameter $q = 0.1$, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Z} = \{0, 1\}$, $P_X(1) = p$, $P_X(0) = 1 - p$, and

$$P_{Z|Y}(z|y) = (1 - q)\mathbb{1}(z = y) + q\mathbb{1}(z \neq y). \quad (5.33)$$




Figure 5.1: Plots of second-order coding rates for JSCC $L(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\epsilon)$ and for SSCC $L_{sscc}(P_X, P_{Z|Y}, D|\epsilon)$ when $D = 0.05$ for a Bernoulli source with parameter p , a binary symmetric channel $P_{Z|Y}$ with parameter $q = 0.1$ under the Hamming distortion measure.

Chapter 6

Mismatch

This chapter concerns the mismatched rate-distortion aspect that tackles a practical problem of lossy data compression: the generating distribution of the information source is *unknown*. Although the results in previous chapters are very insightful, the assumption of the exact knowledge of the source distribution P_X is highly impractical. To tackle this problem, Lapidoth [36, Theorem 3] proposed to use the spherical codebook and minimum Euclidean distance encoding to compress an arbitrary memoryless source under the quadratic distortion measure. Note that such a codebook is optimal for the Gaussian memoryless source under the quadratic distortion measure, asymptotically [2] and second-order asymptotically [12, Theorem 40].

Lapidoth showed that for any ergodic source with known and finite second moment σ^2 , the rate-distortion function for the GMS $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is achievable and ensemble tight as the blocklength tends to infinity. Here ensemble tight means that the analysis of the code is optimal. Lapidoth's codebook design only requires the knowledge of the second-moment of the information source, which is much more accessible than the exact source distribution and can be estimated from observed source sequence.

The results of Lapidoth were refined by Zhou, Tan and Motani [16] who derived ensemble tight second-order asymptotics and also considered the i.i.d. Gaussian codebook. Specifically, the authors of [16, Theorem 1] showed that both i.i.d. Gaussian and spherical codebooks achieve the same second-order coding rate. This chapter is largely based on [16].

6.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

Consider a memoryless source X^n with distribution (either probability mass function or probability density function) P_X satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \sigma^2, \quad \zeta := \mathbb{E}[X^4] < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E}[X^6] < \infty, \quad (6.1)$$

Consider any distortion level $D \in (0, \sigma^2)$. Let $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ be the reproduction alphabet and let $d : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the quadratic distortion defined in (3.2). Given any source sequence x^n and the reproduced source sequence \hat{x}^n , let $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} d(x_i, \hat{x}_i)$, i.e.,

$$d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (\hat{x}_i - x_i)^2 \quad (6.2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \|\hat{x}^n - x^n\|^2. \quad (6.3)$$

Lapidoth's coding scheme is as follows [36, Theorem 3].

Definition 14. An (n, M) -code for the mismatched rate-distortion problem consists of

- A set of M codewords $\{\hat{X}^n(i)\}_{i=1}^M$ known by both the encoder and decoder;
- An encoder f which maps the source sequence X^n into the index of the codeword that minimizes the quadratic distortion with respect to the source sequence X^n , i.e.,

$$f(X^n) := \arg \min_{i \in [1:M]} d(X^n, \hat{X}^n(i)). \quad (6.4)$$

- A decoder ϕ which declares the reproduced sequence as the codeword with index $f(X^n)$, i.e.,

$$\phi(f(X^n)) = \hat{X}^n(f(X^n)). \quad (6.5)$$

We consider two following types of codebooks $\{\hat{X}^n(i)\}_{i=1}^M$.

- First, we consider the *spherical codebook* where each codeword \hat{X}^n is generated independently and uniformly over a sphere with radius $\sqrt{n(\sigma^2 - D)}$, i.e.,

$$\hat{X}^n \sim f_{\hat{X}^n}^{\text{sp}}(\hat{x}^n) = \frac{1\{\|\hat{x}^n\|^2 - n(\sigma^2 - D)\}}{S_n(\sqrt{n(\sigma^2 - D)})}, \quad (6.6)$$

where $1\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function, $S_n(r) = n\pi^{n/2}r^{n-1}/\Gamma(\frac{n+2}{2})$ is the surface area of an n -dimensional sphere with radius r , and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function.

- Second, we consider the *i.i.d. Gaussian codebook* where each codeword \hat{X}^n is generated independently from the product Gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^2 - D$, i.e.,

$$\hat{X}^n \sim f_{\hat{X}^n}^{\text{iid}}(\hat{x}^n) = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\|\hat{x}^n\|^2}{2(\sigma^2 - D)}\right)}{(\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma^2 - D)})^n}. \quad (6.7)$$

To evaluate the performance of the above code, we consider the following *ensemble excess-distortion probability* with M codewords:

$$P_{e,n}(M) := \Pr\{d(X^n, \phi(f(X^n))) > D\} \quad (6.8)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{P_X^n} \left[\left(1 - \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D \mid X^n\} \right)^M \right], \quad (6.9)$$

where (6.9) follows from [12, Theorem 9] and the inner probability is calculated either with respect to the right hand side of (6.6) if we use a spherical codebook or the right hand side of (6.7) if we use an i.i.d. Gaussian codebook. Note that the probability in (6.8) is averaged over the source distribution P_X^n as well as the distribution random codebook $\{\hat{X}^n(i)\}_{i=1}^M$. This is in contrast to the rate-distortion problem and its generalizations in previous chapters, where the excess-distortion probability is averaged over the source distribution only. The additional average over the codebook enables one to pose questions concerning ensemble tightness in the spirit of [70, 71], which guarantees the optimality of the analysis of the code performance.

Analogous to (3.4) for the rate-distortion problem, we next define the non-asymptotic fundamental limit. Let $M_{\text{sp}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D)$ be the minimum number of codewords required to compress a length- n source sequence so that the ensemble excess-distortion probability with respect to the distortion level D is no larger than $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ when a spherical codebook is used, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{sp}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D) \\ := \inf\{M : \exists (n, M) \text{ code using a SC s.t. } P_{e,n} \leq \varepsilon\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

where SC is short for spherical codebook. Similarly, let $M_{\text{iid}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D)$ be the corresponding quantity when an i.i.d. Gaussian codebook is used.

Lapidoth [36, Theorem 3] showed that for any ergodic source with finite second moment σ^2 and any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_{\text{sp}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D}. \quad (6.11)$$

As a by-product of the second-order asymptotics presented in Theorem 24 below, for any source satisfying (6.1) and any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_{\text{iid}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D}. \quad (6.12)$$

Thus, asymptotically, both spherical and i.i.d. Gaussian codebooks achieve the same first-order asymptotic performance. When specialized to a GMS with distribution $P_X = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, the asymptotic result was first established by Shannon [2, Page 346].

6.2 Second-Order Asymptotics

Recall the definitions of σ^2 and ζ in (6.1). Let the *mismatched dispersion* be defined as

$$V(\sigma^2, \zeta) := \frac{\zeta - \sigma^4}{4\sigma^4} = \frac{\text{Var}[X^2]}{4(\mathbb{E}[X^2]^2)}. \quad (6.13)$$

The second-order asymptotic result states as follows.

Theorem 24. *Consider an arbitrary memoryless source X satisfying (6.1). For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$ and any $\dagger \in \{\text{sp}, \text{iid}\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \log M_{\dagger}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D) &= \frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \sqrt{nV(\sigma^2, \zeta)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \\ &\quad + O(\log n). \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

Theorem 24 generalizes Lapidath's result [36, Theorem 3] in two aspects. Firstly, Theorem 24 establishes a second-order asymptotic approximation to the finite blocklength performance and thus refines the first-order asymptotic result valid only for infinite blocklength. Secondly, Theorem 24 holds for both spherical and i.i.d. Gaussian codebooks and shows that both codebooks achieve the same first and second-order coding rates. When specialized to the GMS with $P_X = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, $V(\sigma^2, \zeta) = \frac{1}{2}$ and equals the dispersion established in [12, 11]. Thus, the proof of Theorem 24 provides an alternative second-order achievability proof for a GMS.

The proof of Theorem 24 differs significantly from Lapidath's analyses. Lapidath [36, Theorem 3] used a theorem of Wyner [72] concerning packings and coverings of n -spheres to derive the first-order asymptotic result. The proof of Theorem 24 requires finer analyses as demonstrated in Section 6.3. Specifically, the dominant error event is the atypicality of the source sequence regardless which codebook ensemble is used. Intuitively, it is sufficient to use roughly $\exp(\frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D})$ codewords to cover the set of typical source sequences decaying super-exponentially. Theorem 24 then follows by judiciously analyzing the probability of the set of atypical source sequences with appropriate choices of the minimum number of codewords.

Dual to the problem of the mismatched rate-distortion problem considered in this chapter, Lapidath also considered a mismatched channel coding problem [73]. Specifically, Lapidath proposed to use i.i.d. Gaussian or the spherical codebook and nearest neighbor decoding to transmit a message over an additive noise channel where the distribution of the noise is unknown. Lapidath derived the ensemble tight first-order asymptotic result and showed that both codebooks achieve the asymptotic rate of the capacity of an AWGN channel while Scarlett, Tan and Durisi [71] derived the second-order approximation to the finite blocklength performance. In particular, the authors of [71] showed that the spherical codebook achieves larger second-order coding rate, consistent with the analysis for AWGN channels [74, 6].

Analogous to the noisy channel problem considered in Chapter 5, a mismatched version of the noisy channel problem was studied in [75] where the authors proposed a coding scheme based on the unequal error protection idea [15] to transmit a memoryless source with unknown distribution over an additive noise channel with unknown noise distribution and derived ensemble tight second-order asymptotics. We provide some intuition why two codebooks lead to different behavior in the mismatched rate-distortion and channel coding problem. In channel coding, every codeword in the codebook is used to transmit a uniformly distributed message. If some codewords have powers that deviate from a fixed power P , the overall performance will be adversely affected. However, in the rate-distortion problem, to compress each source sequence, we select only the codeword which minimizes the distortion with respect to the source sequence. As a result, even if there are many codewords with power bounded away from $\sigma^2 - D$, the performance is unaffected.

In [36, Section II], Lapidoth also considered another type of mismatch for the rate-distortion problem where the encoder and decoder use different distortion measures. However, no tight characterization of the rate-distortion function was available. Readers could refer to [76, Chapter 4] for detailed discussions.

6.3 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics

6.3.1 Preliminaries for the Spherical Codebook

In this subsection, we present some definitions and preliminary results for the spherical codebook. For simplicity, let $P_c := \sigma^2 - D$. Furthermore, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let

$$V := \text{Var}[X^2] = \zeta - \sigma^4, \quad (6.15)$$

$$a_n := \sqrt{V \frac{\log n}{n}}, \quad (6.16)$$

$$b_n := \sqrt{\frac{V}{n}} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (6.17)$$

where the second equality in (6.15) follows from the definition in (6.1). Note that for any x^n , $\Pr\{d(x^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\}$ depends on x^n only through its norm $\|x^n\|$. For any x^n such that $\frac{1}{n}\|x^n\|^2 = z > 0$, let

$$\Psi(n, z) := \Pr\{d(x^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\} \quad (6.18)$$

$$= \Pr\{\|x^n - \hat{X}^n\|^2 \leq nD\} \quad (6.19)$$

$$= \Pr\{\|x^n\|^2 + \|\hat{X}^n\|^2 - 2\langle x^n, \hat{X}^n \rangle \leq nD\} \quad (6.20)$$

$$= \Pr\{nz + nP_c - 2\langle x^n, \hat{X}^n \rangle \leq nD\} \quad (6.21)$$

$$= \Pr\{2\langle x^n, \hat{X}^n \rangle \geq n(z + P_c - D)\} \quad (6.22)$$

$$= \Pr\left\{\hat{X}_1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}(z + P_c - D)}{2\sqrt{z}}\right\}, \quad (6.23)$$

where \hat{X}_1 is the first element of sequence $\hat{X}^n = (\hat{X}_1, \dots, Y_n)$ and (6.23) follows because \hat{X}^n is spherically symmetric so we may take $x^n = (\sqrt{nz}, 0, \dots, 0)$ (cf. [71]).

Let $Z := \frac{1}{n} \|X^n\|^2$ be the random variable representing the average power of the source X^n . Furthermore, let f_Z be the corresponding probability distribution function (pdf) of Z . Let

$$r_1 := \sqrt{P_c} - \sqrt{D}, \quad (6.24)$$

$$r_2 := \sqrt{P_c} + \sqrt{D}. \quad (6.25)$$

Kostina and Verdú [12, Theorem 37] showed that for any z such that $\sqrt{z} < r_1$ or $\sqrt{z} > r_2$,

$$\Psi(n, z) = 0, \quad (6.26)$$

and otherwise

$$\Psi(n, z) \geq \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+2}{2})}{\sqrt{\pi n} \Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \left(1 - \frac{(z + P_c - D)^2}{4zP_c} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} =: \underline{g}(n, z), \quad (6.27)$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function. Hence, from (6.9) and (6.26), we conclude that the excess-distortion probability for the spherical codebook is

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(M) &= \Pr\{Z < (\max\{0, r_1\})^2\} + \Pr\{Z > r_2^2\} \\ &\quad + \int_{(\max\{0, r_1\})^2}^{r_2^2} (1 - \Psi(n, z))^M f_Z(z) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

6.3.2 Achievability Proof for the Spherical Codebook

Using the definition of $\underline{g}(\cdot)$ in (6.27), we conclude that $\underline{g}(n, z)$ is a decreasing function of z if $z \geq |P_c - D|$. Invoking the definitions of b_n in (6.17), r_1 in (6.24) and r_2 in (6.25), we conclude that $r_1^2 \leq |P_c - D|$ and $r_2^2 \geq \sigma^2 + b_n$ for n large enough. Thus, combining (6.27), (6.28) and noting that $\Psi(n, z) \geq 0$, for sufficiently large n , we can upper bound the excess-distortion probability as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(M) &\leq \Pr\{Z < |P_c - D|\} + \Pr\{Z > \sigma^2 + b_n\} \\ &\quad + \int_{|P_c - D|}^{\sigma^2 + b_n} (1 - \underline{g}(n, z))^M f_Z(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (6.29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \Pr\{Z < |P_c - D|\} + \Pr\{Z > \sigma^2 + b_n\} \\ &\quad + \int_{|P_c - D|}^{\sigma^2 + b_n} \exp\{-M \underline{g}(n, z)\} f_Z(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (6.30)$$

$$\leq \Pr\{Z < |P_c - D|\} + \Pr\{Z > \sigma^2 + b_n\} + \exp\{-M \underline{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)\}, \quad (6.31)$$

where (6.30) follows since $(1-a)^M \leq \exp\{-Ma\}$ for any $a \in [0, 1]$, and (6.31) follows since $g(n, z)$ is decreasing in z for $z \geq |P_c - D|$. Let the third central moment of X^2 be defined as

$$T := \mathbb{E}[|X^2 - \sigma^2|^3]. \quad (6.32)$$

Using the definitions of V in (6.15), T in (6.32) and the Berry-Esseen theorem (cf. Theorem 3), we conclude that

$$\Pr\{Z < |P_c - D|\} = \Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 < |\sigma^2 - 2D|\right\} \quad (6.33)$$

$$\leq \frac{6T}{\sqrt{n} V^{3/2}} + Q\left((\sigma^2 - |\sigma^2 - 2D|) \sqrt{\frac{n}{V}}\right) \quad (6.34)$$

$$\leq \frac{6T}{\sqrt{n} V^{3/2}} + \exp\left\{-\frac{2n(\sigma^2 - |\sigma^2 - 2D|)^2}{V}\right\} \quad (6.35)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right), \quad (6.36)$$

where (6.35) follows since $Q(a) \leq \exp\{-\frac{a^2}{2}\}$ while (6.36) follows since T (cf. (6.32)) is finite for sources satisfying (6.1) and $\sigma^2 - |\sigma^2 - 2D| > 0$ due to the fact that $\sigma^2 > D$. Similarly, using the definition of b_n in (6.17) and the Berry-Esseen theorem, we have

$$\Pr\{Z > \sigma^2 + b_n\} = \Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^2 > \sigma^2 + b_n\right\} \quad (6.37)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon + \frac{6T}{\sqrt{n} V^{3/2}} \quad (6.38)$$

$$= \varepsilon + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (6.39)$$

Choose M such that

$$\log M = -\log g(n, \sigma^2 + b_n) + \log\left(\frac{1}{2} \log n\right) \quad (6.40)$$

$$= n\left(\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \frac{b_n}{2\sigma^2} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)\right) \quad (6.41)$$

$$= \frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \sqrt{nV(\sigma^2, \zeta)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n), \quad (6.42)$$

where (6.41) follows from the Taylor expansion of $g(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)$ (cf. (6.27)) and noting that $\Gamma(\frac{n+2}{2})/\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2}) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$, and (6.42) follows from the definition of b_n (cf. (6.17)) and $V(\sigma^2, D)$ (cf. (6.13)). Thus, with the choice of M in (6.40), we conclude that

$$\exp\{-Mg(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (6.43)$$

Hence, combining (6.31), (6.36), (6.39), (6.42) and (6.43), we have shown that

$$\log M_{\text{sp}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D) \geq \frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \sqrt{nV(\sigma^2, \zeta)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (6.44)$$

6.3.3 Ensemble Converse for the Spherical Codebook

We now show that the result in (6.14) is ensemble tight. From Stam's paper [77, Eq. (4)], the distribution of \hat{X}_1 is

$$f_{\hat{X}_1}(\hat{x}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n P_c}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \left(1 - \frac{\hat{x}^2}{nP_c}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} 1\{\hat{x}^2 \leq nP_c\}. \quad (6.45)$$

Recall the definitions of a_n in (6.16) and b_n in (6.17). Define the sets

$$\mathcal{P} := \{r \in \mathbb{R} : b_n < r - \sigma^2 \leq a_n\}, \quad (6.46)$$

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{r \in \mathbb{R} : r + P_c - D \geq 0\}. \quad (6.47)$$

Then, for any $z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$ satisfying $\frac{\sqrt{n}(z+P_c-D)}{2\sqrt{z}} \leq \sqrt{nP_c}$, using the definition of $\Psi(\cdot)$ in (6.23), we obtain that

$$\Psi(n, z) = \Pr \left\{ \hat{X}_1 \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}(z+P_c-D)}{2\sqrt{z}} \right\} \quad (6.48)$$

$$= \int_{\frac{\sqrt{n}(z+P_c-D)}{2\sqrt{z}}}^{\sqrt{nP_c}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n P_c}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \left(1 - \frac{\hat{x}^2}{nP_c}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} d\hat{x} \quad (6.49)$$

$$\leq \int_{\frac{\sqrt{n}(z+P_c-D)}{2\sqrt{z}}}^{\sqrt{nP_c}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi n P_c}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \left(1 - \frac{(z+P_c-D)^2}{4zP_c}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} d\hat{x} \quad (6.50)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \left(1 - \frac{(z+P_c-D)^2}{4zP_c}\right)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \quad (6.51)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})} \exp \left\{ \frac{n-3}{2} \log \left(1 - \frac{(z+P_c-D)^2}{4zP_c}\right) \right\} \quad (6.52)$$

$$=: \bar{g}(n, z), \quad (6.53)$$

where (6.49) follows from the definition in (6.45) and the condition that $z \in \mathcal{Q}$ (cf. (6.47)) which implies $\frac{\sqrt{n}(z+P_c-D)}{2\sqrt{z}} \geq 0 > -\sqrt{nP_c}$, (6.50) follows since $(1 - \frac{\hat{x}^2}{nP_c})$ is decreasing in y for positive y , and (6.51) follows by enlarging the integration region (recall that $\frac{\sqrt{n}(z+P_c-D)}{2\sqrt{z}} \geq 0$). Note that $\bar{g}(n, z)$ is decreasing in z for $z \geq |P_c - D|$ and $\bar{g}(n, z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{P}$. Hence, for any $z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\frac{\sqrt{n}(z+P_c-D)}{2\sqrt{z}} > \sqrt{nP_c}$, we still have $\bar{g}(n, z) \geq \Psi(n, z)$.

Recall that $Z = \frac{1}{n} \|X^n\|^2$ and f_Z is the corresponding pdf of Z . Thus,

according to (6.9), for n sufficiently large, we have

$$P_{e,n}(M) = \mathbb{E}_{X^n}[(1 - \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D | X^n\})^M] \quad (6.54)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty (1 - \Psi(n, z))^M f_Z(z) dz \quad (6.55)$$

$$\geq \int_0^\infty (1 - \bar{g}(n, z))^M 1\{z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}\} f_Z(z) dz \quad (6.56)$$

$$\geq \int_{z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}} (1 - \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n))^M f_Z(z) dz \quad (6.57)$$

$$\geq \int_{z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}} \exp\left\{-M \frac{\bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)}{1 - \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)}\right\} f_Z(z) dz \quad (6.58)$$

$$\geq \int_{z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}} \exp\left\{-M \frac{\bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)}{1 - \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)}\right\} \times 1\left\{M \frac{\bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)}{1 - \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} f_Z(z) dz \quad (6.59)$$

$$\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \int_{z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}} 1\left\{M \frac{\bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)}{1 - \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \times f_Z(z) dz \quad (6.60)$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \times \Pr\left\{Z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}, M \leq \frac{1 - \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)}{\bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \quad (6.61)$$

$$\geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \Pr\left\{Z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}, \log M \leq -\log 2 - \log \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n) - \frac{1}{2} \log n\right\}, \quad (6.62)$$

where (6.55) follows from the definition of $\Psi(n, z)$ in (6.23), (6.56) follows by restricting $z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$ and using the definition of $\bar{g}(\cdot)$ in (6.53), (6.57) follows since $\bar{g}(n, z)$ is decreasing in z for $z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$, (6.58) follows since $(1 - a)^M \geq \exp\{-M \frac{a}{1-a}\}$ for any $a \in [0, 1)$, (6.60) follows since $M \frac{\bar{g}(n, z)}{1 - \bar{g}(n, z)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, $\exp\{-a\}$ is decreasing in a , and $\exp\{-a\} \geq 1 - a$ for $a \geq 0$, and (6.62) follows since $\bar{g}(n, z) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for n large enough if $z > \sigma^2$.

Combining (6.53), (6.62) and applying a Taylor expansion of $\bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)$ similarly to (6.41), we conclude that for any (n, M) -code such that

$$\log M \leq -\log 2 - \frac{1}{2} \log n - \log \bar{g}(n, \sigma^2 + b_n) \quad (6.63)$$

$$= n \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \frac{b_n}{2\sigma^2} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \right), \quad (6.64)$$

we have

$$P_{e,n}(M) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \Pr\{Z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}\}. \quad (6.65)$$

The following lemma is essential to complete the converse proof.

Lemma 5. *Consider any source distribution P_X such that (6.1) is satisfied and $\sigma^2 < \infty$. Then, we have*

$$\Pr\{Z \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}\} \geq \varepsilon + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (6.66)$$

The proof of Lemma 5 is available in [16, Appendix A] using the Berry-Esseen theorem.

Combining the definition of $V(\sigma^2, \zeta)$ in (6.13), the definition of b_n in (6.17), the bounds in (6.64), (6.65), and Lemma 5, we conclude that

$$\log M_{\text{sp}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D) \leq \frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \sqrt{nV(\sigma^2, \zeta)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (6.67)$$

6.3.4 Preliminaries for the i.i.d. Gaussian Codebook

Now we consider the i.i.d. Gaussian codebook (cf. (6.7)). Note that $\Pr\{d(x^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\}$ depends on x^n only through its norm $\|x^n\|$ (cf. [78]). Given any x^n such that $\frac{1}{n}\|x^n\|^2 = z$, define

$$\Upsilon(n, z) := \Pr\{d(x^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D\}. \quad (6.68)$$

From (6.7), we obtain that

$$f_{\hat{X}^n}^{\text{iid}}(\hat{X}^n) = \frac{1}{(2\pi(\sigma^2 - D))^{n/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\|\hat{X}^n\|^2}{2(\sigma^2 - D)}\right\}. \quad (6.69)$$

Since $f_{\hat{X}^n}^{\text{iid}}(\hat{X}^n)$ is decreasing in $\|\hat{X}^n\|$, we conclude that $\Upsilon(n, z)$ is a decreasing function of z (cf. [78]). Using the definition of $\Upsilon(\cdot)$ in (6.68), we have

$$\Upsilon(n, z) = \Pr\{\|x^n - \hat{X}^n\|^2 \leq nD\} \quad (6.70)$$

$$= \Pr\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \sqrt{z})^2 \leq nD\right\} \quad (6.71)$$

$$= \Pr\left\{-\frac{1}{nP_c} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \sqrt{z})^2 \geq -\frac{D}{P_c}\right\}. \quad (6.72)$$

where (6.71) follows since the probability depends on x^n only through its power and thus we can choose x^n such that $x_i = \sqrt{z}$ for all $i \in [1 : n]$ (cf. [71, Eq. (94)]). For the i.i.d. Gaussian codebook, each $Y_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, P_c)$ and hence $\frac{1}{P_c}(Y_i - \sqrt{z})^2$ is distributed according to a non-central χ^2 distribution with one degree of freedom.

Given $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and any non-negative number z , define

$$\kappa(s, z) := \frac{(P_c(1 + 2s) + 2z)^2}{P_c(1 + 2s)^3}, \quad (6.73)$$

$$R_{\text{iid}}(s, z) := \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + 2s) + \frac{sz}{(1 + 2s)(\sigma^2 - D)} - \frac{sD}{\sigma^2 - D}, \quad (6.74)$$

$$s^*(z) := \max\left\{0, \frac{\sigma^2 - 3D + \sqrt{(\sigma^2 - D)^2 + 4zD}}{4D}\right\}. \quad (6.75)$$

Using the result of [79, Section 2.2.12] concerning the cumulant generating function of a non-central χ^2 distribution, the definition of $R_{\text{iid}}(\cdot)$ in (6.74), the definition of $s^*(\cdot)$ in (6.75), and the Bahadur-Ranga Rao (strong large deviations) theorem for non-lattice random variables [54, Theorem 3.7.4], we obtain

$$\Upsilon(n, z) \sim \frac{\exp\{-nR_{\text{iid}}(s^*(z), z)\}}{s^*(z)\sqrt{\kappa(s^*(z), z)2\pi n}}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.76)$$

6.3.5 Achievability Proof for the I.I.D. Gaussian Codebook

According to (6.9), the excess-distortion probability under the i.i.d. Gaussian codebook can be upper bounded as follows:

$$P_{e,n}(M) = \mathbb{E} \left[(1 - \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D \mid X^n\})^M \right] \quad (6.77)$$

$$= \int_0^\infty (1 - \Upsilon(n, z))^M f_Z(z) dz \quad (6.78)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_0^{\sigma^2 - a_n} f_Z(z) dz + \int_{\sigma^2 + b_n}^\infty f_Z(z) dz \\ &\quad + \int_{\sigma^2 - a_n}^{\sigma^2 + b_n} (1 - \Upsilon(n, z))^M f_Z(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (6.79)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \Pr\{Z < \sigma^2 - a_n\} + \Pr\{Z > \sigma^2 + b_n\} \\ &\quad + \int_{\sigma^2 - a_n}^{\sigma^2 + b_n} \exp\{-M\Upsilon(n, z)\} f_Z(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (6.80)$$

$$\leq \Pr\{Z < \sigma^2 - a_n\} + \Pr\{Z > \sigma^2 + b_n\} + \exp\{-M\Upsilon(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)\}, \quad (6.81)$$

where (6.79) follows since $\Upsilon(n, z) \geq 0$, (6.80) follows since $(1-a)^M \leq \exp\{-Ma\}$, and (6.81) follows since $\Upsilon(n, z)$ is decreasing in z and $\Pr\{\sigma^2 - a_n \leq Z \leq \sigma^2 + b_n\} \leq 1$.

Using the definitions of $R_{\text{iid}}(\cdot)$ in (6.74) and $s^*(\cdot)$ in (6.75), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{iid}}(s^*(\sigma^2 + b_n), \sigma^2 + b_n) &= \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{P_c + \sqrt{P_c^2 + 4(\sigma^2 + b_n)D}}{2D} \\ &\quad + \frac{z(P_c - 2D + \sqrt{P_c^2 + 4(\sigma^2 + b_n)D})}{2P_c(P_c + \sqrt{P_c^2 + 4(\sigma^2 + b_n)D})} \\ &\quad - \frac{P_c - 2D + \sqrt{P_c^2 + 4(\sigma^2 + b_n)D}}{4P_c} \end{aligned} \quad (6.82)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \frac{b_n}{2\sigma^2} + O(b_n^2) \quad (6.83)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \sqrt{\frac{V(\sigma^2, \zeta)}{n}} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \quad (6.84)$$

where (6.83) follows from a Taylor expansion at $z = \sigma^2$ and recalling that $P_c = \sigma^2 - D$, and (6.84) follows from the definitions of $V(\sigma^2, \zeta)$ in (6.13) and b_n in (6.17).

Choose M such that

$$\log M \geq -\log \Upsilon(n, \sigma^2 + b_n) + \log \left(\frac{1}{2} \log n \right). \quad (6.85)$$

Then, we have

$$\exp\{-M\Upsilon(n, \sigma^2 + b_n)\} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (6.86)$$

Furthermore, using the result in (6.76) and (6.84), we obtain

$$\log M \geq \frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{d} + \sqrt{nV(\sigma^2, \zeta)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (6.87)$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 5, using the Berry-Esseen theorem and the definition of a_n in (6.16), we obtain

$$\Pr\{Z < \sigma^2 - a_n\} = \Pr\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^2 - \sigma^2) < \sqrt{V \frac{\log n}{n}}\right\} \quad (6.88)$$

$$\leq Q(\sqrt{\log n}) + \frac{6T}{\sqrt{n} V^{3/2}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (6.89)$$

Hence, combining (6.39), (6.81), (6.86), (6.87) and (6.89), we conclude that

$$\log M_{\text{iid}}^*(n, \varepsilon, \sigma^2, D) \geq \frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D} + \sqrt{nV(\sigma^2, \zeta)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n). \quad (6.90)$$

6.3.6 Ensemble Converse for the i.i.d. Gaussian Codebook

The ensemble converse proof for the i.i.d. Gaussian codebook is omitted since it is similar to the ensemble converse proof for the spherical codebook in Section 6.3.3 starting from (6.54) except for the following two points: i) replace $\bar{g}(n, z)$ with $\Upsilon(n, z)$, and ii) replace $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$ with \mathcal{P} .

Chapter 7

The Gauss-Markov Source

This chapter concerns lossy data compression of the Gauss-Markov source, which is a Gaussian source with first-order Markovian memory [80]. This chapter generalizes the rate-distortion study for memoryless sources pioneered by Shannon [2] to the sources with memory. Such analyses find practical applications in image and video applications since the pixels and frames are usually correlated. The Gauss-Markov source is a special case of the Gaussian autoregressive source [81, 82].

In contrast to memoryless sources, the Shannon theoretical study for sources with memory are very limited. Kolmogorov [81] initiated the study by deriving the rate-distortion function for a stationary Gaussian autoregressive source under the quadratic distortion measure by using an orthogonal coordinate transformation (see also [80]) that decomposes the autoregressive source into memoryless sources. Berger generalized the result in [81] to the Wiener process, which is a non-stationary case of the Gaussian autoregressive source. Gray [82] generalized the result in [81] to general non-stationary Gaussian autoregressive processes and first-order binary symmetric Markov sources (BSMS). Subsequently, Gray [83] generalized his result for BSMS in [82] to finite-state finite-alphabet Markov sources. A critical result of Gray states that for distortions less than a certain value, the achievable rate for Markov sources is identical to the rate-distortion function for memoryless sources that generate the autoregressive sources. For further discussions on rate-distortion theory of sources with memory, readers could refer to [84, Section IX] or [10, Section II.D] for more details.

All the above results are insightful. However, all tight results are asymptotic and only provide exact guidance when one compresses an infinitely long source sequence. It is natural to wonder what is the penalty in the practical finite blocklength regime. To date, the only known such result is the second-order asymptotics for a Gauss-Markov source by Tian and Kostina, who considered both stationary [17] and nonstationary cases [85]. In this chapter, we present the results in [17, 85] with proof sketches.

7.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

The problem formulation is exactly the same to the rate-distortion problem in Chapter 3 except that we consider a Gauss-Markov source to be specified. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be a non-negative real number and let $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ be the Gaussian distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . The Gauss-Markov source $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the following equation

$$X_i = aX_{i-1} + Z_i, \quad \forall i \geq 1, \quad (7.1)$$

where $X_0 = 0$ and $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a GMS generated i.i.d. from $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Note that when $a = 0$, the random process $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ reduces to a Gaussian memoryless source. The Gauss-Markov source is $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ stationary when $a \in (0, 1)$ and becomes nonstationary when $a \geq 1$. The special case of $a = 1$ is also known as the Wiener process [86]. Let P_{X^n} denote the distribution of the Gauss-Markov source with length- n .

Recall from Definition 7 that an (n, M) -code consists of an encoder $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [M]$ and a decoder $\phi : [M] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that compresses a length- n source sequence X^n into a index over $[M]$ and reproduces it as \hat{X}^n from the compressed index, respectively. Furthermore, let $P_{e,n}(D)$ be the excess-distortion probability when compressing a length- n source sequence under the quadratic distortion measure, i.e.,

$$P_{e,n}(D) = \Pr\{\|\hat{X}^n - X^n\|_2^2 > D\}. \quad (7.2)$$

For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and target distortion level $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$, recall that $M^*(n, D, \varepsilon | a, \sigma^2)$ (3.4) is the non-asymptotic fundamental limit of the rate-distortion problem and corresponds to the minimal number of codewords M such that one can construct an (n, M) -code with excess-distortion probability satisfying $P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon$.

Gray [82, Section II] characterized the first-order asymptotic coding rate $R^*(D | a, \sigma^2) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon | a, \sigma^2)$ for the Gaussian autoregressive source that includes the Gauss-Markov source as a special case. To present Gray's result when specialized to the Gauss-Markov source, we need the following definitions. Define the function $h : [-\pi, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$h(w | a, \sigma^2) := \frac{\sigma^2}{1 + a^2 - 2a \cos w}. \quad (7.3)$$

Let θ_D be the solution of θ to the following equality

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \min\{\theta, h(w | a, \sigma^2)\} dw = D. \quad (7.4)$$

We can then define the following rate-distortion function $R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)$ for the Gauss-Markov source:

$$R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{h(w | a, \sigma^2)}{\theta_D} \right|^+ dw. \quad (7.5)$$

Eq. (7.4) is named reverse water filling since one needs to find a water level θ_D to satisfy the distortion constraint D .

With these definitions, the first-order asymptotic rate $R^*(D|a, \sigma^2)$ is characterized in the following theorem.

Theorem 25. *For the Gauss-Markov source, it follows that*

$$R^*(D|a, \sigma^2) = R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D). \quad (7.6)$$

When $a = 0$, we have $h(w|a, \sigma^2) = \sigma^2$ and $R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) = R_{\text{G}}(\sigma^2, D) = |\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\sigma^2}{D}|^+$ is the rate-distortion function for the GMS with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ under the quadratic distortion measure [2]. Furthermore, Gray [82, Eq. (24)] showed that for any $a \geq 0$,

$$R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) \geq R_{\text{G}}(\sigma^2, D) \quad (7.7)$$

with equality if and only if $D \in [0, D_c]$ where the critical distortion level,

$$D_c = \min_{w \in [-\pi, \pi]} h(w|a, \sigma^2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{1 + a^2}. \quad (7.8)$$

Thus, at low distortion levels, the rate-distortion function of the Gauss-Markov source equals that of the GMS.

7.2 Second-Order Asymptotics

Recall the definition of $h(w|a, \sigma^2)$ in (7.3) and the definition of θ_D as the reverse waterfilling level in (7.4). Define the following dispersion function

$$V_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) := \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \min \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{h(w|a, \sigma^2)}{\theta_D} \right)^2 \right\} dw. \quad (7.9)$$

Furthermore, let

$$D_{\max} := \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2}{1-a^2} & \text{if } a < 1, \\ \frac{\sigma^2}{a^2-1} & \text{if } a > 1. \end{cases} \quad (7.10)$$

Tian and Kostina [17, 85] proved the following result.

Theorem 26. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any $D \in (0, D_{\max})$,*

$$\log M^*(n, D, \varepsilon|a, \sigma^2) = nR_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) + \sqrt{nV_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) + o(\sqrt{n}). \quad (7.11)$$

Note that the non-stationary case of $a = 1$ for the Wiener process is not addressed by Tian and Kostina due to a technical challenge pointed out in [85, Footnote 1]. The proofs of the stationary case when $a \in (0, 1)$ and the non-stationary case are available in [17] and [85], respectively. Generally speaking, in

both cases, the proof follows from generalizations of the non-asymptotic bounds for the rate-distortion problem in Chapter 3 with proper modifications. In the achievability part, a generalization of the lossy AEP in Lemma 2 to the Gauss-Markov source is critical and in both directions, a decomposition of the Gauss-Markov source into independent source is vital. In the next section, we provide a proof sketch for the stationary case.

Theorem 26 refined the classical first-order asymptotic result of Gray [82] for the Gauss-Markov source by deriving the exact order and coefficient of the second-order coding rate. The dispersion function $V_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)$ follows from the same reverse waterfilling solution as the rate-distortion function $R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)$. Tian and Kostina showed that the dispersion term $V_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)$ relates to the dispersion function $V_{\text{G}}(\sigma^2, D) = \frac{1}{2}$ for the GMS $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ [12, 11], analogously to how the rate-distortion function of both cases are related [82, Eq. (24)]. Specifically, it holds that

$$V_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) \leq V_{\text{G}}(\sigma^2, D), \quad (7.12)$$

with equality if and only if $D \in (0, D_c)$, where D_c is the critical distortion level defined in (7.8). Therefore, Theorem 26, combined with [82, Eq. (24)], shows that at low distortion levels $D \in (0, D_c)$, the second-order coding rate of the Gauss-Markov source in (7.1) equals that of the GMS $Z^n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. On the other hand, if $D \in (D_c, D_{\max})$, the first order coding rate $R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)$ is greater than the rate-distortion function $R_{\text{G}}(P_X, D)$ of the GMS but the second-order coding rate $V_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)$ is smaller than $V_{\text{G}}(P_X, D)$. This implies that the memory of the source makes it first-order asymptotically more difficult to compress the Gauss-Markov source but ensures a smaller gap between the non-asymptotic rate and the first-order asymptotic coding rate when $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.5)$.

It would be of interest to consider a mismatched version of the Gauss-Markov source where the innovation process $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ might not be Gaussian, as in Chapter 6. A critical question is then whether one could propose a coding scheme ignorant of the distribution of $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the parameter a to achieve universally good performance. The second-order asymptotic analysis for such a case would be interesting. A even more practical setting would be to incorporate the above mismatched scenario with the noisy source setting in Chapter 4 to consider the case where the source sequence is also corrupted by some additional noise with unknown distribution.

7.3 Proof Sketch

We only present the proof sketch for the stationary case [17] when $a \in (0, 1)$. For the nonstationary case of $a > 1$, readers can refer to [85] for details.

7.3.1 Decorrelation of the Gauss-Markov source

As pointed at the beginning of [84, Section IX], given the knowledge of how to compress a memoryless source, a direct approach to compress a source with memory is to transform the source with memory into several independent memoryless sources. An explicit approach of this kind was given by Davisson [80, Eq. (15)] for correlated stationary Gaussian sources. In this section, we present the application of the transformation to the Gauss-Markov source [17, Section III.A] and decompose it into independent Gaussian sources.

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathbf{A} be the $n \times n$ lower triangular matrix such that for each $(i, j) \in [n]^2$,

$$A_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j, \\ -a & \text{if } j = i - 1, i \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7.13)$$

A pictorial illustration of the matrix \mathbf{A} is

$$\mathbf{A} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -a & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & -a & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -a & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.14)$$

Let \mathbf{X} denote the column vector of $X^n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ of the Gaussian-Markov source X^n in (7.1) and let \mathbf{Z} denote the column vector of $Z^n = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$, where Z^n is the GMS with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. It follows that $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}$ and the covariance matrix $\Sigma_{\mathbf{X}}$ satisfies

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T\mathbf{A}] = \sigma^2(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A})^{-1}. \quad (7.15)$$

Let \mathbf{V} be the unitary matrix corresponding to the eigendecomposition of $(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A})^{-1}$, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A})^{-1} = \mathbf{V}\Lambda\mathbf{V}^T, \quad (7.16)$$

where $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\mu_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{\mu_n})$ is the diagonal matrix where μ_1, \dots, μ_n are the eigen values of $(\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A})^{-1}$.

Define the vector \mathbf{S} such that

$$\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{V}^T\mathbf{X}. \quad (7.17)$$

It follows that $\mathbf{S} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_n, \sigma^2\Lambda)$, i.e., (S_1, \dots, S_n) are independent Gaussian random variables with zero mean and different variances $(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_n^2)$ where $\sigma_i^2 := \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu_i}$ for each $i \in [n]$. This way, the Gauss-Markov source \mathbf{X} is decomposed into independent random variables \mathbf{S} with the product Gaussian distribution $P_{\mathbf{S}} = \prod_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu_i})$, which eases the analysis of second-order asymptotics.

7.3.2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present necessary definitions and preliminary results used to prove Theorem 26. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the following n -th order multi-letter rate-distortion function

$$R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{X}}, D, n) := \min_{P_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}|\mathbf{X}}: \mathbb{E}[d(\mathbf{X}, \hat{\mathbf{X}})] \leq D} I(P_{\mathbf{X}}, P_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}|\mathbf{X}}), \quad (7.18)$$

where $P_{\mathbf{X}}$ is the distribution of the Gauss-Markov source X^n up to time n and $P_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}|\mathbf{X}}$ is induced by $P_{\mathbf{X}}$ and the test channel $P_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}|\mathbf{X}}$. It was shown by Gray [82] that the rate-distortion function $R_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)$ in (7.5) is the limit value of $R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{X}}, D, n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Analogous to (3.17), for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define the distortion-tilted information density for the Gauss-Markov source as follows:

$$j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{x}|P_{\mathbf{X}}, D) := -\log \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{X}}^*} [\exp(n\lambda^* D - \lambda_n^* d(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\mathbf{X}}))], \quad (7.19)$$

where $\lambda_n^* := -\frac{\partial R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{X}}, D, n)}{\partial D}$ is the negative first derivative of $R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{X}}, D, n)$ with respect to the distortion level D and $P_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}^*$ is induced by the source distribution $P_{\mathbf{X}}$ and the optimal test channel $P_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}|\mathbf{X}}^*$ that achieves $R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{X}}, D, n)$. Similar to Lemma 1, one can show that

$$R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{X}}, D, n) = \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{X}}} [j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{X}|P_{\mathbf{X}}, D)]. \quad (7.20)$$

In the proof of Theorem 26, instead of considering the Gauss-Markov source \mathbf{X} with memory, we use the decomposed independent source \mathbf{S} . It follows from (7.17) that

$$R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{S}}, D, n) = R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{X}}, D, n), \quad (7.21)$$

and for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{b}^n$ and $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{x}$,

$$j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{s}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D) = j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{x}|P_{\mathbf{X}}, D). \quad (7.22)$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let θ_D^n be the solution of θ_n to

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \min\{\theta_n, \sigma_i^2\} = D. \quad (7.23)$$

Since \mathbf{S} is memoryless, for any $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{s}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D) = \sum_{i \in [n]} j(s_i|P_{S_i}, \min\{\theta_D^n, \sigma_i^2\}), \quad (7.24)$$

where $j(\cdot)$ is the distortion-tilted information density defined in (3.17) for the rate-distortion problem and $P_{S_i} = \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2)$ is the induced marginal distribution of the random variable S_i . We need the following alternative distortion-tilted information density that approximates $j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{s}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D)$:

$$j_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{s}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) := \sum_{i \in [n]} j(s_i|P_{S_i}, \min\{\theta_D, \sigma_i^2\}), \quad (7.25)$$

where θ_D is defined as the solution of θ to (7.4), which is independent of n and D_n is defined as

$$D_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \min\{\theta_D, \sigma_i^2\}. \quad (7.26)$$

Let E_i , V_i and T_i be the expectation, the variance and the third absolute moment of the random variable $j(S_i|P_{S_i}, \min\{\theta_D, \sigma_i^2\})$ with respect to P_{S_i} , respectively. It follows from [17, Theorem 4] that there exists constants c_r and c_v such that

$$\left| nR_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) - \sum_{i \in [n]} E_i \right| \leq c_r, \quad (7.27)$$

$$\left| \sqrt{nV_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)} - \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n]} V_i} \right| \leq c_v. \quad (7.28)$$

Define C_{BE} as

$$C_{\text{BE}} := \frac{\frac{6}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} T_i}{(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} V_i^2)^{3/2}}. \quad (7.29)$$

It follows from [17, Appendix A] that for the Gauss-Markov source, C_{BE} is a finite positive constant in the tail probability of the Berry-Esseen theorem.

Finally, let $\tilde{c} \in (0, 1)$ be the constant in [17, Theorem 10] and define the event

$$\mathcal{E} := \left\{ \left| j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D) - j_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) \right| \leq \frac{4C_D}{\tilde{c}\theta_D} \right\}. \quad (7.30)$$

It follows from [17, Theorem 10] that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{E}\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n}. \quad (7.31)$$

7.3.3 Achievability

The achievability proof parallels that of Theorem 15 for the rate-distortion problem. Recall from (3.34) the definition of the distortion ball $\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{s}) = \{\hat{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathbb{R}^n : d(\mathbf{s}, \hat{\mathbf{s}}) \leq D\}$ and recall that \mathbf{S} is the decomposed independent source sequence with distribution $P_{\mathbf{S}}$. Similar to Theorem 13, we have the following result.

Lemma 6. *For any $P_{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists an (n, M) -code such that the excess-distortion probability satisfies*

$$P_{e,n}(D) \leq \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}}[(1 - P_{\mathbf{S}}(\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{S})))^M]. \quad (7.32)$$

Define the following constants

$$\eta_n := \sqrt{\frac{a \log \log n}{n}}. \quad (7.33)$$

The following lemma generalizes the lossy AEP in Lemma 2 for memoryless sources to the Gauss-Markov source.

Lemma 7. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and let $q > 1$, $\beta_1 > 0$, β_2 and κ be constants defined in [17, Lemma 3]. There exists a constant $K > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left\{ -\log(P_{\mathbf{S}}^*)^n(\mathcal{B}_D(S^n)) \leq J_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D) + \beta_1(\log n)^q + \beta_2 \right\} \\ & \geq 1 - \frac{K}{(\log n)^{\kappa\alpha}}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.34)$$

where $P_{\mathbf{S}}^*$ is induced by $P_{\mathbf{S}}$ and the optimal test channel $P_{\mathbf{S}|\mathbf{S}}$ that achieves $R_{\text{GM}}(P_{\mathbf{S}}, D, n)$.

Lemma 7 relates the probability of the distortion ball under $P_{\mathbf{S}}^*$ with the distortion-tilted information density $J_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D)$.

Define the event

$$\mathcal{L} := \left\{ -\log(P_{\mathbf{S}}^*)^n(\mathcal{B}_D(S^n)) \leq J_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) + \beta_1(\log n)^q + \beta_2 + \frac{4C_D}{\tilde{c}\theta_D} \right\}. \quad (7.35)$$

Using Lemma 6, we conclude that there exists an (n, M) -code for the Gauss-Markov source such that

$$\text{Pe},n(D) \leq \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}}[(1 - P_{\mathbf{S}^*}(\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{S})))^M] \quad (7.36)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} \left[\exp(-MP_{\mathbf{S}^*}(\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{S}))) \right] \quad (7.37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} \left[\exp(-MP_{\mathbf{S}^*}(\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{S}))) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{L}) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} \left[\exp(-MP_{\mathbf{S}^*}(\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{S}))) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{L}^c) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (7.38)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} \left[\exp(-MP_{\mathbf{S}^*}(\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{S}))) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{L}) \right] + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{K}{(\log n)^{\kappa\alpha}}, \quad (7.39)$$

where (7.37) follows from the inequality $(1 - x)^M \leq \exp(-Mx)$ and (7.39) follows from (7.31) and Lemma 7, which implies that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{L}^c\} \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{K}{(\log n)^{\kappa\alpha}}. \quad (7.40)$$

We next upper bound the first term in (7.39). Let ε_n be defined as

$$\varepsilon_n := \varepsilon - \frac{C_{\text{BE}+1}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{K}{(\log n)^{\kappa\alpha}}. \quad (7.41)$$

Choose M such that

$$\begin{aligned} \log M &= nR_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D) + \sqrt{nV_{\text{GM}}(a, \sigma^2, D)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n) \\ &\quad + \log\left(\frac{\log n}{2}\right) + \beta_1(\log n)^q + \beta_2 + c_r \\ &\quad + c_v|Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n)| + \frac{4C_D}{\tilde{c}\theta_D}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.42)$$

Define the random variable G_n such that

$$G_n := \log M - j_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) - \beta_1(\log n)^q - \beta_2 - \frac{4C_D}{\tilde{c}\theta_D}. \quad (7.43)$$

Combining (7.27) and (7.28), we conclude that

$$G_n \geq \sum_{i \in [n]} E_i + \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n]} V_i} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n) - j_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) + \log\left(\frac{\log n}{2}\right). \quad (7.44)$$

Define the event \mathcal{G} such that

$$\mathcal{G} := \left\{ G_n < \log\left(\frac{\log n}{2}\right) \right\}. \quad (7.45)$$

Using the Berry-Esseen theorem for independent but not identically distributed random variables in Theorem 4, we have

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{G}\} \leq \Pr\left\{ j_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) > \sum_{i \in [n]} E_i + \sqrt{\sum_{i \in [n]} V_i} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n) \right\} \quad (7.46)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon_n + \frac{C_{\text{BE}}}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (7.47)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} \left[\exp(-MP_{\mathbf{S}^*}(\mathcal{B}_D(\mathbf{S}))) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{L}) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} [\exp(-\exp(G_n))] \end{aligned} \quad (7.48)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} [\exp(-\exp(G_n)) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{G})] + \mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{S}}} [\exp(-\exp(G_n)) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{G}^c)] \quad (7.49)$$

$$\leq \Pr\{\mathcal{G}\} + \frac{1}{n} \Pr\{\mathcal{G}^c\} \quad (7.50)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon_n + \frac{C_{\text{BE}+1}}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (7.51)$$

where (7.48) follows from the definitions of the event \mathcal{L} in (7.35) and G_n in (7.43), (7.50) follows from the definition of the event \mathcal{G} in (7.45) and (7.51) follows from (7.47).

The achievability proof is completed by combining (7.39), (7.41) and (7.51) and applying the Taylor expansion of $Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_n)$ around ε .

7.3.4 Converse

Similar to Theorem 14 for memoryless sources, for the Gauss-Markov source, we conclude that any (n, M) -code satisfies that

$$P_{e,n}(D) \geq \Pr \left\{ j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D) \geq \log M + \log n \right\} - \frac{1}{n}, \quad (7.52)$$

where the probability is calculated with respect to $P_{\mathbf{S}}$ of the decomposed independent source sequence $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The first term in (7.52) can be further lower bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left\{ j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D) \geq \log M + \log n \right\} \\ & \geq \Pr \left\{ j_{\text{GM}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D) \geq \log M + \log n \text{ and } \mathcal{E} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (7.53)$$

$$\geq \Pr \left\{ j_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) \geq \log M + \log n + \frac{4C_D}{\tilde{c}\theta_D} \right\} - \Pr\{\mathcal{E}^c\} \quad (7.54)$$

$$\geq \Pr \left\{ j_{\text{alt}}(\mathbf{S}|P_{\mathbf{S}}, D_n) \geq \log M + \log n + \frac{4C_D}{\tilde{c}\theta_D} \right\} - \frac{1}{n}, \quad (7.55)$$

where (7.54) follows from the definition of \mathcal{E} in (7.30) and (7.55) follows from the result in (7.31).

The rest of the converse proof is omitted since it is similar to the achievability proof from Eq. (7.42) to (7.51) by applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the first term in (7.55).

Chapter 8

Variable Length Compression

This chapter concerns variable length lossy compression, where given each source sequence, a binary string with a variable length is output as the compressed codewords. This problem generalizes the rate-distortion problem in Chapter 3 by allowing a flexible codeword length. The excess-length probability criterion was used in variable length compression [87, 88, 89]. However, as pointed out by Verdú [90], the fundamental limit in such a setting is exactly the same as the fixed-length compression allowing errors. Therefore, the more meaningful fundamental limit for variable length compression is usually the average codeword length of an optimal code subject to a certain excess-distortion (error) probability constraint.

The study of variable length compression focuses on the lossless case and dates back to Shannon. By relating the codeword length reversely proportional to the probability of the source sequence, Shannon [1, Section 10] showed that the average codeword length is bounded by the entropy of the source sequence with a deviation of at most one bit, implying that the asymptotic coding rate per source symbol equals the source entropy with zero error probability. Han [91] initiated the study of variable length compression allowing errors by considering a vanishing error probability. The result of Han was later generalized by Koga and Yamamoto [92], who showed that the asymptotic average codeword length per source symbol of an optimal code is less than the source entropy if a non-vanishing error probability is tolerated, demonstrating the asymptotic advantage of variable length compression allowing errors. The result in [92] was refined by Kostina, Polyanskiy and Verdú [18] who derived the second-order asymptotic approximation and further refined by Sakai, Yavas, Tan [93] who further derived the third order asymptotic approximation. The above studies were also generalized to the case with side information [94, 95].

For lossy compression, Zhang, Yang and Wei [59] studied the deviation of the expected codeword length per source symbol to the rate-distortion func-

tion for discrete memoryless sources, which was later generalized by Yang and Zhang [58] to abstract sources. The results in [59, 58] assumed zero excess-distortion probability and were lossy counterparts to [1]. By tolerating a non-vanishing excess-distortion probability, Kostina, Polyanskiy and Verdú [18, Section III] derived a second-order asymptotic approximation to the average codeword length per source symbol. In particular, it follows from [18, Theorem 9] that the asymptotic coding rate is smaller than the rate-distortion function if the excess-distortion probability is not zero and the deviation of the non-asymptotic coding rate from the asymptotic one is always negative, which implies the great advantage of variable length compression allowing errors in the finite blocklength regime. In this chapter, we present the non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds in [18, Section III] with proof sketches.

8.1 Problem Formulation and Existing Results

Similar to the rate-distortion problem in Chapter 3, let X^n be a memoryless source generated i.i.d. from the distribution P_X defined on the alphabet \mathcal{X} and let $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ be the reproduced alphabet. Recall that $d : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the distortion measure and $d(x^n, \hat{x}^n)$ denotes the symbolwise average distortion between a source sequence $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and its reproduction $\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$. Let $D \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be the target distortion level. In variable length compression, we need to use the set of all binary strings, denoted by $\mathcal{B} := \{0, 1\}^* = \{\emptyset, 0, 1, 00, 01, 10, 11, \dots\}$. For any $b \in \mathcal{B}$, let $l(b)$ be the length of the binary string, e.g., $l(\emptyset) = 0$, $l(00) = 1$, $l(1001) = 4$. For simplicity, we let \mathcal{B}_\emptyset to denote $(\mathcal{B} \setminus \{\emptyset\})$, i.e., the elements of all binary strings except the empty one. Different from other chapters, the logarithm in this chapter is base 2 instead of e to account for the fact that the length of a binary string should be in bits.

With above definitions, a code for variable length lossy compression is defined as follows.

Definition 15. *An (n, L) -code consists of a potentially stochastic pair of encoder $P_{\mathcal{B}|X^n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{X}^n)$ and decoder $P_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}^n|\mathcal{B}} \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}^n|\mathcal{B})$ such that the average codeword length is upper bounded by L , i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{E}[l(f(X^n))] \leq L, \quad (8.1)$$

where the expectation are calculated with respect to the distribution P_{X^n} and the potentially stochastic encoder and decoders.

Note that when \mathcal{B} is replaced by the set $\mathcal{M} := [M]$, Def. 15 reduces to the (n, M) -code in Def. 7 for the rate-distortion problem. To evaluate the performance of an (n, L) -code, we consider the excess-distortion probability with respect to the target distortion level D , i.e.,

$$P_{e,n}(D) = \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D\}. \quad (8.2)$$

The fundamental limit of variable length compression is the achievable minimal average codeword length such that the excess-distortion probability is bounded by a constant $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, i.e.,

$$L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) := \min\{L : \exists \text{ an } (n, L)\text{-code s.t. } P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon\}. \quad (8.3)$$

In practice, encoders and decoders are usually deterministic. To account for this case, let $L_{\text{det}}^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$ denote the fundamental limit when both encoder and decoders are deterministic, i.e., for any $(x^n, b, \hat{x}^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{B} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$, $P_{B|X^n}(b|x^n) = \mathbb{1}(b = f(x^n))$ and $P_{\hat{X}^n|B}(\hat{x}^n|b) = \mathbb{1}(\hat{x}^n = \phi(b))$ for some deterministic functions $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $\phi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$.

Recall the definitions of the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D)$, D_{\min} and D_{\max} in (3.61), (3.62) and (3.7), respectively, i.e.,

$$R(P_X, D) = \inf_{P_{\hat{X}|X} : \mathbb{E}[d(X, \hat{X})] \leq D} I(P_X, P_{X|\hat{X}}), \quad (8.4)$$

$$D_{\min} = \inf\{D \in \mathbb{R}_+ : R(P_X, D) < \infty\}, \quad (8.5)$$

$$D_{\max} = \inf_{\hat{x}} \mathbb{E}[d(X, \hat{x})]. \quad (8.6)$$

Zhang, Yang and Wei [59, Theorems 4 and 5] derived the following result.

Theorem 27. *For any $D \in (D_{\min}, D_{\max})$,*

$$L_{\text{det}}^*(n, D, 0) = nR(P_X, D) + \frac{\log n}{2} + o(\log n). \quad (8.7)$$

Theorem 27 derives an approximation to the non-asymptotic performance of an optimal deterministic code when *zero* excess-distortion probability is tolerated. In the rest of the chapter, we present generalizations of Theorem 27 to stochastic codes and demonstrate the great advantage of tolerating a non-zero excess-distortion probability.

8.2 Properties of Optimal Codes

Different from simple coding scheme in the lossless case where one can order source sequences with decreasing probabilities and assign binary strings in \mathcal{B} with increased length, an optimal code for the lossy case does not have explicit simple descriptions. Instead, we recall the properties of the optimal stochastic codes and discuss the relationship between the fundamental limits of optimal deterministic and stochastic codes in [18, Section III.B].

8.2.1 Zero Excess-Distortion Probability

Let $\mathcal{B}_D(\hat{x}^n) = \{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n : d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D\}$ be the distortion ball for a reproduced source sequence \hat{x}^n . For any two distinct binary strings $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathcal{B}^2$, we say $b_1 < b_2$ if $l(b_1) < l(b_2)$ or if $l(b_1) = l(b_2)$ but b_1 has more number of zeros

till the first one appears, i.e., $\emptyset < 0$, $0 < 1$, $0100 < 1101$. For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $b_i \in \mathcal{B}$ be the i -th largest element of \mathcal{B} , i.e., $b_1 = \emptyset$, $b_4 = 00$.

An optimal (n, L) code with $P_{e,n}(D) = 0$ satisfies

1. the optimal code has deterministic encoder and decoder, i.e., for each $(x^n, b, \hat{x}^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{B} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$, $P_{B|X^n}^*(b|x^n) = \mathbb{1}(b = f^*(x^n))$ and $P_{\hat{X}^n|B}^*(\hat{x}^n|b) = \mathbb{1}(\hat{x}^n = \phi^*(b))$ for some deterministic functions $f^* : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $\phi^* : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$;
2. the output $B = f^*(X^n)$ of the optimal deterministic encoder f^* orders binary strings in \mathcal{B} with probability reversely proportional to lengths, i.e., $P_B^*(b_i) \geq P_B^*(b_j)$ if and only if $i \leq j$, where P_B^* is induced by the source distribution P_{X^n} and the optimal encoder f^* ;
3. Given each $b \in \mathcal{B}$, for all $x^n \in (\mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)} \setminus \bigcup_{\bar{b} \in \mathcal{B}: \bar{b} < b} \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(\bar{b})})$, $f^*(x^n) = b$.

All above three claims can be proved via contradiction since violation of any claim would increase the average codeword length $E[L(X^n)]$ and an optimal code has the smallest average codeword length.

The explicit code construction is challenging to describe. However, the relationship between the codeword length and the probability of the source sequence can be made explicit. Property (iii) implies that for each $b \in \mathcal{B}$, given any $x^n \in \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)}$ is mapped into the binary string b and thus

$$P_B^*(b) = \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)}} P_X^n(x^n). \quad (8.8)$$

Let x_1^n, x_2^n, \dots be the ordering of all possible source sequences with decreasing probabilities. Properties (ii) and (iii) imply that for each $i \in [n]$,

$$l(f^*(x_i^n)) \leq \log i \leq -\log P_X^n(x_i^n). \quad (8.9)$$

In other words, for each x^n ,

$$l(f^*(x^n)) \leq -\log P_X^n(x^n). \quad (8.10)$$

8.2.2 Non-Zero Excess-Distortion Probability

Similarly, if one tolerates a non-zero excess-distortion probability of $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, one can show that an optimal (n, L) -code with positive excess-distortion probability satisfies property (ii) and the following two properties:

1. the optimal decoder $P_{\hat{X}^n|B}^*(\hat{x}^n|b) = \mathbb{1}(\hat{x}^n = \phi^*(b))$ is deterministic via the function ϕ^* and the optimal encoder $P_{B|X^n}^*$ is stochastic such that $P_{B|X^n}^*(b|x^n) = 1 - P_{B|X^n}^*(\emptyset|x^n)$ for all $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}_\emptyset$;

2. there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ such that for each $b \in \mathcal{B}_\emptyset$

$$P_{B|X^n}^*(b|x^n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x^n \in (\mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)} \setminus \bigcup_{\bar{b} \in \mathcal{B}: \bar{b} < b} \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(\bar{b})}) \\ & \text{and } l(b) < \eta, \\ 1 - \alpha & \text{if } x^n \in (\mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)} \setminus \bigcup_{\bar{b} \in \mathcal{B}: \bar{b} < b} \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(\bar{b})}) \\ & \text{and } l(b) = \eta, \end{cases} \quad (8.11)$$

$$P_{B|X^n}^*(\emptyset|x^n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x^n \notin \bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)}, \\ \alpha & \text{if } x^n \in \bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)} \text{ and } l(b) = \eta. \end{cases} \quad (8.12)$$

and

$$\Pr \left\{ X^n \notin \bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{B}: b < \eta} \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)} \right\} + \alpha \Pr \{ l(f^*(X^n)) = \eta \} = \varepsilon. \quad (8.13)$$

Note that (8.12) implies that for any x^n that incurs an excess-distortion event with respect to the distortion level D , the encoder maps x^n into \emptyset and incurs no penalty to the average codeword length. Furthermore, (8.13) states that the excess-distortion probability of the above code is exactly ε as desired. From the above code construction, we find that when a non-zero excess-distortion probability is allowed, the optimal code is no longer deterministic since the optimal encoder is stochastic.

8.2.3 Deterministic and Stochastic Codes

Since both optimal encoders and decoders are deterministic when $\varepsilon = 0$ as shown in Section 8.2.1, it follows that

$$L^*(n, D, 0) = L_{\text{det}}^*(n, D, 0). \quad (8.14)$$

Thus, Theorem 27 also holds for optimal stochastic codes. In other words, under the zero excess-distortion probability criterion, the randomization of encoders or decoders does not improve the performance.

When $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ is strictly non-zero, it follows from Section 8.2.2 (cf. [18, Eq. (98)-(99)]) that

$$L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) \leq L_{\text{det}}^*(n, D, \varepsilon) \leq L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) + 1. \quad (8.15)$$

Note that in the upper bound in [18, Eq. (99)] has the constant of $\phi(\min\{\varepsilon, 1/e\})$ instead of 1, where $\phi(x) := -x \log x$. We believe it is easier to present the bound in the simpler form since $\max_{x \in [0, 1]} \phi(x) \leq \frac{\log e}{e} \approx 0.531 < 1$,

The lower bound in (8.15) follows since any deterministic code is a special case of a stochastic code and thus the minimal average codeword length of an optimal stochastic code is no larger than the average codeword length of an optimal deterministic code. The upper bound in (8.15) is justified by analyzing the stochastic nature of the optimal encoder in (8.11) and (8.12). Note that the randomization of the encoder $P_{B|X^n}^*$ occurs if and only if $x^n \in \bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{B}_{\phi^*(b)}$ and $l(b) = \eta$. Specifically, the randomization is applied to one

source sequence. To clarify, let $\mathcal{D} := \{x^n : l(f^*(x^n)) = \eta\}$, let $m := |\mathcal{D}|$ and let x_1^n, \dots, x_m^n be the order of elements in \mathcal{D} with decreasing order of probabilities, i.e., $P_X^n(x_i^n) \geq P_X^n(x_j^n)$ if $i \leq j$. Furthermore, let $i^* \in [m]$ be the smallest value such that the sum probabilities of elements $\{x_i^n\}_{i > i^*}$ is no greater than α , i.e.,

$$i^* := \arg \min_{i \in [m]} \sum_{i \in [m]: i > i^*} P_X^n(x^n) \leq \alpha. \quad (8.16)$$

Using the optimal deterministic encoder f^* for the case of $\varepsilon = 0$, the optimal encoder $P_{B|X^n}^*$ can be described as follows: for any $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$,

1. if $l(f^*(x^n)) < \eta$ or $l(f^*(x^n)) = \eta$, $P_X^n(x^n) > P_X^n(x_{i^*}^n)$, and $P_{B|X^n}^*(b|x^n) = \mathbb{1}(b = f^*(x^n))$;
2. if $l(f^*(x^n)) > \eta$ or $l(f^*(x^n)) = \eta$, $P_X^n(x^n) < P_X^n(x_{i^*}^n)$, and $P_{B|X^n}^*(b|x^n) = \mathbb{1}(b = \emptyset)$;
3. if $x^n = x_{i^*}^n$,

$$P_{B|X^n}^*(b|x^n) = \beta \mathbb{1}(b = f^*(x^n)) + (1 - \beta) \mathbb{1}(b = \emptyset), \quad (8.17)$$

where $\beta \in [0, 1]$ satisfies

$$\beta P_X^n(x_{i^*}^n) + \sum_{i \in [m]: i > i^*} P_X^n(x^n) = \alpha. \quad (8.18)$$

Thus, we can construct a deterministic code by mapping $x_{i^*}^n$ to $f^*(x_{i^*}^n)$. This way, the excess-distortion probability of the deterministic code is upper bounded by ε and the average codeword length is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) + (1 - \beta) P_X^n(x_{i^*}^n) l(f^*(x_{i^*}^n)) \\ \leq L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) - P_X^n(x_{i^*}^n) \log P_X^n(x_{i^*}^n) \end{aligned} \quad (8.19)$$

$$\leq L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) + 1, \quad (8.20)$$

where (8.19) follows from the result in (8.10) and (8.20) follows since $\max_{x \in [0, 1]} \phi(x) \leq 1$.

Therefore, with the relationship in (8.15), it suffices to derive bounds for $L^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$ to fully understand the fundamental limit of variable length lossy compression.

8.3 Non-Asymptotic Bounds

We need the following definitions. Given any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$, let

$$R_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon) := \min_{P_{\hat{X}^n|X^n}: \Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n)\} > D} I(P_X^n, P_{X^n|\hat{X}^n}). \quad (8.21)$$

When $n = 1$, $R_1(P_X, D, \varepsilon)$ is analogous to the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D)$ with the only exception that the constraint on the average distortion is replaced by a constraint on the excess-distortion probability.

For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, given any real valued random variable Y , define the ε -cutoff random variable $\langle Y \rangle_\varepsilon$ such that $\Pr\{\langle Y \rangle_\varepsilon > \eta\} = 0$,

$$\Pr\{\langle Y \rangle_\varepsilon = Y\} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Y < \eta, \\ 1 - \alpha & \text{if } Y = \eta, \end{cases} \quad (8.22)$$

$$\Pr\{\langle Y \rangle_\varepsilon = 0\} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } Y > \eta, \\ \alpha & \text{if } Y = \eta, \end{cases} \quad (8.23)$$

where $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ are chosen such that

$$\Pr\{Y > \eta\} + \alpha \Pr\{Y = \eta\} = \varepsilon. \quad (8.24)$$

Recall that $\mathcal{B}_D(x^n) = \{\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n : d(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D\}$ is the distortion ball around x^n . The following cutoff random variable for the probabilities of the distortion ball around the source sequence X^n is critical:

$$\bar{R}_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon) := \min_{P_{\hat{X}^n}} \mathbb{E}_{P_X^n} \left[\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon \right]. \quad (8.25)$$

With above definitions, Kostina *et al.* [18, Theorem 7] proved the following result.

Theorem 28. *For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,*

$$R_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon) - \log(R_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon) + 1) - \log e \leq L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) \quad (8.26)$$

$$\leq \bar{R}_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon). \quad (8.27)$$

Proof. The converse bound in (8.26) follows from the same argument as in the lossless case and uses a critical results that lower bound the expected codeword length of variable lossless compression with zero error in [96, 97]. Specifically, consider any code with output string $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $P_{e,n}(D) \leq \varepsilon$. Note that $X^n - B - \hat{X}^n$ forms a Markov chain and $\Pr\{d(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D\} \leq \varepsilon$. Thus,

$$H(B) \geq I(X^n; B) \quad (8.28)$$

$$\geq I(X^n; \hat{X}^n) \quad (8.29)$$

$$\geq R_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon), \quad (8.30)$$

where (8.20) follows since $X^n - B - \hat{X}^n$ is a Markov chain and (8.30) follows from the definition of $R_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon)$. Furthermore, it follows from [96, 97] that

$$\mathbb{E}[l(B)] \geq H(B) - \log(H(B) + 1) - \log e. \quad (8.31)$$

The proof of (8.26) is completed by combining (8.30) and (8.31).

The achievability bound in (8.27) is derived as follows. Let $P_{\hat{X}^n}$ be arbitrary and let $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{x}_1^n, \hat{x}_2^n, \dots)$ be a sequence of reproduced codewords generated

independently from $P_{\hat{X}^n}$. Consider a code with encoder f and decoder ϕ that operates as follows. Given any source sequence X^n , the encoder f maps it into the binary string b_W where

$$W := \begin{cases} \min\{i \in [\mathbb{N}] : d(X^n, \hat{x}_i^n) \leq D\} & \text{if } \langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon > 0, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8.32)$$

Upon receiving b_W , the decoder outputs \hat{x}_W^n as the reproduced source sequence.

Using the random coding idea, by averaging over distributions of the source sequence X^n and random codewords $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^n = (\hat{X}_1^n, \hat{X}_2^n, \dots)$, the average codeword length of the code satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[l(f(X^n))] = \mathbb{E}[\lceil \log W \rceil] \quad (8.33)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\log W \mathbb{1}(\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon > 0) \right] \quad (8.34)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\log W | X^n] \mathbb{1}(\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon > 0) \right] \quad (8.35)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\log \mathbb{E}[W | X^n] \mathbb{1}(\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon > 0) \right] \quad (8.36)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon \right], \quad (8.37)$$

where (8.36) follows by applying the Jensen's inequality to the concave function $\log x$ and (8.37) follows from the definition of the ε -cutoff random variable and the fact that if $\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon > 0$ holds, the random variable W is a geometric random variable with success probability $P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n))$, which implies that $\log \mathbb{E}[W | X^n] = -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}(\mathcal{B}_D(x^n))$. By optimizing over all $P_{\hat{X}^n}$, we obtain the bound in (8.27). \square

8.4 Second-Order Asymptotics

8.4.1 Result and Discussions

Recall the definition of the distortion-dispersion function $V(P_X, D)$ in (3.60). Let $P_{\hat{X}^*}$ be the induced marginal distribution that achieves the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D)$ in (8.4).

Assume that $\mathbb{E}_{P_X \times P_{\hat{X}^*}}[(d(X, \hat{X}))^{12}] < \infty$. Kostina, Polyanskiy and Verdú [18, Theorem 9] proved the following result.

Theorem 29. *For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and $D \in (D_{\min}, D_{\max})$,*

$$L^*(n, D, \varepsilon) = (1 - \varepsilon)nR(P_X, D) - \sqrt{\frac{nV(P_X, D)}{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)^2}{2}\right) + O(\log n). \quad (8.38)$$

The proof of Theorem 29 follows by applying Berry-Esseen theorem to the non-asymptotic bounds in Theorem 28 with proper choice of parameters and is available in Section 8.4.2.

Theorem 29 establishes a second-order asymptotic approximation to the average codeword length of an optimal variable-length lossy compression code that tolerates an excess-distortion probability of $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. In light of (8.15), the same second-order asymptotic bound also holds for optimal deterministic codes.

Compared with Theorem 27 that tackles zero excess-distortion probability, tolerating a non-zero excess-distortion probability significantly reduces the average codeword length. Specifically, the asymptotic average codeword rate per source is reduced by a multiplicative factor of ε , i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L^*(n, D, \varepsilon)}{n} = (1 - \varepsilon)R(P_X, D)$ and the negative second-order coding rate implies that the non-asymptotic rate approaches the first-order asymptotic rate from below regardless of $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. This is in stark contrast to the fixed-length case in Theorem 15 where the non-asymptotic rate approaches the asymptotic rate from above if $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, implying a finite blocklength penalty. In summary, the average bit required per source symbol for variable-length lossy compression allowing errors is significantly reduced compared with the fixed-length lossy compression and variable-length compression with zero error, both asymptotically and non-asymptotically. In Fig. 8.1, we plot the second-order asymptotic approximation to $R^*(n, D, \varepsilon) := \frac{L^*(n, D, \varepsilon)}{n}$ for different values of $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and compare with the second-order asymptotics for the fixed-length compression in Theorem 15 for a Bernoulli source with distribution $P_X = \text{Bern}(0.2)$ under the Hamming distortion measure with target excess-distortion probability $\varepsilon = 0.05$ with respect to the distortion level $D = 0.02$.

Similar to Theorem 15, Theorem 29 holds for both discrete and continuous sources that satisfy the assumptions. It would be interesting to generalize Theorem 29 to account for the noisy source, noisy channel, the mismatched setting or the source with memory.

8.4.2 Proof Sketch

The following Lemma [18, Lemmas 1] bounds the expectation of the cutoff random variable and is critical in the proof of second-order asymptotics.

Lemma 8. *Let Y^n be an i.i.d. sequence generated from a distribution P_Y with finite third absolute moment, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y])^3] < \infty$. For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\langle \sum_{i \in [n]} Y_i \right\rangle_\varepsilon\right] = (1 - \varepsilon)n\mathbb{E}[Y] - \sqrt{\frac{n\text{Var}[Y]}{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)^2}{2}\right) + O(1). \quad (8.39)$$

The proof of Lemma 8 follows from the Berry-Esseen theorem for independent random variables and algebra. Readers could refer to [18, Appendix A] for details.




Figure 8.1: Plots of the second-order asymptotic approximation in Theorem 29 to the average codeword length per source symbol $R^*(n, D, \varepsilon)$ for different values of the blocklength n and comparison with the fixed-length compression counterpart in Theorem 15.

The achievability part follows by weakening (8.27) with $\mathbb{E}_{P_X^n} \left[\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}^*(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon \right]$ and using the following lemma that bounds the expectation term explicitly, where $P_{\hat{X}^n}^*$ is the product distribution of P_X^* , i.e., for any $\hat{x}^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$,

$$P_{\hat{x}^n}^*(\hat{x}^n) = \prod_{i \in [n]} P_X^*(x_i). \quad (8.40)$$

Lemma 9. *For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{P_X^n} \left[\langle -\log P_{\hat{X}^n}^*(\mathcal{B}_D(X^n)) \rangle_\varepsilon \right] \\ &= (1 - \varepsilon)nR(P_X, D) - \sqrt{\frac{V(P_X, D)}{2\pi}} \exp \left(-\frac{Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)^2}{2} \right) + O(\log n). \end{aligned} \quad (8.41)$$

The proof of Lemma 9 follows from Lemma 8 and the refined version [18, Lemma 4] of the lossy AEP in Lemma 2, which was implicitly presented in [58].

We next present the proof sketch for the converse part. Recall the definition of the distortion-tilted information density $j(x|D, P_X)$ in (3.17) and recall that λ^* defined in (3.16) is defined as the first negative derivative of $R(P_X, D)$ with respect to D . For any $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$, let $j(x^n|D, P_X) = \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i|D, P_X)$.

The following lemma was derived in [18, Theorem 8].

Lemma 10. *For any $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and $D \in (D_{\min}, D_{\max})$,*

$$R_n(P_X, D, \varepsilon) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\langle J(X^n | D, P_X) \right\rangle_\varepsilon \right] - \log(nR(P_X, D) + n\lambda^* D + 1) - \log e - H_b(\varepsilon). \quad (8.42)$$

The converse proof of Theorem 29 follows from the non-asymptotic bound in (8.26), Lemma 8 and Lemma 10.

Part III

Multiterminal Setting

Chapter 9

Kaspi Problem

In this chapter, we study the lossy source coding problem with one encoder and two decoders, where side information is available at the encoder and one of the two decoders. We term the problem as the Kaspi problem since this problem was first introduced by Kaspi, who derived the asymptotically optimal achievable rate to ensure reliable lossy reconstruction at both decoders [37, Theorem 1]. Analogous to the rate-distortion problem, we term the asymptotic optimal achievable rate as the Kaspi rate-distortion function. The Kaspi problem generalizes the rate-distortion problem by adding one additional decoder and allowing the encoder and the additional decoder to access to some correlated side information.

Kaspi's asymptotic results were recently refined by Zhou and Motani in [20, 19], in which the authors derived non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotics bounds for the Kaspi problem. In this chapter, we present the results in [20, 19] and illustrate the role of side information on lossy data compression in the finite blocklength regime. Specifically, we first present a parametric representation for the Kaspi rate-distortion function. Subsequently, we generalize the notion of the distortion-tilted information density for the rate-distortion problem in Chapter 3 to the Kaspi problem and present a non-asymptotic converse bound. Finally, for a DMS under bounded distortion measures, we present second-order asymptotics and illustrate the results via two numerical examples.

Since the Kaspi problem generalizes the rate-distortion problem, the results for the Kaspi problem generalizes those in Chapter 3. Furthermore, another special case of the Kaspi problem is the conditional rate-distortion problem where side information is available to both the encoder and decoder in the rate-distortion problem. Thus, the results for the Kaspi problem generalize those for the conditional rate-distortion problem [98] as well.

9.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

The setting of the Kaspi problem is shown in Figure 9.1. There are one encoder f and two decoders ϕ_1, ϕ_2 . The side information Y^n is available to the encoder f and the decoder ϕ_2 but *not* to the decoder ϕ_1 . The encoder f compresses the source X^n into a message S given the side information Y^n . Decoder ϕ_1 aims to recover source sequence X^n within distortion level D_1 under distortion measure d_1 using the message S . Decoder ϕ_2 aims to recover X^n within distortion level D_2 under distortion measure d_2 using the message S and the side information Y^n . Consider a correlated memoryless source with distribution P_{XY} defined on the alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. Assume that the source sequence and side information (X^n, Y^n) is generated i.i.d. from P_{XY} . Furthermore, assume that the reproduction alphabets for decoders ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2$ respectively.




Figure 9.1: System model for the Kaspi problem of lossy source with side information at the encoder and one of the two decoders [37, Theorem 1].

Definition 16. An (n, M) -code for the Kaspi problem consists of one encoder

$$f : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M} = [M], \quad (9.1)$$

and two decoders

$$\phi_1 : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1^n \quad (9.2)$$

$$\phi_2 : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_2^n. \quad (9.3)$$

For simplicity, let $\hat{X}_1^n = \phi_1(f(X^n, Y^n))$ and $\hat{X}_2^n = \phi_2(f(X^n, Y^n), Y^n)$. For $i \in [2]$, let $d_i : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}_i \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be two distortion measures. For any $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $\hat{x}_i^n \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_i^n$, let the distortion between x^n and \hat{x}_i^n be additive and defined as $d_i(x^n, \hat{x}_i^n) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in [n]} d_i(x_j, \hat{x}_{i,j})$.

Following [37], the rate-distortion function of the Kaspi problem is defined as follows, which characterizes the asymptotically minimal rate to ensure reliable lossy compression at both decoders as the blocklength tends to infinity.

Definition 17. A rate R is said to be (D_1, D_2) -achievable for the Kaspi problem if there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M}{n} \leq R, \quad (9.4)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[d_i(X^n, \hat{X}_i^n)] \leq D_i, \quad i \in [2]. \quad (9.5)$$

The minimum (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate is called the Kaspi rate-distortion function and denoted as $R^*(D_1, D_2)$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) \\ := \min_{\substack{P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}, P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}: \\ \mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1, \\ \mathbb{E}[d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n)] \leq D_2}} I(XY; \hat{X}_1) + I(X; \hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1). \end{aligned} \quad (9.6)$$

Kaspi [37, Theorem 1] derived the following result.

Theorem 30. *The minimum (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate for the Kaspi problem satisfies*

$$R^*(D_1, D_2) = R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2). \quad (9.7)$$

We refer to $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ as the Kaspi rate-distortion function. Note that $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ is convex and non-increasing in both D_1 and D_2 . We remark that the explicit formulas of the Kaspi rate-distortion function was derived by Perron, Diggavi and Telatar for a GMS under quadratic distortion measures [99] and a binary memoryless erasure source under Hamming distortion measures [100].

To derive non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds, instead of using the average distortion criterion, we adopt the following joint excess-distortion probability as the performance criterion:

$$P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) := \Pr \left\{ d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) > D_1 \text{ or } d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) > D_2 \right\}. \quad (9.8)$$

Note that the probability in (9.8) is calculated with respect to the distribution of the source sequences for a fixed (n, M) -code. For bounded distortion measures, the asymptotically minimal rate to ensure vanishing joint excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2)$ is also $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$. The justification is similar to the case of the rate-distortion problem below Theorem 12.

The Kaspi rate-distortion function $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ equals the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D_2)$ if D_1 is large enough, and equals the conditional rate-distortion function $R(P_{X|Y}, D_1|P_Y)$ if D_2 is large enough where

$$R(P_{X|Y}, D_1|P_Y) := \min_{P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}: \mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1} I(X; \hat{X}_1|Y). \quad (9.9)$$

Note that the conditional rate-distortion function $R(P_{X|Y}, D_1|P_Y)$ is the minimal achievable rate of lossy compression when side information is available at both the encoder and the decoder, which is also known as the conditional rate-distortion problem. Similarly, for second-order asymptotics, the results for the Kaspi problem specialize to either the rate-distortion problem or the conditional rate-distortion problem.

9.2 Properties of the Rate-Distortion Function

We first present the properties of the Kaspi rate-distortion function, which allows us to define the distortions-tilted information density for the Kaspi problem and derive a non-asymptotic converse bound that generalizes the non-asymptotic converse bound for the rate-distortion problem in Theorem 14 of the rate-distortion problem.

Given any (conditional) distributions $(P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}, P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1})$, let $P_{\hat{X}_1}$, $P_{X\hat{X}_1}$, $P_{X\hat{X}_2}$ and $P_{Y\hat{X}_1}$, $P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}$, $P_{Y\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}$ be induced by P_{XY} , $P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}$ and $P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}$. Consider the distortion levels (D_1, D_2) such that $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ is finite and there exists test channels $(P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}^*)$ that achieve $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$. Note that $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ (see (9.6)) corresponds to a convex optimization problem and the dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \min_{P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}, P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}} & \left(I(XY; \hat{X}_1) + I(X; \hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1) \right. \\ & \left. + \lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] - D_1) + \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n)] - D_2) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (9.10)$$

For any given distortion levels (D_1, D_2) , the optimal solutions to the dual problem of $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ are

$$\lambda_1^* := \left. \frac{\partial R(P_{XY}, D, D_2)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_1}, \quad (9.11)$$

$$\lambda_2^* := \left. \frac{\partial R(P_{XY}, D_1, D)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_2}. \quad (9.12)$$

Given any $(x, y, \hat{x}_1) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and distributions $(Q_{\hat{X}_1}, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1) \times \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2|Y, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1)$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1 | Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \\ := \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}} \left[\exp(-\lambda_2^* d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n)) \middle| Y = y, \hat{X}_1 = \hat{x}_1 \right] \right\}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.13)$$

and let

$$\alpha(x, y | Q_{\hat{X}_1}, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) := \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\hat{X}_1}} \left[\frac{\exp(-\lambda_1^* d_1(x, \hat{X}_1))}{\alpha_2(x, y, \hat{X}_1 | Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1})} \right] \right\}^{-1}. \quad (9.14)$$

Lemma 11. *A pair of conditional distributions $(P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}^*)$ achieves $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ if and only if*

- For all (x, y, \hat{x}_1) ,

$$P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}^*(\hat{x}_1 | x, y) = \frac{\alpha(x, y | P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*) P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1) \exp(-\lambda_1^* d_1(x, \hat{x}_1))}{\alpha_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1 | P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)}, \quad (9.15)$$

- For all $(x, y, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$ such that $P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1) > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|x, y, \hat{x}_1) &= \alpha_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|y, \hat{x}_1) \\ &\times \exp(-\lambda_2^*d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n)). \end{aligned} \quad (9.16)$$

Furthermore, if the pair of distributions $(P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}^*)$ achieves $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$,

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) = \mathbb{E}[\log \alpha(x, y|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)] - \lambda_1^*D_1 - \lambda_2^*D_2, \quad (9.17)$$

The proof of Lemma 11 is similar to [101, Properties 1-3] for the rate-distortion problem that mainly uses the KKT conditions for convex optimization problems. Lemma 11 paves the way for the definition of the distortions-tilted information density for the Kaspi problem and also implies critical properties for the Kaspi distortions-tilted information density that parallel Lemma 1 for the rate-distortion problem.

We remark that for any pair of optimal test channels $(P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}^*)$, similarly to [60, Lemma 2], one can verify that the values of $\alpha_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1|P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)$ and $\alpha(x, y|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)$ remain the same. Hence, for simplicity, we define

$$\alpha_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1) := \alpha_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1|P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*), \quad (9.18)$$

$$\alpha(x, y) := \alpha(x, y|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*). \quad (9.19)$$

Furthermore, for any $\hat{x}_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1} \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2|\mathcal{Y}, \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1)$, define the following function

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\hat{x}_1, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \\ := \mathbb{E}_{P_{XY} \times Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}} \left[\alpha(X, Y) \exp(-\lambda_1^*d_1(X, \hat{X}_1) - \lambda_2^*d_2(X, \hat{X}_2)) \middle| \hat{X}_1 = \hat{x}_1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9.20)$$

The following lemma holds.

Lemma 12. For any \hat{x}_1 and arbitrary distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}$, we have

$$\nu(\hat{x}_1, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \leq 1. \quad (9.21)$$

We remark that Lemma 12 holds for both discrete and continuous memoryless sources. The proof of Lemma 12 is inspired by [55, Lemma 1.4], [102, Lemma 5] and [103] and available in [19, Appendix A]. Invoking Lemma 12, we prove a non-asymptotic converse bound for the Kaspi problem in Theorem 31.

9.3 Distortions-Tilted Information Density

Now we introduce the distortions-tilted information density for the Kaspi problem that generalizes distortion-tilted information density for the lossy source coding problem [12, 11]. Recall the definition of $\alpha(\cdot)$ in (9.19).

Definition 18. For any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the (D_1, D_2) -tilted information density for the Kaspi problem is defined as

$$j_K(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) := \log \alpha(x, y) - \lambda_1^* D_1 - \lambda_2^* D_2. \quad (9.22)$$

The properties of the (D_1, D_2) -tilted information density follows from Lemma 11. For example, invoking (9.15) and (9.16), we conclude that for all $(x, y, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$ such that $P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1)P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|y, \hat{x}_1) > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} j_K(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) &= \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}^*(\hat{x}_1|x, y)}{P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1)} + \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}_2|XY\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|x, y, \hat{x}_1)}{P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|y, \hat{x}_1)} \\ &\quad + \lambda_1^*(d_1(x, \hat{x}_1) - D_1) + \lambda_2^*(d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) - D_2). \end{aligned} \quad (9.23)$$

Furthermore, it follows from (9.17) that

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) = \mathbb{E}[j_K(X, Y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})]. \quad (9.24)$$

Finally, we have the following lemma that further relates the distortions-tilted information density with the derivative of the Kaspi rate-distortion function with respect to the distribution P_{XY} . Given a joint probability mass function P_{XY} , recall that $m = |\text{supp}(P_{XY})|$ and $\Gamma(P_{XY})$ is the sorted distribution such that for each $i \in [m]$, $\Gamma_i(P_{XY}) = P_{XY}(x_i, y_i)$ is the i -th largest value of $\{P_{XY}(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$.

Lemma 13. Suppose that for all Q_{XY} in the neighborhood of P_{XY} , $\text{supp}(Q_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*) = \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*)$. Then, for each $i \in [m-1]$,

$$\left. \frac{\partial R(Q_{XY}, D_1, D_2)}{\partial \Gamma_i(Q_{XY})} \right|_{Q_{XY}=P_{XY}} = j(x_i, y_i|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) - j(x_m, y_m|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}). \quad (9.25)$$

The proof of Lemma 13 is available in [19, Appendix I]. Lemma 13 parallels Claim (iv) in Lemma 1 for the rate-distortion problem and is critical in the achievability proof of second-order asymptotics.

9.4 A Non-Asymptotic Converse Bound

Invoking Lemma 12, we obtain the following non-asymptotic converse bound for the Kaspi problem that generalizes Theorem 14 for the rate-distortion problem.

Theorem 31. Given any $\gamma > 0$, the joint excess-distortion probability of any (n, M) -code for the Kaspi problem satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) &\geq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \geq \log M + n\gamma \right\} \\ &\quad - \exp(-n\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (9.26)$$

We remark that Theorem 31 plays a central role in the converse proof the second-order asymptotics and holds for any memoryless sources.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 31 is similar to that of Theorem 14. Given any (n, M) -code with encoder f and decoders (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) , let $S = f(X^n)$ be the compressed index that takes values in \mathcal{M} , let $P_{S|X^n}$ be the conditional distribution induced by the encoder f and let $P_{\hat{X}_1^n|S}$ and let the conditional distributions $P_{\hat{X}_1^n|S}$ and $P_{\hat{X}_2^n|S, Y^n}$ be induced by the decoders ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , respectively. Furthermore, let Q_S be the uniform distribution over \mathcal{M} and let

$$Q_{\hat{X}_1^n}(\hat{x}_1^n) := \sum_{s \in \mathcal{M}} Q_S(s) P_{\hat{X}_1^n|S}(\hat{x}_1^n|s), \quad (9.27)$$

$$Q_{\hat{X}_2^n|Y^n}(\hat{x}_2^n|y^n) := \frac{\sum_s Q_S(s) P_{\hat{X}_1^n|S}(\hat{x}_1^n|s) P_{\hat{X}_2^n|S, Y^n}(\hat{x}_2^n|s, y^n)}{Q_{\hat{X}_1^n}(\hat{x}_1^n)}. \quad (9.28)$$

For ease of notation, we use $\mathcal{C}(D_1, D_2)$ to denote the non-excess-distortion event, i.e., the event that $\{d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) \leq D_1, d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) \leq D_2\}$ and use $\mathcal{E}(D_1, D_2)$ to denote the excess-distortion event $\{d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) > D_1 \text{ or } d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) > D_2\}$. For any $\gamma > 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \geq \log M + n\gamma \right\} \\ & \leq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \geq \log M + n\gamma \text{ and } \mathcal{C}(D_1, D_2) \right\} \\ & \quad + \Pr \{ \mathcal{E}(D_1, D_2) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.29)$$

where the second term in (9.29) is exactly the joint excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2)$.

The first term in (9.29) can be upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \geq \log M + n\gamma, \mathcal{C}(D_1, D_2) \right\} \\ & = \Pr \left\{ M \leq \exp \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) - n\gamma \right) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}(D_1, D_2)) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (9.30)$$

$$\leq \frac{\exp(-\gamma)}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \right) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}(D_1, D_2)) \right] \quad (9.31)$$

$$\leq \frac{\exp(-n\gamma)}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) + \sum_{i \in [2]} \lambda_i^*(D_i - d_i(X^n, \hat{X}_i^n)) \right) \right], \quad (9.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_s \sum_{(x^n, y^n)} \sum_{\hat{x}_1^n, \hat{x}_2^n} Q_S(s) P_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n) P_{S|X^n}(s|x^n) P_{\hat{X}_1^n|S}(\hat{x}_1^n|s) \\ & \quad \times P_{\hat{X}_2^n|Y^n, S}(\hat{x}_2^n|y^n, s) \prod_{i \in [n]} \alpha(x_i, y_i) \times \exp(-\lambda_1^* d(x_i, \hat{x}_{1,i}) - \lambda_2^* d(x_i, \hat{x}_{2,i})) \end{aligned} \quad (9.33)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_{(x^n, y^n)} \sum_{\hat{x}_1^n, \hat{x}_2^n} Q_{\hat{X}_1^n}(\hat{x}_1^n) Q_{\hat{X}_2^n | \hat{X}_1^n}(\hat{x}_2^n | \hat{x}_1^n) P_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{i \in [n]} \alpha(x_i, y_i) \exp(-\lambda_1^* d(x_i, \hat{x}_{1,i}) - \lambda_2^* (d(x_i, \hat{x}_{2,i}))) \end{aligned} \quad (9.34)$$

$$= \exp(-n\gamma) \sum_{\hat{x}_1^n} Q_{\hat{X}_1^n}(\hat{x}_1^n) \left[\prod_{i \in [n]} \nu(\hat{x}_{1,i}, Q_{\hat{X}_{2,i} | Y_i \hat{X}_{1,i}}) \right] \quad (9.35)$$

$$\leq \exp(-n\gamma), \quad (9.36)$$

where (9.31) follows from Markov's inequality and (9.32) follows since $\lambda_i^* \geq 0$ for $i \in [2]$, (9.33) follows from the definitions of $\alpha(\cdot)$ in (9.19) and $\mathcal{J}(\cdot)$ in (9.22), (9.34) follows from the fact $P_{S|X^n}(s|x^n) \leq 1$ and the definitions of distributions $(Q_{\hat{X}_1^n}, Q_{\hat{X}_2^n | \hat{X}_1^n}, Q_{\hat{X}_2^n | Y^n})$, (9.35) since we define $Q_{\hat{X}_{2,i} | Y_i \hat{X}_{1,i}}$ as the marginal distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_{2,i} | Y_i}$ of $Q_{\hat{X}_2^n | Y^n}$ and use the definition of $\nu(\cdot)$ in (9.20) and (9.36) follows from the result in (9.21).

The proof of Theorem 31 is completed by combining (9.29) and (9.36). \square

9.5 Second-Order Asymptotics

In this section, we define and present second-order asymptotics of the Kspi problem for a DMS under bounded distortion measures. In other words, we assume that \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} , \mathcal{X}_1 , \mathcal{X}_2 are all finite sets and $\max_{x, \hat{x}_i} d_i(x, \hat{x}_i)$, $i \in [2]$ is finite.

9.5.1 Definition, Main Result and Discussions

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be fixed.

Definition 19. A rate L is said to be second-order (D_1, D_2, ε) -achievable for the Kspi problem if there exists a sequence of (n, M) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M - nR(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)}{\sqrt{n}} \leq L, \quad (9.37)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (9.38)$$

The infimum second-order (D_1, D_2, ε) -achievable rate is called the optimal second-order coding rate and denoted as $L^*(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$.

Note that in Definition 17 of the rate-distortion region, the average distortion criterion is used, while in Definition 19, the excess-distortion probability is considered. The reason is that for second-order asymptotics, second-order asymptotics always companies with the probability of a certain event. To be specific, the excess-distortion probability plays a similar role as error probability

for the lossless source coding problem [104] or channel coding problems [5, 105]. Let $V(D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$ be the distortions-dispersion function for the Kaspi problem, i.e.,

$$V(D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) := \text{Var}[j(X, Y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})]. \quad (9.39)$$

We impose following conditions:

1. The distortion levels are chosen such that $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) > 0$ is finite;
2. $Q_{XY} \rightarrow R(Q_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of P_{XY} and the derivatives are bounded.

Theorem 32. *Under conditions (1) and (2), the optimal second-order coding rate for the Kaspi problem is*

$$L^*(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \sqrt{V(D_1, D_2, P_{XY})} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon). \quad (9.40)$$

The converse proof of Theorem 32 follows by applying the Berry-Esseen Theorem to the non-asymptotic bound in Theorem 31. In the achievability proof, we first prove a type-covering lemma tailored for the Kaspi problem. Subsequently, we make use of the properties of $j(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$ in Lemma 11 and appropriate Taylor expansions.

We remark that the distortions-tilted information density for the Kaspi problem $j(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$ reduces to the distortion-tilted information density for the lossy source coding problem [12], or the distortion-tilted information density for the lossy source coding problem with encoder and decoder side information [98] for particular choices of distortion levels (D_1, D_2) . Hence, our result in Theorem 32 is a strict generalization of the second-order coding rate for the lossy source coding problem [12] and the conditional lossy source coding problem [98] for a DMS under bounded distortion measures. We also illustrate this point in Section 9.5.2 via a numerical example for the doubly symmetric binary source.

In the next two subsections, we illustrate Theorem 32 via two numerical examples by calculating the second-order coding rate $L^*(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ in close form.

9.5.2 Numerical Examples

Asymmetric Correlated Source

In order to illustrate our results in Lemma 11 and Theorem 32, we consider the following source. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, e\}$ and $P_X(0) = P_X(1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Let Y be the output of passing X through a Binary Erasure Channel (BEC) with erasure probability p , i.e., $P_{Y|X}(y|x) = 1 - p$ if $x = y$ and $P_{Y|X}(e|x) = p$. The explicit formula of the Kaspi rate-distortion function for the above correlated source under Hamming distortion measures was derived by Perron, Diggavi and Telatar in [100]. Here we only recall the *non-degenerate* result, i.e., the case where the distortion levels (D_1, D_2) are chosen such that $\lambda_1^* > 0$ and $\lambda_2^* > 0$.

Define the set

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{bec}} := \left\{ (D_1, D_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : D_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}, D_1 - \frac{1-p}{2} \leq D_2 \leq pD_1 \right\}. \quad (9.41)$$

Lemma 14. *If $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{bec}}$, then the Kaspi rate-distortion function for the above asymmetric correlated source under Hamming distortion measures is*

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) = \log 2 - (1-p)H_b\left(\frac{D_1 - D_2}{1-p}\right) - pH_b\left(\frac{D_2}{p}\right). \quad (9.42)$$

Hence, for $(D_1, D_2) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{bec}}$, using the definitions of λ_1^* in (9.11) and λ_2^* in (9.12), we obtain

$$\lambda_1^* = \log \frac{(1-p) - (D_1 - D_2)}{1-p} - \log \frac{D_1 - D_2}{1-p} \quad (9.43)$$

$$= \log \frac{(1-p) - (D_1 - D_2)}{D_1 - D_2}, \quad (9.44)$$

$$\lambda_2^* = \log \frac{p - D_2}{p} + \log \frac{D_1 - D_2}{1-p} - \log \frac{(1-p) - (D_1 - D_2)}{1-p} - \log \frac{D_2}{p} \quad (9.45)$$

$$= -\lambda_1^* + \log \frac{p - D_2}{D_2}. \quad (9.46)$$

Then, using the definitions of $\alpha_2(\cdot)$ in (9.18) and $\alpha(\cdot)$ in (9.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2(0, 0, 0) &= \alpha_2(0, 0, 1) = \alpha_2(1, 1, 0) = \alpha_2(1, 1, 1) \\ &= \alpha_2(0, \text{e}, 0) = \alpha_2(1, \text{e}, 1) = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (9.47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_2(1, 0, 0) &= \alpha_2(1, 0, 1) = \alpha_2(0, 1, 0) = \alpha_2(0, 1, 1) \\ &= \alpha_2(1, \text{e}, 0) = \alpha_2(0, \text{e}, 1) = \exp(\lambda_2^*), \end{aligned} \quad (9.48)$$

and

$$\alpha(0, 0) = \alpha(1, 1) = \frac{2}{1 + \exp(-\lambda_1^*)}, \quad (9.49)$$

$$\alpha(0, \text{e}) = \alpha(1, \text{e}) = \frac{2}{1 + \exp(-\lambda_1^* - \lambda_2^*)}. \quad (9.50)$$

It can be verified easily that (9.15), (9.16), (9.17) hold. In the following, we will verify that (9.21) holds for arbitrary $Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}$ and \hat{x}_1 . As a first step, we can verify that for any $(y, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_x P_{XY}(x, y) \alpha(x, y) \exp(-\lambda_1^* d_1(x, \hat{x}_1) - \lambda_2^* d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n)) \\ &\leq \sum_x P_{XY}(x, y) \frac{\alpha(x, y)}{\alpha_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1)} \exp(-\lambda_1^* d_1(x, \hat{x}_1)). \end{aligned} \quad (9.51)$$

Then, for any distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}$, using the definition of $\nu(\cdot)$ in (9.20), multiplying $Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}(\hat{x}_2|y, \hat{x}_1)$ over both sides of (9.51), and summing over (y, \hat{x}_2) , we obtain that

$$\nu(\hat{x}_1, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \leq 1. \quad (9.52)$$

Using the definition of $j(\cdot)$ in (9.22), we have

$$j(0, 0|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) = j(1, 1|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \quad (9.53)$$

$$= \log \alpha(0, 0) - \lambda_1^* D_1 - \lambda_2^* D_2, \quad (9.54)$$

and

$$j(0, e|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) = j(1, e|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \quad (9.55)$$

$$= \log \alpha(0, e) - \lambda_1^* D_1 - \lambda_2^* D_2. \quad (9.56)$$

Furthermore, using the definition of the distortion-dispersion function $V(D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$ in (9.39), we have

$$V(D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) = \text{Var}[j(X, Y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})] \quad (9.57)$$

$$= p(1-p) \left(\log \frac{p-D_2}{p} - \log \frac{(1-p)-(D_1-D_2)}{1-p} \right)^2. \quad (9.58)$$

Thus,

$$L^*(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \sqrt{V(D_1, D_2, P_{XY})} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon). \quad (9.59)$$

Doubly Symmetric Binary Source (DSBS)

In this example, we show that under certain distortion levels, the Kaspi rate-distortion function reduces to the rate-distortion function [2] (see also [106, Theorem 3.5]) and the conditional rate-distortion function [106, Eq. (11.2)]. We consider the DSBS where $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$, $P_{XY}(0, 0) = P_{XY}(1, 1) = \frac{1-p}{2}$ and $P_{XY}(0, 1) = P_{XY}(1, 0) = \frac{p}{2}$ for some $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

Lemma 15. *Depending on the distortion levels (D_1, D_2) , the Kaspi rate-distortion function for the DSBS with Hamming distortion measures satisfies*

- $D_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $D_2 \geq p$

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) = 0. \quad (9.60)$$

- $D_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $D_2 \geq \min\{p, D_1\}$

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) = \log 2 - H_b(D_1), \quad (9.61)$$

where $H_b(x) = -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$ is the binary entropy function.

- $D_1 \geq D_2 + \frac{1-2p}{2}$ and $D_2 < p$

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) = H_b(p) - H_b(D_2). \quad (9.62)$$

When $D_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $D_2 < pD_1$, the Kaspi rate-distortion function reduces to the rate-distortion function for the lossy source coding problem. Thus, the distortion-tilted information density for the Kaspi problem reduces to the D_1 -tilted information density in (9.63), i.e.,

$$j(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) = \log 2 - H_b(D_1). \quad (9.63)$$

Hence, $L^*(D_1, D_1|P_{XY}) = 0$. When $D_1 \geq D_2 + \frac{1-2p}{2}$ and $D_2 < p$, the Kaspi rate-distortion function reduces to the conditional rate-distortion function. Under the optimal test channel, we have $\hat{X}_1 = 0/1$ and $X \rightarrow \hat{X}_2 \rightarrow Y$ forms a Markov chain. In this case, the distortion-tilted information density for the Kaspi problem reduces to the conditional distortion-tilted information density [101, Definition 5] (see also [98]), i.e.,

$$j(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) = -\log P_{X|Y}(x|y) - H_b(D_2). \quad (9.64)$$

Hence,

$$V(D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) = \text{Var}[-\log P_{X|Y}(X|Y)] \quad (9.65)$$

$$= (1-p)(-\log(1-p) - H_b(p))^2 + p(-\log p - H_b(p))^2 \quad (9.66)$$

$$:= V(p), \quad (9.67)$$

and

$$L^*(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \sqrt{V(p)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon). \quad (9.68)$$

9.6 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics

9.6.1 Achievability

We first prove a type covering lemma for the Kaspi problem, based on which we derive an upper bound on the excess-distortion probability. Subsequently, using the Berry-Esseen theorem together with proper Taylor expansions, we manage to prove the desired achievable second-order coding rate.

To present our type covering lemma, define the following constant

$$c = \left(8|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| \cdot |\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1| \cdot |\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2| + 6 \right). \quad (9.69)$$

Lemma 16. *There exists a set $\mathcal{B} \subset \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1^n$ such that for each $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_{XY}}$, if*

$$(z^n)^* = \arg \min_{\hat{x}_1^n \in \mathcal{B}} d_1(x^n, \hat{x}_1^n), \quad (9.70)$$

then the following conclusion hold.

1. the distortion between x^n and $(z^n)^*$ is upper bounded by D_1 , i.e.,

$$d_1(x^n, (z^n)^*) \leq D_1, \quad (9.71)$$

2. there exists a set $\mathcal{B}((z^n)^*, y^n) \subset \hat{\mathcal{X}}_2^n$ such that

$$\min_{\hat{x}_2^n \in \mathcal{B}((z^n)^*, y^n)} d_2(x^n, \hat{x}_2^n) \leq D_2. \quad (9.72)$$

3. and the size of the set $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}((z^n)^*, y^n)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \log |\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{B}((z^n)^*, y^n)| \\ & \leq nR(Q_{XY}, D_1, D_2) + c \log(n+1). \end{aligned} \quad (9.73)$$

The proof of Lemma 16 is similar to the proof of type covering lemmas for rate-distortion problem.

Invoking Lemma 16, we can upper bound the excess-distortion probability of an (n, M) -code. To do so, for any $(n, M) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, define

$$R_n := \frac{1}{n} \log M - (c + |\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}|) \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}. \quad (9.74)$$

Lemma 17. *There exists an (n, M) -code whose excess-distortion probability satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \Pr \left\{ R_n < R(\hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}, D_1, D_2) \right\}. \quad (9.75)$$

Proof. Consider the following coding scheme. Given source sequence pair (x^n, y^n) , the encoder first calculates the joint type $\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}$, which can be transmitted reliably using at most $|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| \log(n+1)$ nats. Then the encoder calculates $R(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}, D_1, D_2)$ and declares an error if $nR(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}, D_1, D_2) + c \log(n+1) + |\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| \log(n+1) > \log M$. Otherwise, the encoder chooses a set \mathcal{B} satisfying the properties specified in Lemma 16 and sends the index of $(z^n)^* = \arg \min_{\hat{x}_1^n \in \mathcal{B}} d_1(x^n, \hat{x}_1^n)$. Subsequently, the decoder chooses a set $\mathcal{B}((z^n)^*, y^n)$ satisfying the properties specified in Lemma 16 and sends the index of $\arg \min_{\hat{x}_2^n \in \mathcal{B}((z^n)^*, y^n)} d_2(x^n, \hat{x}_2^n)$. Lemma 16 implies that the decoding is error free if $nR(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}, D_1, D_2) + c \log(n+1) + |\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| \log(n+1) \leq \log M$. The proof of Lemma 17 is now completed. \square

Given any distribution P_{XY} on the finite set $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, define the typical set

$$\mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) := \left\{ Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) : \|Q_{XY} - P_{XY}\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \right\}. \quad (9.76)$$

It follows from [62, Lemma 22] that

$$\Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} \leq \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2}. \quad (9.77)$$

If we choose

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M = R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} + \left(c + |\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}|\right) \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}, \quad (9.78)$$

then

$$R_n = R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (9.79)$$

For any (x^n, y^n) such that $\hat{T}_{x^n y^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY})$, since the mapping $Q_{XY} \rightarrow R(Q_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of P_{XY} and the derivative is bounded, applying Taylor expansion of $R(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}, D_1, D_2)$ around $\hat{T}_{x^n y^n} = P_{XY}$ and using Lemma 13, we have

$$R(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}, D_1, D_2) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i, y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right). \quad (9.80)$$

Define $\xi_n = \frac{\log n}{n}$. It follows from Lemma 17 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \leq \Pr \left\{ R_n < R(\hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}, D_1, D_2), \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} \\ & \quad + \Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (9.81)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \Pr \left\{ R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) + \frac{L}{\sqrt{n}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) + O(\xi_n) \right\} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2} \end{aligned} \quad (9.82)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in [n]} (j(X_i, Y_i | D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)) > L + O(\xi_n \sqrt{n}) \right\} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2} \end{aligned} \quad (9.83)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{Q} \left(\frac{L + O(\xi_n \sqrt{n})}{\sqrt{V(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})}} \right) + \frac{6T(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})}{\sqrt{n} V^{3/2}(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2}, \quad (9.84)$$

where (9.82) follows from the results in (9.77) and Lemma 9.80 and (9.84) follows from Berry-Esseen theorem, where $T(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$ is the third absolute moment of $j(X, Y | D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$, which is finite for a DMS.

Therefore, if L satisfies

$$L \geq \sqrt{V(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})} \mathbb{Q}^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (9.85)$$

by noting that $O(\xi_n \sqrt{n}) = O(\log n / \sqrt{n})$, it follows that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (9.86)$$

Thus, the optimal second-order coding rate satisfies

$$L^*(\varepsilon, D_1, D_2) \leq \sqrt{V(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon). \quad (9.87)$$

9.6.2 Converse

The converse part follows by applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the non-asymptotic converse bound in Theorem 31. Let

$$\log M := nR(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) + L\sqrt{n} - \frac{1}{2}\log n. \quad (9.88)$$

Invoking (9.26) with $\varepsilon = \frac{\log n}{2n}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ & \geq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \geq nR(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) + L\sqrt{n} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (9.89)$$

$$\geq Q \left(\frac{L}{\sqrt{V(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})}} \right) - \frac{6T(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})}{\sqrt{n}V^{3/2}(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})}, \quad (9.90)$$

where (9.90) follows from the Berry-Esseen theorem. If

$$L < \sqrt{V(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (9.91)$$

then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) > \varepsilon. \quad (9.92)$$

The converse proof is thus completed.

Chapter 10

Successive Refinement

In this chapter, we study the successive refinement problem with two encoders and two decoders, which generalizes the rate-distortion problem by introducing an additional pair of encoders and decoders. Based on the encoding process of the original encoder, the additional encoder further compresses the source sequence and the additional decoder uses compressed information from both encoders to produce a finer estimate of the source sequence than the first decoder that only accesses the original encoder. The optimal rate-distortion region for a DMS under bounded distortion measures was derived by Rimoldi in [38], which collects rate pairs of encoders with vanishing joint excess-distortion probabilities.

Successive refinement is the first lossy source coding problem with multiple encoders studied in this monograph. The successive refinement problem is an information-theoretic formulation of whether it is possible to interrupt a transmission to provide a finer reconstruction of the source sequence without any loss of optimality for lossy compression. For such a problem, in order to derive the second-order asymptotics, we need to study the backoff of the encoders' rates from a boundary rate-point on the rate-distortion region, analogously to the study of the backoff of the encoder's rate from the rate-distortion function in second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion problem. For a DMS under bounded distortion measures, we derive the optimal second-order coding region under a joint excess-distortion criterion (JEP) [21]. We also recall the second-order asymptotics under the separate excess-distortion probabilities (SEP) criteria by No, Ingber and Weissman [22]. For successively refinable discrete memoryless source-distortion measure triplets [107, 108], under SEP, the second-order region is significantly simplified and the notion of successive refinability [108, 107] is generalized to the second-order asymptotic regime under the SEP criterion. This chapter is largely based on [21, 22].

There are several new insights on the second-order coding region that we can glean when we consider the joint excess-distortion probability (cf. Section 10.3.4). For example, under the joint excess-distortion probability criterion, the second-order region is curved for successively refinable source-distortion triplets,

which implies that if one second-order coding rate is small, the other is necessarily large. This reveals a fundamental tradeoff that cannot be observed if one adopts the separate excess-distortion probability criterion. Therefore, in subsequent chapters that involve more complicated multiterminal lossy source coding problems, we only consider the joint excess-distortion probability criterion that better captures the rate tradeoff of multiple encoders.

10.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

10.1.1 Problem Formulation

The successive refinement source coding problem [38, 108] is shown in Figure 10.1. There are two encoders and two decoders. Encoder f_i , $i = 1, 2$ has access to a source sequence X^n and compresses it into a message S_i , $i = 1, 2$. Decoder ϕ_1 aims to recover source sequence X^n under distortion measure d_1 and distortion level D_1 with the encoded message S_1 from encoder f_1 . The decoder ϕ_2 aims to recover X^n under distortion measure d_2 and distortion level D_2 with messages S_1 and S_2 .




Figure 10.1: System model for the successive refinement problem [38].

We consider a memoryless source with distribution P_X supported on a finite alphabet \mathcal{X} . Thus, X^n is an i.i.d. sequence where each X_i is generated according to P_X . We assume the reproduction alphabets for decoder ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are respectively alphabets $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2$. We follow the definitions in [38] for codes and the achievable rate region.

Definition 20. An (n, M_1, M_2) -code for successive refinement source coding consists of two encoders:

$$f_1 : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1 = [M_1], \quad (10.1)$$

$$f_2 : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 = [M_2], \quad (10.2)$$

and two decoders:

$$\phi_1 : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1^n, \quad (10.3)$$

$$\phi_2 : \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_2^n. \quad (10.4)$$

For each $i \in [2]$, define a distortion measure $d_i : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}_i \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and let the distortion between x^n and \hat{x}_i^n be defined as $d_i(x^n, \hat{x}_i^n) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} d_i(x_i, \hat{x}_i)$. Define the joint excess-distortion probability as

$$P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) := \Pr \left\{ d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) > D_1 \text{ or } d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) > D_2 \right\}, \quad (10.5)$$

where $\hat{X}_1^n = \phi_1(f_1(X^n))$ and $\hat{X}_2^n = \phi_2(f_1(X^n), f_2(X^n))$ are the reconstructed sequences.

Definition 21. A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is said to be (D_1, D_2) -achievable for the successive refinement source coding if there exists a sequence of (n, M_1, M_2) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_1 \leq R_1, \quad (10.6)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(M_1 M_2) \leq R_1 + R_2, \quad (10.7)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) = 0. \quad (10.8)$$

The closure of the set of all (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate pairs is called optimal (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate region and denoted as $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$.

Note that in the original work by Rimoldi [38], the rate R_2 corresponds to the sum rate $R_1 + R_2$. In this monograph, to be consistent with other chapters, we use R_2 to denote the rate of message S_2 in Figure 10.1.

10.1.2 Rimoldi's Rate-Distortion Region

The optimal rate region for a DMS with arbitrary distortion measures was characterized in [38]. Let $\mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2)$ be the set of joint distributions $P_{X\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}$ such that the \mathcal{X} -marginal is P_X , $\mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1$ and $\mathbb{E}[d_2(X, \hat{X}_2)] \leq D_2$. Given $P_{X\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2} \in \mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2)$, let

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{R}(P_{X\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}) \\ &:= \left\{ (R_1, R_2) : R_1 \geq I(X; \hat{X}_1), R_1 + R_2 \geq I(X; \hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.9)$$

Theorem 33. The optimal (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate region for a DMS with arbitrary distortion measures under successive refinement source coding is

$$\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X) = \bigcup_{P_{X\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2} \in \mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2)} \mathcal{R}(P_{X\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}). \quad (10.10)$$

Now we introduce an important quantity for subsequent analyses for a DMS. Given a rate R_1 and distortion pair (D_1, D_2) , let the minimal sum rate $R_1 + R_2$ such that $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ be $R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$, i.e.,

$$R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) := \min \{R_1 + R_2 : (R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)\} \quad (10.11)$$

$$= \inf_{\substack{P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2|X} : \mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1 \\ \mathbb{E}[d_2(X, \hat{X}_2)] \leq D_2, I(X; \hat{X}_1) \leq R_1}} I(X; \hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2), \quad (10.12)$$

where (10.12) follows from [109, Corollary 1].

Let $R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R(P_X, D_2)$ be the rate-distortion functions [106, Chapter 3] (see also (3.7)) when the reproduction alphabets are $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2$ respectively, i.e., for each $i \in [2]$,

$$R(P_X, D_i) := \inf_{P_{\hat{X}_i|X} : \mathbb{E}[d_i(X, \hat{X}_i)] \leq D_i} I(X; \hat{X}_i). \quad (10.13)$$

Note that if $R_1 < R(P_X, D_1)$, then the convex optimization in (10.12) is infeasible. Otherwise, since $\mathcal{R}(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is a convex optimization problem, the minimization in (10.12) is attained for some test channel $P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2|X}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{x,y,z} P_X(x) P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2|X}(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2|x) d_1(x, \hat{x}_1) = D_1, \quad (10.14)$$

$$\sum_{x,y,z} P_X(x) P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2|X}(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2|x) d_2(x, \hat{x}_2) = D_2, \quad (10.15)$$

$$I(P_X, P_{\hat{X}_1|X}) = R_1. \quad (10.16)$$

Therefore, a rate pair (R_1^*, R_2^*) lies on the boundary of the rate-distortion region $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ if and only if $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ or $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$.

10.1.3 Successive Refinability

Next we introduce the notion of a *successively refinable source-distortion measure triplet* [107, 108]. We recall the definitions with a slight generalization in accordance to [22, Definition 2].

Definition 22. Given distortion measures d_1, d_2 and a source X with distribution P_X , the source-distortion measure triplet (X, d_1, d_2) is said to be (D_1, D_2) -successively refinable if the rate pair $(R(P_X, D_1), R(P_X, D_2))$ is (D_1, D_2) -achievable. If the source-distortion measure triplet is (D_1, D_2) -successively refinable for all (D_1, D_2) such that $R(P_X, D_1) < R(P_X, D_2)$, then it is said to be successively refinable.

For a successively refinable source-distortion measure triplet, the minimal sum rate $R_1 + R_2$ given R_1 in a certain interval is exactly the rate-distortion function (see (10.27) to follow). This reduces the computation of the optimal rate region in (10.10).

Koshelev [107] presented a sufficient condition for a source-distortion measure triplet to be successively refinable while Equitz and Cover [108, Theorem 2] presented a necessary and sufficient condition which we reproduce below.

Theorem 34. *A memoryless source-distortion measure triplet is successively refinable if and only if there exists a conditional distribution $P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}^*$ such that*

$$R(P_X, D_1) = I(P_X, P_{\hat{X}_1 | X}^*), \mathbb{E}_{P_X \times P_{\hat{X}_1 | X}^*} [d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1, \quad (10.17)$$

$$R(P_X, D_2) = I(P_X, P_{\hat{X}_2 | X}^*), \mathbb{E}_{P_X \times P_{\hat{X}_2 | X}^*} [d_2(X, \hat{X}_2)] \leq D_2, \quad (10.18)$$

and

$$P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}^* = P_{\hat{X}_1 | X}^* P_{\hat{X}_2 | X}^*. \quad (10.19)$$

In [108], it was shown that a DMS with Hamming distortion measures, a GMS with quadratic distortion measures, and a Laplacian source with absolute distortion measures are successively refinable. Note that in the original paper of Equitz and Cover [108], the authors only considered the case where both decoders use the same distortion measure, i.e., $d_1 = d_2 = d$. Interestingly, as pointed out in [22, Theorem 4], the result still holds even when $d_1 \neq d_2$. This can be verified easily for a DMS by invoking [38, Theorem 1].

10.2 Rate-Distortions-Tilted Information Density

Throughout the section, we assume that $R(P_X, D_1) \leq R_1^* < R(P_X, D_2)$ and $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ is smooth on a boundary rate pair (R_1^*, R_2^*) of our interest, i.e.,

$$\xi^* := - \left. \frac{\mathcal{R}(R, D_1, D_2 | P_X)}{\partial R} \right|_{R=R_1^*}, \quad (10.20)$$

is well-defined. Note that $\xi^* \geq 0$ since $\mathcal{R}(R_1, D_2, D_2)$ is convex and non-increasing in R_1 . Further, for a positive distortion pair (D_1, D_2) , define

$$\nu_1^* := - \left. \frac{\mathcal{R}(P_X, R_1, D, D_2)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_1}, \quad (10.21)$$

$$\nu_2^* := - \left. \frac{\mathcal{R}(P_X, R_1, D_1, D)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_2}. \quad (10.22)$$

Note that for a successively refinable discrete memoryless source-distortion measure triplet, from (10.27), we obtain $\xi^* = 0$ and $\nu_1^* = 0$. Let $P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}^*$ be the optimal test channel achieving $\mathcal{R}(R_1, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ in (10.11) (assuming it is unique)¹.

¹If optimal test channels are not unique, then following the proof of [60, Lemma 2], we can argue that the tilted information density is still well defined.

Let $P_{X\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{X\hat{X}_2}^*, P_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*, P_{\hat{X}_1}^*$, and $P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*$ be the induced (conditional) marginal distributions. We are now ready to define the tilted information density for successive refinement source coding problem.

Let (R_1^*, R_2^*) be any boundary rate pair of the rate-distortion region $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$.

Definition 23. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the rate-distortions tilted information density for the successive refinement problem is defined as

$$j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) := -\log \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*} \left(\exp \left\{ -\xi^* \left(\log \frac{P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*(\hat{X}_1|x)}{P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{X}_1)} - R_1^* \right) - \sum_{i \in [2]} \nu_i^*(d_i(x, \hat{X}_i) - D_i) \right\} \right). \quad (10.23)$$

The properties of $j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ are summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 18. The following claims hold.

1. For any (\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) such that $P_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) > 0$,

$$j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) = \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2|X}^*(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2|x)}{P_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)} + \xi^* \left(\log \frac{P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*(\hat{x}_1|x)}{P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1)} - R_1^* \right) - \nu_1^*(d_1(x, \hat{x}_1) - D_1) - \nu_2^*(d_2(x, \hat{x}_2) - D_2). \quad (10.24)$$

2. The minimal sum rate $\mathcal{R}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ equals the expectation of the rate-distortions-tilted information density, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) = \mathbb{E}_{P_X} [j(X, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)]. \quad (10.25)$$

3. Suppose that for all Q_X in the neighborhood of P_X , $\text{supp}(Q_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*) = \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2}^*)$. Then for all $a \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|Q_X)}{\partial Q_X(a)} \right|_{Q_X=P_X} = j(a, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) - (1 + \xi^*). \quad (10.26)$$

Lemma 18 generalizes the properties of the distortion-tilted information density for the rate-distortion problem in Lemma 1, which are also available in [101, Properties 1-3] and [56, Theorems 2.1-2.2].

For a successively refinable discrete memoryless source-distortion measure triplet, it follows from Definition 22 that if $\mathcal{R}(P_X, D_1) \leq R_1 < \mathcal{R}(P_X, D_2)$,

$$\mathcal{R}(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) = \mathcal{R}(P_X, D_2). \quad (10.27)$$

In this case, $\xi^* = 0$, $\nu_1^* = 0$. The rate-distortions-tilted information density $j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ reduces to the distortion-tilted information density $j(x, D_2 | P_X)$ in (3.17) for the rate-distortion problem, where

$$j(x, D | P_X) = -\log \mathbb{E}_{P_X^*} [\exp(-\lambda_1^*(d(x, \hat{X}) - D))], \quad (10.28)$$

$$\lambda^* = - \left. \frac{\partial R(P_X, D')}{\partial D'} \right|_{D'=D}. \quad (10.29)$$

10.3 Second-Order Asymptotics

10.3.1 Definitions and Discussions

Recall that for the rate-distortion problem with only one encoder, the second-order coding rate is defined as the backoff from the minimal achievable rate, i.e., the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D)$ (cf. Definition 10). Analogously, for a multiterminal lossy source coding problem such as successive refinement, in order to derive the second-order asymptotics, we need to study the backoff of the rates of encoders from a boundary point on the rate-distortion region, which is a minimal achievable rate pair and takes role of the rate-distortion function for the rate-distortion problem.

Formally, let (R_1^*, R_2^*) be a rate pair on the boundary of the rate-distortion region $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_X)$. The second-order coding region for the successive refinement problem is defined as follows.

Definition 24. *Given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, a pair (L_1, L_2) is said to be second-order $(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ -achievable if there exists a sequence of (n, M_1, M_2) -codes such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\log M_1 - nR_1^*) \leq L_1, \quad (10.30)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\log(M_1 M_2) - n(R_1^* + R_2^*)) \leq L_2, \quad (10.31)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (10.32)$$

The closure of the set of all second-order $(R_1^, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ -achievable pairs is called the second-order $(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ coding region and denoted as $\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$.*

We emphasize that the JEP criterion (10.32) is consistent with original setting of successive refinement in Rimoldi's work [38] and the error exponent analysis of Kanlis and Narayan [109]. In contrast, Tuncel and Rose [110] considered the separate excess-distortion events and probabilities and derived the tradeoff between exponents of two excess-distortion probabilities. Note that the rate-distortion region remains the same [38, 108] regardless whether we

consider vanishing joint or the separate excess-distortion probabilities. In the study of second-order asymptotics, the second-order coding region can also be defined under the SEP criterion [22]. Specifically, the second-order coding region $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sep}}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ is defined similarly to Definition 24, except that (10.32) is replaced by

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left\{ d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) > D_1 \right\} \leq \varepsilon_1, \quad (10.33)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left\{ d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) > D_2 \right\} \leq \varepsilon_2, \quad (10.34)$$

for some fixed $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0, 1)^2$ and the boundary rate-pair (R_1^*, R_2^*) is fixed as $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(R(P_X, D), D_1, D_2 | P_X)$, which corresponds to the case where both encoders respectively use their own optimal (i.e., minimum possible) asymptotic rates.

The main content of this chapter is the characterization of $\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sep}}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ for a DMS under bounded distortion measures, e.g., a binary source with Hamming distortion measures. We note that $\mathcal{L}(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ can, in principle, be evaluated for rate pairs that are not on the boundary of the first-order region $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_X)$. However, this would lead to degenerate solutions.

We next explain some advantages of using the JEP criterion over the SEP criterion in second-order asymptotics.

1. The JEP criterion is consistent with recent works in the second-order literature [111, 112, 60]. For example, in [112], Le, Tan and Motani established the second-order asymptotics for the Gaussian interference channel in the strictly very strong interference regime under the joint error probability criterion. If in [112], one adopts the separate error probabilities criterion, one would *not* be able to observe the performance tradeoff between the two decoders.
2. In Section 10.3.4, we show, via different proof techniques compared to existing works, that the second-order region is curved for successively refinable source-distortion triplets. This shows that if one second-order coding rate is small, the other is necessarily large. This reveals a fundamental tradeoff that cannot be observed if one adopts the separate excess-distortion probability criterion.

10.3.2 A General DMS

Recall that $\Psi(x_1, x_2; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ is the bivariate generalization of the Gaussian cdf. Given each $i \in [2]$, let $V(D_i | P_X) := \text{Var}[j(X, D_i | P_X)]$ be the *rate-dispersion function* (cf. (3.60)). Given a rate pair (R_1^*, R_2^*) on the boundary of $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_X)$, also define another rate-dispersion function $V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X) := \text{Var}[j(X, R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)]$. Let $\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X) \succeq 0$ be the covariance matrix of the two-dimensional random vector $[j(X, D_1 | P_X), j(X, R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)]^\top$, i.e., the *rate-dispersion matrix*.

We impose the following conditions on the rate pair (R_1^*, R_2^*) , the distortion measures (d_1, d_2) , the distortion levels (D_1, D_2) and the source distribution P_X :

1. $R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is finite;
2. $\xi^* \geq 0$ in (10.20) and ν_i^* , $i = 1, 2$ in (10.21), (10.22) are well-defined;
3. $(Q_X, D'_1) \mapsto R(Q_X, D'_1)$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (P_X, D_1) and the derivatives are bounded (i.e., the spectral norm of the Hessian matrix is bounded);
4. $(R_1, D'_1, D'_2, Q_X) \mapsto R(R_1, D'_1, D'_2|Q_X)$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (R_1^*, D_1, D_2, P_X) and the derivatives are bounded;

Note that similar regularity assumptions were made on second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion and Kaspi problems.

We first present the second-order asymptotics under the JEP criterion.

Theorem 35. *Under conditions (1) to (4), depending on the values of (R_1^*, R_2^*) , for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the second-order coding region satisfies:*

- *Case (i): $R(P_X, D_1) < R_1^* < R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) \\ &= \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : \xi^* L_1 + L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.35)$$

- *Case (ii): $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* > R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$*

$$\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : L_1 \geq \sqrt{V(D_1|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\}. \quad (10.36)$$

- *Case (iii): $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$, $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) \\ &= \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : \Psi(L_1, \xi^* L_1 + L_2; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.37)$$

The proof of Theorem 35 is provided in Section 10.4. In the achievability part, we leverage the type covering lemma [22, Lemma 8]. In the converse part, we follow the perturbation approach proposed by Gu and Effros in their proof for the strong converse of Gray-Wyner problem [61], leading to a type-based strong converse. In the proofs of both directions, we leverage the properties of appropriately defined rate-distortions-tilted information densities and use the (multi-variate) Berry-Esseen theorem. An alternative converse proof of Theorem 35 is possible by applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the non-asymptotic converse bound in [103, Corollary 2] (see also Lemma 28 from our analysis of the Fu-Yeung problem), analogously to the converse proof of second-order

asymptotics for the rate-distortion and Kaspi problems. We omit the alternative converse proof of Theorem 35.

In both Cases (i) and (ii), the code is operating at a rate bounded away from one of the first-order fundamental limits. Hence, a univariate Gaussian suffices to characterize the second-order behavior. In contrast, for Case (iii), the code is operating at precisely the two first-order fundamental limits. Hence, in general, we need a bivariate Gaussian to characterize the second-order behavior. Using an argument by Tan and Kosut [111, Theorem 6], we note that this result holds for both positive definite and rank deficient rate-dispersion matrices $\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$. However, we exclude the degenerate case in which $\text{rank}(\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) = 0$. Note that if the rank of $\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is 0, it means that the dispersion matrix is all zeros matrix, i.e., $\text{Cov}[j(X, D_1|P_X), j(X, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)] = 0$, $V(D_1|P_X) = 0$, and $V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) = 0$. This implies that $j(x, D_1|P_X)$ and $j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ are both deterministic. In this case, the second-order term (dispersion) vanishes, and if one seeks refined asymptotic estimates for the optimal finite blocklength coding rates, one would then be interested to analyze the *third-order* or $\Theta(\log n)$ asymptotics (cf. [12, Theorem 18]).

We next present inner (achievability) and outer (converse) bounds on the second-order coding region under the SEP criterion.

Theorem 36. *Under conditions (1) to (4), for any $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0, 1)^2$, the second-order coding region $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sep}}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ satisfies that when $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(R(P_X, D_1), D_1, D_2|P_X)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : L_1 \geq \sqrt{V(D_1|P_X)}Q^{-1}(\min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}), \right. \\ & \quad \left. L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)}Q^{-1}(\min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}) \right\} \\ & \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\text{sep}}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \\ & \subseteq \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : L_1 \geq \sqrt{V(D_1|P_X)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_1), \right. \\ & \quad \left. L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_2) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.38)$$

The achievability proof of Theorem 36 was proved by No, Ingber and Weissman using the type covering lemma for the successive refinement problem [22, Section V] and the converse part follows by applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the non-asymptotic converse bound by Kostina and Tuncel [103, Theorem 3]. The inner bound could also be obtained similarly to the proof Case (iii) of Theorem 35 with ε replaced by $\min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$.

The inner and outer bounds match when $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$. It was claimed by No, Ingber and Weissman [22] that the outer bound was achievable for any $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0, 1)^2$. However, a careful check suggests that it is impossible. This is because, in order not to incur an excess-distortion event at decoder ϕ_2 for a sequence x^n , decoder ϕ_1 should not incur an excess-distortion constraint since otherwise, the “correct” decoding of decoder ϕ_2 is not guaranteed.

10.3.3 A Successively Refinable DMS

In this subsection, we specialize the results in Theorem 35 to successively refinable discrete memoryless source-distortion measure triplets. Note that for such source-distortion measure triplets, $R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) = R(P_X, D_2)$ if $R(P_X, D_1) \leq R_1^* < R(P_X, D_2)$. Hence, $\xi^* = 0$ and $\nu_1^* = 0$ and $j(X, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) = j(X, D_2|P_X)$. The covariance matrix $\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is also simplified to $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ with diagonal elements being $V(D_1|P_X)$ and $V(D_2|P_X)$ and off-diagonal element being the covariance $\text{Cov}[j(X, D_1|P_X), j(X, D_2|P_X)]$. The conditions in Theorem 35 are also now simplified to: $(Q_X, D'_1) \mapsto R(Q_X, D'_1)$ and $(Q_X, D'_2) \mapsto R(Q_X, D'_2)$ are twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (P_X, D_1, D_2) and the derivatives are bounded.

Corollary 4. *Under the conditions stated above, depending on (R_1^*, R_2^*) , the optimal second-order $(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ coding region for a successively refinable discrete memoryless source-distortion measure triplet is as follows:*

- *Case (i): $R(P_X, D_1) < R_1^* < R(P_X, D_2)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(P_X, D_2)$*

$$\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(D_2|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\}. \quad (10.39)$$

- *Case (ii): $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_2)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* > R(P_X, D_2)$*

$$\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : L_1 \geq \sqrt{V(D_1|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\}. \quad (10.40)$$

- *Case (iii): $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_2)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(P_X, D_2)$ and $\text{rank}(\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1$,*

$$\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : \Psi(L_1, L_2; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (10.41)$$

Specifically, if $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X) = V(D_1|P_X) \cdot \text{ones}(2, 2)$, or equivalently $j(X, D_1|P_X) - R_1^ = j(X, D_2|P_X) - R_2^*$ almost surely,*

$$\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : \min\{L_1, L_2\} \geq \sqrt{V(D_1|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\}. \quad (10.42)$$

Corollary 4 results from specializations of Theorem 35. The special case in (10.42) is proved in Section 10.4.3. We notice that the expressions in the second-order regions are simplified for successively refinable discrete memoryless source-distortion measure triplets. In particular, the optimization to compute the optimal test channel $P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2|X}^*$ in $R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$, defined in (10.11)–(10.12), is no longer necessary since the Markov chain $X - Z - Y$ holds for $P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2|X}^*$ [108].

Furthermore, in Section 10.4.4, we provide an alternative converse proof of Corollary 4 by generalizing the one-shot converse bound of Kostina and Verdú

in [101, Theorem 1]. We remark that the alternative converse proof is also applicable to successively refinable continuous memoryless source-distortion measure triplets such as the a GMS with quadratic distortion measures.

The case in (10.42) pertains, for example, to a binary source with Hamming distortion measures. For such a source-distortion measure triplet, $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is rank 1 and proportional to the all ones matrix. See Section 10.3.4. The result in (10.42) implies that both excess-distortion events in (10.5) are perfectly correlated so that the one consisting of the *smaller* second-order rate L_i , $i = 1, 2$ dominates, since the first-order rates are fixed at the first-order fundamental limits $(R(P_X, D_1), R(P_X, D_2))$. In fact, our result in (10.42) specializes to the scenario where one considers the *separate* excess-distortion criterion [22] in (10.33)–(10.34) with $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$ and $V(D_1|P_X) = V(D_2|P_X)$. More importantly, the case in (10.41) when $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is full rank pertains to a source-distortion measure triplets with more “degrees-of-freedom”. See Section 10.3.4 for a concrete example. Thus our work is a strict generalization of that in [22].

The result under the SEP criterion follows from Theorem 36.

Corollary 5. *Under conditions (1) to (4), for any $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \in (0, 1)^2$, the second-order coding region $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sep}}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$ satisfies that when $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(P_X, D_2)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : L_i \geq \sqrt{V(D_i|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}) \right\} \\ & \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\text{sep}}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) \\ & \subseteq \left\{ (L_1, L_2) : L_i \geq \sqrt{V(D_i|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_i) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.43)$$

The converse part also follows from the converse proof of second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion problem in Theorem 15. Corollary 5 implies that when $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$, for a successively refinable DMS, under the SEP criterion, the second-order coding rates are also successively refinable since the pair $L_1 = \sqrt{V(D_1|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_1)$ and $L_2 = \sqrt{V(D_2|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon_2)$ is second-order achievable for the boundary rate pair $(R_1^*, R_2^*) = (R(P_X, D_1), R(P_X, D_2))$. Such a result implies that it is optimal to interrupt a transmission to provide a finer reconstruction of the source sequence without any loss in terms of second-order asymptotics, which is stronger than the original definition of successively refinability in terms of first-order asymptotics and coined “strong successive refinability” in [22].

10.3.4 Numerical Examples

Recall that any discrete memoryless source with Hamming distortion measures is successively refinable [108]. In this subsection, we consider two such numerical examples originated in [12] to illustrate Corollary 4. We use the logarithm with base 2 in this subsection.




Figure 10.2: Rate-dispersion function $V(D|P_X)$ for the source $P_X = [1/3, 1/4, 1/4, 1/6]$ [12, Section VII.B] as a function of the distortion D .

A Binary Memoryless Source with Hamming Distortion Measures

Fix $p \in [0, 1]$. We consider a binary source with $P_X(0) = p$. For any distortion levels $D_2 < D_1 < p$, it follows from (3.28) that for each $i \in [2]$,

$$j(x, D_i|P_X) = \iota(x|P_X) - H_b(D_i). \quad (10.44)$$

Hence,

$$V(D_1|P_X) = V(D_2|P_X) = p(1-p) \log^2 \left(\frac{1-p}{p} \right), \quad (10.45)$$

and the rate-dispersion matrix is

$$\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X) = V(D_1|P_X) \cdot \text{ones}(2, 2) \quad (10.46)$$

$$= p(1-p) \log^2 \left(\frac{1-p}{p} \right) \cdot \text{ones}(2, 2), \quad (10.47)$$

which does not depend on (D_1, D_2) . From the above considerations, we see that a binary source with Hamming distortion measures is an example that falls under (10.42) in Corollary 4.

A Quaternary Memoryless Source with Hamming Distortion Measures

We next consider a more interesting source with the joint excess-distortion probability upper bounded by $\varepsilon = 0.005$. In particular, we consider a quaternary




Figure 10.3: Boundaries of the second-order coding region $\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ for Case (iii) in Corollary 4. The regions are to the top right of the boundaries.

memoryless source with distribution $P_X = [1/3, 1/4, 1/4, 1/6]$. This example illustrates Case (iii) of Corollary 4 and is adopted from [12, Section VII.B]. The expressions for the rate-distortion function and the distortion-tilted information density are given in [12, Section VII.B] (and will not be reproduced here as they are not important for our discussion). Since $j(x, D_1|P_X) = j(x, D_2|P_X)$ when $D_1 = D_2 = D$, we use $j(x, D|P_X)$ to denote the common value of the distortion-tilted information density. Similarly, let $V(D|P_X)$ be the common value of $V(D_1|P_X)$ and $V(D_2|P_X)$ when $D_1 = D_2 = D$. As shown in Figure 10.2 (reproduced from [12, Section VII.B, Figure 4]), the rate-dispersion function $V(D|P_X)$ is dependent on the distortion level D , unlike the binary example in Section 10.3.4.

In this numerical example, we fix $D_2 = 0.3$, which is denoted by the circle in Figure 10.2. Then we decrease D_1 from 0.6 to 0.55 and finally to 0.5. These points are denoted respectively by the diamond, the pentagram and the square in Figure 10.2. Given these values of (D_1, D_2) , we plot the second-order coding rate for Case (iii) of Corollary 4 in Figure 10.3.

From Figure 10.3, we make the following observations and conclusions.

- The minimum L_1 converges to $\sqrt{V(D_1|P_X)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ as $L_2 \uparrow \infty$. This is because as L_2 increases, the bivariate Gaussian cdf asymptotically degenerates to the univariate Gaussian cdf with mean 0 and variance $V(D_1|P_X)$. A similar observation was made for the Slepian-Wolf problem in [111].
- As we decrease the value of D_1 , the second-order coding region shrinks. We remark that there is a transition from (10.41) with

$\text{rank}(\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)) = 2$ to (10.42) (where $\text{rank}(\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)) = 1$) as we decrease D_1 with the critical value of D_1 being 0.5.

- When $D_2 < D_1 \leq 0.5$, the rate-dispersion matrix $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is rank 1 (and proportional to the all ones matrix). Correspondingly, the result in (10.42) applies. Here, the second-order region is a (unbounded) rectangle with a sharp corner at the left bottom since the smaller L_i , $i = 1, 2$ dominates. The second-order region remains unchanged as we decrease D_1 towards D_2 for fixed $D_2 = 0.3$.
- When $0.5 < D_1 < 2/3$, the result in (10.41) applies. In this case, neither L_1 nor L_2 dominates. The second-order coding rates (L_1, L_2) are coupled together by the full rank rate-dispersion matrix $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$, resulting the smooth boundary at the left bottom.

We conclude that depending on the value of the distortion levels, the rate-dispersion matrix is either rank 1 or rank 2, illustrating Case (iii) of Corollary 4. These interesting observations cannot be gleaned from the work of No, Ingber and Weissman [22] in which the separate excess-distortion criteria are employed for the successive refinement problem. When $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is rank 1, exactly one excess-distortion event dominates the probability in (10.5) entirely; when $\mathbf{V}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is rank 2, both excess-distortion events contribute non-trivially to the probability and a bivariate Gaussian is required to characterize the second-order fundamental limit.

10.4 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics

10.4.1 Achievability

We make use of the type covering lemma [22, Lemma 8], which is modified from [109, Lemma 1]. Leveraging the type covering lemma, we can then upper bound the excess-distortion probability. Finally, we Taylor expand appropriate terms and invoke the Berry-Essen theorem to obtain an achievable second-order coding region.

Define two constants:

$$c_1 = 4|\mathcal{X}||\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1| + 9, \quad (10.48)$$

$$c_2 = 6|\mathcal{X}||\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1||\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2| + 2|\mathcal{X}||\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1| + 17. \quad (10.49)$$

We are now ready to recall the *discrete* type covering lemma for successive refinement.

Lemma 19. *Given type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, for all $R_1 \geq R(Q_X, D_1)$, the following holds:*

- *There exists a set $\mathcal{B}_1 \subset \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1^n$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{B}_1| \leq R_1 + c_1 \frac{\log n}{n} \quad (10.50)$$

and the type class is D_1 -covered by the set \mathcal{B}_1 , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{T}_{Q_X} \subset \bigcup_{\hat{x}_1^n \in \mathcal{B}_1} \{x^n : d_1(x^n, \hat{x}_1^n) \leq D_1\}. \quad (10.51)$$

- For each $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_Q$ and each $\hat{x}_1^n \in \mathcal{B}_1$, there exists a set $\mathcal{B}_2(\hat{x}_1^n) \subset \hat{\mathcal{X}}_2^n$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\hat{x}_1^n \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathcal{B}_2(\hat{x}_1^n)| \right) \leq R(R_1, D_1, D_2 | Q_X) + c_2 \frac{\log n}{n} \quad (10.52)$$

and the D_1 -distortion ball $\mathcal{N}_1(\hat{x}_1^n, D_1) := \{x^n : d_1(x^n, \hat{x}_1^n) \leq D_1\}$ is D_2 -covered by the set $\mathcal{B}_2(\hat{x}_1^n)$ i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_1(\hat{x}_1^n, D_1) \subset \bigcup_{\hat{x}_2^n \in \mathcal{B}_2(\hat{x}_1^n)} \{x^n : d_2(x^n, \hat{x}_2^n) \leq D_2\}. \quad (10.53)$$

Invoking Lemma 19, we can then upper bound the excess-distortion probability for some (n, M_1, M_2) -code. Given any (n, M_1, M_2) -code, define

$$R_{1,n} := \frac{1}{n} \left(\log M_1 - c_1 \log n - |\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1) \right), \quad (10.54)$$

$$R_{2,n} := \frac{1}{n} \left(\log(M_1 M_2) - c_2 \log n \right) - R_{1,n}. \quad (10.55)$$

Lemma 20. *There exists an (n, M_1, M_2) -code such that*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) &\leq \Pr \left\{ R_{1,n} < R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_1) \text{ or} \right. \\ &\quad \left. R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} < R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.56)$$

The proof of Lemma 20 is similar to [60, Lemma 5] and available in [21, Appendix D].

Recall the definition of the typical set in (3.90) and the result in (3.91) that

$$\Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_X) \right\} \leq \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \quad (10.57)$$

For a rate pair (R_1^*, R_2^*) satisfying the conditions in Theorem 35, we choose

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_1 = R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{c_1 \log n + |\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1)}{n}, \quad (10.58)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log(M_1 M_2) = R_1^* + R_2^* + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + c_2 \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (10.59)$$

Hence,

$$R_{1,n} = R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (10.60)$$

$$R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} = R_1^* + R_2^* + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (10.61)$$

From the conditions in Theorem 35, we know that the second derivative of $R(Q_X, D_1)$ is bounded in the neighborhood of P_X , and that the second derivative of $R(R_1, D_1, D_2|Q_X)$ with respect to (R_1, R_2, Q_X) is bounded around a neighborhood of (R_1^*, P_X) . Hence, for any x^n such that $\hat{T}_{x^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$, applying Taylor's expansion and invoking Lemmas 1 and 18, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D_1) &= R(P_X, D_1) + \sum_x \left(\hat{T}_{x^n}(x) - P_X(x) \right) j_X(x, D_1|P_X) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (10.62)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i, D_1|P_X) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right), \quad (10.63)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2|\hat{T}_{x^n}) &= R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) - \xi^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_x \left(\hat{T}_{x^n}(x) - P_X(x) \right) j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) \end{aligned} \quad (10.64)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) - \xi^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right). \quad (10.65)$$

Define $\eta_n = \frac{\log n}{n}$.

In subsequent analyses, for ease of notation, we use $j(x, R_1^*)$ and $j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ interchangeably. It follows from Lemma 20 that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) &\leq \Pr \left\{ R_{1,n} < R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_1) \text{ or } R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} < R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2|\hat{T}_{X^n}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (10.66)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \Pr \left\{ R_{1,n} < R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_1) \text{ or } R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} < R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2|\hat{T}_{X^n}), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{and } \hat{T}_{X^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X) \right\} + \Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_X) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (10.67)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \Pr \left\{ R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1|P_X) + O(\eta_n) \text{ or } \right. \\ &\quad \left. R_1^* + R_2^* + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, R_1^*) - \xi^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2} \end{aligned} \quad (10.68)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Pr \left\{ R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1 | P_X) + O(\eta_n) \text{ or} \right. \\
&\quad \left. R_1^* + R_2^* + \xi^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, R_1^*) + O(\eta_n) \right\} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \quad (10.69)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \text{Pe},n(D_1, D_2) &\geq \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1 | P_X) \leq R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, R_1^*) \leq R_1^* + R_2^* + \xi^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \quad (10.70)
\end{aligned}$$

We first consider Case (i) where $R(P_X, D_1) < R_1^* < R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$. Using the weak law of large numbers in Theorem 1, we obtain

$$\Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1 | P_X) \leq R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} \rightarrow 1. \quad (10.71)$$

Invoking the Berry-Esseen Theorem in Theorem 3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, R_1^*) \leq R_1^* + R_2^* + \xi^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} \\
&\geq 1 - Q \left(\frac{\xi^* L_1 + L_2 + O(\sqrt{n}\eta_n)}{\sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)}} \right) - \frac{6T(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)}{\sqrt{n}V^{3/2}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)}, \quad (10.72)
\end{aligned}$$

where $T(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ is the third absolute moment of $j(X, R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$, which is finite for a DMS. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Pe},n(D_1, D_2) &\leq Q \left(\frac{\xi^* L_1 + L_2 + O(\sqrt{n}\eta_n)}{\sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)}} \right) + \frac{6T(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)}{\sqrt{n}V^{3/2}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)} \\
&\quad + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \quad (10.73)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if (L_1, L_2) satisfies

$$\xi^* L_1 + L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (10.74)$$

then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Pe},n(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon$. The proof of Case (ii) is omitted since it is similar to Case (i).

The most interesting case is Case (iii) where $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_1^* + R_2^* = R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$. If $\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ is positive definite we invoke the multivariate Berry-Esseen Theorem in Theorem 5 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \leq 1 - \Psi(L_1 + O(\eta_n), \xi^* L_1 + L_2 + O(\eta_n); \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)) \\ & \quad + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (10.75)$$

Note that if $\mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ is rank 1, we can use the argument (projection onto a lower-dimensional subspace) in [111, Proof of Theorem 6] to conclude that (10.75) also holds. Now if we choose (L_1, L_2) such that

$$\Psi(L_1, \xi^* L_1 + L_2; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \quad (10.76)$$

then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon$. The achievability proof is now completed.

10.4.2 Converse

We first prove a type-based strong converse. Define $\bar{d}_i := \max_{x,y} d_1(x, \hat{x}_i)$ for each $i \in [2]$. Given a type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$, define

$$g(Q_X) := \Pr \{d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) \leq D_1, \text{ and } d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) \leq D_2 \mid X^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_X}\}. \quad (10.77)$$

Lemma 21. *Fix $\alpha > 0$ and a type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$. If the excess-distortion probability satisfies*

$$g(Q_X) \geq \exp(-n\alpha), \quad (10.78)$$

then there exists a conditional distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}$ such that

$$\log M_1 \geq nI(Q_X, Q_{\hat{X}_1 | X}) - \vartheta_n, \quad (10.79)$$

$$\log(M_1 M_2) \geq nI(Q_X, Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}) - \vartheta_n, \quad (10.80)$$

where $\vartheta_n := |\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1) + \log n + n\alpha$, and the expected distortions are bounded as

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_X \times Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1 + \frac{\bar{d}_1}{n} =: D_{1,n}, \quad (10.81)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_X \times Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}}[d_2(X, \hat{X}_2)] \leq D_2 + \frac{\bar{d}_2}{n} =: D_{2,n}. \quad (10.82)$$

The proof of Lemma 21 is inspired by [61], which generalizes Lemma 4 for the rate-distortion problem and is available in [21, Appendix E].

Invoking Lemma 21 with $\alpha = \frac{\log n}{n}$, we can lower bound the excess-distortion probability for any (n, M_1, M_2) -code. Define $\beta_n = |\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1) + 2 \log n$. Define

$$R'_{1,n} := \frac{1}{n} \log M_1 + \beta_n, \quad (10.83)$$

$$R'_{2,n} := \frac{1}{n} \log(M_1 M_2) + \beta_n - R'_{1,n}. \quad (10.84)$$

Lemma 22. *For any (n, M_1, M_2) -code, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \geq \Pr \left\{ R'_{1,n} < R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_{1,n}) \text{ or } R'_{1,n} + R'_{2,n} < R(R_{1,n}, D_{1,n}, D_{2,n} | \hat{T}_{X^n}) \right\} \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.85}$$

Choose $\log M_1 = nR_1^* + L_1\sqrt{n} + \beta_n$ and $\log(M_1M_2) = n(R_1^* + R_2^*) + L_2\sqrt{n} + \beta_n$. Recall the shorthand notation $\eta_n = \frac{\log n}{n}$. Now for x^n such that $\hat{T}_{x^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$, applying Taylor's expansion in a similar manner as (10.63) and (10.65), invoking Lemma 22 and noting that $\Pr\{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}\} \geq \Pr\{\mathcal{F}\} - \Pr\{\mathcal{G}^c\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \mathbb{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) & \leq \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1 | P_X) \leq R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n), \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, R_1^*) \leq R_1^* + R_2^* + \xi^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.86}$$

Note that in (10.86), we Taylor expand $R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_{1,n})$ around the source distribution P_X and distortion level D_1 . We also Taylor expand the minimal sum rate function $R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n})$ at (P_X, D_1, D_2) . The residual terms when we Taylor expand with respect to the distortion levels are of the order $O(\frac{1}{n})$, which can be absorbed into $O(\eta_n)$. Furthermore, recall that we use $j(x, R_1^*)$ and $j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ interchangeably.

The rest of converse proof can be done similarly as the achievability part in Section 10.4.1 by using the uni- or multi-variate Berry-Esseen Theorem for Cases (i), (ii) and (iii).

10.4.3 Proof of a Special Case

We now present a proof for the special case where the source-distortion measure triplet is successively refinable. Recall that for this case, $\xi^* = 0$, $\nu_1^* = 0$, and $j(x, R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X) = j(x, D_2 | P_X)$ for $R(P_X, D_1) \leq R_1^* < R(P_X, D_2)$. For the achievability part, invoking (10.70), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \mathbb{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) & \geq \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (j(X_i, D_1 | P_X) - R_1^*) \leq \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n), \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (j(X_i, D_2 | P_X) - (R_1^* + R_2^*)) \leq \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} \\ & \quad - \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.87}$$

According to the assumption in (10.42) of Corollary 4, we have $j(X_i, D_1|P_X) - R_1^* = j(X_i, D_2|P_X) - (R_1^* + R_2^*)$. Given a random variable X and two real numbers $a < b$, we obtain $\Pr\{X < a \text{ and } X < b\} = \Pr\{X < a\}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \geq \Pr \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} (j(X_i, D_1|P_X) - R_1^*) \leq \frac{\min\{L_1, L_2\}}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.88)$$

The rest of the proof is similar to Case (i) in Section 10.4.1.

Using (10.86), similarly to the achievability part, we complete the proof of converse part.

10.4.4 Alternative Converse Proof

We next present an alternative converse proof of Corollary 4 using the finite blocklength converse bound in [21, Lemma 15] that generalizes Theorem 14 for the rate-distortion problem.

Lemma 23. *Given any $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, any (n, M_1, M_2) -code for the successive refinement satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) & \geq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1|P_X) \geq \log M_1 + \gamma_1 \text{ or } \right. \\ & \quad \left. \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_2|P_X) \geq \log(M_1 M_2) + \gamma_2 \right\} \\ & \quad - \exp(-n\gamma_1) - \exp(-n\gamma_2). \end{aligned} \quad (10.89)$$

Choose $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \frac{\log n}{2n}$. Let $\log M_1 = nR_1^* + L_1\sqrt{n} - \frac{1}{2}\log n$ and $\log(M_1 M_2) = n(R_1^* + R_2^*) + L_2\sqrt{n} - \frac{1}{2}\log n$. Invoking Lemma 23, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) & \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1|P_X) < nR_1^* + L_1\sqrt{n} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \text{and } \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_2|P_X) < n(R_1^* + R_2^*) + L_2\sqrt{n} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.90)$$

The rest of the proof is similar to the converse proof of Corollary 4 in Section 10.4.3. We remark that this alternative converse proof also applies to continuous memoryless sources, such as a GMS under quadratic distortion measures and a Laplacian source with absolute distortion measures [113].

A stronger non-asymptotic converse bound is provided in [103, Corollary 2], which holds for any memoryless source and yields an alternative converse proof of Theorem 35. The same bound is also presented in Lemma 28 in the next chapter, which is obtained as a special case of the non-asymptotic converse bound in Theorem 27 for the Fu-Yeung problem.

Chapter 11

Fu-Yeung Problem

In this chapter, we study a special case of the multiple descriptions problem [114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120] with two encoders and three decoders proposed by Fu and Yeung [39] and thus we term the problem as the Fu-Yeung problem. The Fu-Yeung problem generalizes the successive refinement problem by adding an additional decoder that aims to recover a deterministic function of the source sequence losslessly. The rate-distortion region was characterized by Fu and Yeung [39, Theorem 1], which collects rate pairs to ensure reliable lossy compression at two decoders and reliable lossless data compression at the other decoder. For this special case of multiple descriptions, the El Gamal-Cover inner bound [115] was proved optimal.

Through the lens of the Fu-Yeung problem, this chapter reveals the trade-off between encoders for simultaneous lossless and lossy compression. We will present a non-asymptotic converse bound and second-order asymptotics for the Fu-Yeung problem. Specifically, we first present properties of the minimal sum rate function given the rate of one encoder. Subsequently, we generalize the rate-distortions-tilted information for the successive refinement problem to the Fu-Yeung problem and present a non-asymptotic converse bound. This non-asymptotic bound, when specialized to the case where $|\mathcal{Y}| = 1$, gives a stronger non-asymptotic converse bound for the successive refinement problem than Lemma 23. Finally, we present the second-order asymptotics for a DMS under bounded distortion measures and illustrate the results with numerical examples. This chapter is largely based on [23] and the second part of [19].

11.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

11.1.1 Problem Formulation

The setting for the Fu-Yeung problem is shown in Figure 11.1. There are two encoders and three decoders. Each encoder f_i , $i = 1, 2$ has access to the source

sequence X^n and compresses it into a message S_i , $i = 1, 2$. Decoder ϕ_1 aims to recover X^n with distortion level D_1 using the encoded message S_1 from encoder f_1 . Decoder ϕ_2 aims to recover X^n with distortion level D_2 using encoded messages S_1 and S_2 . Decoder ϕ_3 aims to recover Y^n , which is a symbolwise deterministic function of the source sequence X^n .




Figure 11.1: System model for the Fu-Yeung problem of multiple descriptions with one Semi-deterministic decoder [39].

Consider a memoryless source X^n generated i.i.d. from a probability mass function P_X supported on a finite alphabet \mathcal{X} . Let reproduction alphabets for decoders ϕ_1, ϕ_2 be $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2$ respectively. Fix a finite set \mathcal{Y} and define a deterministic function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. Let $Y_i = g(X_i)$, $i \in [1 : n]$. Note that P_Y is induced by the source distribution P_X and the deterministic function g , i.e., for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $P_Y(y) = \sum_{x: g(x)=y} P_X(x)$. We assume that for each y , $P_Y(y) > 0$. Decoder ϕ_3 is required to recover $Y^n = g(X^n) = (g(X_1), \dots, g(X_n))$ losslessly and the decoded sequence is denoted as \hat{Y}^n . We follow the definitions of codes and the rate-distortion region in [39].

Definition 25. An (n, M_1, M_2) -code for the Fu-Yeung problem consists of two encoders:

$$f_1 : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1 = [M_1], \quad (11.1)$$

$$f_2 : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 = [M_2], \quad (11.2)$$

and three decoders:

$$\phi_1 : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1^n, \quad (11.3)$$

$$\phi_2 : \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}_2^n, \quad (11.4)$$

$$\phi_3 : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^n. \quad (11.5)$$

Using the encoding and decoding functions, we have $\hat{X}_1^n = \phi_1(f_1(X^n))$, $\hat{X}_2^n = \phi_2(f_1(X^n), f_2(X^n))$ and $\hat{Y}^n = \phi_3(f_2(X^n))$. Let d_H denote the Hamming distortion measure in (3.1) and let the average distortion between y^n and its reproduced version \hat{y}^n be defined as $d_H(Y^n, \hat{Y}^n) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} d_H(Y_i, \hat{Y}_i)$. For each $i \in [2]$, let the distortion function $d_i : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}}_i \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a bounded

distortion measure and let $d(x^n, \hat{x}_i^n) = \sum_{j \in [n]} d_i(x_j, \hat{x}_{j,i})$. The rate-distortion region for the Fu-Yeung problem is defined as follows.

Definition 26. A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is said to be (D_1, D_2) -achievable for the Fu-Yeung problem if there exists a sequence of (n, M_1, M_2) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M_i}{n} \leq R_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (11.6)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[d_i(X^n, \hat{X}_i^n)] \leq D_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (11.7)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[d_H(Y^n, \hat{Y}^n)] = 0. \quad (11.8)$$

The closure of the set of all (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate pairs is called the first-order (D_1, D_2) -coding region and denoted as $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$.

11.1.2 Rate-Distortion Region

The first-order coding region $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ was characterized by Fu and Yeung in [39] for DMS. In particular, Fu and Yeung [39] showed that the El-Gamal-Cover inner bound [115] for the multiple description coding problem is tight.

To present the result, let $\mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2)$ be the set of all pairs of conditional distributions $(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}) \in \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1|X) \times \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2|X\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1$ and $\mathbb{E}[d_2(X, \hat{X}_2)] \leq D_2$. Given a pair of conditional distributions $(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1})$, let $\mathcal{R}(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1})$ be the collection of rate pairs $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ such that

$$R_1 \geq I(X; \hat{X}_1), \quad (11.9)$$

$$R_2 \geq H(Y), \quad (11.10)$$

$$R_1 + R_2 \geq H(Y) + I(\hat{X}_1; Y) + I(X; \hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2|Y). \quad (11.11)$$

Theorem 37. The rate-distortion region for the Fu-Yeung problem satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X) = \bigcup_{\substack{(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}) \\ \in \mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2)}} \mathcal{R}(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}). \quad (11.12)$$

When the Y is a constant, i.e., $|\mathcal{Y}| = 1$, the rate-distortion region in Theorem 37 reduced to the rate-distortion region of the successive refinement problem. The rate-distortion function of the Kaspi problem can also be recovered from Theorem 37 as the minimal rate R_1 by setting $R_2 = H(Y)$ and choosing the source as $X = (S_1, S_2)$ and the side information as $Y = S_2$ for correlated discrete random variables (S_1, S_2) .

Although Theorem 37 was derived under the average distortion criterion, the same rate-distortion region holds when one considers a vanishing joint excess-distortion and error probability $P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2)$ defined as follows:

$$P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) := \Pr \left\{ d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) > D_1 \text{ or } d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) > D_2 \text{ or } \hat{Y}^n \neq Y^n \right\}. \quad (11.13)$$

The reason is analogous to why Theorem 12 derived under the average distortion criterion still holds under the excess-distortion probability criterion for the rate-distortion problem.

11.1.3 Boundary Rate Pairs

We next discuss conditions for a rate pair (R_1^*, R_2^*) to be on the boundary of the rate-distortion region $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_X)$, which enables our definition and analyses of second-order asymptotics.

Given any distributions $(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1})$, let $P_{XY}, P_{X|Y}, P_{\hat{X}_1}, P_{Y\hat{X}_1}, P_{X\hat{X}_1}, P_{X\hat{X}_2}, P_{XY\hat{X}_1}, P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}$ and $P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}$ be induced by $P_X, P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}$ and the deterministic function $g: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. Recall the definition of $\mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2)$ above Theorem 37. Given any rate R_1 of encoder f_1 , define the following function

$$R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) := \min_{\substack{(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}) \\ \in \mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2): \\ R_1 \geq I(X; \hat{X}_1)}} I(\hat{X}_1; Y) + I(X; \hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2|Y). \quad (11.14)$$

It follows from the rate-distortion region in Theorem 37 that given a rate R_1 of encoder f_1 , the minimal achievable sum rate is

$R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) + H(P_Y)$. Furthermore, the minimal achievable rate R_1 for encoder f_1 is the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D_1)$ [3] and the minimal achievable rate R_2 for encoder f_2 is the entropy $H(P_Y)$. When $R_1 = R(P_X, D_1)$, the minimal achievable rate R_2 is

$$R_2^*(D_1, D_2|P_X) := H(P_Y) + R(R(P_X, D_1), D_1, D_2|P_X) - R(P_X, D_1), \quad (11.15)$$

and when $R_2 = H(P_Y)$, the minimal achievable rate R_1 is

$$R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X) := \min_{\substack{P_{\hat{X}_1|X}, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1} \\ \in \mathcal{P}(P_X, D_1, D_2)}} I(\hat{X}_1; Y) + I(X; \hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2|Y), \quad (11.16)$$

since $R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is the solution to $R_1 = R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$. With these observations, we find all cases of boundary rate pairs and illustrate it in Figure 11.2. Note that the Curve from case (ii) to Case (iv) is drawn as a line segment for ease of plot. In fact, it should be a convex curve.




Figure 11.2: Illustration of boundary rate pairs on the rate-distortion region of the Fu-Yeung problem, where $\underline{R}_1 = R(P_X, D)$, $\overline{R}_1 = R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$, $\underline{R}_2 = H(P_Y)$ and $\overline{R}_2 = R_2^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$.

11.2 Minimal Sum Rate Function and Its Properties

11.2.1 Definitions

Note that (11.14) is a convex optimization problem. Assume that (R_1, D_1, D_2) is chosen such that $R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is finite. Therefore, there exist test channels achieving $R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$. Let $(\xi^*, \lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*)$ be the optimal solutions to the dual problem of $R(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$, i.e.,

$$\xi^* := - \left. \frac{\partial R(R, D_1, D_2|P_X)}{\partial R} \right|_{R=R_1}, \quad (11.17)$$

$$\lambda_1^* := - \left. \frac{\partial R(R_1, D, D_2|P_X)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_1}, \quad (11.18)$$

$$\lambda_2^* := - \left. \frac{\partial R(R_1, D_1, D|P_X)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_2}. \quad (11.19)$$

Given distributions $(Q_{\hat{X}_1}, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1})$ and (x, y, \hat{x}_1) , define the following two functions

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1|Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \\ &:= \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}} \left[\exp(-\lambda_2^* d_2(x, \hat{X}_2)) \mid Y = y, \hat{X}_1 = \hat{x}_1 \right] \right\}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (11.20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta(x, y|Q_{\hat{X}_1}, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \\ &:= \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\hat{X}_1}} \left[\exp \left(- \frac{\lambda_1^* d_1(x, \hat{X}_1)}{1 + \xi^*} - \frac{\log \beta_2(x, y, \hat{X}_1|Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1})}{1 + \xi^*} \right) \right] \right\}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.21)$$

11.2.2 Properties

We first present the properties of the optimal test channels that achieve (11.14).

Lemma 24. *A pair of test channels $(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*)$ achieves $\mathbf{R}(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ if and only if*

- For all $(x, y, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$ such that $y = g(x)$,

$$P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*(\hat{x}_1|x) = \beta(x, y|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1) \times \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_1^* d_1(x, \hat{x}_1) + \log \beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1|P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)}{1 + \xi^*}\right), \quad (11.22)$$

- For all $(x, y, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$ such that $y = g(x)$ and $P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*(\hat{x}_1|x) > 0$

$$P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|x, \hat{x}_1) = \beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1|P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*) \times P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|y, \hat{x}_1) \exp(-\lambda_2^* d_2(x, \hat{x}_2)). \quad (11.23)$$

- For all $(x, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$ such that $P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*(\hat{x}_1|x) = 0$, $P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*(\cdot|x, \hat{x}_1)$ can be arbitrary distribution.

Furthermore, if a pair of channels $(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*)$ achieves $\mathbf{R}(R_1, D_1, D_2)$, the following claims hold.

- The parametric representation of $\mathbf{R}(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is

$$\mathbf{R}(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) = (1 + \xi^*)\mathbf{E}_{P_{XY}}[\log \beta(X, Y|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)] - \xi^* R_1 - \lambda_1^* D_1 - \lambda_2^* D_2. \quad (11.24)$$

- For $(x, y, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$ such that $y = g(x)$ and $P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1)P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|g(x), \hat{x}_1) > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 + \xi^*) \log \beta(x, y|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*) \\ &= (1 + \xi^*) \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*(\hat{x}_1|x)}{P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1)} + \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|x, \hat{x}_1)}{P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|y, \hat{x}_1)} + \sum_{i \in [2]} \lambda_i^* d_i(x, \hat{x}_i). \end{aligned} \quad (11.25)$$

The proof of Lemma 24 is similar to [55, Lemma 1.4], [60, Lemma 3], Lemma 12 for the Kaspi problem and Lemma 18 for the successive refinement problem.

Similarly as [60], we can show that, for any pair of optimal test channels $(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*)$, the value of $\beta(x, y|P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)$ and $\beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1|P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*)$ remain the same. From now on, fix a pair of test channels $(P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*)$ such that that i) (11.22), (11.23) hold; ii) for any (y, \hat{x}_1) such

that $P_{Y\hat{X}_1}^*(y, \hat{x}_1) = 0$, the induced distribution defined as $P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|y, \hat{x}_1) := \sum_x P_X(x) \mathbb{1}(y = g(x)) P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_2|x, \hat{x}_1)$ satisfies

$$P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^* = \arg \sup_{Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}} \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} \left[\beta(X, y) \beta_2^{-\frac{1}{1+\xi^*}}(X, y, \hat{x}_1 | Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \right. \\ \left. \times \exp \left(-\frac{\lambda_1^*}{1+\xi^*} d_1(X, \hat{x}_1) \right) \right]. \quad (11.26)$$

Note that the choice of $P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*$ satisfying (11.26) is possible since the set $\{x : g(x) = y\}$ is disjoint for each $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

For simplicity, given any (x, y, \hat{x}_1) , let

$$\beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1) := \beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1 | P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*), \quad (11.27)$$

$$\beta(x, y) := \beta(x, y | P_{\hat{X}_1}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}^*) \quad (11.28)$$

$$\iota_1(x, y, \hat{x}_1) = \log \beta(x, y) - \frac{1}{1+\xi^*} \log \beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1) \quad (11.29)$$

$$\iota_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1) := \log \beta(x, y) + \frac{\xi^*}{1+\xi^*} \log \beta_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1). \quad (11.30)$$

Furthermore, given any \hat{x}_1 and arbitrary conditional distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}$, define

$$w_1(\hat{x}_1) := \mathbb{E}_{P_{XY}} \left[\exp \left(\iota_1(X, Y, \hat{x}_1) - \frac{\lambda_1^* d_1(X, \hat{x}_1)}{1+\xi^*} \right) \right], \quad (11.31)$$

$$w_2(\hat{x}_1, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) := \mathbb{E}_{P_{XY} \times Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}} \left[\exp \left(\iota_2(X, Y, \hat{x}_1) - \frac{\lambda_1^*}{1+\xi^*} d_1(X, \hat{x}_1) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - \lambda_2^* d_2(X, \hat{X}_2) \right) \middle| \hat{X}_1 = \hat{x}_1 \right]. \quad (11.32)$$

In the following, we present an important property of the quantities in (11.31) and (11.32).

Lemma 25. *Given any $(P_{\hat{X}_1|XY}^*, P_{\hat{X}_2|X\hat{X}_1}^*)$ satisfying (11.22), (11.23), and (11.26), for any $\hat{x}_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}_1$ and arbitrary distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}$,*

$$w_2(\hat{x}_1, Q_{\hat{X}_2|Y\hat{X}_1}) \leq w_1(\hat{x}_1) \leq 1. \quad (11.33)$$

The proof of Lemma 25 is inspired by [102, Lemma 5], [103, Theorem 2] and omitted due to similarity to Lemma 12 for the Kaspi problem. We remark that Lemmas 24 and 25 hold for any memoryless source, not restricted to a DMS. As we shall show, the result in Lemma 25 leads to a non-asymptotic converse bound for the Fu-Yeung problem.

11.3 Rate-Distortions-Tilted Information Density

Recall that P_{XY} is induced by P_X and the deterministic function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$.

Definition 27. For any $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that $y = g(x)$, the rate-distortions-tilted information density for the Fu-Yeung problem is defined as

$$j(x, y | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) := (1 + \xi^*) \log \beta(x, y) - \xi^* R_1 - \lambda_1^* D_1 - \lambda_2^* D_2, \quad (11.34)$$

where $\beta(\cdot)$ was defined in (11.28)

The properties of $j(x, y | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X)$ follow from Lemma 24. For example, it follows from (11.24) that

$$R(R_1, D_1, D_2 | P_X) = \mathbb{E}_{P_{XY}} [j(X, Y | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X)] \quad (11.35)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{P_X} [j(X, g(X) | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X)]. \quad (11.36)$$

Let $j(x, D_1 | P_X)$ be the D_1 -tilted information density in (3.17), i.e.,

$$j(x, D_1 | P_X) := -\log \left(\sum_{\hat{x}_1} P_{\hat{X}_1}^*(\hat{x}_1) \exp(-\lambda^*(d_1(x, \hat{x}_1) - D_1)) \right), \quad (11.37)$$

where $P_{\hat{X}_1}^*$ is induced by the source distribution P_X and the optimal test channel $P_{\hat{X}_1|X}^*$ for the rate-distortion function $R(P_X, D_1)$ (cf. (3.7)) and $\lambda^* = -\frac{\partial R(P_X, D)}{\partial D} \big|_{D=D_1}$.

Furthermore, similarly to the proofs Lemma 13 for the Kaspi problem and Claim (iii) in Lemma 18, we have the following lemma that further relates the rate-distortions-tilted information density with the derivative of the minimum sum rate function with respect to the distribution P_X for the Fu-Yeung problem.

Lemma 26. Suppose that for all Q_X in the neighborhood of P_X , $\text{supp}(Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2}^*) = \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2}^*)$. Then for any $a \in \text{supp}(P_X)$,

$$\left. \frac{\partial R(R_1, D_1, D_2 | Q_X)}{\partial Q_X(a)} \right|_{Q_X=P_X} = j(x, g(x) | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) - (1 + s^*). \quad (11.38)$$

11.4 A Non-Asymptotic Converse Bound

We next present a non-asymptotic converse bound for the Fu-Yeung problem. Given any $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, define the following three sets:

$$\mathcal{A}_1^n := \left\{ (x^n, y^n) : \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i, D_1 | P_X) \geq \log M_1 + n\gamma \right\}, \quad (11.39)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_2^n := \left\{ (x^n, y^n) : -\sum_{i \in [n]} \log P_Y(y_i) \geq \log M_2 + n\gamma \right\}, \quad (11.40)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_3^n := \left\{ (x^n, y^n) : \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i, y_i | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) \geq \log M_1 M_2 + \xi^* \log M_1 + (1 + \xi^*)n\gamma \right\}. \quad (11.41)$$

Lemma 27. *Any (n, M_1, M_2) -code for the Fu-Yeung problem satisfies that for any $\gamma \geq 0$,*

$$P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \geq \Pr \left\{ (X^n, Y^n) \in \bigcup_{i \in [3]} \mathcal{A}_i^n \right\} - 4 \exp(-\gamma). \quad (11.42)$$

We remark that Lemma 25 plays an important role in the proof of Lemma 27. This can be made clear by the following definitions. Given $(x, y, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2)$, using the definitions of $\iota_1(\cdot)$ in (11.29) and $\iota_2(\cdot)$ in (11.30), we define

$$j_1(x, y, \hat{x}_1, D_1) := \iota_1(x, y, \hat{x}_1) - \frac{\lambda_1^* D_1}{1 + \xi^*}, \quad (11.43)$$

$$j_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1, D_1, D_2) := \iota_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1) - \frac{\lambda_1^* D_1}{1 + \xi^*} - \lambda_2^* D_2. \quad (11.44)$$

Using the definition of the rate-distortions-tilted information density in (11.34), we conclude that

$$j(x, y | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) = \xi^* j_1(x, y, \hat{x}_1, D_1) + j_2(x, y, \hat{x}_1, D_1, D_2) - \xi^* R_1. \quad (11.45)$$

In the proof of Lemma 27, we make use of (11.45) and the fact that $\Pr\{A + B \geq c + d\} \leq \Pr\{A \geq c\} + \Pr\{B \geq d\}$ for any variables (A, B) and constants (c, d) .

Recall the setting of the Fu-Yeung problem in Figure 11.1. Note that when Y is a constant, i.e. $|\mathcal{Y}| = 1$, we recover the setting of the successive refinement problem [38]. Recall the definitions of an (n, M_1, M_2) -code for the successive refinement problem Definition 20, the definition of the joint excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}^{\text{SR}}(D_1, D_2)$ in (10.5), the definition of the minimal sum rate $R_{\text{SR}}(R_1, D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ in (10.11) and the definition of the rate-distortions tilted information density $j_{\text{SR}}(x | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X)$ in (10.23). When $|\mathcal{Y}| = 1$, it follows that

$$R_{\text{SR}}(R_1, D_1, D_2 | P_X) = R(R_1, D_1, D_2 | P_X), \quad (11.46)$$

$$j_{\text{SR}}(x | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) = j(x, g(x) | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X). \quad (11.47)$$

We remark that although the definition of the rate-distortions-tilted information density for the successive refinement problem in the right hand side of (11.47) appears different from (10.23), the two quantities share same properties (cf. [21, Lemma 3]) and are thus essentially the same. Invoking Lemma 27 with $\mathcal{Y} = \{1\}$, we obtain the following non-asymptotic converse bound for the successive refinement problem.

Lemma 28. *Any (n, M_1, M_2) -code for the successive refinement problem satisfies that for any $\gamma \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}^{\text{SR}}(D_1, D_2) \geq \Pr \Big\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} J(X_i, D_1 | P_X) \geq \log M_1 + n\gamma \text{ or} \\ \sum_{i \in [n]} J_{\text{SR}}(X_i | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) \geq \log M_1 M_2 \\ + \xi^* \log M_1 + (1 + \xi^*)n\gamma \Big\} - 4 \exp(-n\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (11.48)$$

Lemma 28 was also derived by Kostina and Tuncel [103, Corollary 2]. We remark that the non-asymptotic converse bound in (11.48) can be used to establish converse results for second-order asymptotics for any memoryless source, including the results in Theorem 35 for a DMS. Invoking Lemma 28, for the successive refinement problem, we have the potential to establish tight second-order asymptotics for non-successively refinable continuous memoryless sources, e.g., a symmetric GMS under quadratic distortion measures [121].

11.5 Second-Order Asymptotics

11.5.1 Preliminaries

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be fixed and let (R_1^*, R_2^*) be a boundary rate pair on the rate-distortion region $\mathcal{D}(D_1, D_2 | P_X)$ of the Fu-Yeung problem.

Definition 28. *Given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, a pair (L_1, L_2) is said to be second-order $(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ -achievable for the Fu-Yeung problem if there exists a sequence of (n, M_1, M_2) -codes such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M_i - nR_i}{\sqrt{n}} \leq L_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (11.49)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (11.50)$$

The closure of the set of all second-order $(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ -achievable pairs is called the second-order $(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ coding region and denoted as $\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$.

To present characterization of $\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$, we need several definitions. Recall that P_{XY} and P_Y are induced by P_X and the deterministic function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and the definition of the source dispersion function (cf. (2.27)), i.e.,

$$V(P_Y) = \sum_y P_Y(y) (-\log P_Y(y) - H(P_Y))^2 \quad (11.51)$$

$$= \sum_x P_X(x) (-\log P_Y(g(x)) - H(P_Y))^2. \quad (11.52)$$

Recall that $V(P_X, D_1) = \text{Var}[j(X, D_1|P_X)]$ is the distortion-dispersion function (cf. (3.60)). Let the rate-distortion-dispersion function be

$$V(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) := \text{Var}\left[j(X, g(X)|R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) - \log P_Y(Y)\right]. \quad (11.53)$$

Define two covariance matrices:

$$\mathbf{V}_1(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) := \text{Cov}\left([j(X, g(X)|R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) - \log P_Y(g(X))]^\top, j(X, D_1|P_X)\right), \quad (11.54)$$

$$\mathbf{V}_2(R_1, D_1, D_2|P_X) := \text{Cov}\left([j(X, g(X)|R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) - \log P_Y(g(X)), -\log P_Y(g(X))]^\top\right). \quad (11.55)$$

Finally, recall that $\Psi(x_1, x_2; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ is the bivariate generalization of the Gaussian cdf.

11.5.2 Main Result and Discussions

Suppose the following conditions hold:

1. $(Q_X, D'_1) \rightarrow R(Q_X, D'_1)$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (P_X, D_1) and the derivatives are bounded;
2. $(Q_X, R'_1, D'_1, D'_2) \rightarrow R(R'_1, D'_1, D'_2|Q_X)$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (P_X, R_1, D_1, D_2) and the derivatives are bounded;
3. The functions $R(P_X, D_1)$, $R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$, $R_2^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ are positive and finite;
4. The dispersion functions $V(P_X, D_1)$ and $V(P_Y)$ are positive and the dispersion function $V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)$ is positive for $R(P_X, D_1) < R_1^* < R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$;
5. The covariance matrices $\mathbf{V}_1(R(P_X, D_1), D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $\mathbf{V}_2(R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X), D_1, D_2|P_X)$ are positive semi-definite.

Conditions (i) and (ii) concern the differentiability of rate-distortion functions and have been discussed in detail by Ingber and Kochman in [11, Section III.A]. Condition (iii) can easily be verified by calculating the values of rate-distortion functions using convex optimization tools such as [57]. In order to verify conditions (iv) and (v), in general, one needs to develop specialized Blahut-Arimoto-type algorithms [42, Chapter 8] to solve for the optimal test channels.

Theorem 38. *Under conditions (1) to (5), depending on (R_1^*, R_2^*) , for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the second-order coding region satisfies*

- *Case (i): $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_2^* > R_2^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$*

$$\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \{(L_1, L_2) : L_1 \geq \sqrt{V(P_X, D_1)}Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)\}. \quad (11.56)$$

- *Case (ii):* $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_2^* = R_2^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) &= \{(L_1, L_2) : \\ &\Psi(L_1, (1 + \xi^*)L_1 + L_2; \mathbf{0}_2; \mathbf{V}_1(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.57)$$

- *Case (iii):* $R(P_X, D_1) < R_1^* < R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $R_2^* = R^*(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X) + H(P_Y) - R_1^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) &= \{(L_1, L_2) : \\ &(1 + \xi^*)L_1 + L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.58)$$

- *Case (iv)* $R_1^* = R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $R_2^* = H(P_Y)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) &= \{(L_1, L_2) : \\ &\Psi(L_1 + L_2, L_2; \mathbf{0}_2, \mathbf{V}_2(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.59)$$

- *Case (v)* $R_1^* > R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $R_2^* = H(P_Y)$

$$\mathcal{L}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \{(L_1, L_2) : L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(P_Y)Q^{-1}(\varepsilon)}\}. \quad (11.60)$$

The proof of Theorem 38 is provided in Section 11.6. The achievability part follows by the method of types, where we first prove a type-covering lemma tailored to the Fu-Yeung problem, and subsequently apply Taylor expansions of the rate-distortion function and the minimal sum rate function of empirical distributions around the source distribution P_X , and finally apply the Berry-Esseen theorem for each case. The converse part follows by deriving a type-based strong converse analogously to the converse proof the successive refinement problem in Theorem 35 and proceeding similarly to the achievability proof.

Since the successive refinement problem is special case of the Fu-Yeung problem when $Y = g(X)$ is a constant, the second-order asymptotics for the successive refinement problem for a DMS under bounded distortion measures in Theorem 35 is recovered by cases (i)-(iii) in Theorem 38 by noting that R_2^* is used as the sum rate for the successive refinement problem.

11.5.3 An Numerical Example

We consider the numerical example inspired by [100] and calculate the dispersion function for cases (iii) and (iv) in Theorem 38. Let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{0, 1, e\}$. Let S_1 take values in \mathcal{S}_1 with equal probability and let $P_{S_2|S_1}(s_2|s_1) = (1 - p)\mathbb{1}(s_1 = s_2) + p\mathbb{1}(s_2 = e)$. Let the source be $X = (S_1, S_2)$ and the deterministic function be $Y = g(X) = g(S_1, S_2) = S_2$. Let $\hat{X}_1 = \hat{X}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ and the distortion measures be $d_1(x, \hat{x}_1) = \mathbb{1}(s_1 = \hat{x}_1)$ and $d_2(x, \hat{x}_2) = \mathbb{1}(s_2 = \hat{x}_2)$. Choose (p, D_1, D_2) such that $D_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $D_1 - \frac{1-p}{2} \leq D_2 \leq pD_1$. For this

case, using the definitions of ξ^* in (11.17), λ_1^* in (11.18) and λ_2^* in (11.19), we have

$$\xi^* = 0, \quad (11.61)$$

$$\lambda_1^* = \log((1-p)/(D_1 - D_2) - 1), \quad (11.62)$$

$$\lambda_2^* = -\lambda_1^* + \log(p/D_2 - 1). \quad (11.63)$$

Recall that $H_b(\cdot)$ is the binary entropy function. Let

$$\alpha_0 := \log(2/(1 + \exp(-\lambda_1^*))) - \lambda_1^* D_1 - \lambda_2^* D_2, \quad (11.64)$$

$$\alpha := \log(2/(1 + \exp(-\lambda_1^* - \lambda_2^*))) - \lambda_1^* D_1 - \lambda_2^* D_2, \quad (11.65)$$

$$g_1(p, D_1, D_2) := \log 2 - (1-p)H_b((D_1 - D_2)/(1-p)) - pH_b(D_2/p), \quad (11.66)$$

$$g_2(p, D_1, D_2) := p(1-p) \left\{ \log(1 - D_2/p) - \log(1 - (D_1 - D_2)/(1-p)) \right\}^2, \quad (11.67)$$

$$g_3(p, D_1, D_2) := (1-p)\alpha_0 \log \frac{2}{1-p} + p\alpha \log \frac{1}{p}. \quad (11.68)$$

Then, it can be verified that

$$H(P_Y) = (1-p) \log 2 + H_b(p), \quad (11.69)$$

$$V(P_Y) = p(1-p) \left(\log \frac{2p}{1-p} \right)^2. \quad (11.70)$$

Thus,

$$V(R_1, D_1, D_2 | P_X) = 2 \left(g_3(p, D_1, D_2) - H(P_Y)g_1(p, D_1, D_2) \right) + g_2(p, D_1, D_2) + V(P_Y). \quad (11.71)$$

11.6 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics

11.6.1 Achievability

In this subsection, we first present a type covering lemma tailored to the Fu-Yeung problem, using which we derive an upper bound on the joint excess-distortion and error probability. Finally, invoking Taylor expansions and the Berry-Esseen Theorem, we derive an achievable second-order coding region.

Define

$$c_1 = |\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| \cdot |\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1| + 2, \quad (11.72)$$

$$c_2 = 7|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| \cdot |\hat{\mathcal{X}}_1| \cdot |\hat{\mathcal{X}}_2| + 4. \quad (11.73)$$

We are now ready to present the type covering lemma.

Lemma 29. Consider any type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X})$. Let Q_Y be induced by Q_X and the deterministic function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, and let $R_1 \geq R(Q_X, D_1)$. The following conclusions hold.

1. There exists a set $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{X}_1^n$ such that for each $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_X}$, $d_1(x^n, (z^n)^*) \leq D_1$ where $(z^n)^* := \arg \min_{z \in \mathcal{B}} d_1(x^n, z)$.
2. Given $(z^n)^*$, there exists a set $\mathcal{B}((z^n)^*) \in \mathcal{X}_2^n$ such that

$$\min_{\hat{x}_2^n \in \mathcal{B}((z^n)^*)} d_2(x^n, \hat{x}_2^n) \leq D_2. \quad (11.74)$$

3. There exists a set $\mathcal{B}_Y \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^n$ satisfying that $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{B}_Y| \leq H(Q_Y)$ and there exists $\hat{y}^n \in \mathcal{B}_Y$ such that $\hat{y}^n = g(x^n)$.
4. The sizes of sets \mathcal{B} and $\mathcal{B}((z^n)^*)$ satisfy

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{B}| \leq R_1 + c_1 \log(n+1) \quad (11.75)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log (|\mathcal{B}| \cdot |\mathcal{B}((z^n)^*)|) \leq R(R_1, D_1, D_2 | Q_X) + (c_1 + c_2) \log(n+1). \quad (11.76)$$

The proof of Lemma 29 is similar to the type covering lemma for the successive refinement problem [22].

Let

$$R_{1,n} := \frac{1}{n} (\log M_1 - (c_1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log(n+1)), \quad (11.77)$$

$$R_{2,n} := \frac{1}{n} (\log M_2 - (c_2 + |\mathcal{Y}|) \log(n+1)). \quad (11.78)$$

Invoking Lemma 29, we can upper bound the joint excess-distortion and error probability for an (n, M_1, M_2) -code.

Lemma 30. There exists an (n, M_1, M_2) -code such that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \leq \Pr \left\{ R_{1,n} < R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_1) \text{ or } R_{2,n} + \frac{c_2 \log(n+1)}{n} < H(\hat{T}_{g(X^n)}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \text{or } R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} < R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n}) + H(\hat{T}_{g(X^n)}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.79)$$

Proof. Set $(R_1, R_2) = (R_{1,n}, R_{2,n})$. Consider the following coding scheme. Given a source x^n , the encoder f_2 calculates its type \hat{T}_{x^n} . Then, the encoder f_2 obtain y^n using the deterministic function $y_i = g(x_i)$ and its type \hat{T}_{y^n} . Now encoder f_2 calculates $R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D_1)$ and $R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{x^n})$. If $\log M_1 < nR(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D_1) + (c_1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log(n+1)$ or $\log M_2 < nH(\hat{T}_{y^n}) + |\mathcal{Y}| \log(n+1)$ or

$\log M_1 M_2 < nR(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{x^n}) + nH(\hat{T}_{y^n}) + (c_1 + c_2 + |\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \log(n+1)$, then the system declares an error. Otherwise, the encoder f_1 sends the type of x^n with at most $|\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1)$ nats and the encoder f_2 sends the type of y^n using at most $|\mathcal{Y}| \log(n+1)$ nats. Furthermore, the encoder f_2 sends the index of $y^n = g(x^n)$ in the type class $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{T}_{y^n}}$. Now, choose $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{X}_1^n$ in Lemma 29 and let $(z^n)^* = \arg \min_{z \in \mathcal{B}} d_1(x^n, z)$. Given $(z^n)^*$, choose $\mathcal{B}((z^n)^*)$ in Lemma 29 and let $z_2^* = \arg \min_{z_2 \in \mathcal{B}((z^n)^*)} d_2(x^n, z_2)$. Finally, we use the encoder f_1 to send the index of z_1^* and use either f_1 or f_2 to send out the index of z_2^* . Invoking Lemma 29, we conclude that no error will be made if $\log M_1 \geq nR(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D_1) + (c_1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log(n+1)$, $\log M_2 \geq nH(\hat{T}_{y^n}) + |\mathcal{Y}| \log(n+1)$ and $\log M_1 M_2 \geq nR(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{x^n}) + nH(\hat{T}_{y^n}) + (c_1 + c_2 + |\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \log(n+1)$. The proof is now complete. \square

Recall that (R_1^*, R_2^*) is a boundary rate-pair on the rate-distortion region of the Fu-Yeung problem. Choose (M_1, M_2) such that

$$\log M_1 = nR_1^* + L_1 \sqrt{n} + (c_1 + |\mathcal{X}|) \log(n+1), \quad (11.80)$$

$$\log M_2 = nR_2^* + L_2 \sqrt{n} + (c_2 + |\mathcal{Y}|) \log(n+1). \quad (11.81)$$

It follows from (11.77) and (11.78) that

$$R_{i,n} = R_i^* + \frac{L_i}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (11.82)$$

Recall the definition of the typical set $\mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$ in (3.90). The result in (3.91) states that

$$\Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_X) \right\} \leq \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \quad (11.83)$$

Recall that P_Y is induced by the source distribution P_X and the deterministic function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. Thus, given any x^n , for each $y \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\hat{T}_{y^n}(y) - P_Y(y) = \hat{T}_{g(x^n)}(y) - P_Y(y) \quad (11.84)$$

$$= \sum_{x: g(x)=y} \left(\hat{T}_{x^n}(x) - P_X(x) \right). \quad (11.85)$$

Thus, if $\hat{T}_{X^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$,

$$\|\hat{T}_{Y^n} - P_Y\|_\infty \leq |\mathcal{X}| \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}. \quad (11.86)$$

For x^n such that $\hat{T}_{x^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$, applying Taylor's expansions and noting

that $y^n = g(x^n)$, we obtain

$$H(\hat{T}_{g(x^n)}) = H(\hat{T}_{y^n}) \quad (11.87)$$

$$= H(P_Y) + \sum_y (\hat{T}_{y^n}(y) - P_Y(y))(-\log P_Y(y)) + O(\|\hat{T}_{y^n} - P_Y\|^2) \quad (11.88)$$

$$= \sum_y -\hat{T}_{y^n}(y) \log P_Y(y) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \quad (11.89)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} -\log P_Y(y_i) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right), \quad (11.90)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{x^n}) \\ &= R(R_1^*, D_1, D_2 | P_X) - s^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O(|R_{1,n} - R_1^*|^2) \\ & \quad + \sum_x (\hat{T}_{x^n} - P_X(x)) j(x, g(x) | R_1^*, D_1, D_2, P_X) + O(\|\hat{T}_{x^n} - P_X\|^2), \end{aligned} \quad (11.91)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i, g(x_i) | R_1^*, D_1, D_2, P_X) - \frac{s^* L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right), \quad (11.92)$$

where (11.91) follows from Lemma 26. Furthermore, for x^n such that $\hat{T}_{x^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_X)$, it follows from (3.93) that

$$R(\hat{T}_{x^n}, D) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(x_i | D, P_X) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right). \quad (11.93)$$

Recall that $\xi_n = \frac{\log n}{n}$. Therefore, invoking Lemma 30, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \leq \Pr \left\{ R_{1,n} < R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_1) \text{ or } R_{2,n} + \frac{c_2 \log(n+1)}{n} < H(\hat{T}_{g(X^n)}) \right. \\ & \quad \text{or } R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} < H(\hat{T}_{g(X^n)}) + R(R_{1,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n}) \\ & \quad \left. \text{and } \hat{T}_{X^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} + \Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (11.94)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \Pr \left\{ R_1 + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1 | P_X) + O(\xi_n) \text{ or } R_2 < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \log \frac{1}{P_Y(Y_i)} + O(\xi_n) \right. \\
&\quad \text{or } R_1 + R_2 + \frac{(1+s^*)L_1 + L_2}{n} \\
&\quad \left. < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(j(X_i, g(X_i) | R_1, D_1, D_2, P_X) - \log P_Y(Y_i) \right) + O(\xi_n) \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2}. \tag{11.95}
\end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, we upper bound (11.95) for different cases of boundary rate pairs (R_1^*, R_2^*) in Theorem 38. For simplicity, let $j(x | R_1^*)$ denote $j(x^*, g(x^*) | R_1^*, D_1, D_2, P_X)$ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

- Case (i) $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_2^* > R_2^*(D_1, D_2 | P_X)$

In this case $R_2^* > H(P_Y)$. Thus, it follows from the weak law of large numbers in Theorem 1 that

$$\kappa_{1,n} := \Pr \left\{ R_2^* < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \log \frac{1}{P_Y(Y_i)} + O(\xi_n) \right\} \rightarrow 0 \tag{11.96}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{2,n} &:= \Pr \left\{ R_1^* + R_2^* + \frac{(1+s^*)L_1 + L_2}{n} \right. \\
&\quad \left. < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(j(X_i | R_1^*) - \log P_Y(Y_i) \right) + O(\xi_n) \right\} \\
&\rightarrow 0. \tag{11.97}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (11.95) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\
&\leq \Pr \left\{ R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1 | P_X) + O(\xi_n) \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2} + \kappa_{1,n} + \kappa_{2,n} \tag{11.98}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{Q} \left(\frac{L_1 + O(\sqrt{n}\xi_n)}{\sqrt{V(P_X, D_1)}} \right) + \frac{6T(P_X, D_1)}{\sqrt{n}V(P_X, D_1)} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2} + \kappa_{1,n} + \kappa_{2,n}, \tag{11.99}$$

where $T(P_X, D_1)$ is the third absolute moment of $j(X, D_1 | P_X)$ (which is finite for a DMS) and (11.99) follows by applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to the first term in (11.98). If we choose (L_1, L_2) such that

$$L_1 \geq \sqrt{V(P_X, D_1)} \mathbb{Q}^{-1}(\varepsilon), \tag{11.100}$$

then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{P}_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon$ as desired.

- Case (ii) $R_1^* = R(P_X, D_1)$ and $R_2^* = R_2^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$

In this case, $R_2^* > H(P_Y)$ still holds. Hence, invoking (11.95), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1 - P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\
& \geq \Pr \left\{ R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} j(X_i, D_1|P_X) + O(\xi_n), \right. \\
& \quad R_1^* + R_2^* + \frac{(1+s^*)L_1 + L_2}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \\
& \quad \left. \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(-\log P_Y(Y_i) + j(X_i|R_1^*) + O(\xi_n) \right) \right\} \\
& \quad - \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2} - \kappa_{1,n} \tag{11.101}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \geq 1 - \Psi(L_1 + O(\xi_n), (1+s^*)L_1 + L_2 + O(\xi_n); \mathbf{0}_2; \mathbf{V}_1(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) \\
& \quad - \frac{2|\mathcal{X}|}{n^2} - \kappa_{1,n} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{11.102}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if we choose (L_1, L_2) such that

$$\Psi(L_1, (1+s^*)L_1 + L_2; \mathbf{0}_2; \mathbf{V}_1(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \tag{11.103}$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon.$$

- Case (iii) $R(P_X, D_1) < R_1^* < R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$, and $R_2^* = R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X) + H(P_Y) - R_1^*$

In this case, $R_2^* > H(P_Y)$ holds again. The analysis is similar to Case (i). It can be verified that if we choose (L_1, L_2) such that

$$(1+s^*)L_1 + L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \tag{11.104}$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon.$$

- Case (iv) $R_1^* = R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $R_2^* = H(P_Y)$

The analysis is similar to Case (ii). It can be verified that if

$$\Psi((1+s^*)L_1 + L_2, L_2; \mathbf{0}_2; \mathbf{V}_2(R_1^*, D_1, D_2|P_X)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \tag{11.105}$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon.$$

- Case (v) $R_1 > R_1^*(D_1, D_2|P_X)$ and $R_2^* = H(P_Y)$

The analysis is similar to Case (i). It can be verified that if

$$L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(P_Y)} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \tag{11.106}$$

$$\text{we have } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon.$$

The achievability proof of Theorem 38 is now completed.

11.6.2 Converse

The following type-based strong converse lemma is critical in the converse proof.

Lemma 31. *Fix $c > 0$ and a type $Q_X \in \mathcal{P}_n(P_X)$. For any (n, M_1, M_2) -code such that*

$$\Pr \left\{ d_1(X^n, \hat{X}_1^n) \leq D_1, d_2(X^n, \hat{X}_2^n) \leq D_2, \hat{Y}^n = Y^n | X^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_X} \right\} \geq \exp(-nc), \quad (11.107)$$

there exists a conditional distribution $Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_1 \geq I(Q_X, Q_{\hat{X}_1 | X}) - \xi_{1,n}, \quad (11.108)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_2 \geq H(Q_Y) - \xi_{2,n}, \quad (11.109)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log M_1 M_2 &\geq H(Q_Y) + I(Q_Y, Q_{\hat{X}_1 | Y}) \\ &\quad + I(Q_{X|Y}, Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | XY} | Q_Y) - \xi_{1,n} - \xi_{2,n}, \end{aligned} \quad (11.110)$$

where

$$\xi_{1,n} = \frac{|\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1) + \log n + nc}{n}, \quad (11.111)$$

$$\xi_{2,n} = 2\xi_{1,n} + \frac{2(\log n + nc) + |\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| \log(n+1)}{n} + \frac{\log |\mathcal{Y}| + h_b(1/n)}{n}. \quad (11.112)$$

and $Q_{X|Y}$, $Q_{\hat{X}_1 | Y}$, $Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | XY}$ are induced by Q_X , $Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}$ and the deterministic function $y = g(x)$.

Furthermore, the expected distortions are bounded as

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_X \times Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}}[d_1(X, \hat{X}_1)] \leq D_1 + \frac{\bar{d}_1}{n} := D_{1,n}, \quad (11.113)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_X \times Q_{\hat{X}_1 \hat{X}_2 | X}}[d_2(X, \hat{X}_2)] \leq D_2 + \frac{\bar{d}_2}{n} := D_{2,n}. \quad (11.114)$$

The proof of Lemma 31 is similar to Lemma 4 for the rate-distortion problem and Lemma 21 for the successive refinement problem. The main technique is the perturbation approach by Gu and Effros [61] and the generalization with method of types [60].

Let $c = \frac{\log n}{n}$, then we have

$$\xi_{1,n} = \frac{|\mathcal{X}| \log(n+1) + 2 \log n}{n}, \quad (11.115)$$

$$\xi_{2,n} = \frac{8 \log n + (|\mathcal{X}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}| + 2|\mathcal{X}|) \log(n+1)}{n} + \frac{\log |\mathcal{Y}| + h_b(1/n)}{n}. \quad (11.116)$$

Define

$$R_{i,n} = \frac{1}{n}(\log M_i + n\xi_{i,n}), \quad i \in [2]. \quad (11.117)$$

Invoking Lemma 31, we can prove the following lower bound on the joint excess-distortion and error probability for any (n, M_1, M_2) -code.

Lemma 32. *Any (n, M_1, M_2) -code satisfies that*

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \geq \Pr \left\{ R_{1,n} < R(\hat{T}_{X^n}, D_{1,n}) \text{ or } R_{2,n} < H(\hat{T}_{g(X^n)}) \text{ or } \right. \\ & \quad \left. R_{1,n} + R_{2,n} < R(R_{1,n}, D_{1,n}, D_{2,n} | \hat{T}_{X^n}) + H(\hat{T}_{g(X^n)}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.118)$$

The rest of the converse proof is omitted since it is analogous to the achievability proof where we use Taylor expansions similarly to (11.90) to (11.93) and apply (multi-variate) Berry-Esseen theorems for each case of boundary rate pairs (R_1^*, R_2^*) in Theorem 38.

Chapter 12

Gray-Wyner Problem

This chapter studies the lossy Gray-Wyner problem where three encoders cooperatively compress two correlated source sequences so that each of the two decoders could recover a source sequence reliably in a lossy manner. The lossy Gray-Wyner problem is a paradigm of the multiterminal lossy source coding problem where there exist multiple source sequences, multiple encoders and multiple decoders. The problem significantly generalizes the rate-distortion problem by introducing one more source sequence, two more encoders and one more decoder.

The rate-distortion region for the problem was derived by Gray and Wyner [40] and this is why the problem is so named. An auxiliary random variable is needed to characterize the rate-distortion region of the lossy Gray-Wyner problem, which makes it significantly different from all problems discussed in previous chapters. The second-order asymptotics for the lossless version of the Gray-Wyner problem was derived by Watanabe [60]. This chapter presents the generalization of [60] to the lossy case, analogously to the generalization of second-order asymptotics from lossless source coding in Chapter 2 (cf. [4, 9]) to the rate-distortion problem in Chapter 3 (cf. [12, 11]).

The Gray-Wyner problem is interesting beyond data compression. In the Gray-Wyner problem, there is an encoder who transmits messages to both decoders and its rate is known as the common rate. Given rates of the other two encoders, the minimal common rate equals a measure of common information of two correlated random variables [122]. Leveraging results on lossy common information by Viswanatha, Akyol, and Rose [122] and considering rate triples on the Pangloss plane where the sum rate is constrained, the second-order asymptotic result is simplified and numerically illustrated. This chapter is largely based on [24].

12.1 Problem Formulation and Asymptotic Result

12.1.1 Problem Formulation

The lossy Gray-Wyner source coding problem [40] is shown in Figure 12.1. There are three encoders and two decoders. Encoder f_i has access to a source sequence pair (X^n, Y^n) and compresses it into a message S_i . Decoder ϕ_1 aims to recover source sequence X^n under fidelity criterion d_1 and distortion level D_1 with the encoded message S_0 from encoder f_0 and S_1 from encoder f_1 . Similarly, the decoder ϕ_2 aims to recover Y^n with messages S_0 and S_2 . We consider a correlated memoryless source (X^n, Y^n) generated i.i.d. from a joint distribution P_{XY} defined on a finite alphabet $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.




Figure 12.1: System model for the lossy Gray-Wyner source coding problem [40].

Definition 29. An (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -code for lossy Gray-Wyner source coding consists of three encoders:

$$f_0 : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_0 := [M_0], \quad (12.1)$$

$$f_1 : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_1 := [M_1], \quad (12.2)$$

$$f_2 : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2 := [M_2], \quad (12.3)$$

and two decoders:

$$\phi_1 : \mathcal{M}_0 \times \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n, \quad (12.4)$$

$$\phi_2 : \mathcal{M}_0 \times \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^n. \quad (12.5)$$

Let $d_1 : \mathcal{X} \times \hat{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and $d_2 : \mathcal{Y} \times \hat{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be two bounded distortion measures, Let $\bar{d}_1 := \max_{x, \hat{x}} d_1(x, \hat{x})$ and $\underline{d}_1 := \min_{x, \hat{x}: d_1(x, \hat{x}) > 0} d_1(x, \hat{x})$ denote the maximal and minimal distortion, respectively. Similarly, we define \bar{d}_2 and \underline{d}_2 . Furthermore, let the average distortion between x^n and \hat{x}^n be defined as $\bar{d}_1(x^n, \hat{x}^n) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_1(x_i, \hat{x}_i)$ and the average distortion $d_2(y^n, \hat{y}^n)$ be defined similarly.

12.1.2 Rate-Distortion Region

The rate-distortion region of the lossy Gray-Wyner problem is defined as follows.

Definition 30. A rate triplet (R_0, R_1, R_2) is said to be (D_1, D_2) -achievable if there exists a sequence of (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -codes such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_0 \leq R_0, \quad (12.6)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_1 \leq R_1, \quad (12.7)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M_2 \leq R_2, \quad (12.8)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [d_1(X^n, \hat{X}^n)] \leq D_1, \quad (12.9)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [d_2(Y^n, \hat{Y}^n)] \leq D_2. \quad (12.10)$$

The closure of the set of all (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate triplets is the (D_1, D_2) -optimal rate region and denoted as $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$.

Gray and Wyner characterized the (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate region in [40]. Let $\mathcal{P}(P_{XY})$ be the set of all joint distributions $P_{XYW} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{W})$ such that the $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ -marginal of P_{XYW} is the source distribution P_{XY} and $|\mathcal{W}| \leq |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| + 2$. Denote the $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W}$ marginal distribution as P_{XW} and the $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{W}$ marginal distribution as P_{YW} .

Theorem 39. The (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate region for lossy Gray-Wyner source coding is

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) \\ &= \bigcup_{P_{XYW} \in \mathcal{P}(P_{XY})} \left\{ (R_0, R_1, R_2) : R_0 \geq I(X, Y; W) \right. \\ & \quad \left. R_1 \geq R_{X|W}(P_{XW}, D_1), R_2 \geq R_{Y|W}(P_{YW}, D_2) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.11)$$

where $R_{X|W}(P_{XW}, D_1)$ and $R_{Y|W}(P_{YW}, D_2)$ are conditional rate-distortion functions [106, pp. 275, chapter 11], i.e.,

$$R_{X|W}(P_{XW}, D_1) = \min_{P_{\hat{X}|XW} : \mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X})] \leq D_1} I(X; \hat{X} | W), \quad (12.12)$$

and $R_{Y|W}(P_{YW}, D_2)$ is defined similarly.

Similarly to the rate-distortion and the Kaspi problems, the rate-distortion region in Theorem 39 still hold under the vanishing joint excess-distortion probability criterion, i.e., when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) = 0$, where

$$P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) := \Pr \left\{ d_1(X^n, \hat{X}^n) > D_1 \text{ or } d_2(Y^n, \hat{Y}^n) > D_2 \right\}. \quad (12.13)$$

An equivalent form of the first-order coding region for Gray-Wyner problem was given in [106, Exercise 14.9] and states that

$$\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_{XY}) = \bigcup_{\substack{P_{W|XY}, P_{\hat{X}_1|XW}, P_{\hat{Y}|YW}: \\ \mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X})] \leq D_1, \mathbb{E}[d_2(Y, \hat{Y})] \leq D_2}} \left\{ (R_0, R_1, R_2) : R_0 \geq I(X, Y; W) \right. \\ \left. R_1 \geq I(X; \hat{X}|W), R_2 \geq I(Y; \hat{Y}|W) \right\}, \quad (12.14)$$

Given any rates (R_1, R_2) , let the minimal common rate be defined as

$$R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2|P_{XY}) := \min\{R_0 : (R_0, R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})\} \quad (12.15)$$

$$= \min_{\substack{P_{XYW} \in \mathcal{P}(P_{XY}): \\ R_1 \geq R_{X|W}(P_{XW}, D_1) \\ R_2 \geq R_{Y|W}(P_{YW}, D_2)}} I(X, Y; W) \quad (12.16)$$

$$= \min_{\substack{P_{W|XW} P_{\hat{X}_1|XW} P_{\hat{Y}|YW}: \\ \mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X})] \leq D_1, \mathbb{E}[d_2(Y, \hat{Y})] \leq D_2 \\ I(X; \hat{X}|W) \leq R_1, I(Y; \hat{Y}|W) \leq R_2}} I(X, Y; W), \quad (12.17)$$

where (12.16) follows from Theorem 39 and (12.17) follows from (12.14). Given distortion levels (D_1, D_2) , a rate triple (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) lies on the boundary of the rate-distortion region if and only if $R_0^* = R_0(R_0^*, R_1^*, D_1, D_2)$, which is of interest in the study of second-order asymptotics.

12.2 Rates-Distortions-Tilted Information Density

Analogously to the derivation of second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion problem, the definition of a tilted information density is critical and is usually related to the rate-distortion function (region). For the lossy Gray-Wyner problem, a slight obstacle is encountered on whether to define the rates-distortions-tilted information density using the formula of the minimal common rate in (12.16) that follows from Theorem 39 or the formula in (12.17) that follows from the equivalent form of the rate-distortion region in (12.14). This chapter shows that the latter is more amenable since it does not involve optimization in the conditional rate-distortion function in (12.12).

We now introduce the rates-distortions-tilted information density for the lossy Gray-Wyner problem. Since $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})$ is a convex set [40], the minimization in (12.16) is attained when $R_1 = R_{X|W}(P_{XW}, D_1)$ and $R_2 = R_{Y|W}(P_{YW}, D_2)$ for some optimal test channel $P_{W|XY}$ unless $R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2|P_{XY}) = 0$ or ∞ . To avoid degenerate cases, assume that $R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2|P_{XY}) > 0$ is finite and $\mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})$ is smooth at a boundary rate triplet (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) of

our interest, i.e.,

$$\xi_i^* := - \frac{\partial R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})}{\partial R_i} \bigg|_{(R_1, R_2) = (R_1^*, R_2^*)}, \quad (12.18)$$

$$\lambda_i^* := - \frac{\partial R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1', D_2' | P_{XY})}{\partial D_i'} \bigg|_{(D_1', D_2') = (D_1, D_2)}, \quad (12.19)$$

are well-defined for $i \in [2]$ ¹. Note that $\xi_i^*, \lambda_i^* \geq 0$ since $R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$ is non-increasing in (R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2) . Assume that all derivatives $(\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*, \lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*)$ are strictly positive, which holds for all rate triplets (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) such that $R_0^* = R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$ is positive and finite.

Let $P_{W|XY}^* P_{\hat{X}|XW}^* P_{\hat{Y}|YW}^*$ a tuple of optimal test channels² that achieves $R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$ in (12.17). Let $P_{\hat{X}|W}^*, P_{\hat{Y}|W}^*, P_W^*$ be the induced (conditional) distributions. Given any $(x, y, w) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{W}$, define the following two conditional distortion-tilted information densities

$$j(x, D_1 | w) := \log \frac{1}{\sum_{\hat{x}} P_{\hat{X}|W}^*(\hat{x} | w) \exp \left(\frac{\lambda_1^*}{\xi_1^*} (D_1 - d_1(x, \hat{x})) \right)}, \quad (12.20)$$

$$j(y, D_2 | w) := \log \frac{1}{\sum_{\hat{y}} P_{\hat{Y}|W}^*(\hat{y} | w) \exp \left(\frac{\lambda_2^*}{\xi_2^*} (D_2 - d_2(y, \hat{y})) \right)}. \quad (12.21)$$

The rates-distortions-tilted information density for the lossy Gray-Wyner problem is defined as follows.

Definition 31. For a boundary rate triplet (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) , given any (D_1, D_2) , the rates-distortions-tilted information density for lossy Gray-Wyner source coding is defined as

$$j(x, y | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2) := - \log \left(\sum_w P_W^*(w) \exp \left(\xi_1^* (R_1^* - j(x, D_1 | w)) + \xi_2^* (R_2^* - j(y, D_2 | w)) \right) \right). \quad (12.22)$$

Recall that there are two equivalent characterizations of the Gray-Wyner region, one defined in terms of conditional rate-distortion functions in Theorem 39 and the other defined solely in terms of (conditional) mutual information quantities in (12.14). For the lossless Gray-Wyner problem [60], the two regions are exactly the same. The tilted information densities derived based on these two regions are subtly different. We find that the tilted information density derived from the second region in (12.14) is more amenable to subsequent second-order

¹Due to these regularity conditions, our result in Chapter 2 does not hold for some singular points (e.g., where the derivatives do not exist) of the rate-distortion region, as in the lossless case by Watanabe in [60].

²The following tilted information density is still well-defined even if the optimal test channel is not unique due to similar arguments as [60, Lemma 2]

analyses on the Pangloss plane (Lemma 36). Thus the “correct” non-asymptotic fundamental quantity for the lossy Gray-Wyner problem is the rates-distortions-tilted information density in (12.22).

The rates-distortions-tilted information density for lossy Gray-Wyner source coding has the following properties.

Lemma 33. *The following properties hold.*

1. *The minimal common rate function equals the following expectation of the rate-distortions-tilted information density, i.e.,*

$$R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) = \mathbb{E}_{P_{XY}} [J_{XY}(X, Y | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY})], \quad (12.23)$$

2. *For (w, \hat{x}, \hat{y}) such that $P_W^*(w)P_{\hat{X}|W}^*(\hat{x}|w)P_{\hat{Y}|W}^*(\hat{y}|w) > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & J_{XY}(x, y | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \\ &= \log \frac{P_{W|XY}^*(w|x, y)}{P_W^*(w)} + \xi_1^* \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}|XW}^*(\hat{x}|x, w)}{P_{\hat{X}|W}^*(\hat{x}|w)} + \xi_2^* \log \frac{P_{\hat{Y}|YW}^*(\hat{y}|y, w)}{P_{\hat{Y}|W}^*(\hat{y}|w)} \\ & \quad - \xi_1^* R_1^* - \xi_2^* R_2^* + \lambda_1^*(d_1(x, \hat{x}) - D_1) + \lambda_2^*(d_2(y, \hat{y}) - D_2). \end{aligned} \quad (12.24)$$

Lemma 33 generalizes [60, Lemma 1] for the lossless Gray-Wyner problem and [55, Lemma 1.4] for the rate-distortion problem.

In the following lemma, we relate the derivative of the minimum common rate function with the rates-distortions-tilted information density. Recall that given a joint probability distribution $P_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, $m = |\text{supp}(P_{XY})|$ and $\Gamma(P_{XY})$ be the sorted distribution such that for each $i \in [m]$, $\Gamma_i(P_{XY}) = P_{XY}(x_i, y_i)$ is the i -th largest value of $\{P_{XY}(x, y) : (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$. For any Q_{XY} , let $Q_{W|XY}^*, Q_{\hat{X}|XW}^*, Q_{\hat{Y}|YW}^*$ be the optimal test channel for $R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | \Gamma(Q_{XY}))$ in (12.17). Let $Q_W^*, Q_{\hat{X}|W}^*, Q_{\hat{Y}|W}^*$ be the corresponding induced distributions.

Lemma 34. *Suppose that for all Q_{XY} in some neighborhood of P_{XY} , $\text{supp}(Q_W^*) \subset \text{supp}(P_W^*)$, $\text{supp}(Q_{\hat{X}|W}^*) \subset \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}|W}^*)$ and $\text{supp}(Q_{\hat{Y}|W}^*) \subset \text{supp}(P_{\hat{Y}|W}^*)$. Then for $i \in [1 : m - 1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{\partial R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | \Gamma(Q_{XY}))}{\partial \Gamma_i(Q_{XY})} \right|_{Q_{XY}=P_{XY}} \\ &= J_{XY}(x_i, y_i | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \Gamma(P_{XY})) - J_{XY}(x_m, y_m | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \Gamma(P_{XY})). \end{aligned} \quad (12.25)$$

Lemma 34 generalizes [60, Lemma 3] for the lossless Gray-Wyner problem and [56, Theorem 2.2] for the rate-distortion problem.

12.3 Second-Order Asymptotics

12.3.1 Result

Let (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) be a boundary rate triplet on the rate-distortion region of the lossy Gray-Wyner problem.

Definition 32. *Given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, a triplet (L_0, L_1, L_2) is said to be second-order $(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ -achievable if there exists a sequence of (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -codes such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\log M_0 - nR_0) \leq L_0, \quad (12.26)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\log M_1 - nR_1) \leq L_1, \quad (12.27)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\log M_2 - nR_2) \leq L_2, \quad (12.28)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (12.29)$$

The closure of the set of all second-order $(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ -achievable triplets is called the second-order coding region and denoted as $\mathcal{L}(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$.

Note that in Definition 30 of the rate-distortion region, the expected distortion measure was considered, whereas in Definition 32, the excess-distortion probability is considered. This is consistent with other lossy source coding problems studied in previous chapters and the joint-excess-distortion probability allows us to derive second-order asymptotics that provides deeper understanding of the tradeoff among encoders beyond the rate-distortion region.

Let the rates-distortions-dispersion function be

$$V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) := \text{Var} [J_{XY}(X, Y | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY})]. \quad (12.30)$$

For any boundary rate triplet $(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) \in \mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$, we impose the following conditions:

1. $R_0^* = R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$ is positive and finite;
2. For $i \in [2]$, the derivatives ξ_i in (12.18) and λ_i^* in (12.19) are well-defined and positive;
3. $(R_1, R_2, Q_{XY}) \mapsto R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2 | Q_{XY})$ is twice differentiable in the neighborhood of (R_1^*, R_2^*, P_{XY}) and the derivatives are bounded;
4. The dispersion function $V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$ is finite.

Theorem 40. *Under conditions (1) to (3), given any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the second-order coding region satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) &= \left\{ (L_0, L_1, L_2) : L_0 + \xi_1^* L_1 + \xi_2^* L_2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12.31)$$

Theorem 40 is proved in Section 12.4. In the achievability proofs, we derive a type covering lemma (cf. Lemma 37) designed specifically for the lossy Gray-Wyner source coding problem. While the proof of this type covering lemma itself hinges on various other works, e.g., [22, 123, 60], piecing the ingredients together and ensuring that the resultant asymptotic results are tight is non-trivial. One of the main challenges here in proving the type covering lemma is the requirement to establish the uniform continuity of the conditional rate-distortion function in *both* the source distribution and distortion level. The converse proof is done similarly to the successive refinement or the Fu-Yeung problem where we first derive a type-based strong converse, then use Taylor expansions of the minimal common rate function of empirical distributions and finally apply the Berry-Esseen theorem (cf. Theorem 3).

12.3.2 Specialization to the Pangloss Plane

In general, it is not easy to calculate $\mathcal{L}(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$. Here we consider calculating $\mathcal{L}(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ for a rate triplet (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) on the Pangloss plane [40]. It is shown in Theorem 6 in [40] that (R_0, R_1, R_2) is (D_1, D_2) -achievable if

$$R_0 + R_1 + R_2 \geq R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2), \quad (12.32)$$

$$R_0 + R_1 \geq R(P_X, D_1), \quad (12.33)$$

$$R_0 + R_2 \geq R(P_Y, D_2), \quad (12.34)$$

where $R(P_X, D_1)$, $R(P_Y, D_2)$ are rate-distortion functions (cf. (3.7)) and $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ is the following joint rate-distortion function

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) := \min_{P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}|XY} : \mathbb{E}[d_1(X, \hat{X})] \leq D_1, \mathbb{E}[d_2(Y, \hat{Y})] \leq D_2} I(X, Y; \hat{X}, \hat{Y}). \quad (12.35)$$

The set of (D_1, D_2) -achievable rate triplets (R_0, R_1, R_2) satisfying $R_0 + R_1 + R_2 = R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$ is called the Pangloss plane, denoted as $\mathcal{R}_{\text{pgp}}(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\text{pgp}}(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) &:= \left\{ (R_0, R_1, R_2) : (R_0, R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{R}(D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. R_0 + R_1 + R_2 = R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12.36)$$

Let $P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}|XY}^*$ be an optimal conditional distribution that achieves $R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2)$. Let $P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}}^*$ be induced by $P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}|XY}^*$ and P_{XY} . Define the following distortions-tilted information density:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{XY}(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) \\ := -\log \mathbb{E}_{P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}}^*} \left[\exp \left(\nu_1^*(D_1 - d_1(x, \hat{X})) + \nu_2^*(D_2 - d_2(y, \hat{Y})) \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (12.37)$$

where

$$\nu_1^* := - \left. \frac{\partial R(P_{XY}, D, D_2)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_1}, \quad (12.38)$$

$$\nu_2^* := - \left. \frac{\partial R(P_{XY}, D_1, D)}{\partial D} \right|_{D=D_2}. \quad (12.39)$$

Lemma 35. *The properties of $\iota_{XY}(\cdot|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$ include*

- *The joint rate-distortion function is the expectation of the joint tilted information density, i.e.,*

$$R(P_{XY}, D_1, D_2) = \mathbb{E}_{P_{XY}} [\iota_{XY}(X, Y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})]. \quad (12.40)$$

- *For each $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \text{supp}(P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}}^*)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{XY}(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) &= \log \frac{P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}|XY}^*(\hat{x}, \hat{y}|x, y)}{P_{\hat{X}\hat{Y}}^*(\hat{x}, \hat{y})} \\ &\quad + \nu_1^*(d_1(x, \hat{x}) - D_1) + \nu_2^*(d_2(y, \hat{y}) - D_2). \end{aligned} \quad (12.41)$$

Lemma 35 can be proved similarly to [60, Lemma 1] for the lossless Gray-Wyner problem and [55, Lemma 1.4] for the rate-distortion problem. By considering a fixed rate triplet on the Pangloss plane, we can relate $j_{XY}(x, y|R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$ to $\iota_{XY}(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$.

Lemma 36. *When a boundary rate-triple lies in the Pangloss plane, i.e., $(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{pgp}}(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})$ and the common rate $R_0^* > 0$,*

$$j_{XY}(x, y|R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) = \iota_{XY}(x, y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY}) - R_1^* - R_2^*. \quad (12.42)$$

The proof of Lemma 36 invokes Lemma 33. Besides, we use an idea from [122] in which it was shown that the following Markov chains hold for the optimal test channels $P_{W|XY}^*$ achieving $\mathcal{R}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2|P_{XY})$ and $P_{\hat{X}|XW}^*$ as well as $P_{\hat{Y}|YW}^*$ achieving conditional rate-distortion functions $R_{X|W}(P_{XW}^*, D_1)$ and

$R_{Y|W}(P_{YW}^*, D_2)$:

$$\hat{X} \rightarrow W \rightarrow \hat{Y} \quad (12.43)$$

$$(X, Y) \rightarrow (\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) \rightarrow W \quad (12.44)$$

$$\hat{X} \rightarrow (X, Y, W) \rightarrow \hat{Y} \quad (12.45)$$

$$\hat{X} \rightarrow (X, W) \rightarrow Y \quad (12.46)$$

$$\hat{Y} \rightarrow (Y, W) \rightarrow X. \quad (12.47)$$

Invoking Lemma 36, for a rate triplet (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) on the Pangloss plane, the expression of the second-order coding region is simplified as follows.

Proposition 1. *When $(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{pgp}}(D_1, D_2|P_{XY})$ and the conditions in Theorem 40 are satisfied, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) &= \left\{ (L_0, L_1, L_2) : L_0 + L_1 + L_2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2|P_{XY})} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.48)$$

where the rate-dispersion function [12] is

$$V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2|P_{XY}) = \text{Var}[J_{XY}(X, Y|R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY})] \quad (12.49)$$

$$= \text{Var}[\imath_{XY}(X, Y|D_1, D_2, P_{XY})]. \quad (12.50)$$

12.3.3 A Numerical Example for the Pangloss Plane

Consider a doubly symmetric binary source (DSBS), where $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$, $P_{XY}(0, 0) = P_{XY}(1, 1) = \frac{1-p}{2}$ and $P_{XY}(0, 1) = P_{XY}(1, 0) = \frac{p}{2}$ for $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. We consider $\hat{\mathcal{X}} = \hat{\mathcal{Y}} = \{0, 1\}$ and Hamming distortion for both sources, i.e., $d_1(x, \hat{x}) = \mathbb{1}(x \neq \hat{x})$ and $d_2(y, \hat{y}) = \mathbb{1}(y \neq \hat{y})$. Furthermore, let $R_1 = R_2 = R$ and $D_1 = D_2 = D$. Recall that $H_b(\delta) = -\delta \log(\delta) - (1-\delta) \log(1-\delta)$ is the binary entropy function. Define $f(x) := -x \log x$. Let $p_1 := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1-2p}$. It follows from [63, Exercise 2.7.2] that

$$\begin{aligned} R(P_{XY}, D, D) &= \begin{cases} 1 + H_b(p) - 2H_b(D) & 0 \leq D \leq p_1, \\ f(1-p) - \frac{1}{2}(f(2D-p) + f(2(1-D)-p)) & p_1 \leq D \leq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (12.51)$$

It was shown in [40, Example 2.5(A)] that for $0 \leq D \leq \Delta \leq p_1$, if $R_0 = R(P_{XY}, \Delta, \Delta)$, $R_1 = R_2 = H_b(\Delta) - H_b(D)$, then $(R_0, R_1, R_2) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{pgp}}(D, D|P_{XY})$.

When $D \leq p_1$, the joint (D, D) -tilted information density satisfies

$$\iota_{XY}(0, 0|D, D, P_{XY}) = \iota_{XY}(1, 1|D, D, P_{XY}) \quad (12.52)$$

$$= \log \frac{1}{(2p-1)D - (2p-1)D^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1-p)} - 2H_b(D), \quad (12.53)$$

$$\iota_{XY}(0, 1|D, D, P_{XY}) = \iota_{XY}(1, 0|D, D, P_{XY}) \quad (12.54)$$

$$= \log \frac{1}{(2p-1)D^2 - (2p-1)D + \frac{1}{2}p} - 2H_b(D). \quad (12.55)$$

Hence, the joint dispersion function satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}[\iota_{XY}(X, Y|D, D, P_{XY})] \\ &= \sum_{x,y} P_{XY}(x, y) (\iota_{XY}(x, y|D, D, P_{XY}) - R(P_{XY}, D, D))^2 \end{aligned} \quad (12.56)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (1-p) \left(\log \frac{1}{(2p-1)D - (2p-1)D^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1-p)} - 1 - H_b(p) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + p \left(\log \frac{1}{(2p-1)D^2 - (2p-1)D + \frac{1}{2}p} - 1 - H_b(p) \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (12.57)$$

12.4 Proof of Second-Order Asymptotics

12.4.1 Achievability

We first prove that for any given joint type $Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, there exists an (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -code such that the excess-distortion probability is mainly due to the incorrect decoding of side information W . To do so, we present a novel type covering lemma for the lossy Gray-Wyner problem. Using this result, we then prove an upper bound of the excess-distortion probability for the (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -code. Finally, we establish the achievable second-order coding region by estimating this probability.

Define four constants

$$c_0 = (3|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{W}| + 4), \quad (12.58)$$

$$c'_0 = c_0 + |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|, \quad (12.59)$$

$$c_1 = \left(\frac{11\bar{d}_1}{\underline{d}_1} |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{W}| + 3|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{W}||\hat{\mathcal{X}}| + 5 \right), \quad (12.60)$$

$$c_2 = \left(\frac{11\bar{d}_2}{\underline{d}_2} |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{W}| + 3|\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{W}||\hat{\mathcal{Y}}| + 5 \right). \quad (12.61)$$

The following type covering lemma is critical for second-order analysis for the lossy Gray-Wyner problem.

Lemma 37. *Let n satisfy $(n+1)^4 > n \log |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|$, $\log n \geq \frac{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{W}||\hat{\mathcal{X}}| \log |\mathcal{X}| \bar{d}_1}{D_1}$, $\log n \geq \frac{|\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{W}||\hat{\mathcal{Y}}| \log |\mathcal{Y}| \bar{d}_2}{D_2}$, and $\log n \geq \log \frac{|\hat{\mathcal{X}}|}{|\mathcal{Y}|}$. Given a joint type $Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, for any rate pair $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ such that $R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2 | Q_{XY})$ is achievable by some test channel, there exists a conditional type $Q_{W|XY} \in \mathcal{V}_n(\mathcal{W}, Q_{XY})$ such that the following holds:*

- *There exists a set $\mathcal{C}_n \subset \mathcal{T}_{Q_W}$ (Q_W is induced by Q_{XY} and $Q_{W|XY}$) such that*
 - *For any $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_{XY}}$, there exists a $w^n \in \mathcal{C}_n$ whose joint type with (x^n, y^n) is Q_{XYW} , i.e., $(x^n, y^n, w^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_{XYW}}$.*
 - *The size of \mathcal{C}_n is upper bounded by*

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{C}_n| \leq R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2 | Q_{XY}) + c_0 \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}. \quad (12.62)$$

- *For each $w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_{W|XY}}(x^n, y^n)$, there exist sets $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}(w^n) \in \hat{\mathcal{X}}^n$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{Y}}}(w^n) \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^n$ satisfying*
 - *For each $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_{XY|W}}(w^n)$, there exists $\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}(w^n)$ and $\hat{y}^n \in \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{Y}}}(w^n)$ such that $d_1(x^n, \hat{x}^n) \leq D_1$ and $d_2(y^n, \hat{y}^n) \leq D_2$,*
 - *The sizes of $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}(w^n)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{Y}}}(w^n)$ are upper bounded as*

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}(w^n)| \leq R_1 + c_1 \frac{\log n}{n}, \quad (12.63)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathcal{Y}}}(w^n)| \leq R_2 + c_2 \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (12.64)$$

Lemma 37 is proved by combining a few ideas from the literature: a type covering lemma for the conditional rate-distortion problem (modified from Lemma 4.1 in [42] for the standard rate-distortion problem and Lemma 8 in [22] for the successive refinement problem), a type covering lemma for the common side information for the Gray-Wyner problem (Lemma 4 in [60]) and finally, a uniform continuity lemma for the conditional rate-distortion function (modified from [22, 124]). The proof of Lemma 37 adopts similar ideas as the proof of the first-order coding region [40] and is available in [24, Appendix F]. The main idea is that we first send the common information via the common link carrying S_0 and then we consider two conditional rate-distortion problems on the two private links carrying S_1, S_2 using the common information as the side information.

Invoking Lemma 37, we show that there exists an (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -code whose excess-distortion probability can be upper bounded as follows. Recall the definitions of c'_0 in (12.59), c_1 in (12.60) and c_2 in (12.61). Define three

rates

$$R_{0,n} = \frac{1}{n} \log M_0 - c'_0 \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}, \quad (12.65)$$

$$R_{1,n} = \frac{1}{n} \log M_1 - c_1 \frac{\log n}{n}, \quad (12.66)$$

$$R_{2,n} = \frac{1}{n} \log M_2 - c_2 \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (12.67)$$

Lemma 38. *There exists an (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -code such that*

$$P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \Pr \left\{ R_{0,n} < R_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}) \right\}. \quad (12.68)$$

The proof of Lemma 38 is similar to [60, Lemma 5] and available in [24, Appendix J].

Recall the definition of the typical set $\mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY})$ in (9.76) and the result in (9.77) that

$$\Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} \leq \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2}. \quad (12.69)$$

For a rate triplet (R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*) satisfying conditions in Theorem 40, let

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_0 = R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) + \frac{L_0}{\sqrt{n}} + c'_0 \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}, \quad (12.70)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_1 = R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + c_1 \frac{\log n}{n}, \quad (12.71)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_2 = R_2^* + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + c_2 \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (12.72)$$

It follows that

$$R_{i,n} = R_i^* + \frac{L_i}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2. \quad (12.73)$$

In subsequent analyses, for ease of notation, we use $J_{XY}(X_i, Y_i)$ to denote $J_{XY}(X_i, Y_i | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$. From the conditions in Theorem 40, the second derivatives of the minimal sum rate function $R_0(R_1, R_2, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$ with respect to (R_1, R_2, P_{XY}) are bounded around a neighborhood of (R_1^*, R_2^*, P_{XY}) . Hence, for any $\hat{T}_{x^n y^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY})$, for large n , invoking Lemma 34 and applying

Taylor's expansion for $R_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{x^n y^n})$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & R_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{x^n y^n}) \\ &= R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) - \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\lambda_i(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}) - \lambda_i(P_{XY}) \right) \left(j(x_i, y_i) - j(x_m, y_m) \right) \\ &\quad + O \left(\|\lambda(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}) - \Gamma(P_{XY})\|^2 \right) + O \left((R_{1,n} - R_1^*)^2 + (R_{2,n} - R_2^*)^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (12.74)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) - \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{x,y} \left(\hat{T}_{x^n y^n}(x, y) - P_{XY}(x, y) \right) j_{XY}(x, y) \end{aligned} \quad (12.75)$$

$$\leq \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) j_{XY}(x, y) - \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right) \quad (12.76)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n j_{XY}(x_i, y_i) - \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right), \quad (12.77)$$

where (12.76) follows from Lemma 33 and the definition of the typical set $\mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY})$ in (9.76).

Define $\eta_n = \frac{\log n}{n}$. Invoking Lemma 38, we can upper bound the excess-distortion probability as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \\ & \leq \Pr \left\{ R_{0,n} < R_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12.78)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}), R_{0,n} < R_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}) \right\} \\ & \quad + \Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12.79)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \Pr \left\{ R_{0,n} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n j_{XY}(X_i, Y_i) - \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} \\ & \quad + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2} \end{aligned} \quad (12.80)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \Pr \left\{ \frac{L_0}{\sqrt{n}} + \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(j_{XY}(X_i, Y_i) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) \right) \right\} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2} \end{aligned} \quad (12.81)$$

$$\leq Q \left(\frac{L_0 + \xi_1^* L_1 + \xi_2^* L_2 + O(\sqrt{n}\eta_n)}{\sqrt{V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})}} \right) + \frac{6T(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2)}{\sqrt{n}V^{3/2}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2)} + \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2}, \quad (12.82)$$

where (12.82) follows from the Berry-Esseen Theorem and $T(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2)$ is third absolute moment of the rates-distortions-tilted information density $j_{XY}(X, Y)$, which is finite for a DMS from the conditions in Theorem 40. Therefore, if (L_0, L_1, L_2) satisfies

$$L_0 + \xi_1^* L_1 + \xi_2^* L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})} Q^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (12.83)$$

then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \leq \varepsilon$.

12.4.2 Converse

We follow the method of types, similarly to the proof of the lossless case in [60] and to the converse proof of the successive refinement and Fu-Yeung problem in previous chapters. We first establish a type-based strong converse and use it to derive a lower bound on excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2)$. Finally, we use a Taylor expansion and apply the Berry-Esseen Theorem to obtain an outer region expressed essentially using $V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})$.

We now consider an (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -code for the correlated source (X^n, Y^n) with joint distribution $U_{\mathcal{T}_{Q_{XY}}}(x^n, y^n) = |\mathcal{T}_{Q_{XY}}|^{-1}$, the uniform distribution over the type class $\mathcal{T}_{Q_{XY}}$.

Lemma 39. *If the non-excess-distortion probability satisfies*

$$\Pr \left\{ d_1(X^n, \hat{X}^n) \leq D_1, d_2(Y^n, \hat{Y}^n) \leq D_2 | (X^n, Y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_{XY}} \right\} \geq \exp(-n\alpha) \quad (12.84)$$

for some positive number α , then for n large enough such that $\log n \geq \max\{\bar{d}_1, \bar{d}_2\} \log |\mathcal{X}|$, there exists a conditional distribution $Q_{W|XY}$ with $|\mathcal{W}| \leq |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| + 2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_0 \geq I(X, Y; W) - \frac{(|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| + 1) \log(n+1)}{n} - \alpha, \quad (12.85)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_1 \geq R_{X|W}(Q_{XW}, D_1) - \frac{\log n}{n}, \quad (12.86)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_2 \geq R_{Y|W}(Q_{YW}, D_2) - \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (12.87)$$

where $(X, Y, W) \sim Q_{XY} \times Q_{W|XY}$.

The proof of Lemma 39 is similar to the lossless Gray-Wyner problem [60, Lemma 6] but we need to also combine this with the (weak) converse proof

for lossy Gray-Wyner problem under the expected distortion criterion in [40]. Readers could refer to [24, Appendix K] for details.

We then prove a lower bound on the excess-distortion probability $P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2)$ in (12.13). Define the constant $c = \frac{|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|+2}{n}$ and the three quantities

$$R_{0,n} := \frac{1}{n} \log M_0 + c \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}, \quad (12.88)$$

$$R_{1,n} := \frac{1}{n} \log M_1 + \frac{\log n}{n}, \quad (12.89)$$

$$R_{2,n} := \frac{1}{n} \log M_2 + \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (12.90)$$

Lemma 40. *Consider any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\log n \geq \max\{\bar{d}_1, \bar{d}_2\} \log |\mathcal{X}|$. Any (n, M_0, M_1, M_2) -code satisfies*

$$P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) \geq \Pr \left\{ R_{0,n} < \mathsf{R}_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}) \right\} - \frac{1}{n}. \quad (12.91)$$

The proof of Lemma 40 is similar to [60, Lemma 7] and available in [24, Appendix L].

Choose (M_0, M_1, M_2) such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_0 = R_0^* + \frac{L_0}{\sqrt{n}} - c \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}, \quad (12.92)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_1 = R_1^* + \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\log n}{n}, \quad (12.93)$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log M_2 = R_2^* + \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\log n}{n}. \quad (12.94)$$

Hence, according to (12.88) to (12.90) in Lemma 40, for $i \in [0 : 2]$,

$$R_{i,n} = R_i^* + \frac{L_i}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (12.95)$$

Recall that we use $j_{XY}(X_i, Y_i)$ to denote $j_{XY}(X_i, Y_i | R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, P_{XY})$. Invoking Lemma 40, similarly to the achievability proof,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) &\geq \Pr \left\{ R_{0,n} < \mathsf{R}_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}) \right\} - \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned} \quad (12.96)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \Pr \left\{ R_{0,n} < \mathsf{R}_0(R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}, D_1, D_2 | \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n}), \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned} \quad (12.97)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \Pr \left\{ R_0^* + \frac{L_0}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n j_{XY}(X_i, Y_i) - \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{and } \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \in \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} - \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned} \quad (12.98)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \Pr \left\{ R_0^* + \frac{L_0}{\sqrt{n}} < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n J_{XY}(X_i, Y_i) - \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} - \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) \right\} \\ &\quad - \Pr \left\{ \hat{T}_{X^n Y^n} \notin \mathcal{A}_n(P_{XY}) \right\} - \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned} \quad (12.99)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \Pr \left\{ \frac{L_0}{\sqrt{n}} + \xi_1^* \frac{L_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \xi_2^* \frac{L_2}{\sqrt{n}} + O(\eta_n) < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n J_{XY}(X_i, Y_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - R_0(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY}) \right\} - \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2} - \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned} \quad (12.100)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \mathbb{Q} \left(\frac{L_0 + \xi_1^* L_1 + \xi_2^* L_2 + O(\sqrt{n}\eta_n)}{\sqrt{V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})}} \right) - \frac{6T(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2)}{\sqrt{n}V^{3/2}(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2)} \\ &\quad - \frac{2|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|}{n^2} - \frac{1}{n}, \end{aligned} \quad (12.101)$$

where (12.99) follows from the fact that $\Pr\{\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{F}\} \geq \Pr\{\mathcal{E}\} - \Pr\{\mathcal{F}^c\}$. Hence, if (L_0, L_1, L_2) satisfies

$$L_0 + \xi_1^* L_1 + \xi_2^* L_2 < \sqrt{V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})} \mathbb{Q}^{-1}(\varepsilon), \quad (12.102)$$

then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{e,n}(D_1, D_2) > \varepsilon$. Therefore, for sufficiently large n , any second-order $(R_0^*, R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon)$ -achievable triplet (L_0, L_1, L_2) must satisfy

$$L_0 + \xi_1^* L_1 + \xi_2^* L_2 \geq \sqrt{V(R_1^*, R_2^*, D_1, D_2 | P_{XY})} \mathbb{Q}^{-1}(\varepsilon). \quad (12.103)$$

Chapter 13

Reflections, Other Results and Future Directions

13.1 Reflections

In this monograph, we reviewed recent advances in the second-order asymptotics for lossy source coding, which provides approximation to the finite blocklength performance of optimal codes. The monograph is divided into three parts: Part I, consisting of two chapters, introduces the basics; Part II, consisting of six chapters, is concerned with the point-to-point setting; and Part III, consisting of four chapters, deals with multiterminal settings.

Specifically, in Chapter 1, we introduced the notation and critical mathematical background. In Chapter 2, we illustrated non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic analyses via lossless source coding. Subsequently, in Chapter 3 of Part II, we presented the generalization of the results from lossless source coding to the rate-distortion problem of lossy source coding, highlighted the role of the distortion-tilted information density and introduced two proof sketches. One proof method to yield second-order asymptotics is applying the Berry-Esseen theorem to carefully derive non-asymptotic achievability and converse bounds, where the achievability part uses random coding and minimal distortion encoding while the converse part relies on the properties of the distortion-tilted information density. Although this method is simple and elegant, it is not always possible to derive the desired non-asymptotic bounds for multiterminal lossy source coding problems. Thus, we also introduced another proof technique using the method of types, where the achievability part uses the type covering lemma tailored to the rate-distortion problem and the converse part depends on a type-based strong converse analysis. The first proof sketch using the non-asymptotic bounds usually applies to any memoryless source while the method of types is valid only for a DMS. In the rest of Part II, the results and proofs for the rate-distortion problem are generalized to account for noisy sources, noisy channels, mismatched compression, sources with memory and variable length

compression in Chapters 4 to 8.

In Part III, the two proof methods for the rate-distortion problem are generalized in combination to derive non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds for four multiterminal lossy source coding problems in the increasingly complicated order: the Kaspi problem in Chapter 9; the successive refinement problem in Chapter 10; the Fu-Yeung problem in Chapter 11; and the Gray-Wyner problem in Chapter 12. For the Kaspi problem, we introduced the distortions-tilted information density, illustrated the role of side information and showed that the conditional rate-distortion problem is a special case of the Kaspi problem. For the successive refinement problem, we defined a rate-distortions-tilted information density, showed its connection to the minimal sum rate subject to the rate of one encoder, demonstrated the tradeoff between second-order coding rates of two encoders, and validated the joint excess-distortion probability as the “correct” performance criterion. For the Fu-Yeung problem, we presented a non-asymptotic converse bound which yielded tight second-order converse result when specializing to the successive refinement problem and presented tight second-order asymptotics for simultaneous lossless and lossy compression. Finally, for the Gray-Wyner problem in which an auxiliary random variable is required in the characterization of the rate-distortion region, we presented a second-order asymptotic result, where the achievability part follows by deriving a type covering lemma tailored to the problem which uses the continuity of conditional rate-distortion function with respect to the distortion level and the distributions.

13.2 Other Results

This monograph mainly focused on fixed-length compression of a DMS under bounded distortion measures with the excess-distortion probability as the performance criterion. For a GMS under quadratic distortion measures, the second-order asymptotics for the rate-distortion problem was derived by Ingber and Kochman [11, Theorem 2] and by Kostina and Verdú [12, Theorem 40], and the second-order asymptotics for the successive refinement problem was derived by No, Ingber and Weissman [22, Theorem 7] and by Zhou, Tan and Motani [21, Theorem 20], and the second-order asymptotics for a Laplacian source under the magnitude-error distortion measure could be derived using the type-covering lemma in [113] for the achievability result and using the non-asymptotic converse bound in [103, Corollary 2]. When the distortion measure is the logarithm loss, the non-asymptotic analysis for the rate-distortion and the multiple descriptions problem was derived by Shkel and Verdú [125] and the successive refinement problem was studied by No [126]. When the excess-distortion probability is replaced by the average distortion, a non-asymptotic analysis of the rate-distortion problem was done by Moulin [127] and by Elkayam and Feder [128].

Besides second-order asymptotics, the large and moderate deviations asymptotic analyses also provide deeper understanding beyond Shannon theory anal-

yses, as illustrated in Fig. 2.2 for lossless source coding. For simplicity, we call the rate-distortion function or the rate-distortion region the Shannon limit. Large deviations, also known as the error exponent analysis, focuses on deriving the exponential decay rate of excess-distortion probabilities for rates beyond the Shannon limit in lossy source coding problems. For the rate-distortion problem, the error exponent was derived by Marton for a DMS [123], by Ihara and Kubo [78] for a GMS under the quadratic distortion measure and by Zhong, Alajaji and Campbell [113] for a Laplacian memoryless source under the magnitude-error distortion measure. For the successive refinement problem with a DMS, the error exponent region was derived by Tuncel and Rose [110] under the separate excess-distortion probabilities criterion and by Kanlis and Narayan under the joint excess-distortion probability criterion [109]. For a DMS, the error exponent (region) for the Kaspi problem was derived in [19, Theorem 7], for the Fu-Yeung problem was derived in [19, Theorem 16] and for the Gray-Wyner problem was derived in [24, Theorem 12].

Moderate deviations asymptotics [129, 87, 130] compromises between large deviations and second-order asymptotics by deriving the subexponential decay rates, also known as the moderate deviations constants, of excess-distortion probabilities while allowing rates to approach the Shannon limit. The moderate deviations constant for the rate-distortion problem was derived by Tan [131] for a DMS. For the successive refinement problem, the moderate deviations constants were derived by Zhou, Tan and Motani for both a DMS and a GMS [21, Theorems 6 and 15]. For a DMS, the moderate deviations asymptotics was derived for the Kaspi problem in [19, Theorem 8], for the Fu-Yeung problem was derived in [19, Theorem 17] and for the Gray-Wyner problem was derived in [24, Theorem 13].

13.3 Future Directions

We briefly discuss possible future research directions for lossy source coding beyond the results covered in this monograph.

13.3.1 Higher-Order Asymptotics

For the rate-distortion problem and its five generalizations in Part II of this monograph, we present a second-order asymptotic approximation to the finite blocklength performance. It was recently shown by Yavas, Kostina and Efros [132] that for channel coding, the third-order asymptotic approximation in the moderate deviations regime could provide a rather accurate approximation to the performance of an optimal code for blocklengths as small as $n = 100$ with error probabilities as small as 10^{-10} . This high-order approximation is of great interest for beyond 5G communication networks where enhanced ultra-reliable and low-latency communication is required. However, to the best of our knowledge, in general, no tight third-order asymptotic results have been established for the rate-distortion problem. It would be worthwhile to derive

higher-order asymptotic results to complement the second-order asymptotics for the problems presented in this monograph.

13.3.2 Multiterminal Compression of a GMS

Although the second-order asymptotics results of the rate-distortion and the successive refinement problems have been established for a GMS under quadratic measures, the second-order asymptotics of many other multiterminal lossy source coding for a GMS is generally unknown. For the Kaspi problem, the non-asymptotic converse bound in Chapter 3 is valid for a GMS, but the achievability analysis is non-trivial despite the rate-distortion function was derived by Perron, Diggavi and Telatar [99]. For the multiple descriptions problem [114], the rate-distortion region for a GMS was derived by Ozarow [133]. Both achievability and converse analyses of non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds require novel ideas. For the Gray-Wyner problem, although the rate-distortion region is known [40], the exact formula for a GMS remains open and the second-order asymptotics are challenging.

13.3.3 Mismatched Multiterminal Compression

Most contents in this monograph concerned matched compression, where the distribution of the source sequence is assumed perfectly known. Such an assumption is invalid in practice because one is not able to know the exact distribution of a source to be compressed. Thus, it is important to use mismatched coding schemes ignorant of the exact source distribution to compress any memoryless sources. In Chapter 6, we presented the second-order asymptotics by Zhou, Tan and Motani [16], who analyzed the mismatched compression scheme proposed by Lapidoth [36, Theorem 3], where the minimum Euclidean distance encoding with the i.i.d. Gaussian codebook is used to compress an arbitrary memoryless source. However, the non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic analysis for more complicated multiterminal lossy source coding remains largely unexplored. Some attempts have been made very recently by Wu, Bai and Zhou [134, 135] in the achievability analysis of the successive refinement problem.

13.3.4 Variable-Length Multiterminal Compression

This monograph focused on fixed-length lossy source coding. Motivated by the need to reduce the codeword length of frequently appeared symbols, fixed-to-variable length (FVL) source coding has also been widely studied for the point-to-point case [91, 92, 18, 136, 137, 93]. In particular, Kostina and Verdú derived the second-order asymptotics for average codeword length of the FVL rate-distortion problem subject to a non-vanishing excess-distortion probability, which was presented in Chapter 8. Saito, Yagi and Matsushima [136, 137] studied the FVL rate-distortion problem under constraints on both the excess-distortion probability and the excess-length probability. However, no results have been established for FVL multiterminal lossy source coding. It would be

worthwhile to derive non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic bounds on the average codeword length for a multiterminal lossy source coding problem such as the successive refinement problem.

13.3.5 Decoder Side Information Problems

Although we have presented results for several multiterminal lossy source coding problems, many more remain open, such as the Wyner-Ziv problem [138], the Kaspi-Heegard-Berger problem [37, Theorem 2], [139], and the Berger-Tung problem [140]. A common feature of these problems is that in the asymptotic rate-distortion function (region), there exists an auxiliary random variable that forms a Markov chain with the source sequences and/or the side information. For the Wyner-Ziv problem, some attempts in characterizing the second-order asymptotics have been made in the achievability part by Watanabe, Kuzuoka and Tan [141] and by Yassaee, Aref and Gohari [142] and the converse part by Oohama [143]. However, the achievability and converse bounds do not match even in the sign of the second-order term. Novel ideas and mathematical tools are required to establish second-order asymptotics.

13.3.6 Rate-Distortion-Perception Tradeoff

As evidenced in many applications of image compression, optimal schemes achieving the rate-distortion function lead to low performance due to the ignorance of the distribution of the reproduced sequences. The perceptual quality of an image is shown to be determined by the distribution of the reproduced sequences. However, this information is omitted in the design of codes described in this monograph. To solve this problem, recent studies on rate-distortion-perception tradeoff [144, 145] revisit the rate-distortion problem by constraining that the distribution of the output of the decoder is either identical or approximately identical to the distribution of the source sequence. All these results are asymptotic Shannon theoretical analysis on the rate-distortion function for the simple point-to-point case. It would be of interest to conduct a non-asymptotic and second-order asymptotic analysis of the rate-distortion-perception problem and also generalize it to more complicated multiterminal lossy source coding problems.

Bibliography

- [1] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 27(1):379–423, 1948.
- [2] C. E. Shannon. Coding theorems for a discrete source with a fidelity criterion. *IRE Nat. Conv. Rec.*, 4(142-163):1, 1959.
- [3] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [4] Volker Strassen. Asymptotische abschätzungen in shannons informations-theorie. In *Trans. Third Prague Conf. Information Theory*, pages 689–723, 1962.
- [5] M. Hayashi. Information spectrum approach to second-order coding rate in channel coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 55(11):4947–4966, 2009.
- [6] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú. Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 56(5):2307–2359, 2010.
- [7] V. Y. F. Tan. Asymptotic estimates in information theory with non-vanishing error probabilities. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 11(1–2):1–184, 2014.
- [8] A. A. Yushkevich. On limit theorems connected with the concept of entropy of Markov chains. *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 8(5):177–180, 1953.
- [9] M. Hayashi. Second-order asymptotics in fixed-length source coding and intrinsic randomness. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 54(10):4619–4637, 2008.
- [10] R. M. Gray and D. L. Neuhoff. Quantization. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 44(6):2325–2383, 1998.
- [11] A. Ingber and Y. Kochman. The dispersion of lossy source coding. In *IEEE DCC*, pages 53–62, 2011.
- [12] V. Kostina and S. Verdú. Fixed-length lossy compression in the finite blocklength regime. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 58(6):3309–3338, 2012.

- [13] V. Kostina and S. Verdú. Nonasymptotic noisy lossy source coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 62(11):6111–6123, 2016.
- [14] V. Kostina and S. Verdú. Lossy joint source-channel coding in the finite blocklength regime. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 59(5):2545–2575, 2013.
- [15] D. Wang, A. Ingber, and Y. Kochman. The dispersion of joint source-channel coding. In *Proc. 49th Annu. Allerton Conf.*, pages 180–187. IEEE, 2011.
- [16] L. Zhou, V. Y. F. Tan, and M. Motani. Refined asymptotics for rate-distortion using Gaussian codebooks for arbitrary sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 65(5):3145–3159, 2019.
- [17] P. Tian and V. Kostina. The dispersion of the gauss–markov source. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 65(10):6355–6384, 2019.
- [18] V. Kostina, Y. Polyanskiy, and S. Verdú. Variable-length compression allowing errors. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 61(8):4316–4330, 2015.
- [19] L. Zhou and M. Motani. Non-asymptotic converse bounds and refined asymptotics for two source coding problems. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 65(10):6414–6440, 2019.
- [20] L. Zhou and M. Motani. Kaspi problem revisited: Non-asymptotic converse bound and second-order asymptotics. In *IEEE Globecom*, 2017.
- [21] L. Zhou, V. Y. F. Tan, and M. Motani. Second-order and moderate deviation asymptotics for successive refinement. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(5):2896–2921, 2017.
- [22] A. No, A. Ingber, and T. Weissman. Strong successive refinability and rate-distortion-complexity tradeoff. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 62(6):3618–3635, 2016.
- [23] L. Zhou and M. Motani. On the multiple description coding with one semi-deterministic distortion measure. In *IEEE Globecom*, 2017.
- [24] L. Zhou, V. Y. F. Tan, and M. Motani. Discrete lossy Gray-Wyner revisited: Second-order asymptotics, large and moderate deviations. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(3):1766–1791, 2017.
- [25] L. Sankar, S. R. Rajagopalan, and H. V. Poor. Utility-privacy trade-offs in databases: An information-theoretic approach. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security*, 8(6):838–852, 2013.
- [26] W. Gao, Y. H. Liu, C. Wang, and S. Oh. Rate distortion for model compression: From theory to practice. In *ICML*, pages 2102–2111, 2019.
- [27] G. J. Sullivan and T. Wiegand. Rate-distortion optimization for video compression. *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, 15(6):74–90, 1998.

- [28] A. Ortega and K. Ramchandran. Rate-distortion methods for image and video compression. *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, 15(6):23–50, 1998.
- [29] Amirhossein Habibiian, Ties van Rozendaal, Jakub M Tomczak, and Taco S Cohen. Video compression with rate-distortion autoencoders. In *IEEE/CVF ICCV*, pages 7033–7042, 2019.
- [30] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf. Noiseless coding of correlated information sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 19(4):471–480, 1973.
- [31] A. C. Berry. The accuracy of the Gaussian approximation to the sum of independent variates. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 49(1):122–136, 1941.
- [32] C. G. Esseen. *On the Liapounoff limit of error in the theory of probability*. Almqvist & Wiksell, 1942.
- [33] R. Dobrushin and B. Tsybakov. Information transmission with additional noise. *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 8(5):293–304, 1962.
- [34] D. Sakrison. Source encoding in the presence of random disturbance. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 14(1):165–167, 1968.
- [35] H. Witsenhausen. Indirect rate distortion problems. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 26(5):518–521, 1980.
- [36] A. Lapidoth. On the role of mismatch in rate distortion theory. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 43(1):38–47, 1997.
- [37] A. Kaspi. Rate-distortion function when side-information may be present at the decoder. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 40(6):2031–2034, 1994.
- [38] B. Rimoldi. Successive refinement of information: characterization of the achievable rates. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 40(1):253–259, 1994.
- [39] F. W. Fu and R. W. Yeung. On the rate-distortion region for multiple descriptions. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 48(7):2012–2021, 2002.
- [40] R. Gray and A. Wyner. Source coding for a simple network. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 53(9):1681–1721, 1974.
- [41] T. Cormen, C. Leiserson, R. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. McGraw-Hill Science/Engineering/Math, 2nd edition, 2003.
- [42] I. Csiszár and J. Körner. *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [43] I. Csiszar. The method of types [information theory]. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 44(6):2505–2523, 1998.
- [44] W. Feller. Law of large numbers for identically distributed variables. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications*, 2:231–234, 1971.

- [45] F. Gotze. On the rate of convergence in the multivariate clt. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 724–739, 1991.
- [46] V. Bentkus. On the dependence of the Berry-Esseen bound on dimension. *J. Stat. Planning and Inference*, 113:385–402, 2003.
- [47] M. Raič. A multivariate berry-esseen theorem with explicit constants. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2824–2853, 2019.
- [48] I. Kontoyiannis and S. Verdú. Optimal lossless data compression: Non-asymptotics and asymptotics. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(2):777–795, 2014.
- [49] S. Chen, M. Effros, and V. Kostina. Lossless source coding in the point-to-point, multiple access, and random access scenarios. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 66(11):6688–6722, 2020.
- [50] T. S. Han. *Information-Spectrum Methods in Information Theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003.
- [51] R. G. Gallager. Source coding with side information and universal coding. Technical report, LIDS, MIT, 1976.
- [52] I. Csiszár and G. Longo. On the error exponent for source coding and for testing simple statistical hypotheses. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungarica*, 6:181, 1971.
- [53] Y. Altuğ, A. B. Wagner, and I. Kontoyiannis. Lossless compression with moderate error probability. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 1744–1748, 2013.
- [54] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, volume 38. Springer, 2009.
- [55] I. Csiszár. On an extremum problem of information theory. *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*, 9(1):57–72, 1974.
- [56] V. Kostina. *Lossy Data Compression: Non-asymptotic fundamental limits*. PhD thesis, Department of Electrical Engineering, Princeton University, 2013.
- [57] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [58] E. H. Yang and Z. Zhang. On the redundancy of lossy source coding with abstract alphabets. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 45(4):1092–1110, 1999.
- [59] Z. Zhang, E.-H. Yang, and V. K. Wei. The redundancy of source coding with a fidelity criterion. 1. known statistics. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 43(1):71–91, 1997.

- [60] S. Watanabe. Second-order region for Gray-Wyner network. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(2):1006–1018, 2017.
- [61] W. Gu and M. Effros. A strong converse for a collection of network source coding problems. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 2316–2320, 2009.
- [62] M. Tomamichel and V. Y. F. Tan. Second-order coding rates for channels with state. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(8):4427–4448, 2014.
- [63] T. Berger. *Rate-Distortion Theory*. Wiley Online Library, 1971.
- [64] J. Wolf and J. Ziv. Transmission of noisy information to a noisy receiver with minimum distortion. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 16(4):406–411, 1970.
- [65] T. Weissman. Universally attainable error exponents for rate-distortion coding of noisy sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 50(6):1229–1246, 2004.
- [66] Y. Oohama. Indirect and direct Gaussian distributed source coding problems. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(12):7506–7539, 2014.
- [67] Y. Oohama. Distributed source coding of correlated gaussian remote sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 58(8):5059–5085, 2012.
- [68] Y. Polyanskiy and Y. Wu. Lecture notes on information theory. 6(2012-2016):7, 2014.
- [69] I. Csiszár. Joint source-channel error exponent. *Prob. Contr. & Info. Theory*, 9(5):315–328, 1980.
- [70] R. Gallager. The random coding bound is tight for the average code (corresp.). *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 19(2):244–246, 1973.
- [71] J. Scarlett, V. Y. F. Tan, and G. Durisi. The dispersion of nearest-neighbor decoding for additive Non-Gaussian channels. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(1):81–92, 2017.
- [72] A. D. Wyner. Random packings and coverings of the unit n -sphere. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 46(9):2111–2118, 1967.
- [73] A. Lapidoth. Nearest neighbor decoding for additive non-Gaussian noise channels. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 42(5):1520–1529, 1996.
- [74] V. Y. F. Tan and T. Tomamichel. The third-order term in the normal approximation for the AWGN channel. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 61(5):2430–2438, 2015.
- [75] L. Zhou, V. Y. F. Tan, and M. Motani. The dispersion of mismatched joint source-channel coding for arbitrary sources and additive channels. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 65(4):2234–2251, 2019.

- [76] J. Scarlett, A. G. i. Fàbregas, A. Somekh-Baruch, and A. Martinez. Information-theoretic foundations of mismatched decoding. *Foundations and Trends® in Communications and Information Theory*, 17(2–3):149–401, 2020.
- [77] A. J. Stam. Limit theorems for uniform distributions on spheres in high-dimensional Euclidean spaces. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 19(1):221–228, 1982.
- [78] S. Ihara and M. Kubo. Error exponent for coding of memoryless Gaussian sources with a fidelity criterion. *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, 83(10):1891–1897, 2000.
- [79] H. Tanizaki. *Computational methods in statistics and econometrics*. CRC Press, 2004.
- [80] L. D. Davisson. Rate-distortion theory and application. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 60(7):800–808, 1972.
- [81] A. Kolmogorov. On the shannon theory of information transmission in the case of continuous signals. *IRE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 2(4):102–108, 1956.
- [82] R. Gray. Information rates of autoregressive processes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 16(4):412–421, 1970.
- [83] R. Gray. Rate distortion functions for finite-state finite-alphabet markov sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 17(2):127–134, 1971.
- [84] T. Berger and J. D. Gibson. Lossy source coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 44(6):2693–2723, 1998.
- [85] P. Tian and V. Kostina. Nonstationary gauss-markov processes: Parameter estimation and dispersion. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 67(4):2426–2449, 2021.
- [86] T. Berger. Information rates of Wiener processes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 16(2):134–139, 1970.
- [87] D. K. He, L. A. Lastras-Montano, E. H. Yang, A. Jagmohan, and J. Chen. On the redundancy of Slepian–Wolf coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 55(12):5607–5627, 2009.
- [88] I. Kontoyiannis and S. Verdú. Optimal lossless data compression: Non-asymptotics and asymptotics. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(2):777–795, 2014.
- [89] O. Kosut and L. Sankar. Asymptotics and non-asymptotics for universal fixed-to-variable source coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(6):3757–3772, 2017.
- [90] S. Verdú. Teaching lossless data compression. *IEEE Inf. Theory Soc. Newsletter*, 61(1):18–19, 2011.

- [91] T. S. Han. Weak variable-length source coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 46(4):1217–1226, 2000.
- [92] H. Koga and H. Yamamoto. Asymptotic properties on codeword lengths of an optimal fv code for general sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 51(4):1546–1555, 2005.
- [93] Y. Sakai, R. C. Yavas, and V. Y. F. Tan. Third-order asymptotics of variable-length compression allowing errors. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 67(12):7708–7722, 2021.
- [94] S. Kuzuoka and S. Watanabe. An information-spectrum approach to weak variable-length source coding with side-information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 61(6):3559–3573, 2015.
- [95] Y. Sakai and V. Y. F. Tan. Variable-length source dispersions differ under maximum and average error criteria. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 66(12):7565–7587, 2020.
- [96] N. Alon and A. Orlitsky. A lower bound on the expected length of one-to-one codes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 40(5):1670–1672, 1994.
- [97] A. D. Wyner. An upper bound on the entropy series. *Information and Control*, 20(2):176–181, 1972.
- [98] S. Le, V. Y. F. Tan, and M. Motani. Second-order coding rates for conditional rate-distortion. *arXiv:1410.2687*, 2014.
- [99] E. Perron, S. Diggavi, and E. Telatar. The Kaspi rate-distortion problem with encoder side-information: Gaussian case. Technical report, EPFL, 2005.
- [100] E. Perron, S. Diggavi, and E. Telatar. The Kaspi rate-distortion problem with encoder side-information: Binary erasure case. Technical report, EPFL, 2006.
- [101] V. Kostina and S. Verdú. A new converse in rate-distortion theory. In *CISS*, pages 1–6, 2012.
- [102] E. Tuncel and K. Rose. Computation and analysis of the n-layer scalable rate-distortion function. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 49(5):1218–1230, 2003.
- [103] V. Kostina and E. Tuncel. Successive refinement of abstract sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 65(10):6385–6398, 2019.
- [104] M. Hayashi. Second-order asymptotics in fixed-length source coding and intrinsic randomness. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 54(10):4619–4637, 2008.
- [105] Y. Polyanskiy. *Channel Coding: Non-Asymptotic Fundamental Limits*. PhD thesis, Department of Electrical Engineering, Princeton University, 2010.

- [106] A. E. Gamal and Y. H. Kim. *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [107] V. N. Koshelev. Estimation of mean error for a discrete successive-approximation scheme. *Problemy Peredači Informacii*, 17(3):20–33, 1981.
- [108] W. H. Equitz and T. M. Cover. Successive refinement of information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 37(2):269–275, 1991.
- [109] A. Kanlis and P. Narayan. Error exponents for successive refinement by partitioning. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 42(1):275–282, 1996.
- [110] E. Tuncel and K. Rose. Error exponents in scalable source coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 49(1):289–296, 2003.
- [111] V. Y. F. Tan and O. Kosut. On the dispersions of three network information theory problems. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(2):881–903, 2014.
- [112] S. Q. Le, V. Y. F. Tan, and M. Motani. A case where interference does not affect the channel dispersion. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 61(5):2439–2453, 2015.
- [113] Y. Zhong, F. Alajaji, and L. L. Campbell. A type covering lemma and the excess distortion exponent for coding memoryless Laplacian sources. In *23rd Biennial Symposium on Communications*, pages 100–103, 2006.
- [114] J. K. Wolf, A. D. Wyner, and J. Ziv. Source coding for multiple descriptions. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 59(8):1417–1426, 1980.
- [115] A. E. Gamal and T. M. Cover. Achievable rates for multiple descriptions. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 28(6):851–857, 1982.
- [116] Z. Zhang and T. Berger. New results in binary multiple descriptions. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 33(4):502–521, 1987.
- [117] R. Ahlswede. On multiple descriptions and team guessing. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 32(4):543–549, 1986.
- [118] R. Zamir. Gaussian codes and Shannon bounds for multiple descriptions. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 45(7):2629–2636, 1999.
- [119] R. Venkataramani, G. Kramer, and V. K. Goyal. Multiple description coding with many channels. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 49(9):2106–2114, 2003.
- [120] R. Venkataramanan and S. S. Pradhan. Multiple descriptions with feed-forward: A single-letter achievable rate region. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 692–696, 2008.
- [121] J. Chow and T. Berger. Failure of successive refinement for symmetric Gaussian mixtures. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 43(1):350–352, 1997.

- [122] K. B. Viswanatha, E. Akyol, and K. Rose. The lossy common information of correlated sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(6):3238–3253, 2014.
- [123] K. Marton. Error exponent for source coding with a fidelity criterion. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 20(2):197–199, 1974.
- [124] H. Palaiyanur and A. Sahai. On the uniform continuity of the rate-distortion function. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 857–861, 2008.
- [125] Y. Y. Shkel and S. Verdú. A single-shot approach to lossy source coding under logarithmic loss. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 64(1):129–147, 2018.
- [126] A. No. Universality of logarithmic loss in successive refinement. *Entropy*, 21(2), 2019.
- [127] P. Moulin. Lower bounds on rate of fixed-length source codes under average- and 6-fidelity constraints. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 3220–3224, 2017.
- [128] N. Elkayam and M. Feder. One shot approach to lossy source coding under average distortion constraints. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 2389–2393, 2020.
- [129] J. Chen, D. K. He, A. Jagmohan, and L. A. Lastras-Montano. On the redundancy-error tradeoff in Slepian-Wolf coding and channel coding. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 1326–1330, 2007.
- [130] Y. Altuğ and A. B. Wagner. Moderate deviations in channel coding. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(8):4417–4426, 2014.
- [131] V. Y. F. Tan. Moderate-deviations of lossy source coding for discrete and Gaussian sources. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 920–924, 2012.
- [132] R. C. Yavas, V. Kostina, and M. Effros. Third-order analysis of channel coding in the moderate deviations regime. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 2309–2314, 2022.
- [133] L. Ozarow. On a source-coding problem with two channels and three receivers. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 59(10):1909–1921, 1980.
- [134] Zhuangfei Wu, Lin Bai, and Lin Zhou. Excess-distortion exponents for successive refinement using gaussian codebooks. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 234–239, 2022.
- [135] L. Bai, Z. Wu, and L. Zhou. Achievable second-order asymptotics for successive refinement using Gaussian codebooks. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 2888–2893, 2021.
- [136] S. Saito, H. Yagi, and T. Matsushima. Variable-length lossy compression allowing positive overflow and excess distortion probabilities. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 1568–1572, 2017.

- [137] S. Saito, H. Yagi, and T. Matsushima. New results on variable-length lossy compression allowing positive overflow and excess distortion probabilities. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 359–363, 2018.
- [138] A. D. Wyner and J. Ziv. The rate-distortion function for source coding with side information at the decoder. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 22(1):1–10, 1976.
- [139] C. Heegard and T. Berger. Rate distortion when side information may be absent. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 31(6):727–734, 1985.
- [140] T. Berger. Multiterminal source coding. *The information theory approach to communications*, 1978.
- [141] S. Watanabe, S. Kuzuoka, and V. Y. F. Tan. Nonasymptotic and second-order achievability bounds for coding with side-information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 61(4):1574–1605, 2015.
- [142] M. H. Yassaee, M. R. Aref, and A. Gohari. A technique for deriving one-shot achievability results in network information theory. In *IEEE ISIT*, pages 1287–1291, 2013.
- [143] Y. Oohama. Exponential strong converse for source coding with side information at the decoder. *Entropy*, 20(5), 2018.
- [144] L. Theis and A. B. Wagner. A coding theorem for the rate-distortion-perception function. *ICLR neural compression workshop*, 2021.
- [145] Y. Blau and T. Michaeli. Rethinking lossy compression: The rate-distortion-perception tradeoff. In *ICML*, pages 675–685, 2019.