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Abstract

Recently, two extensions of Wyner’s common information — exact and Rényi common informations — were introduced respectively by Kumar, Li, and El Gamal (KLE), and the present authors. The class of common information problems refers to determining the minimum rate of the common input to two independent processors needed to generate an exact or approximate joint distribution. For the exact common information problem, an exact generation of the target distribution is required, while for Wyner’s and $\alpha$-Rényi common informations, the relative entropy and Rényi divergence with order $\alpha$ were respectively used to quantify the discrepancy between the synthesized and target distributions. The exact common information is larger than or equal to Wyner’s common information. However, it was hitherto unknown whether the former is strictly larger than the latter. In this paper, we first establish the equivalence between the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations, and then provide single-letter upper and lower bounds for these two quantities. For doubly symmetric binary sources, we show that the upper and lower bounds coincide, which implies that for such sources, the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations are completely characterized. Interestingly, we observe that for such sources, these two common informations are strictly larger than Wyner’s. This answers an open problem posed by KLE. Furthermore, we extend Wyner’s, $\infty$-Rényi, and exact common informations to sources with countably infinite or continuous alphabets, including Gaussian sources.
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I. INTRODUCTION

How much common randomness is needed to simulate two correlated sources in a distributed fashion? This problem (depicted in Fig. 1a), termed distributed source simulation, was first studied by Wyner [1], who used the normalized relative entropy (Kullback-Leibler divergence or KL divergence) to measure the approximation level (discrepancy) between the simulated joint distribution and the joint distribution of the original correlated sources. He defined the minimum rate needed to ensure that the normalized relative entropy vanishes asymptotically as the common information between the sources. He also established a single-letter characterization for the common information, i.e., the common information between correlated sources $X$ and $Y$ (with target distribution $\pi_{XY}$) is

$$C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) := \min_{P_W} \min_{P_{X|W}} I(X; Y; W).$$

Recently, the present authors [2], [3] introduced the notion of Rényi common information, which is defined as the minimum rate needed to guarantee that the (normalized and unnormalized) Rényi divergences vanish asymptotically is equal to Wyner’s common information. However, for Rényi divergences of order $1 + s \in (0,1]$, the minimum rate needed to guarantee that the (normalized and unnormalized) Rényi divergences vanish asymptotically is equal to Wyner’s common information. However, for Rényi divergences of order $1 + s \in (1,2]$, we only provided an upper bound, which is larger than Wyner’s common information in general. Furthermore, the common information with approximation error measured by the total variation (TV) distance is also equal to Wyner’s common information [2], [4], [5]; and exponential achievability and converse results was established in [2], [4], [6].

Kumar, Li, and El Gamal (KLE) [5] extended Wyner’s common information in a different way. They assumed variable-length codes and exact generation of the correlated sources $(X, Y) \sim \pi_{XY}$, instead of block codes and approximate simulation of $\pi_{XY}$ as assumed by Wyner [1] and by us [2], [3]. For such exact generation problem, KLE [5] characterized the minimum common rate, coined exact common information, by

$$T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{P_{W_n} \cdots P_{Y_{n-1}|W_n} P_{Y_n|W_n}} \min_{P_{X_n|Y_{n-1}:Y_n} = \pi_{XY}^{n}} H(W_n).$$

The exact common information is no smaller than Wyner’s common information. However, it was previously unknown whether they are equal in general. Even for simple sources, e.g., doubly symmetric binary sources (DSBSes), the exact common information was still unknown. It is worth noting that the quantity $T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$ was first considered by Witsenhausen in 1976 [7, p. 331]. However, without giving a proof, he wrongly pointed out that for any joint distribution $\pi_{XY}$ defined on the Cartesian product of two finite alphabets,

$$T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}).$$

L. Yu is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore (NUS), Singapore 117583 (e-mail: leiyu@nus.edu.sg).
V. Y. F. Tan is with the with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Department of Mathematics, NUS, Singapore 119076 (e-mail: vtan@nus.edu.sg).
denote the common randomness, in place of the simulation problem refers to determining the minimum communication rate needed to generate two correlated sources (generating correlation), illustrated in Fig. 1b, was studied in [4], [9]–[12]. The distributed exact (resp. TV-approximate) channel simulation problem. The distributed channel simulation problem (or the communication complexity problem for does not always hold.

Furthermore, the exact common information for continuous sources was studied by Li and El Gamal, and an (one-shot) upper bound was provided [8]. In this paper, we first completely characterize the exact common information for DSBSes, and then show that for these cases, the exact common information is strictly larger than Wyner’s common information. This implies (3) does not always hold.

Furthermore, in both the exact and TV-approximate senses, the common information problem is equivalent to the distributed channel simulation problem. The distributed channel simulation problem (or the communication complexity problem for generating correlation), illustrated in Fig. 1b, was studied in [4], [9]–[12]. The distributed exact (resp. TV-approximate) channel simulation problem refers to determining the minimum communication rate needed to generate two correlated sources \( (X^n, Y^n) \) respectively at the encoder and decoder such that the induced joint distribution \( P^n_{X^n,Y^n} \) exactly equals \( \pi^n_{X^n,Y^n} \) (resp. the TV distance \( D_{TV}(P^n_{X^n,Y^n},\pi^n_{X^n,Y^n}) \) vanishes asymptotically). Bennett et al. [9] and Winter [10] respectively studied the exact and TV-approximate simulation of a target channel. However in both these two works, they assumed unlimited common randomness available at the encoder and decoder, and showed that the minimum rates for both the exact and TV-approximate cases are equal to the mutual information between \( X,Y \sim \pi_{X,Y} \). Harsha et al. [12] used a rejection sampling scheme to study the one-shot case for TV-approximate simulation. In the introduction of [12], the authors also introduced a notion of minimum communication rate for exact simulation with no shared randomness. However, such a notion was not studied in the main part of the paper. Cuff [4] and Bennett et al. [11] investigated the tradeoff between the communication rate and the rate of common randomness available at the encoder and decoder in the TV-approximate simulation problem. Hence the exact channel simulation with no shared randomness was an open problem (and so are the tradeoff between the communication rate and the shared randomness rate for the exact channel simulation problem). It is, however, easy to verify that the minimum communication rate for such a distributed exact channel simulation problem (with no shared randomness) is equal to the exact common information. Hence in this paper, we apply our results on the exact common information to characterize the minimum rate for the exact channel simulation problem.

A. Main Contributions

Our contributions include the following aspects.

- We first consider sources with finite alphabets. We establish the equivalence between the exact common information and \( \infty \)-Rényi common information. We provide a multi-letter characterization for the exact and \( \infty \)-Rényi common informations. Using this multi-letter characterization, we derive single-letter upper and lower bounds.

- When specialized to DSBSes, the upper and lower bounds coincide. This implies that the exact and \( \infty \)-Rényi common informations for DSBSes are completely solved. Interestingly, we show that they are both strictly larger than Wyner’s common information. This solves an open problem posed by Kumar, Li, and El Gamal [5].

- We extend the exact and \( \infty \)-Rényi common informations, and also (the relative entropy version and the TV distance version of) Wyner’s common information to sources with general (countable or continuous) alphabets, including Gaussian sources. We establish the equivalence between the exact and \( \infty \)-Rényi common informations. We provide an upper bound on the exact and \( \infty \)-Rényi common informations for Gaussian sources, which is at least 22.28 bits/symbol smaller than Li and El Gamal’s bound [8]. However, it is worth noting that theirs is a one-shot bound that is obtained by a scheme with blocklength 1, but ours is an asymptotic one which requires the blocklength to tend to infinity.

- Due to the equivalence between the exact common information and exact channel simulation, we apply our results on the former problem to the latter problem. In [4], [9]–[11], it was shown that when there exists unlimited shared randomness,
the minimum communication rates are the same for TV-approximate and exact channel simulation problems, and this rate is equal to the mutual information. However, this is not the case when there is no shared randomness. Our results imply that with no shared randomness, the minimum communication rate for TV-approximate channel simulation is Wyner’s common information; however the minimum rate for exact channel simulation is the exact common information which is larger than Wyner’s common information.

- In the aspect of proof techniques, our proofs rely on a technique so-called mixture decomposition or splitting technique, which was previously used in [5], [13]–[17]. However, in this paper, we combine it with truncation techniques to deal with sources with infinitely countable alphabets, and also combine it with truncation, discretization, and Li and El Gamal’s dyadic decomposition techniques [8] to deal with sources with continuous alphabets. Besides the mixture decomposition, a superblock coding technique is also adopted to prove the equivalence between the exact and ∞-Rényi common informations. Furthermore, as byproducts, various lemmas are derived, e.g., Product Coupling Set Lemma, Distributed Rényi-Covering Lemma, Log-Concavity Invariance Lemma, etc.

B. Notations

We use $P_X$ to denote the probability distribution of a random variable $X$. For brevity, we also use $P_X(x)$ to denote the corresponding probability mass function (pmf) for discrete distributions, and the corresponding probability density function (pdf) for continuous distributions. This will also be denoted as $P(x)$ (when the random variable $X$ is clear from the context).

We also use $\pi_X, \tilde{P}_X, \tilde{P}_X$ and $Q_X$ to denote various probability distributions with alphabet $X$. The set of probability measures on $X$ is denoted as $\mathcal{P}(X)$, and the set of conditional probability measures on $Y$ given a variable in $X$ is denoted as $\mathcal{P}(Y|X) := \{ P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x) \in \mathcal{P}(Y), x \in X \}$. Furthermore, the support of a distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ is denoted as $\text{supp}(P) = \{ x \in X : P(x) > 0 \}$.

The TV distance between two probability mass functions $P$ and $Q$ with a common alphabet $X$ is defined as

$$|P - Q| := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in X} |P(x) - Q(x)|. \quad (4)$$

We use $T_{x^n}(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1 \{ x_i = x \}$ to denote the type (empirical distribution) of a sequence $x^n$, $T_X$ and $V_{Y|X}$ to respectively denote a type of sequences in $X^n$ and a conditional type of sequences in $Y^n$ (given a sequence $x^n \in X^n$). For a type $T_X$, the type class (set of sequences having the same type $T_X$) is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_X$. For a conditional type $V_{Y|X}$ and a sequence $x^n$, the $V_{Y|X}$-shell of $x^n$ (the set of $y^n$ sequences having the same conditional type $V_{Y|X}$ given $x^n$) is denoted by $\mathcal{V}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n)$. For brevity, sometimes we use $T(x, y)$ to denote the joint distributions $T(x)V(y|x)$ or $T(y)V(x|y)$.

The $\epsilon$-strongly, $\epsilon$-weakly, and $\epsilon$-unified typical sets [18]–[21] of $P_X$ are respectively denoted as

$$\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X) := \{ x^n \in X^n : |T_{x^n}(x) - P_X(x)| \leq \epsilon P_X(x), \forall x \in X \}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X) := \{ x^n \in X^n : -\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^n(x^n) - H(X) \leq \epsilon \}, \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{U}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X) := \{ x^n \in X^n : D(T_{x^n}||P_X) + |H(T_{x^n}) - H(P_X)| \leq \epsilon \} \quad (7)$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$ only applies to sources with finite alphabets, and $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$ applies to sources with countable alphabets. For $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$, if $P_X$ is an absolutely continuous distribution, in $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$ and $H(X)$ are respectively replaced with the corresponding pdf and differential entropy. The corresponding jointly typical sets are defined similarly. The conditionally $\epsilon$-strongly typical set of $P_{XY}$ is denoted as

$$\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_{XY}|x^n) := \left\{ y^n \in Y^n : (x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_{XY}) \right\}, \quad (8)$$

and the conditionally $\epsilon$-weakly and $\epsilon$-unified typical sets are defined similarly. For brevity, sometimes we write $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X), \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$ as $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}, \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ and $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon^{(n)}$, respectively.

Fix distributions $P_X, Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(X)$. The relative entropy and the Rényi divergence of order $1 + s$ are respectively defined as

$$D(P_X \| Q_X) := \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} P_X(x) \log \frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)} \quad (9)$$

$$D_{1+s}(P_X \| Q_X) := \frac{1}{s} \log \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} P_X(x) ^{1+s} Q_X(x)^{-s}, \quad (10)$$

1In the case where the alphabets $X$ is abstract in general, it is understood that $\frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)}$ denotes the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $P_X$ respect to $Q_X$. If $P_X$ is not absolutely continuous respect to $Q_X$, then as assumed conventionally, its values is $\infty$. 

and the conditional versions are respectively defined as
\[ D(P_{X|X} || Q_{Y|X}|X) := D(P_X P_{Y|X} || P_X Q_{Y|X}|X), \]
\[ D_1 + s(P_{Y|X} || Q_{Y|X}|X) := D_1 + s(P_X P_{Y|X} || P_X Q_{Y|X}|X), \]
where the summations in (9) and (10) are taken over the elements in \( \text{supp}(P_X) \). Throughout, \( \log \) and \( \exp \) are to the natural base \( e \) and \( s \geq -1 \). It is known that \( \lim_{s \to 0} D_{1+s}(P_X || Q_X) = D(P_X || Q_X) \) so a special case of the Rényi divergence (or the conditional version) is the usual relative entropy (or the conditional version). The Rényi divergence of infinity order is defined as
\[ D_\infty(P_X || Q_X) := \lim_{s \to \infty} D_{1+s}(P_X || Q_X) = \log \sup_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} \frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)}. \]
Denote the coupling sets of \((P_X, P_Y)\) and \((P_X|W, P_Y|W)\) respectively as
\[ C(P_X, P_Y) := \{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y) : X = P_X, Y = P_Y\} \]
\[ C(P_X|W, P_Y|W) := \{Q_{XY|W} \in \mathcal{P}(X \times Y|W) : X|W = P_X|W, Y|W = P_Y|W\}. \]
For \( i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( i \leq j \), we define \([i : j] := \{i, i + 1, \ldots, j\}\). Given a number \( a \in [0, 1] \), we define \( \pi = 1 - a \). Define \( [x]_{+} = \max\{x, 0\} \). Denote \( A^c \) as the complement of the set \( A \). Finally, we write \( f(n) \sim g(n) \) if \( \lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/g(n) = 1 \).

II. Problem Formulations

A. Rényi Common Information

Consider the distributed source simulation setup depicted in Fig. 1a. Two terminals both have access to a uniformly distributed common randomness \( M_n \). Given a target distribution \( \pi_{XY} \), one of terminals uses \( M_n \) and his own local randomness to generate \( X^n \) and the other one uses \( M_n \) and his own local randomness to generate \( Y^n \) such that the the generated (or synthesized) distribution \( P_{X^n,Y^n} \) is close to the product distribution \( \pi_{XY}^n \) under Rényi divergence measures. We wish to find the limit on the least amount of common randomness satisfying such requirement. More specifically, given a target distribution \( \pi_{XY} \), we wish to minimize the alphabet size of a random variable \( M_n \) that is uniformly distributed over\(^2\) \( \mathcal{M}_n := [1 : e^{nR}] \) (\( R \) is a positive number known as the rate), such that the generated (or synthesized) distribution
\[ P_{X^n,Y^n}(x^n, y^n) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_n|} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} P_{X^n|M_n}(x^n|m) P_{Y^n|M_n}(y^n|m) \]
forms a good approximation to the product distribution \( \pi_{XY}^n \). The pair of random mappings \((P_{X^n|M_n}, P_{Y^n|M_n})\) constitutes a fixed-length synthesis code.

In the Rényi common information problem [2], the unnormalized Rényi divergence \( D_{1+s}(P_{X^n,Y^n} || \pi_{XY}^n) \) and the normalized Rényi divergence \( \frac{1}{n} D_{1+s}(P_{X^n,Y^n} || \pi_{XY}^n) \) are adopted to measure the discrepancy between \( P_{X^n,Y^n} \) and \( \pi_{XY}^n \). The minimum rates required to ensure these two measures vanish asymptotically are respectively termed the unnormalized and normalized Rényi common information, and denoted as
\[ T_{1+s}(\pi_{XY}) := \inf \left\{ R : \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{1+s}(P_{X^n,Y^n} || \pi_{XY}^n) = 0 \right\}, \]
\[ \overline{T}_{1+s}(\pi_{XY}) := \inf \left\{ R : \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{1+s}(P_{X^n,Y^n} || \pi_{XY}^n) = 0 \right\}. \]
It is clear that
\[ \overline{T}_{1+s}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_{1+s}(\pi_{XY}). \]
If \( s = 0 \), then the unnormalized and normalized Rényi common informations respectively reduce to the unnormalized and normalized versions of Wyner’s common informations [1].

B. Exact Common Information

In the formulation of the Rényi common information problem, fixed-length block codes and approximate generation of the target distribution \( \pi_{XY}^n \) are assumed. In contrast, in the exact common information problem [5], KLE considered variable-length codes and exact generation of \( \pi_{XY}^n \). The target is also to find the limit on the least amount of common randomness satisfying such a requirement, but the amount here is quantified in term of per-letter expected codeword length, rather than the exponent of alphabet size described in the previous subsection.

Define \( \{0,1\}^+ := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \{0,1\}^n \) as the set of finite-length strings of symbols from a binary alphabet \( \{0,1\} \). Denote the alphabet of the common random variable \( W_n \) as \( \mathcal{W}_n \), which can be any countable set. Consider a uniquely decodable code \( f : \mathcal{W}_n \to \{0,1\}^+ \). Then for each symbol \( w \in \mathcal{W}_n \) and the code \( f \), let \( \ell(f(w)) \) denote the length of the codeword \( f(w) \).

\(^2\)For simplicity, we assume that \( e^{nR} \) and similar expressions are integers.
Definition 1. The expected codeword length $L_f(W_n)$ for compressing the random variable $W_n$ by a uniquely decodable code $f$ is defined as $L_f(W_n) := \mathbb{E}[\ell_f(W_n)]$.

By using variable-length codes, $W_n$ is transmitted to two terminals with error free. The generated (or synthesized) distribution for such setting is

$$P_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n) := \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_{W_n}(w)P_{X^n|W_n}(x^n|w)P_{Y^n|W_n}(y^n|w),$$

(20)

which is required to be $\pi_{XY}^n$ exactly. The distribution $P_{W_n}$ of random variable $W_n$, the variable-length code $f$, and the pair of random mappings $P_{X^n|W_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n}$ constitute a variable-length synthesis code $(P_{W_n}, f, P_{X^n|W_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n})$. The code rate induced by such a synthesis code is $L_f(W_n)/n$. The minimum asymptotic rate required to ensure $P_{X^nY^n} = \pi_{XY}^n, \forall n \geq 1$ is termed the exact common information [5], and denoted as

$$T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) := \inf \left\{ \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{L_f(W_n)}{n} : P_{X^nY^n} = \pi_{XY}^n, \forall n \geq 1 \right\}. \quad (21)
$$

By observing that the expected codeword length $L_f(W_n)$ satisfies $H(W_n) \leq L_f(W_n) < H(W_n) + 1$, it is easy to verify that $\frac{L_f(W_n)}{n} \to H(W)$ as $n \to \infty$. Based on such an argument, KLE [5] provided the following multi-letter characterization of the exact common information.

$$T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{P_W} P_{X^n|W}P_{Y^n|W} : P_{X^nY^n} = \pi_{XY}^n H(W). \quad (22)
$$

Hence a variable-length synthesis code can be represented by $(P_{W_n}, P_{X^n|W_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n})$, where the dependence on the variable-length compression code $f$ is omitted.

III. MAIN RESULTS FOR SOURCES WITH FINE ALPHABETS

A. Equivalence and Multi-letter Characterization

We first establish the equivalence between the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations, and characterize them using a multi-letter expression. The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix A.

Theorem 1 (Equivalence). For a source with distribution $\pi_{XY}$ defined on a finite alphabet,

$$T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \Gamma(\pi_{XY}^n), \quad (23)
$$

where

$$\Gamma(\pi_{XY}^n) := \min_{P_W} \max_{Q_{X^nY^n}|W \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W})} -H(X^nY^n|W) \tag{24}
$$

$$- \sum_w P(w) \sum_{x^n,y^n} Q(x^n, y^n|w) \log \pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n).$$

Remark 1. By a similar proof to that for the converse part above, one can show the following lower bound on the normalized $\infty$-Rényi common information.

$$\overline{T}_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{P_W} \max_{Q_{X^nY^n}|W \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W})} -H(X^nY^n|W) \tag{25}
$$

$$- \sum_w P(w) \sum_{x^n,y^n} Q(x^n, y^n|w) \log \pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n).$$

Remark 2. A similar equivalence as the first equality in (23) has been found by Kumar, Li, and El Gamal in [5, Remark on Page 164]. They showed that the exact common information is equal to a variant of the $\infty$-Rényi common information in which variable-length codes are allowed. However, our equivalence enhances their equivalence, and more importantly, our equivalence enables us to derive the converse part of the multiletter characterization given in (23).

In the proof, an truncated i.i.d. code is adopted to prove the achievability part. For such a code, the codewords are independent with each drawn according to a truncated distribution $P_{W^n}$ which are generated by truncating a product distribution $Q_{n}^{n}$ into some (strongly) typical sets. This coding scheme was also used by the present authors [2], [22] to study the $\alpha$-Rényi common information with $\alpha \in [0, 2]$, and by Vellambi and Kliwer [17], [23] to study sufficient conditions for the equality of the exact and Wyner’s common informations.
B. Single-letter Bounds

Define the maximal cross-entropy over couplings \( C(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w') \) as
\[
\mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w'||\pi_{XY}) := \max_{Q_{XY} \in C(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w')} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)}. \tag{26}
\]

Define
\[
\Gamma^{\text{UB}}(\pi_{XY}) := \min_{P_W, P_X|W, P_Y|W: P_{XY}=\pi_{XY}} \Big\{ -H(X|W) + \sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w||\pi_{XY}) \Big\}, \tag{27}
\]
and
\[
\Gamma^{\text{LB}}(\pi_{XY}) := \inf_{P_W, P_X|W, P_Y|W: P_{XY}=\pi_{XY}} \Big\{ -H(X|W) + \inf_{Q_{WW'}} \sum_{w,w'} Q_{WW'}(w,w') \mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w'||\pi_{XY}) \Big\}. \tag{28}
\]

For (27), it suffices to restrict the alphabet size of \( W \) such that \(|W| \leq |X||Y|\).

By utilizing the multi-letter expression in Theorem 1, we provide single-letter lower and upper bounds for the exact and \( \infty \)-Rényi common informations. The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Appendix B.

**Theorem 2 (Single-letter Bounds).** The exact and \( \infty \)-Rényi common informations for a source with distribution \( \pi_{XY} \) defined on a finite alphabet satisfy
\[
\max \{ \Gamma^{\text{LB}}(\pi_{XY}), C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) \} \leq T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY}) = T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \Gamma^{\text{UB}}(\pi_{XY}). \tag{29}
\]

Note that the only difference between the upper and lower bounds is that in the lower bound, the minimization operation is taken over all couplings of \( (P_W, P_Y) \), but in the upper bound, it is not (or equivalently, the expectation in (27) can be seen as being taken under the equality coupling of \( (P_W, P_Y) \), namely \( P_W(w)1\{w'=w\} \).

If the region of exact common and private informations is defined as
\[
\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) := \left\{ \left( R_0, R_1, R_2 : \exists \{ P_W P_X|W, P_Y|W \} \ s.t. \ P_X^n P_Y^n = \pi_{XY}^n, \forall n \right) \right\}, \tag{30}
\]
then
\[
\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{(\alpha)}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}), \tag{31}
\]
where
\[
\mathcal{R}^{(i)}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) := \left\{ \left( R_0, R_1, R_2 : \exists P_W P_X|W, P_Y|W \ s.t. \ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \right) \right\}, \tag{32}
\]
and
\[
\mathcal{R}^{(\alpha)}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) := \left\{ \left( R_0, R_1, R_2 : \exists P_W P_X|W, P_Y|W \ s.t. \ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \right) \right\}. \tag{33}
\]
The proof of this claim is similar to that of Theorem 2, and hence omitted.

C. Doubly Symmetric Binary Sources

A doubly symmetric binary source (DSBS) is a source \((X, Y)\) with distribution
\[
\pi_{XY} := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 & \beta_0 \\ \beta_0 & \alpha_0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{34}
\]
where \( \alpha_0 = \frac{1-p}{2}, \beta_0 = \frac{p}{2} \) with \( p \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \). This is equivalent to \( X \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2}) \) and \( Y = X \oplus E \) with \( E \sim \text{Bern}(p) \) independent of \( X \), or \( X = W \oplus A \) and \( Y = W \oplus B \) with \( W \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2}) \), \( A \sim \text{Bern}(a) \), and \( B \sim \text{Bern}(a) \) mutually independent, where \( a := \frac{1-p}{2} \) and \( p \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) or equivalently, \( \alpha_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left( a^2 + (1-a)^2 \right) \), \( \beta_0 = a(1-a) \). Here we do not lose any generality by restricting \( p \) or \( a \) to \((0, \frac{1}{2})\), since otherwise, we can set \( X \oplus 1 \) to \( X \).
By utilizing the lower and upper bounds in Theorem 2, we completely characterize the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations for DSBSes. The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Appendix C.

**Theorem 3.** For a DSBS $(X,Y)$ with distribution $\pi_{XY}$ given in (34),

$$T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$$

$$= -2H_2(a) - (a^2 + (1 - a)^2) \log \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( a^2 + (1 - a)^2 \right) \right] - 2a \log [a(1-a)],$$

where

$$H_2(a) := -a \log a - (1 - a) \log(1 - a)$$

denotes the binary entropy function.

**Corollary 1.** For a DSBS $(X,Y)$ with distribution $\pi_{XY}$ given in (34),

$$T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) > C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$$

for the parameter $a \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

**Remark 3.** The exact common information is larger than Wyner’s common information. This answers an open problem posed by KLE [5].

**Proof:** For DSBSes, Wyner [1] showed that

$$T_1(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$$

$$= -2H_2(a) - (a^2 + (1 - a)^2) \log \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( a^2 + (1 - a)^2 \right) \right] - 2a(1-a) \log [a(1-a)].$$

Hence

$$T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) - C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$$

$$= \left( (a^2 + (1 - a)^2) - (1 - 2a) \right) \log \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( a^2 + (1 - a)^2 \right) \right] + (2a(1-a) - 2a) \log [a(1-a)]$$

$$= 2a^2 \log \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( a^2 + (1 - a)^2 \right) \right] a(1-a) > 0.$$  

We obtain the desired result.

Theorem 4 follows from the following lemma.

**D. Sufficient Conditions for Equality of Exact and Wyner’s Common Informations**

In Corollary 1, we have showed that for a DSBS, the exact common information is strictly larger than Wyner’s common information. Now we study sufficient conditions for equality of exact and Wyner’s common informations. Obviously, if $\Gamma^{\text{UB}}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$, then the exact and Wyner’s common informations are equal. We first introduce the following condition on $\pi_{XY}$.

Condition ($\ast$): There exists some optimal distribution $P_W P_X|W P_Y|W$ attaining $C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$ such that $\pi_{XY}$ is product on $\supp(P_X|W=w) \times \supp(P_Y|W=w)$ for each $w \in \supp(P_W)$.

Now we provide a sufficient condition for equality of exact and Wyner’s common informations.

**Theorem 4.** If $\pi_{XY}$ satisfies the condition ($\ast$), then the exact and Wyner’s common informations are equal, i.e.,

$$T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}).$$

**Remark 4.** Theorem 4 generalizes the sufficient conditions given in [5], [17], [23].

**Theorem 4** follows from the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** $\Gamma^{\text{UB}}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$ if and only if $\pi_{XY}$ satisfies the condition ($\ast$).

**Remark 5.** Lemma 1 implies that if the upper bound $\Gamma^{\text{UB}}(\pi_{XY})$ is tight for the exact common information (i.e., $T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \Gamma^{\text{UB}}(\pi_{XY})$), then the condition ($\ast$) is necessary and sufficient for $T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$.

**Proof:** “If” Part: Suppose that $\pi_{XY}$ satisfies the condition ($\ast$). Then by [24, Proposition 2], we obtain that for any $w \in \supp(P_W)$,

$$H(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w \| \pi_{XY}) = \sum_{x,y} P(x|w)P(y|w) log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)}.$$
Fig. 2: Illustrations of the exact and \(\infty\)-Rényi common informations (35) and Wyner’s common information (38) for DSBSes \((X,Y)\) such that \(X \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})\) and \(Y = X \oplus E\) with \(E \sim \text{Bern}(p)\) independent of \(X\).

After taking expectation respect to \(P_W\), we obtain

\[
\sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w \parallel \pi_{XY}) = H(XY).
\]

(43)

Therefore, substituting the distribution \(P_W P_X|W P_Y|W\) into \(\Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY})\), we obtain that \(\Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY}) \leq C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY})\). Since \(\Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY}) \geq C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY})\), we obtain that \(\Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY})\).

“Only If” Part: The proof of “only if” part follows a similar idea as the proof of “if” part. Suppose that \(\Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY})\). For a distribution \(\pi_{XY}\), denote \(P_W P_X|W P_Y|W\) as an optimal distribution attaining \(\Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY})\). Then we have that for any \(w \in \text{supp}(P_W)\), \(\text{supp}(P_X|W=w) \times \text{supp}(P_Y|W=w) \subseteq \text{supp}(\pi_{XY})\), otherwise, \(\sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w \parallel \pi_{XY}) = \infty\) which contradicts with the optimality of \(P_W P_X|W P_Y|W\). On the other hand, we have that

\[
\Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY}) = -H(XY|W) + \sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w \parallel \pi_{XY})
\]

(44)

\[
\geq -H(XY|W) + H(XY)
\]

(45)

\[
\geq C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY})
\]

(46)

By assumption, equalities hold in the above equations. Hence 1) \(P_W P_X|W P_Y|W\) also attains \(C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY})\); 2) the following equality holds:

\[
\sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w \parallel \pi_{XY}) = H(XY).
\]

(47)

Equation (47) implies

\[
\mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w \parallel \pi_{XY}) = \sum_{x,y} P(x|w) P(y|w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)}
\]

(48)

for every \(w \in \text{supp}(P_W)\). By [24, Proposition 2], for every \(w \in \text{supp}(P_W)\), \(\pi_{XY}\) is product on the set \(\text{supp}(P_X|W=w) \times \text{supp}(P_Y|W=w)\). Hence \(\pi_{XY}\) satisfies the condition (*)

The following is a special case of the condition (*).
Definition 2. A joint distribution $\pi_{XY}$ is pseudo-product if

$$
\pi_{XY}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
\alpha(x)\beta(y) & (x, y) \in A \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

(49)

for some $A \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where $\alpha(x) : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\beta(y) : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ are two positive functions such that $\sum_{(x,y) \in A} \alpha(x)\beta(y) = 1$, and $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are respectively the supports of $\pi_X$ and $\pi_Y$.

Remark 6. In general, a pseudo-product distribution is not a product distribution. However, if $\text{supp}(\pi_{XY})$ is a product set, then a pseudo-product distribution $\pi_{XY}$ is a product distribution. For example,

$$
\frac{1}{\alpha_0\beta_0 + \alpha_0\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_0} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0\beta_0 & \alpha_0\beta_1 \\ \alpha_1\beta_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
$$

is a pseudo-product distribution but not a product distribution.

Obviously, pseudo-product distributions satisfy the condition $(\ast)$. Hence for pseudo-product distributions, the exact and Wyner’s common informations are equal.

IV. EXTENSION TO SOURCES WITH GENERAL ALPHABETS

A. Wyner’s Common Information

Wyner [1] only characterized the common information for sources with finite alphabets. Here we extend his results to general alphabets. The proof of Theorem 5 is given in Appendix D.

Theorem 5 (Wyner’s Common Information for General Sources). For a source $(X, Y)$ with distribution $\pi_{XY}$ defined on an arbitrary alphabet,

$$
\tilde{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_1(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_1(\pi_{XY}) \leq C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}),
$$

(51)

where

$$
\tilde{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \inf_{P_W | P_X: W \mid Y : D(P_{XY} || \pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon} I(XY; W).
$$

(52)

Obviously, $\tilde{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY})$. We do not know if they are equal in general. However, they are equal for many sources, e.g., the sources with countable (i.e., finite or countably infinite) alphabets and some class of continuous sources. The finite alphabet case was solved by Wyner [1]. The countably infinite alphabet case and continuous alphabet case are solved in the following corollaries. The proofs are given in Appendices E and F.

Corollary 2. For a source $(X, Y)$ with distribution $\pi_{XY}$ defined on a countably infinite alphabet,

$$
\tilde{T}_1(\pi_{XY}) = T_1(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}),
$$

(53)

Remark 7. In our proof, we show that

$$
\tilde{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}^{(n)}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}^{(n)}[X][Y]),
$$

(54)

where

$$
\pi_{XY}^{(n)}(x, y) := \frac{\pi_{XY}(x, y)1\{x, y \in [-n, n]^2\}}{\pi_{XY}([-n, n]^2)}
$$

(55)

and $\pi_{XY}^{(n)}[X][Y]$ with $[z]_n := z$, if $|z| \leq n$, and $n + 1$, otherwise, denote distributions induced by truncation operations. That is to say, we can compute Wyner’s common information for countably-infinite-valued sources by computing the common information for their truncated versions and then taking limits.

Corollary 3. Assume $\pi_{XY}$ is an absolutely continuous distribution such that its pdf $^6 \pi_{XY}$ is log-concave and differentiable. For $d > 0$, define

$$
L_d := \sup_{(x, y) \in [-d, d]^2} \frac{|\partial \pi_{XY}/\partial x(x, y)| + |\partial \pi_{XY}/\partial y(x, y)|}{\pi_{XY}(x, y)},
$$

(56)

and

$$
\epsilon_d := 1 - \pi_{XY}([-d, d]^2).
$$

(57)

$^6$For brevity, we use the same notation $\pi_{XY}$ to denote both an absolutely continuous distribution and the corresponding pdf.

$^4$A pdf $\pi_{XY}$ is log-concave if $\log \pi_{XY}$ is concave.
If there exists a sequence \( \Delta_d \) such that \( \Delta_d = \operatorname{de}^{-\alpha(x_d)} \) and \( \Delta_d = o \left( (dL_d)^{-\alpha} \right) \) for some \( \alpha > 1 \), then

\[
\overline{T}_1(\pi_{XY}) = T_1(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}). \tag{58}
\]

It is easy to verify that any bivariate Gaussian source with a correlation coefficient \( \rho \in (-1, 1) \) satisfies the conditions given in the corollary above. Hence we have the following result. Without loss of any generality, we assume the correlation coefficient \( \rho \) between \((X, Y)\) is nonnegative; otherwise, we can set \(-X \) to \(X\).

**Corollary 4.** For a Gaussian source \((X, Y)\) with correlation coefficient \( \rho \in [0, 1) \), we have

\[
\overline{T}_1(\pi_{XY}) = T_1(\pi_{XY}) = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho} \right). \tag{59}
\]

**Proof:** The first two equalities in (59) are proven in Corollary 3 by verifying the assumption holds for Gaussian sources. The last equality in (59) was proven in [25], [26].

If we replace the relative entropy measure with the TV distance measure, we can define the TV measure version of Wyner’s common information as

\[
T_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY}) := \inf \left\{ R : \lim_{n \to \infty} |P_{X^n Y^n} - \pi^n_{XY}| = 0 \right\}. \tag{60}
\]

By replacing the relative entropy with the TV distance measure in our proofs, one can easily obtain the following result. The proof is omitted.

**Theorem 6.** Theorem 5 (with the relative entropy replaced by the TV distance measure) as well as Corollaries 2, 3, and 4 still hold for the TV measure version of Wyner’s common information.

### B. Exact and \(\infty\)-Rényi Common Informations

1) **Equivalence:** In Theorem 1, we established the equivalence between the exact and \(\infty\)-Rényi common informations for sources with finite alphabets. Now we extend it to the countably infinite alphabet case.

**Theorem 7 (Equivalence).** For a source with distribution \( \pi_{XY} \) defined on a countably infinite alphabet,

\[
T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY}). \tag{61}
\]

For sources with discrete (finite or countably infinite) or continuous alphabets, we have shown \( T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \geq T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY}) \) in Lemma 6 in Appendix A. Thus it suffices to prove the reverse inequality.

**Lemma 2.** For a source with distribution \( \pi_{XY} \) defined on a countably infinite alphabet, if there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rate \( R \) that generates \( P_{X^n Y^n} \) such that \( D_{\infty}(P_{X^n Y^n} || \pi^n_{XY}) \to 0 \), then there must exist a sequence of variable-length codes with rate \( R \) that exactly generates \( \pi^n_{XY} \). That is, \( T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY}) \).

The proof of Lemma 2 is given in Appendix G.

Until now, we have shown that \( T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \geq T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY}) \) holds for sources with discrete or continuous alphabets, and \( T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY}) \) holds for sources with discrete alphabets. However, we do not know whether \( T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY}) \) always holds for continuous sources. Next we prove that it indeed holds if continuous sources satisfy certain regularity conditions, and the optimal (minimum) \(\infty\)-Rényi divergence \( D_{\infty}(P_{X^n Y^n} || \pi^n_{XY}) \) converges to zero sufficiently fast. The proof of Lemma 3 is given in Appendix H.

**Lemma 3.** Assume \( \pi_{XY} \) is an absolutely continuous distribution with \( \mathbb{E}[X^2], \mathbb{E}[Y^2] < \infty \). Without loss of generality, we assume \( \mathbb{E}[X^2] = \mathbb{E}[Y^2] = 1 \). Assume the pdf of \( \pi_{XY} \) is log-concave, and continuously differentiable. For \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), define

\[
L_{\epsilon, n} := \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon, n}} \left( \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log \pi_{XY}(x, y) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \log \pi_{XY}(x, y) \right| \right), \tag{62}
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon, n} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| \leq \sqrt{n (1 + \epsilon)} \right\}. \tag{63}
\]

Assume \( \log L_{\epsilon, n} \) is sub-exponential in \( n \) for fixed \( \epsilon \). Then for a source with such a distribution \( \pi_{XY} \), if there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rate \( R \) that generates \( P_{X^n Y^n} \) such that \( D_{\infty}(P_{X^n Y^n} || \pi^n_{XY}) = o \left( \frac{1}{n + \log L_{\epsilon, n}} \right) \) for any \( \epsilon > 0 \), then there must exist a sequence of variable-length codes with rate \( R \) that exactly generates \( \pi^n_{XY} \). That is, \( T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_{\infty}'(\pi_{XY}) \), where

\[
T_{\infty}'(\pi_{XY}) := \inf \left\{ R : D_{\infty}(P_{X^n Y^n} || \pi^n_{XY}) = o \left( \frac{1}{n + \log L_{\epsilon, n}} \right), \forall \epsilon > 0 \right\}. \tag{64}
\]
Remark 8. One important example satisfying the conditions in the lemma above is bivariate Gaussian sources. Consider a bivariate Gaussian source $\pi_{XY} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{XY})$ where $\Sigma_{XY} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ with $\rho \in [0, 1)$. For this case,

$$L_{c,n} = \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X}_n^2} \frac{x - \rho y}{1 - \rho^2} + \frac{y - \rho x}{1 - \rho^2} = \frac{2 \sqrt{n} (1 + \epsilon)}{1 - \rho}. \quad (65)$$

Hence $\log L_{c,n}$ is sub-exponential in $n$ for fixed $\epsilon$. Observe that $\frac{1}{n+\log L_{c,n}} \sim \frac{1}{n}$. Hence if there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rate $R$ that generates $P_{X^nY^n}$ such that $D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n}, \pi_{XY}^{n\epsilon}) = o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, then there must exist a sequence of variable-length codes with rate $R$ that exactly generates $\pi_{XY}^n$.

2) Discrete Sources with Countably Infinite Alphabets: In the proof of Theorem 1, a truncated i.i.d. code was adopted to prove the achievability part, in which the codewords are i.i.d. with each drawn according to a set of truncated distributions obtained by truncating a set of product distributions into some (strongly) typical sets. For the countably infinite alphabet case, we need replace strongly typical sets with unified typical sets (defined in (7)). Then we establish the following result.

Corollary 5. For a source $(X,Y)$ with distribution $\pi_{XY}$ defined on a countably infinite alphabet,

$$\max \left\{ \bar{R}_{LB}(\pi_{XY}), C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY}) \right\} \leq \bar{T}_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \bar{R}_{UB}(\pi_{XY}), \quad (67)$$

where

$$\bar{R}_{UB}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \min_{P_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X,Y})} \sup_{Q_{W|X,Y} : \|Q_{W|X,Y} - \pi_{XY}\|_\epsilon \leq \epsilon} \left\{ -H(X|Y) + \min_{Q_{W,W'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{W,W'})} \sum_{w,w'} Q_{W,W'}(w,w') \right\} \quad (68)$$

and

$$\bar{R}_{LB}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \min_{P_{Y|X} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X,Y})} \inf_{Q_{W|X,Y} : \|Q_{W|X,Y} - \pi_{XY}\|_\epsilon \leq \epsilon} \left\{ -H(X|Y) + \min_{Q_{W,W'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{W,W'})} \sum_{w,w'} Q_{W,W'}(w,w') \right\} \quad (69)$$

For the finite alphabet case, since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ is compact, we can remove both $\epsilon$‘s in the optimizations in (68) and (69) by finding a convergent sequence of distributions. However, for the countably infinite alphabet case, in general we cannot do this. Furthermore, it may be possible to remove both $\epsilon$‘s in the optimizations in (68) and (69) by truncating the distributions into finite alphabet ones, as in the proof of Corollary 2. However, we need carefully deal with the terms involving $\log \pi(x,y)$ in (68) and (69), since a little difference between $Q_{X|Y}$ and $\pi_{XY}$ could lead to a large increase of $\sum_{x,y} Q_{X|Y}(x,y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)}$.

3) Gaussian Sources: Next we prove an upper bound on $T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$ and $T_\infty(\pi_{XY})$ for Gaussian sources $\pi_{XY}$. Without loss of any generality, we assume that the correlation coefficient $\rho$ between $(X,Y)$ is nonnegative. The proof of Theorem 8 is given in Appendix I.

Theorem 8. For a Gaussian source $(X,Y)$ with correlation coefficient $\rho \in [0, 1)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho} \right] \leq \bar{T}_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho} \right] + \frac{\rho}{1 + \rho}. \quad (70)$$

Remark 9. For Gaussian sources $(X,Y)$ with correlation coefficient $\rho \in [0, 1)$, Li and El Gamal [8] provided the following upper bound

$$T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} \right] + 24 \log 2. \quad (71)$$

Such an upper bound is one-shot bound, and hence it is also valid for the case with blocklength equal to 1. However, our upper bound requires blocklength to be infinity. Furthermore, for the asymptotic case, Li and ElGamal’s bound is rather loose, since the difference between the upper bounds in (71) and (70) is

$$\frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1}{1 - \rho^2} \right] + 24 \log 2 - \left( \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho} + \frac{\rho}{1 + \rho} \right) \geq 15.44 \text{ Nats/Symbol} \quad (72)$$

$$= 22.28 \text{ Bits/Symbol}. \quad (74)$$
In addition, it is worth noting that our exact common information scheme is a mixture of Li and El Gamal’s scheme and an $\infty$-Rényi common information scheme. In our scheme, Li and El Gamal’s scheme is invoked with asymmetrically vanishing probability, and hence the performance of our scheme is mainly determined by the $\infty$-Rényi common information scheme which requires a much lower rate.

For the DSBS case, our upper bound is tight. Hence it is natural to conjecture that for Gaussian sources, the upper bound in (70) is also tight. Similarly to the discrete source case, one can show the following lower bound on $T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$ and $T_{\infty}(\pi_{XY})$ holds for continuous sources (including Gaussian sources).

$$\hat{\Gamma}^{\text{LB}}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{P_W} \int_{P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \Delta(P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}) \leq \epsilon} \left\{ -h(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{WW'} \in C(P_W,P_W)} \int_{Q_{WW'}(w,w')} Q_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)} dxdydwdw' \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (75)

However, we do not know how to prove $\hat{\Gamma}^{\text{LB}}(\pi_{XY}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho} \right] + \frac{\rho}{1+\rho}$. Furthermore, it is possible to generalize the upper bound in Theorem 8 to other continuous sources by utilizing general typicality, e.g., [27], [28].

For Gaussian sources, Li and El Gamal’s upper bound in (71), our upper bound in (70), and Wyner’s common information in (59) are illustrated in Fig. 3. The exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations are lower bounded by Wyner’s common information. Hence the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations are between Wyner’s common information and our bound. The gap between them is $\frac{\rho}{1+\rho} \leq 0.5$ nats/symbol or 0.72 bits/symbol.

V. CONNECTION TO OTHER PROBLEMS

The exact common information problem is related to (or can be generalized to) the following problems.

- **Exact Channel Simulation**
  The exact common information problem (or exact correlation generation problem) is essentially equivalent to the distributed channel simulation problem (or the communication complexity problem for generating correlation) [4], [9]–[12] (illustrated in
Fig. 1b) when there is no common randomness shared by the sender and receiver. This can be easily obtained by observing that if there exists an exact common information code \((P_{Mn}, P_{X^n|Mn}, P_{Y^n|Mn})\) then \((P_{Mn|X^n}, P_{Y^n|Mn})\) forms an exact channel synthesis code; and vice versa. Hence our results imply that the minimum communication rate for exact channel synthesis is the exact common information, which is in general larger than Wyner’s common information. However, when approximate channel synthesis is considered (under the total variance distance measure), the minimum communication rate is Wyner’s common information. Hence for channel synthesis problems, the exact version requires a larger rate than the approximate version. This is consistent with the conclusions drawn for common information problems in this paper.

- Exact Rényi Common Informations

As shown in (22), the exact common information for \(\pi_{XY}\) is equal to

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{P_W} P_{X^n|W} P_{Y^n|W: P_{X^nY^n}=\pi_{XY}^n} H(W). \tag{76}
\]

Note that the \(\alpha\)-Rényi entropy with \(\alpha \in [-\infty, \infty]\) is defined as

\[
H_\alpha(W) := \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \sum_{w \in \text{supp}(P_W)} P_W(w)^\alpha
\]

for \(\alpha \neq -1, \infty\); and it is defined by continuous extensions for \(\alpha = -\infty, 1, \infty\). The \(\alpha\)-Rényi entropy is a natural generalization of the Shannon entropy. For \(\pi_{XY}\), we define the common \(\alpha\)-Rényi entropy with \(\alpha \in [-\infty, \infty]\) as

\[
G_\alpha(\pi_{XY}) := \min_{P_W} P_{X^n|W} P_{Y^n|W: P_{X^nY^n}=\pi_{XY}^n} H_\alpha(W). \tag{78}
\]

(The common \(\alpha\)-Rényi entropy is a generalization of the common entropy [5], [7]; see the “Case of \(\alpha = 1\)” below.) The exact common information can be generalized to the exact \(\alpha\)-Rényi common information with \(\alpha \in [-\infty, \infty]\), which is defined as

\[
T_\text{Exact}^{(\alpha)}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} G_\alpha(\pi_{XY}^n) \tag{79}
\]

Here the existence of the limit in (79) follows by the subadditivity of the sequence of \(\{G_\alpha(\pi_{XY}^n)\}\) for \(n \in \mathbb{N}\). Now we consider the following special cases.

Case of \(\alpha = 1\): Obviously, for \(\alpha = 1\), \(T_\text{Exact}^{(1)}(\pi_{XY}) = T_\text{Exact}(\pi_{XY})\) which was studied above. For this case,

\[
G(\pi_{XY}) = \min_{P_W} P_{X^n|W} P_{Y^n|W: P_{X^nY^n}=\pi_{XY}^n} H(W) \tag{80}
\]

is called the common entropy [5] and was first introduced by Witsenhausen (1976) [7].

Case of \(\alpha = 0\): This case corresponds to the common information problem in which the common random variable is only allowed to be compressed by fixed-length codes. Denote \(\text{rank}^+(A)\) as the nonnegative rank of a matrix \(A\). Then for \(\alpha = 0\),

\[
G_0(\pi_{XY}) = \log \min_{U,D,V} \|D\|_0
\]

\[
= \log \text{rank}^+(\pi_{XY}), \tag{82}
\]

where the minimization in (81) is taken over all nonnegative matrix \(U \in \mathbb{R}^{(|X|\times k), D \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times |Y|}\) for some \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(D\) is diagonal and \(U^T DV = \pi_{XY}\). Hence the exact 0-Rényi common information can be expressed as

\[
T_\text{Exact}^{(0)}(\pi_{XY}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \text{rank}^+(\pi_{XY}^n), \tag{83}
\]

where \(\pi_{XY}^n\) denotes the Kronecker product of \(n\) copies of the matrix \(\pi_{XY}\). That is, \(T_\text{Exact}^{(0)}(\pi_{XY})\) is the exponent of \(\text{rank}^+(\pi_{XY}^n)\) as \(n \to \infty\). By definition, we can easily obtain

\[
\log \text{rank}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_\text{Exact}^{(0)}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \log \text{rank}^+(\pi_{XY}). \tag{84}
\]

Case of \(\alpha = \infty\): For \(\alpha = \infty\),

\[
H_\infty(W) = -\log \max_w P_W(w). \tag{85}
\]
Hence
\[
G_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = \min_{P_W} \text{min}_{P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}:P_{XY}=\pi_{XY}} - \log \max_w P_W(w) \quad (86)
\]
\[
= - \log \text{min}_{P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}:P_{XY}=\pi_{XY}} \max_w P_W(w) \quad (87)
\]
\[
= - \log \text{min}_{P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}:P_{XY}=\pi_{XY}} \max_w P_W(w) \quad (88)
\]
\[
\geq - \log \text{min}_{P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}:P_{XY}=\pi_{XY}} \max_w P_W(w) \quad (89)
\]
\[
\geq \min_{P_{X|W}, P_{Y|W}} D_\infty(P_{X|W}=w, P_{Y|W}=w||\pi_{XY}) \quad (90)
\]
\[
\geq \min_{Q_X, Q_Y} D_\infty(Q_X Q_Y || \pi_{XY}). \quad (91)
\]

On the other hand, denote \((Q_X^*, Q_Y^*)\) as an optimal pair of distributions attaining \(\epsilon := \min_{Q_X, Q_Y} D_\infty(Q_X Q_Y || \pi_{XY})\). By Lemma 5, we can decompose \(\pi_{XY}\) as
\[
\pi_{XY} = e^{-\epsilon} Q_X^* Q_Y^* + (1 - e^{-\epsilon}) \hat{P}, \quad (92)
\]
where
\[
\hat{P} := \begin{cases} 
\text{any distribution} & \epsilon = 0 \\
\frac{e^{\epsilon} Q_X^* - \pi_{XY}}{\epsilon} & \epsilon \in (0, \infty) \\
\frac{Q_X^* Q_Y^*}{\epsilon} & \epsilon = \infty
\end{cases} \quad (93)
\]

Then set \(W := (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \cup \{w_0\}\) with some \(w_0 \notin \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\), and choose
\[
P_W(w) := \begin{cases} 
e^{-\epsilon} & w = w_0 \\
(1 - e^{-\epsilon}) \hat{P}(x', y') & w = (x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} 
\end{cases} \quad (94)
\]
and
\[
P_{X|W}(x|w) := \begin{cases} 
Q_X^* & w = w_0 \\
1 \{x = x'\} & w = (x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} 
\end{cases} \quad (95)
\]
\[
P_{Y|W}(y|w) := \begin{cases} 
Q_Y^* & w = w_0 \\
1 \{y = y'\} & w = (x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} 
\end{cases} \quad (96)
\]

It is easy to verify that such a distribution \(P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}\) satisfies
\[
P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \quad (97)
\]
\[
H_\infty(W) \leq \epsilon. \quad (98)
\]

Hence
\[
G_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \leq \min_{Q_X, Q_Y} D_\infty(Q_X Q_Y || \pi_{XY}). \quad (99)
\]

Combining (91) and (99) we know that
\[
G_\infty(\pi_{XY}) = \min_{Q_X, Q_Y} D_\infty(Q_X Q_Y || \pi_{XY}). \quad (100)
\]

Therefore,
\[
T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}} D_\infty(Q_{X^n} Q_{Y^n} || \pi_{XY}^n). \quad (101)
\]

In conclusion, we have
\[
G_\alpha(\pi_{XY}) = \begin{cases} 
\log \text{rank}^+(\pi_{XY}), & \alpha = 0 \\
\min_{P_W, P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}:P_{XY}=\pi_{XY}} H(W), & \alpha = 1 \\
\min_{Q_X, Q_Y} D_\infty(Q_X Q_Y || \pi_{XY}), & \alpha = \infty
\end{cases} \quad (101)
\]

- Nonnegative \(\alpha\)-rank

The common information problems can be seen as problems of approximate or exact decomposition of a joint distribution. The exact common information problem is equivalent to decomposing a joint distribution as a mixture of product conditional distributions
\[
P_{XY} = P_{X|W}^T P_W P_{Y|W} \quad (102)
\]
such that the entropy $H(P_W)$ is minimized, where $P_W$ is the diagonal matrix with the probability values of $P_W$ as diagonal elements and $\top$ denotes the transposition operation. Such a decomposition is closely related to nonnegative matrix factorization (NMF) and nonnegative rank \cite{29}, as shown in the "case of \( \alpha = 0 \)" above.

Recall the common $\alpha$-Rényi entropy defined in (78). When $\alpha = 0$, it is equal to the logarithm of nonnegative rank of the joint distribution matrix. Inspired by such relationship, we can generalize the nonnegative rank to the "nonnegative $\alpha$-rank" as follows. For a nonnegative matrix $A$ and $\alpha \in [-\infty, \infty]$, we define the nonnegative $\alpha$-rank of $A$ as

$$\text{rank}_\alpha^+(A) := \exp \left\{ G_\alpha \left( \frac{A}{\|A\|_1} \right) \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (103)

When $\alpha = 0$, the nonnegative 0-rank reduces to the traditional nonnegative rank, i.e., $\text{rank}_0^+(A) = \text{rank}^+(A)$. Equivalently, the nonnegative $\alpha$-rank $\text{rank}_\alpha^+(A)$ can be alternatively expressed as

$$\text{rank}_\alpha^+(A) = \min_{U, D, V} \|D\|_A^\alpha$$  \hspace{1cm} (104)

where the minimization in (104) is taken over all nonnegative matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{|X| \times k}, D \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times |Y|}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D$ is diagonal and $U^\top DV = \frac{A}{\|A\|_1}$.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we established the equivalence between the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations; provided single-letter upper and lower bounds on these two quantities; completely characterized them for DSBSes; and extended the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations, and also Wyner’s common information to sources with general (countable or continuous) alphabets, including Gaussian sources.

For DSBSes, we observed that the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations are both strictly larger than Wyner’s common information. This resolves an open problem posed by Kumar, Li, and ElGamal \cite{5}. For Gaussian sources with correlation coefficient $\rho \in (0, 1)$, we provided an upper bound on the exact and $\infty$-Rényi common informations, which is at most 0.72 (exactly, $\frac{1}{1+\rho} \log_2 e$) bits/symbol larger than Wyner’s common information, and at least 22.28 bits/symbol smaller than Li and ElGamal’s one-shot bound \cite{8}. We conjectured our upper bound is tight.

We also connected the common information problem to the distributed channel synthesis problem. Our results imply that with no shared randomness, the minimum rate for exact channel simulation is the exact common information which is larger than Wyner’s common information. When there is randomness shared by the encoder and decoder, the best tradeoff between the shared randomness rate and the communication rate were studied in our paper \cite{24}. In the future, we are planning to work on various closely-related problems, e.g., the exact versions of various coordination problems \cite{30}.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

A. Proof of $T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = T_\infty(\pi_{XY})$

This desired result follows from the following lemmas.

Lemma 4. \cite{5} If there exists a sequence of fixed-length synthesis codes with rate $R$ that generates $P_{X^nY^n}$ such that $D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n\|\pi^n_{XY}}) \to 0$, then there must exist a sequence of variable-length synthesis codes with asymptotic rate $R$ that exactly generates $\pi^n_{XY}$. That is, $T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq T_\infty(\pi_{XY})$.

This lemma was proven by Kumar, Li, and ElGamal in \cite[Remark on Page 164]{5} using the following mixture decomposition technique (also termed “splitting technique”). According to the definition of $D_\infty$, $D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n\|\pi^n_{XY}}) \leq \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$ implies that $P_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n) \leq e^\epsilon \pi_{XY}(x^n, y^n)$ for all $x^n, y^n$. Define

$$\hat{P}_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n) := \frac{e^\epsilon \pi_{XY}(x^n, y^n) - P_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n)}{e^\epsilon - 1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (105)

then obviously, $\hat{P}_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n)$ is a distribution. Hence $\pi^n_{XY}$ can be written as a mixture distribution

$$\pi^n_{XY}(x^n, y^n) = e^{-\epsilon} P_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n) + (1 - e^{-\epsilon}) \hat{P}_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n).$$  \hspace{1cm} (106)

The encoder first generates a Bernoulli random variable $U$ with $P_U(1) = e^{-\epsilon}$, compresses it to rate $\leq H(e^{-\epsilon}) + 1$, and transmits it to the two generators. If $U = 1$, then the encoder generates a uniform random variable $M \sim \text{Unif}[1: e^{nR}]$, and the encoder and two generators use the fixed-length synthesis codes with rate $R$ to generate $P_{X^nY^n}$. If $U = 0$, then the encoder

\footnote{One can also define a variant of the nonnegative $\alpha$-rank by replacing $\|D\|_A^{\alpha}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^k |D_i|_1^{\alpha}$ or $\|D\|_\alpha$ and meanwhile replacing the constraint $U^\top DV = \frac{A}{\|A\|_1}$ with $U^\top DV = A$. These two variants are respectively equal to $\|A\|_1^\alpha (\text{rank}_\alpha^+(A))^{1-\alpha}$ and $\|A\|_1 (\text{rank}_\alpha^+(A))^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$ with $\text{rank}_\alpha^+(A)$ denoting the nonnegative $\alpha$-rank defined in (103) or (104).}
generates \((X^n, Y^n) \sim \tilde{P}_{X^n, Y^n}\), and uses a variable-length compression code with rate \(\leq \log |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|\) to generate \(\hat{P}_{X^n, Y^n}\). The distribution generated by such a mixed code is \(e^{-\epsilon}P_{X^n, Y^n} + (1-e^{-\epsilon})\tilde{P}_{X^n, Y^n}\). The total code rate is no larger than \(\frac{1}{\epsilon}(H(e^{-\epsilon}) + 1) + e^{-\epsilon}R + (1-e^{-\epsilon})\log |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|\), which converges to \(R\) upon taking the limit in \(n \to \infty\) and the limit in \(\epsilon \to 0\).

The mixture decomposition (or split) of a distribution in (106) can be generalized to general distributions.

**Lemma 5** (Mixture Decomposition of General Distributions). Assume \(P, Q\) are two distributions defined on the same but arbitrary Borel-measurable space. Assume\(^6\) \(D_\infty(P\|Q) \leq \epsilon\) for some \(\epsilon \in [0, \infty]\). Then

\[
Q = e^{-\epsilon}P + (1-e^{-\epsilon})\hat{P},
\]

where

\[
\hat{P} := \begin{cases} 
\text{any distribution} & \epsilon = 0 \\
e^{-\epsilon}P - P & \epsilon \in (0, \infty) \\
Q & \epsilon = \infty
\end{cases}
\]

Moreover, if we define

\[
\Lambda(Q, P) := \sup \left\{ \alpha : \exists \text{ a distribution } \hat{P} \text{ s.t. } Q = \alpha P + (1-\alpha)\hat{P}, \alpha \in [0, 1] \right\},
\]

then

\[
\Lambda(Q, P) = e^{-D_\infty(P\|Q)} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{\text{ess sup}_P \frac{dP}{dQ}} & P \ll Q \\
0 & P \not\ll Q
\end{cases}
\]

**Remark 10.** Given a set of distributions \(\{P_i : i \in [1:n]\}\) and a target distribution \(Q\) defined on the same space \((\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})\), a natural question is to determine the minimum value \(\alpha_0 \geq 0\) such that

\[
Q = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i P_i + \alpha_0 \hat{P}
\]

for some distribution \(\hat{P}\) and some values \(\alpha_i \geq 0, i \in [1:n]\) and \(\sum_{i=0}^{n} \alpha_i = 1\). By Lemma 5 such a mixture decomposition problem is equivalent to

\[
\min_{\{\hat{P}\}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \hat{P}_i \|Q\).
\]

If we consider \(\{P_i\}\) as a channel \(P_{Y|X}\) with \(P_{Y|X=i} = P_i\) and denote \(Q_Y := Q\), then (112) can be rewritten as

\[
\min_{P_X} D_\infty(P_Y\|Q_Y)
\]

where \(P_X\) is a distribution on \([1:n]\) and \(P_Y\) is the output distribution of \(P_{Y|X}\) when the input distribution is \(P_X\). The problem in (113) is just the so-called \(\infty\)-Rényi resolvability problem (or channel resolvability problem under \(\infty\)-Rényi divergence measure). The cases with product channels and product target distributions were studied in our another paper [22].

The decomposition of a distribution into a mixture of several distributions, as in (106) and (107), is termed the mixture decomposition (or split) of a distribution. This mixture decomposition is rather useful to construct a desired distribution. Such an idea originated from Nummelin’ work [13] and Athreya and Ney’s work [14]. In both of [13] and [14], the authors used this splitting technique to study limiting theorems of recurrent Markov processes. Furthermore, such a technique was also used to study the mixing rate of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method [15], by constructing a coupling of an original Markov chain and an target Markov chain. Besides as a tool, mixture decomposition is also an important topic in probability and statistics theories that has independent interest; see [31] (or more general decomposition theories [32]). Furthermore, the mixture decomposition is also related to other information-theoretic problems. For example, such a technique was used in the proof of [16, Theorem 16]; and as mentioned in Remark 10, finding an optimal mixture decomposition (with the minimum coefficient for the residual part) is equivalent to the \(\infty\)-Rényi resolvability problem, which was studied in [22].

**Lemma 6.** If there exists a sequence of variable-length synthesis codes with asymptotic rate \(R\) that exactly generates \(\pi^n_{XY}\), then there must exist a sequence of fixed-length synthesis codes with rate \(R\) that generates \(P_{X^n,Y^n}\) such that \(D_\infty(P_{X^n,Y^n}\|\pi^n_{XY}) \to 0\). That is, \(T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \geq T_\infty(\pi_{XY})\).

**Remark 11.** Note that by checking our proof, one can find that this lemma holds not only for sources with finite alphabets, but also for those with countably infinite or continuous/countable alphabets.

\(^6\)For general distributions \(P, Q\) such that \(P \ll Q, D_\infty(P\|Q) := \log \text{ess sup}_P \frac{dP}{dQ}\), where \(\frac{dP}{dQ}\) denotes Radon–Nikodym derivative of \(P\) respect to \(Q\), and \(\text{ess sup}_P \frac{dP}{dQ}\) denotes the essential supremum of \(\frac{dP}{dQ}\) with respect to \(P\). Moreover, if \(P \not\ll Q\), then \(D_\infty(P\|Q) := +\infty\).
Proof: Assume \( \{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \) is a sequence of variable-length codes with rate \( R \) that exactly generates \( \pi^k_{XY} \). Assume \( W_k \) is the common random variable, and \( P_{X^k|W_k} \) and \( P_{Y^k|W_k} \) are the two generators that define \( c_k \). Hence \( \sum \pi_{W_k}(w)P_{X^k|W_k}(\cdot|w)P_{Y^k|W_k}(\cdot|w) = \pi^k_{XY} \), and \( \frac{1}{k}H(W_k) \to R \) as \( k \to \infty \). Now we consider a superblock code that consists of \( n \) independent \( k \)-length codes as defined above. That is, \( W'_k \sim P_{W_k}^n \) is the common random variable and \( P_{X^k|W_k} \) and \( P_{Y^k|W_k} \) are the two generators. Observe that \( W_k \) is an \( n \)-length i.i.d. random sequence with each \( W_{k,i} \sim P_{W_k} \). Hence we have

\[
P \left( W^n_k \in \mathcal{A}^{(n)}(P_{W_k}) \right) \to 1
\]

as \( n \to \infty \) for fixed \( k \). Furthermore, \( |\mathcal{A}_k^{(n)}| \leq e^{n(H(W_k)+\epsilon)} \). Define a truncated distribution

\[
Q_{W^n_k}(w^n_k) := \frac{P^n_{W_k}(w^n_k)}{P^n_{W_k}(\mathcal{A}_k^{(n)})} 1 \left\{ w^n_k \in \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)} \right\}
\]

Then we use a uniform random variable \( M \sim \text{Uni}[1 : e^{nkR}] \) to simulate such a truncated distribution by mappings \( f_n(m) \) such that the output distribution \( \bar{P}_{W^n_k} \) satisfying \( \bar{P}_{W^n_k}(w^n_k) = e^{-nkR} \left[ e^{nkR}Q_{W^n_k}(w^n_k) \right] \) or \( \bar{P}_{W^n_k}(w^n_k) = e^{-nkR} \left[ e^{nkR}Q_{W^n_k}(w^n_k) \right] \) for \( w^n_k \in \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)} \). Then by [33, Theorem 7], we obtain that if \( R' > \frac{1}{k}H(W_k) + \epsilon \), then

\[
D_\infty(\bar{P}_{W^n_k} || Q_{W^n_k}) = \log \max_{w^n_k \in \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)}} \frac{\bar{P}_{W^n_k}(w^n_k)}{Q_{W^n_k}(w^n_k)} \to 0,
\]

as \( n \to \infty \) for fixed \( k \). Such a simulation code is also valid for simulating \( P^n_{W_k} \). This is because

\[
D_\infty(\bar{P}_{W^n_k} || P^n_{W_k}) = \log \max_{w^n_k \in \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)}} \bar{P}_{W^n_k}(w^n_k) \leq D_\infty(\bar{P}_{W^n_k} || Q_{W^n_k}) + \log \max_{w^n_k \in \mathcal{A}_k^{(n)}} \frac{P^n_{W_k}(w^n_k)}{Q_{W^n_k}(w^n_k)} \to 0,
\]

as \( n \to \infty \) for fixed \( k \).

Now we consider a cascaded synthesis code by concatenating the simulation code \( f_n \) above with the two generators \( P^n_{X^k|W_k} \) and \( P^n_{Y^k|W_k} \) of the variable-length synthesis code. Observe that \( P_{X^kY^k|W_k} \) and \( \pi^{kn}_{XY} \) are respectively the outputs of the channel \( P_{X^k|W_k}P_{Y^k|W_k} \) respectively induced by the channel inputs \( \bar{P}_{W^n_k} \) and \( P^n_{W_k} \). Hence by the data processing inequality [34], for such a code, we have

\[
D_\infty(P_{X^kY^k|W_k} || \pi^{kn}_{XY}) \leq D_\infty(\bar{P}_{W^n_k} || P^n_{W_k}) \to 0,
\]

as \( n \to \infty \) for fixed \( k \), as long as the code rate \( R' > \frac{1}{k}H(W_k) + \epsilon \).

As for the case where the blocklength \( n' \) is not a multiple of \( k \), i.e., \( n' = kn + l \) with \( l \in [1 : k-1] \), we need to construct a code with blocklength \( k(n+1) \) and then truncate the outputs \( (X^{k(n+1)}, Y^{k(n+1)}) \) to \( (X'^{n'}, Y'^{n'}) \). Obviously, \( D_\infty(P_{X'^{n'}Y'^{n'}} || \pi^{n'}_{XY}) \leq D_\infty(P_{X^{k(n+1)}Y^{k(n+1)}} || \pi^{kn}_{XY}) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). Furthermore, the code rate for such a code is \( \frac{k(n+1)R'}{n'} \leq (1 + \frac{1}{n'})R' \to R' \) as \( n \to \infty \). On the other hand, \( \frac{1}{k}H(W_k) \to R \) as \( k \to \infty \). Therefore, there exists a sequence of fixed-length synthesis codes with asymptotic rate \( R \) that generates \( P_{X^nY^n} \) such that \( D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n} || \pi^{n'}_{XY}) \to 0 \) as \( n' \to \infty \).

B. Proof of \( T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \Gamma(\pi^k_{XY}) \)

Here we prove the achievability result from the perspective of \( \infty \)-Rényi common information problem. We borrow an idea from [17]. The corresponding coding scheme was also independently used by the present authors in [2], [22].

\[
\pi^n_{XY} \to \pi^{n'}_{XY} \to \pi^{kn}_{XY}
\]
To show the achievability part, we only need to show that the single-letter expression $\Gamma(\pi_{XY})$ satisfies $T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \leq \Gamma(\pi_{XY})$. This is because we can obtain the upper bound $\Gamma(\pi_{XY})$ by substituting $\pi_{XY}$ with $\pi^*_X$ into the single-letter expression. For $\epsilon > 0$ and a joint distribution $Q_{WXY} = Q_W Q_X|W|Q_Y|W$, define the distributions

$$P_{W^n}(w^n) \propto Q_W^n(w^n) 1 \{ w^n \in T^{(m)}(Q_W) \}, \quad (123)$$
$$P_{X^n|W^n}(x^n|w^n) \propto Q_{X|W}^n(x^n|w^n) 1 \{ x^n \in T^{(m)}(Q_{WX}|w^n) \}, \quad (124)$$
$$P_{Y^n|W^n}(y^n|w^n) \propto Q_{Y|W}^n(y^n|w^n) 1 \{ y^n \in T^{(m)}(Q_{WY}|w^n) \}. \quad (125)$$

We set $C_n = \{W^n(m)\}_{m \in M_n}$ with $W^n(m)$, $m \in M_n$ drawn independently for different $m$’s and according to the same distribution $P_{W^n}$. Upon receiving $W^n(M_n)$, the generators respectively use random mappings $P_{X^n|W^n}$ and $P_{Y^n|W^n}$ to generate $X^n$ and $Y^n$. Define $P_{M_n} := \text{Unif}[1 : e^{nR}]$. For random mappings $(P_{X^n|W^n}, P_{Y^n|W^n})$, we define

$$P_{X^nY^n|C_n}(x^n, y^n|\{W^n(m)\}) := \sum_m P_{M_n}(m) P_{X^n|W^n}(x^n|W^n(m)) P_{Y^n|W^n}(y^n|W^n(m)), \quad (126)$$

which is the output distribution induced by the codebook $C_n$ in a distributed source simulation system with simulators $(P_{X^n|W^n}, P_{Y^n|W^n})$. For such a code, we have the following distributed Rényi-covering lemma.

**Lemma 7** (Distributed Rényi-Covering). For the random code described above, if

$$R > I(Q) := -H_Q(XY|W) + \sum_w Q(w) \mathcal{H}(Q_X|W = w, Q_Y|W = w||Q_{XY}), \quad (127)$$

then there exists some $\alpha, \epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{C_n}(D_{\infty}(P_{X^nY^n|C_n} || Q^n_{XY}) \leq \epsilon^{-n\alpha}) \to 1 \quad (128)$$

doubly exponentially fast.

Set $Q_{WXY}$ as an optimal distribution attaining $\Gamma(\pi_{XY})$. Then $I(Q) = \Gamma(\pi_{XY})$. Hence this lemma implies that there exists a sequence of codebooks $\{c_n\}$ with rate $R$ such that $D_{\infty}(P_{X^nY^n|C_n} || Q^n_{XY}) \leq \epsilon^{-n\alpha}$ as long as $R > \Gamma(\pi_{XY})$. This completes the proof of $T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \leq \Gamma(\pi_{XY})$. Hence what we need to do is to prove Lemma 7. The proof is provided in the following.

**Proof of Lemma 7:** Define

$$\mathcal{B}_\epsilon := \left\{ P_{WXY} \in \mathcal{P}(W \times X \times Y) : \right. \quad \left. \forall w, |P_W(w) - Q_W(w)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} Q_W(w), \quad (129) \right.$$ 
$$\forall (w, x), |P_{W,X}(w, x) - Q_{W,X}(w, x)| \leq \epsilon Q_{W,X}(w, x),$$
$$\forall (w, y), |P_{W,Y}(w, y) - Q_{W,Y}(w, y)| \leq \epsilon Q_{W,Y}(w, y),$$

and

$$I_\epsilon(Q) := \max_{P_{WXY} \in \mathcal{B}_\epsilon} \sum_{w,x} \tilde{P}(w, x) \log Q(x|w) + \sum_{w,y} \tilde{P}(w, y) \log Q(y|w) - \sum_{x,y} \tilde{P}(x, y) \log Q(x, y). \quad (131)$$

Obviously, $I_\epsilon(Q) \geq I(Q)$, hence $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} I_\epsilon(Q) \geq I(Q)$, where $I(Q)$ is defined in (127). Now we prove $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} I_\epsilon(Q) \leq I(Q)$. Let $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of decreasing positive numbers with $\lim_{k \to \infty} \epsilon_k = 0$. Assume $\left\{P_{WXY}^{(k)}\right\}^\infty_{k=1}$ is a sequence of optimal distributions attaining $\hat{\Gamma}_{\epsilon_k}(\pi_{XY})$. Since $P(W \times X \times Y)$ is compact, there must exist some subsequence $\{\epsilon_{k_i}\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $P_{WXY}^{(k_i)}$ converges to some distribution $\tilde{P}_{WXY}$ as $i \to \infty$. Since $\lim_{i \to \infty} \epsilon_{k_i} = 0$, we must have

$$\tilde{P}_{W,X} = Q_{W,X} \quad (132)$$
$$\tilde{P}_{W,Y} = Q_{W,Y} \quad (133)$$

Since the objective function in the right hand side of (131) is continuous in $\tilde{P}_{WXY}$, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} I_\epsilon(Q) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \max_{P_{WXY}: P_{W,X} = Q_{W,X}, P_{W,Y} = Q_{W,Y}} \sum_{w,x} \tilde{P}(w, x) \log Q(x|w) + \sum_{w,y} \tilde{P}(w, y) \log Q(y|w) - \sum_{x,y} \tilde{P}(x, y) \log Q(x, y) \quad (134)$$
$$\leq \tilde{P}_{W,X} = Q_{W,X}, \tilde{P}_{W,Y} = Q_{W,Y}, \sum_{w,x} \tilde{P}(w, x) \log Q(x|w) + \sum_{w,y} \tilde{P}(w, y) \log Q(y|w) - \sum_{x,y} \tilde{P}(x, y) \log Q(x, y) \quad (135)$$
$$= I(Q). \quad (136)$$
Therefore,
\[
\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mathcal{I}_\epsilon(Q) = \mathcal{I}(Q).
\] (137)

By the continuity shown in (137), we can assume the \( \epsilon \) used in definitions (123)-(125) is a positive value such that
\[
R > \mathcal{I}_\epsilon(Q) + \epsilon.
\] (138)

For brevity, in the following we denote \( M = e^{nR} \). According to the definition of the Rényi divergence, we first have\(^7\)
\[
e^{D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n} \| \pi_{X^nY}^n)}
= \max_{x^n,y^n} \frac{P_{X^nY^n} (x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{X^nY}^n (x^n, y^n)}
= \max_{x^n,y^n} \bar{g}(x^n, y^n | C_n),
\] (139)
where \( \bar{g}(x^n, y^n | C_n) := \sum_{m \in M_n} \frac{1}{n} g(x^n, y^n | W^n(m)) \) with \( g(x^n, y^n | w^n) := \frac{1}{n} P_{X^nW^n}(x^n | w^n) P_{Y^nW^n}(y^n | w^n) \).
Then for \( w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{\frac{1}{2}}^n(Q_W) \),
\[
g(x^n, y^n | w^n) = \frac{Q_{XW}^n(x^n | w^n) 1\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\frac{1}{2}^n(Q_{XW} | w^n)\} \ Q_{YW}^n(y^n | w^n) 1\{y^n \in \mathcal{T}_\frac{1}{2}^n(Q_{YW} | w^n)\}}{Q_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n)}
\] (141)
\[
\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{w^n} \sum_{x^n, y^n} T_{\alpha_n} n \log Q(x^n) + n \sum_{w^n} T_{\alpha_n} n (w, y) \log Q(y) - n \sum_{w^n} T_{\alpha_n} n (x, y) \log Q(x, y)
\] (142)
\[
\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \delta_{1,n}) (1 - \delta_{2,n})} e^{n \mathcal{I}_\epsilon(Q)}
= : \beta_n,
\] (143)
where both \( \delta_{1,n} := 1 - Q_{XW}^n \left( \mathcal{T}_\frac{1}{2}^n(Q_{XW} | w^n) \right) | w^n \) and \( \delta_{2,n} := 1 - Q_{YW}^n \left( \mathcal{T}_\frac{1}{2}^n(Q_{YW} | w^n) \right) | w^n \) converge to zero exponentially fast as \( n \to \infty \), and \( \mathcal{I}_\epsilon(Q) \) is defined in (131).

Continuing (140), we get for any \( \delta > 0 \),
\[
P_{C_n} \left( D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n} \| \pi_{X^nY}^n) \right) \geq \delta
\leq P_{C_n} \left( e^{D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n} \| \pi_{X^nY}^n)} - 1 \geq \delta \right)
= P_{C_n} \left( \max_{x^n, y^n} \bar{g}(x^n, y^n | C_n) \geq 1 + \delta \right)
\leq |X^n| |Y^n| \max_{x^n, y^n} P_{C_n} \left( \bar{g}(x^n, y^n | C_n) \geq 1 + \delta \right),
\] (147)
where (147) follows from the union bound. Obviously, \( |X^n| |Y^n| \) is only exponentially growing. Therefore, if the probability vanishes doubly exponentially fast, then \( \max_{x^n, y^n} \bar{g}(x^n, y^n | C_n) < 1 + \delta \) with probability of failure decaying to zero doubly exponentially fast as \( n \to \infty \). To this end, we use the Bernstein inequality \([35]\) to bound the probability. Observe that \( g(x^n, y^n | W^n(m)) \), \( m \in M_n \) are i.i.d. random variables with mean
\[
\mu_n := E_{W^n} [g(x^n, y^n | W^n)]
= \sum_{w^n} \frac{Q_{XW}^n(w^n) 1\{w^n \in \mathcal{T}_\frac{1}{2}^n(Q_W)\}}{Q_{XY}^n(w^n)}
\] (148)
\[
\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \delta_{0,n}) (1 - \delta_{1,n}) (1 - \delta_{2,n})}
\to 1 \text{ exponentially fast as } n \to \infty,
\] (150)
and variance
\[
\text{Var}_{W^n} [g(x^n, y^n | W^n)] \leq E_{W^n} [g(x^n, y^n | W^n)^2]
\] (152)
\[
\leq \beta_n \mu_n.
\] (153)

\(^7\)For brevity, we denote \( P_{X^nY^n} | C_n \) as \( P_{X^nY^n} \).
Here (151) follows since $\delta_{0,n} := 1 - Q^n_W \Gamma(\frac{T'(n)}{\gamma}(Q_W))$ converges to zero exponentially fast as $n \to \infty$. Then we get

$$P_{C_n}(g(x^n, y^n)|C_n) \geq 1 + \delta$$

$$= P_{C_n} \left( \sum_{m \in M_n} g(x^n, y^n|W^n(m)) - \mu_n M \geq (1 + \delta - \mu_n) M \right)$$

$$\leq \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} (1 + \delta - \mu_n)^2 M^2 \right)$$

$$M/(\beta_n) = (1 - \delta_{1,n}) (1 - \delta_{2,n}) e^{n(R - I_e(Q))} \to \infty$$

exponentially fast as long as $R > I_e(Q)$. Denote $\alpha_0$ as the exponent of $\mu_n - 1$. By (150) and [2, Lemma 4],

$$\alpha_0 \geq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{\epsilon}{2 + \epsilon} + 2 \min \left\{ Q^{(\min)}_{X|W}, Q^{(\min)}_{Y|W} \right\} \right\},$$

where $Q^{(\min)}_{X|W} := \min_{w:Q(w) > 0} Q(w)$, $Q^{(\min)}_{Y|W} := \min_{w:Q_X(w) \geq 0} Q_X(w|w)$, and similarly for $Q^{(\min)}_{Y|W}$.

Set $\delta = e^{-n\alpha_1}$ with $\alpha_1 := \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\epsilon}{2 + \epsilon} \right\} > 0$, then the exponent of $\frac{3(1 + \delta - \mu_n)^2 M}{(1 + \delta + 2\mu_n) \beta_n}$ is $R - I_e(Q) - 2\alpha_1 \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ (by (138)). Hence (156) converges to zero doubly exponentially fast. Combined with (147), this implies that

$$P_{C_n}(D_infinity(P_{XY}n\|\pi^m_{XY}) \geq e^{-n\alpha_1}) \to 0$$

doubly exponentially fast as $n \to \infty$.

C. Proof of $T_{Exact}(\pi_{XY}) \geq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \Gamma(\pi^m_{XY})$

We prove the converse result from the perspective of exact common information, i.e.,

$$T_{Exact}(\pi_{XY}) \geq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \Gamma(\pi^m_{XY}).$$

Similar to the idea used in Appendix A-A, we first independently replicate a $k$-length optimal exact common information code $(P_{W_{k,1}}, P_{X|W_{k,1}}, P_{Y|W_{k,1}})$ $n$ times. Then the resulting superblock code is also an exact common information code, i.e.,

$$\sum_{w^n} P^n_{W_{k}}(w^n) P^n_{X\mid W_{k}}(x^n|w^n) P^n_{Y\mid W_{k}}(y^n|w^n) = \pi^kn_{XY}.$$ Observe that $W^n_k = (W_{k,1}, W_{k,2}, ..., W_{k,n})$ is an $n$-length i.i.d. random sequence with each $W_{k,i} \sim P_{W_{k}}$. Hence we have for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$P \left( W^n_k \in A_{\epsilon}^{(n)}(P_{W_{k}}) \right) \to 1$$

as $n \to \infty$ for fixed $k$. Furthermore, $|A_{\epsilon}^{(n)}| \leq e^{n(H(W_k)+\epsilon)}$. Consider

$$D_{\infty}(P_{XY^n}\|\pi^kn_{XY})$$

$$= \log \left( \max_{x^n, y^n} \sum_{w^n} P^n_{W_{k}}(w^n) P^n_{X\mid W_{k}}(x^n|w^n) P^n_{Y\mid W_{k}}(y^n|w^n) \right)$$

$$\geq \log \left( \max_{x^n, y^n} \max_{w^n \in A_{\epsilon}^{(n)}} \frac{P^n_{W_{k}}(w^n) P^n_{X\mid W_{k}}(x^n|w^n) P^n_{Y\mid W_{k}}(y^n|w^n)}{\pi^kn_{XY}(x^n, y^n)} \right)$$

$$\geq \log \left( \max_{x^n, y^n} \max_{w^n \in A_{\epsilon}^{(n)}} \frac{e^{-n(H(W_k)+\epsilon)} P^n_{X\mid W_{k}}(x^n|w^n) P^n_{Y\mid W_{k}}(y^n|w^n)}{\pi^kn_{XY}(x^n, y^n)} \right)$$

$$= \log \left( \max_{x^n, y^n} \max_{w^n \in A_{\epsilon}^{(n)}} \frac{P^n_{X\mid W_{k}}(x^n|w^n) P^n_{Y\mid W_{k}}(y^n|w^n)}{\pi^kn_{XY}(x^n, y^n)} \right) - n(H(W_k)+\epsilon)$$
Since for the exact common information superblock code, \( D_\infty(P_{X_k|Y_k^n}\|\pi_{XY}^{kn}) = 0 \), we have

\[
\frac{1}{k} (H(W_k) + \epsilon) \\
\geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{kn} \log \left( \max_{x^n,y^n \in A^n} \max_{w\in A} \frac{P^n_{X_k|W_k}(x^{kn}|w^n)P^n_{Y_k|W_k}(y^{kn}|w^n)}{\pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^{kn},y^{kn})} \right) \\
= \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{kn} \max_{w\in A} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{x^k,y^k} \log \frac{P^n_{X_k|W_k}(x^k|w_i)P^n_{Y_k|W_k}(y^k|w_i)}{\pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^k,y^k)}. 
\]

Continuing (167), we obtain

\[
\max_{w\in A} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{x^k,y^k} \log \frac{P^n_{X_k|W_k}(x^k|w_i)P^n_{Y_k|W_k}(y^k|w_i)}{\pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^k,y^k)} \\
\geq \sum_{w\in A} \frac{P^n_{W_k}(w^n)}{\max_{w\in A} P^n_{W_k}(A^n)} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k} \in C(P_{X_k|W_k},P_{Y_k|W_k})} -H(X^k|W_k = w_i) - H(Y^k|W_k = w_i) \\
- \sum_{x^k,y^k} \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}} Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}(x^k,y^k|w_i) \log \pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^k,y^k) \\
= \sum_{w\in A} \frac{P^n_{W_k}(w^n)}{\max_{w\in A} P^n_{W_k}(A^n)} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k} \in C(P_{X_k|W_k},P_{Y_k|W_k})} \left\{ -H(X^k|W_k = w_i) - H(Y^k|W_k = w_i) \right\} \\
- \sum_{x^k,y^k} \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}} Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}(x^k,y^k|w_i) \log \pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^k,y^k) \\
\geq \sum_{w\in A} \frac{P^n_{W_k}(A^n)}{\max_{w\in A} P^n_{W_k}(A^n)} \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k} \in C(P_{X_k|W_k},P_{Y_k|W_k})} \left\{ -H(X^k|W_k) - H(Y^k|W_k) \right\} \\
- \sum_{x^k,y^k} \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}} Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}(x^k,y^k|w_i) \log \pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^k,y^k) \\
\geq \sum_{w\in A} \frac{P^n_{W_k}(A^n)}{\max_{w\in A} P^n_{W_k}(A^n)} \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k} \in C(P_{X_k|W_k},P_{Y_k|W_k})} -H(X^k|W_k) - H(Y^k|W_k) \\
- \sum_{x^k,y^k} \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}} Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}(x^k,y^k|w_i) \log \pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^k,y^k) \\
+ \frac{1}{nk} \min_{x,y} \log \pi_{XY}(x,y),
\]

where (168) follows since the maximum is no smaller than the average, and (171) follows since \( \mathbb{E} \max \geq \max \mathbb{E} \). Since \( P^n_{W_k}(A^n) \to 1 \), combining this fact with (167) and (172), we have

\[
\frac{1}{k} (H(W_k) + \epsilon) \\
\geq \frac{1}{k} \left( \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k} \in C(P_{X_k|W_k},P_{Y_k|W_k})} -H(X^k|W_k) - H(Y^k|W_k) \right) \\
- \sum_{x^k,y^k} \max_{Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}} Q_{X_kY_k|W_k}(x^k,y^k|w_i) \log \pi_{XY}^{kn}(x^k,y^k).
\]
\[
\frac{1}{k} \left( P_{W_k} \min_{P_{X^k|W_k} P_{Y^k|W_k}} \max_{Q_{X^k Y^k|W_k} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X^k|W_k}, P_{Y^k|W_k})} -H(X^k|W_k) - H(Y^k|W_k) \\
- \sum_w P_{W_k}(w) \sum_{x^k, y^k} Q_{X^k Y^k|W_k}(x^k, y^k|w) \log \pi_{XY}^k(x^k, y^k) \right) \quad (174)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{k} \Gamma(\pi_{XY}). \quad (175)
\]

Furthermore, since \( \frac{1}{k} H(W_k) \to R \) as \( k \to \infty \), we have

\[
R \geq \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \Gamma(\pi_{XY}). \quad (176)
\]

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF OF THEOREM 2**

Here we only need to prove the lower bound, i.e., \( \tilde{T}_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \geq \Gamma_{LB}(\pi_{XY}) \), since the upper bound has been proved in Appendix A-B.

Observe by Remark 1,

\[
\tilde{T}_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{P_{X^n Y^n|W^n} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X^n|W^n}, P_{Y^n|W^n})} \max_{Q_{X^n Y^n|W^n} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X^n|W^n}, P_{Y^n|W^n})} -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i|X^{i-1}W) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(Y_i|Y^{i-1}W) \\
- \sum_w P_W(w) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sum_{x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}} Q_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}|W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}|w) \sum_{x, y} Q_{X_i Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W}(x, y|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \log \pi(x, y) \right). \quad (177)
\]

Denote \( J \sim P_J := \text{Unif}[1 : n] \) as a time index independent of \((W, X^n, Y^n)\). Then

\[
- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i|X^{i-1}W) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(Y_i|Y^{i-1}W) = -H(X_J|X^{J-1}W, J) - H(Y_J|Y^{J-1}W, J). \quad (178)
\]

Next we consider single-letterize the last term in (177). On one hand,

\[
\sum_{x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}} Q_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}|W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}|w) \sum_{x, y} Q_{X_i Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W}(x, y|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \geq \min \sum_{x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}} \tilde{Q}_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}|W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}|w) \sum_{x, y} Q_{X_i Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W}(x, y|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)}. \quad (179)
\]

On the other hand, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 8 (Product Coupling Set).** For a pair of conditional distributions \((P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W})\), we have

\[
\prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W}), \quad (180)
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{C}(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}) := \{Q_{X_i Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} : Q_{X_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} = P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, Q_{Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} = P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}\}, i \in [1 : n] \quad (181)
\]

and

\[
\prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}) := \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n Q_{X_i Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} : Q_{X_i Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}), i \in [1 : n] \right\}. \quad (182)
\]
Proof: If \( \{Q_{X,Y_i|X^i-1Y_{i-1}W}\}_{i=1:n} \) is a set of distributions such that \( Q_{X,Y_i|X^i-1Y_{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X_i|X^i-1W}, P_{Y_i|Y^i-1W}) \), \( \forall i \in [1:n] \), then we have that for any \((w, x^n)\),

\[
\sum_{y^n=1}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W}(x_i, y_i|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \\
= \sum_{y^n=1}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W}(x_i, y_i|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \sum_{y^n}^{n} Q_{X,Y_n|X^{n-1}Y_{n-1}W}(x_n, y_n|x^{n-1}, y^{n-1}, w) \\
= \sum_{y^n=1}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W}(x_i, y_i|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) Q_{X_{X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}W}}(x_n|x^{n-1}, y^{n-1}, w) \\
= P_{X_n|X^{n-1}W}(x_n|x^{n-1}, w) \sum_{y^n=1}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W}(x_i, y_i|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \\
= P_{X_n|X^{n-1}W}(x_n|x^{n-1}, w) P_{X_{n-1}|X^{n-2}W}(x_{n-1}|x^{n-2}, w) \sum_{y^n=1}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W}(x_i, y_i|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \\
= \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}(x_i|x^{i-1}, w) \\
= P_{X^n|W}(x^n|w),
\]

where (185) follows since \( Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^i-1W}) \).

Hence \( \prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W} \) has marginal conditional distributions \( P_{X^n|W} \) and \( P_{Y^n|W} \), i.e., \( \prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W}) \). Since for any \( i \in [1:n] \), \( Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W} \) is an arbitrary distribution in \( C(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}) \), we have that \( \prod_{i=1}^{n} C(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}) \subseteq C(P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W}) \).

By Lemma 8, we have that for any function \( f : \mathcal{P}(X^n \times Y^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\max_{Q_{X^nY^n|W} \in C(P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W})} f(Q_{X^nY^n|W}) \geq \max_{Q_{X^nY^n|W} \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} C(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W})} f\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W}\right). \tag{190}
\]

Therefore, substituting (179) into the last term in (177) and utilizing (190), we obtain that

\[
\max_{Q_{X^nY^n|W} \in C(P_{X^n|W}, P_{Y^n|W})} \sum_{w} P_{W}(w) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}} Q_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}|w) \times \sum_{x,y} Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W}(x, y|x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)} \\
\geq \sum_{w} P_{W}(w) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}} \max_{Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W})} \min_{\tilde{Q}_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y^{i-1}W})} \sum_{x,y} \tilde{Q}_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}|w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)} \\
= \sum_{w} P_{W}(w) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x,y} \min_{Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W})} \max_{\tilde{Q}_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y^{i-1}W})} \sum_{x,y} \tilde{Q}_{X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}|w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)} \\
= \sum_{w} P_{W}(w) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{j}(i) \min_{Q_{X^{j-1}Y^{j-1}W} \in C(P_{X^{j-1}W}, P_{Y^{j-1}W})} \sum_{x,y} \tilde{Q}_{X^{j-1}Y^{j-1}W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}|w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)} \\
= \sum_{w} P_{W}(w) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{j}(i) \max_{Q_{X^{j-1}Y^{j-1}W} \in C(P_{X^{j-1}W}, P_{Y^{j-1}W})} \sum_{x,y} Q_{X^{j-1}Y^{j-1}W}(x^{i-1}, y^{i-1}, w, i) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)},
\]

where (182) follows since \( Q_{X,Y_i|X^{i-1}Y_{i-1}W} \in C(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^i-1W}) \).
Define $T = \min\{\pi(x, y)\} \in \mathbb{R}$, using the splitting technique, we can write

\begin{equation}
\min_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \sum_{x, y} Q_{X|Y}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \right] \geq \sum_{x, y} Q_{X|Y}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)}
\end{equation}

(191)

with

\begin{equation}
Q_{X|Y}(x, y) := \arg \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \sum_{x, y} Q_{X|Y}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \right]
\end{equation}

(192)

\begin{equation}
\pi(x, y) = e^{-\epsilon} \pi_{XY}(x, y) + (1 - e^{-\epsilon}) \bar{P}_{XY}(x, y)
\end{equation}

(200)

where

\begin{equation}
\bar{P}_{XY}(x, y) := \frac{e^{\epsilon} \pi_{XY}(x, y) - P_{XY}(x, y)}{e^{\epsilon} - 1}
\end{equation}

(201)

Define

\begin{equation}
\bar{P}_{XY|w}(x, y, w, u) = \begin{cases} 
    e^{-\epsilon} P_{w|w} P_{Y|w} & \text{if } u = 1 \\
    (1 - e^{-\epsilon}) \bar{P}_{XY}(x, y) 1\{w = (x, y)\} & \text{if } u = 0
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

(202)

Next we prove that the constraint $D_{\infty}(P_{XY} \| \pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon$ in (199) can be replaced with $P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}$. For $D_{\infty}(P_{XY} \| \pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon$, using the splitting technique, we can write

\begin{equation}
\pi_{XY}(x, y) = e^{-\epsilon} P_{XY}(x, y) + (1 - e^{-\epsilon}) \bar{P}_{XY}(x, y)
\end{equation}

(200)

where
Then

\[-H_p(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{W|W’} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{P}_{W|W’}, \bar{P}_{W|W’})} \sum_{w,u,w’,u’} Q_{W,W’|U}(w, u, w’, u’) \times \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{P}_{X|W,U}=(w,u), \bar{P}_{Y|W,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \leq -e^{-\epsilon} H(XY|W) + \sum_{u,w’} \bar{P}_0 \bar{P}_U \min_{Q_{W,W’} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{W,U}=(w,u), P_{W’,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{w,w’} Q_{WW’}(w, w’) \times \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(\bar{P}_{X|W,U}=(w,u), \bar{P}_{Y|W,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \leq -e^{-\epsilon} H(XY|W) + e^{-2\epsilon} \min_{Q_{WW’} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{W,U}=(w,u), P_{W’,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{w,w’} Q_{WW’}(w, w’) \times \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X|W,U}=(w,u), P_{Y|W,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} + (1 - e^{-2\epsilon}) \left( -H(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{WW’} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{W,U}=(w,u), P_{W’,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{w,w’} Q_{WW’}(w, w’) \times \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X|W,U}=(w,u), P_{Y|W,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \right) + o(\epsilon) \]

Hence

\[
\tilde{T}_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} P_W P_X | W | P_Y | W : D_{\operatorname{a}}(P_{XY} || \pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon \]

\[-H(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{WW’} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{W,U}=(w,u), P_{W’,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{w,w’} Q_{WW’}(w, w’) \times \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X|W,U}=(w,u), P_{Y|W,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} P_W P_X | W | P_Y | W : D_{\operatorname{a}}(P_{XY} || \pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon \]

\[
d^{211} \left( -H(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{WW’} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{W,U}=(w,u), P_{W’,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{w,w’} Q_{WW’}(w, w’) \times \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X|W,U}=(w,u), P_{Y|W,U}=(w’,u’))} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \right) + o(\epsilon) \]

**APPENDIX C**

**PROOF OF THEOREM 3**

*Upper Bound:* Set $X = W \oplus A$ and $Y = W \oplus B$ with $W \sim \operatorname{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$, $A \sim \operatorname{Bern}(a)$, and $B \sim \operatorname{Bern}(a)$ mutually independent, where $a := \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2\epsilon}}{2} \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

\[
\mathcal{H}(P_X|W=w, P_Y|W=w || \pi_{XY}) = \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w})} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} = \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + 2 \min\{a, \pi\} \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \]

\[
= \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + 2a \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \]
Hence we have
\[ \Gamma_{UB}(\pi_{XY}) \leq -H_2(a) - H_2(a) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + 2a \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \] (214)
\[ = -2H_2(a) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + 2a \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}. \] (215)

Substituting \( \alpha_0, \beta_0 \) into (215), we get the right hand side of (35).

**Lower Bound:** We adopt similar techniques as ones used by Wyner [1]. Denote
\[ \alpha(w) := \mathbb{P}(X = 0|W = w) \] (216)
\[ \beta(w) := \mathbb{P}(Y = 0|W = w). \] (217)

Hence \( P_{XY} = \pi_{XY} \) implies
\[ \mathbb{E} \alpha(W) = \mathbb{P}(X = 0) = \frac{1}{2} \] (218)
\[ \mathbb{E} \beta(W) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) = \frac{1}{2} \] (219)
\[ \mathbb{E} \alpha(W) \beta(W) = \mathbb{P}(X = 0, Y = 0) = \alpha_0. \] (220)

Observe that
\[
\mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'}) \| \pi_{XY}) = \max_{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'})} \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)}
\]
\[ = \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + \left( \min \{\alpha(w), \beta(w')\} + \min \{\alpha(w), \beta(w')\} \right) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \] (222)
\[ = \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + \min \{\alpha(w) + \beta(w'), \overline{\alpha(w)} + \overline{\beta(w')}\} \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \] (223)
\[ \geq \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + \left( \min \{\alpha(w), \overline{\alpha(w)}\} + \min \{\beta(w'), \overline{\beta(w')}\} \right) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}. \] (224)

Here \( \pi = 1 - a. \)
Define \( \alpha'(W) := |\alpha(W) - \frac{1}{2}|, \beta'(W) := |\beta(W) - \frac{1}{2}|, \gamma(W) := \frac{\alpha'(W) + \beta'(W)}{2}, \delta(W) := \gamma^2(W) \), and \( \theta := \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)}. \)

Then we can lower bound \( \Gamma_{LB}(\pi_{XY}) \) as
\[ \Gamma_{LB}(\pi_{XY}) \geq \inf_{P_{W, \alpha()}, \beta()}: \frac{\mathbb{E} \Gamma_2(\alpha(W)) - \mathbb{E} \Gamma_2(\beta(W))}{\mathbb{E}(\alpha(W)) = \frac{1}{4}} \frac{\mathbb{E} \beta(W) = \frac{1}{2}}{\mathbb{E}(\beta(W)) = \alpha_0} + \left( \mathbb{E} \min \{\alpha(W), \overline{\alpha(W)}\} + \mathbb{E} \min \{\beta(W), \overline{\beta(W)}\} \right) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \] (225)
\[ \geq \inf_{P_{W, \alpha()}, \beta()}: \frac{\mathbb{E} \Gamma_2(\alpha(W)) - \mathbb{E} \Gamma_2(\beta(W))}{\mathbb{E}(\alpha(W)) = \frac{1}{4}} \frac{\mathbb{E} \beta(W) = \frac{1}{2}}{\mathbb{E}(\beta(W)) = \alpha_0} + \left( \mathbb{E} \min \{\alpha(W), \overline{\alpha(W)}\} + \mathbb{E} \min \{\beta(W), \overline{\beta(W)}\} \right) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \] (226)
\[ \geq \inf_{P_{W, \alpha()}, \beta()}: \frac{\mathbb{E} \Gamma_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha'(W)\right) - \mathbb{E} \Gamma_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \beta'(W)\right) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0}}{\mathbb{E} \alpha'(W) = \gamma(W) = \frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left(1 - \alpha'(W)\right) + \mathbb{E} \left(1 - \beta'(W)\right)}{\mathbb{E}\gamma(W) = \alpha_0 - \frac{1}{2}} \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \] (227)
\[ \geq \inf_{P_{W, \alpha()}, \beta()}: \frac{\mathbb{E} \Gamma_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \gamma(W)\right) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0}}{\mathbb{E} (1 - 2\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}} \] (228)
where (227) follows from [1, Prop. 3.2]; (228) follows since $-H_2(t)$ is convex in $t$; (230) follows from [1, Prop. 3.3] and the fact $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$ is a concave function; (232) follows since the objective function in (231) is non-decreasing in $\theta$ (this can be seen from the facts that the stationary point $\theta^* = \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} - 1 \right)$ of the objective function is not larger than $\sqrt{\alpha_0 - \frac{1}{4}}$, the objective function is convex, and the derivative of the objective function is continuous).

Substituting $a = \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\alpha_0 - \frac{1}{4}}$ into (232), we obtain the desired result.

APPENDIX D

PROOF OF THEOREM 5

Achievability Part: The achievability part is obtained by the following lemma.

Lemma 9 (One-Shot Soft-Covering). [22] Assume $P_W$ and $P_{X|W}$ are unconditional and conditional distributions respectively (which can be defined on any discrete or continuous alphabets). Consider a random mapping $P_{X|W}$ and a random codebook $C = \{W(i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}}$ with $W(i) \sim P_W, i \in \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \ldots, e^R\}$. We define

$$P_{X|C}(\cdot | \{w(i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}}) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} P_{X|W}(\cdot | w(m))$$

(233)

Then we have for $s \in (0, 1]$ and for any distribution $\pi_X$,

$$e^{sD_{1+s}(P_{X|C} \| \pi_X | P_C)}$$

$$\leq e^{sD_{1+s}(P_{X|W} \| \pi_X | P_W) - sR} + e^{sD_{1+s}(P_X \| \pi_X)}$$

(234)

$$\leq 2e^{s\Lambda_{1+s}(P_W, P_{X|W}, \pi_X, R)}$$

(235)

where

$$\Lambda_{1+s}(P_W, P_{X|W}, \pi_X, R) := \max \{ D_{1+s}(P_{X|W} \| \pi_X | P_W) - R, D_{1+s}(P_X \| \pi_X) \}$$

(236)

By setting $\pi_X, P_{X|W}, P_W, \text{ and } R$ to $\pi_X, P^n_{X|W}, P^n_W, \text{ and } nR$ respectively where for some distributions $P_W, P^n_{X|W}, P^n_Y$ with its marginal distribution on $X, Y$ of $P_W P^n_{X|W} P^n_Y$ equal to $\pi_X \pi_Y \text{ a.e.}$ Then Lemma 9 implies that if

$$R > D_{1+s}(P_{X|W} P_Y \| \pi_{XY} | P_W),$$

(237)

then $D_{1+s}(P_{X^n Y^n | C_n} \| \pi^n_{XY} | P_{C_n}) \to 0$. That is, there exists at least one sequence of codebooks indexed by $\{c_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $D(P_{X^n Y^n | C_n = c_n} \| \pi^n_{XY}) \leq D_{1+s}(P_{X^n Y^n | C_n = c_n} \| \pi^n_{XY}) \to 0$. By letting $s \downarrow 0$, we have $R > D_P(X^n | W) \| \pi_{XY} | P_W) = I(XY; W) \text{ is sufficient to ensure } D(P_{X^n Y^n | C_n = c_n} \| \pi^n_{XY}) \to 0$. This completes the achievability proof.

*The pair $(X^n, Y^n)$ plays the role of $X$ in Lemma 9.
Converse Part: Observe

\[
R = \frac{1}{n} H(M) \\
\geq \frac{1}{n} I(X^n Y^n; M) \\
= \frac{1}{n} h(X^n Y^n) - \frac{1}{n} h(X^n Y^n|\pi) \\
= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{X,Y_i}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h(X_i Y_i|MX^{i-1}Y^{i-1}) \\
\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x,y} P_{X,Y_j}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h(X_i Y_i|\pi) - \frac{1}{n} D(P_{X,Y^n}|\pi^n_{XY}) \\
= D(P_{X,Y|M|J}\pi_{XY}|P_{M,J}) - \frac{1}{n} D(P_{X,Y^n}|\pi^n_{XY}) \\
= D(P_{XY|W}\pi_{XY}|P_{W}) - \frac{1}{n} D(P_{X,Y^n}|\pi^n_{XY})
\]

where \( X := X_j, Y := Y_j, W := MJ. \)

On the other hand,

\[
\frac{1}{n} D(P_{X,Y^n}|\pi^n_{XY}) \\
= -\frac{1}{n} h(X^n Y^n) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{X,Y_i}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \\
\geq -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} h(X_i Y_i) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{X,Y_i}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \\
= -h(X_j Y_j) + \sum_{x,y} P_{X,Y_j}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \\
= D(P_{X,Y_j}|\pi_{XY}) \\
= D(P_{XY}|\pi_{XY}).
\]

By assumption, \( \frac{1}{n} D(P_{X,Y^n}|\pi^n_{XY}) \to 0. \) Hence (245) and (250) imply

\[
R \geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf \sup_{P_X, P_Y, P_{XY}: D(P_{XY}|\pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon} D(P_{XY|W}\pi_{XY}|P_{W}) \\
= \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{P_X, P_Y, P_{XY}: D(P_{XY}|\pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon} I(XY; W).
\]

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF COROLLARY 2

We only need to prove \( \bar{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) \geq C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}). \) In this appendix, we combine the distribution truncation technique and the mixture decomposition to prove this result.

Without loss of generality, we assume \( X, Y \) are integer-valued. Let \( [z]_n := z, \) if \( |z| \leq n, \) and \( n + 1, \) otherwise, denote the truncation operation. We introduce a random variable (in fact, a function of \( X, Y \))

\[
V := 1 \{ (X, Y) \in [-n, n]^2 \}.
\]
Hence \( P_{Y|W[X],Y}[v|w,x,y] = 1 \{ (x,y) \in [-n,n]^2 \} \), and \( q_n := P_Y(1) = P_{X_n|Y_n}(\{-n,n\}) \). Then

\[
\tilde{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) = \lim_{c \downarrow 0} \inf_{c \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \liminf_{n \to \infty} I(XY;W)
\]

(254)

\[
\geq \lim_{n \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \liminf_{n \to \infty} I([X]_n[Y]_n;W)
\]

(255)

\[
= \lim_{n \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \min_{P_W[P_X|W|Y|W]} I([X]_n[Y]_n;W)
\]

(256)

\[
\geq \lim_{n \to \infty} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \min_{P_W[P_X|W|Y|W]} I([X]_n[Y]_n;W) - H(V)
\]

(257)

\[
\geq \lim_{n \to \infty} \min_{P_W[P_X|W|Y|W]} I([X]_n[Y]_n;W) = \pi_{XY}([X]_n[Y]_n) \to 1
\]

(259)

where (255) follows by the data processing inequalities \( D(P_{X|Y|Y} || \pi_{X|Y}) \leq D(P_{XY} || \pi_{XY}) \) and \( I([X]_n[Y]_n;W) \leq I(XY;W) \); (256) follows since the alphabet size of \( W \) can be restricted to be no larger than \((2n+1)^2\) (by standard cardinality bounding techniques) and the probability simplex defined on the alphabet of \((W,X,Y)\) is compact; and the last line above follows since \( q_n = P_{X_n|Y_n}([-n,n]^2) = \pi_{X_n|Y_n}([-n,n]^2) \to 1 \) and \( H(V) = H(q_n) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \).

Now we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 10** (Conditional Markov Chain). If \( X \to W \to Y \) form a Markov chain, then for any \( A \subseteq X, B \subseteq Y \), they also form a Markov chain under the condition \( X \in A, Y \in B \).

**Proof:**

\[
\mathbb{P}((W,X,Y) = (w,x,y)|X \in A, Y \in B) = \frac{P_W(w)P_{X|W}(x|w)P_{Y|W}(y|w)1 \{ (x,y) \in A \times B \}}{P_{XY}(A \times B)}
\]

(261)

\[
= \frac{P_W(w)P_{X|W}(A|w)P_{Y|W}(B|w)P_{X|W}(x|w)1 \{ x \in A \}}{P_{XY}(A \times B)} \frac{P_{Y|W}(B|w)}{P_{Y|W}(y|w)}
\]

(262)

\[
= \tilde{P}_W(w)\tilde{P}_{X|W}(x|w)\tilde{P}_{Y|W}(y|w)
\]

(263)

i.e., \( X \to W \to Y \) forms a Markov chain under \( \tilde{P} \).

By Lemma 10, for \( (x,y) \in [-n,n]^2 \), \( P_{W[X_n|Y_n]|V}(w,x,y)|1 \) can be factorized as

\[
P_{W[X_n|Y_n]|V}(w,x,y) = \tilde{P}_W(w)\tilde{P}_{X|W}(x|w)\tilde{P}_{Y|W}(y|w)
\]

(264)

i.e., \( X \to W \to Y \) forms a Markov chain under \( \tilde{P} \). Hence

\[
I([X]_n[Y]_n;W) = I(\tilde{P};XY;W)
\]

(265)

On the other hand, \( P_{X_n|Y_n} = \pi_{X_n|Y_n} \) implies

\[
\sum_w \tilde{P}_W(w)\tilde{P}_{X|W}(x|w)\tilde{P}_{Y|W}(y|w) = P_{X_n|Y_n}(x,y)
\]

(266)

\[
= \frac{P_{X_n|Y_n}P_{Y|X_n|Y_n}(1|x,y)}{P_Y(1)}
\]

(267)

\[
= \pi_{XY}(x,y)1 \{ (x,y) \in [-n,n]^2 \}
\]

(268)

\[
= : \pi_{XY}^{(n)}(x,y).
\]

(269)

Hence (260) implies that

\[
\tilde{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) \geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \min_{\tilde{P}_W}\tilde{P}_{X|W}\tilde{P}_{Y|W}:\tilde{P}_{XY} = \pi_{XY}^{(n)} I(\tilde{P};XY;W) \leq \limsup_{n \to \infty} C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}^{(n)}).
\]

(270)
Next we prove 
\[C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \lim \inf_{n \to \infty} C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY}^{(n)}).\] Obviously, \(p_n := \pi_{XY}([-n, n]^2) \to 1\) as \(n \to \infty\). Then for \((x, y) \in \text{supp}(\pi_{XY})\),

\[
\frac{\pi_{XY}^{(n)}(x, y)}{\pi_{XY}(x, y)} = \frac{1 \{ (x, y) \in [-n, n]^2 \}}{p_n}
\leq \frac{1}{p_n}.
\]

(271)

(272)

and

\[
H \left( \pi_{XY}^{(n)} \right) = -\sum_{(x,y)\in [-n,n]^2} \pi_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{\pi_{XY}(x,y)}{p_n}
\]

\[
= \log p_n - \frac{1}{p_n} \sum_{(x,y)\in [-n,n]^2} \pi_{XY}(x,y) \log \pi_{XY}(x,y).
\]

(273)

(274)

According to the definition of entropy,

\[-\sum_{(x,y)\in [-n,n]^2} \pi_{XY}(x,y) \log \pi_{XY}(x,y) \to H(\pi_{XY})
\]

as \(n \to \infty\). Hence

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} H \left( \pi_{XY}^{(n)} \right) \to H(\pi_{XY}).
\]

(275)

(276)

We construct a new distribution

\[
\hat{\pi}_{XY}^{(n)}(x,y) := \frac{1}{p_n} \pi_{XY}(x,y) - \pi_{XY}^{(n)}(x,y)
\]

(277)

Hence \(\pi_{XY}\) can be written as a mixture distribution \(\pi_{XY}(x,y) = p_n \hat{\pi}_{XY}^{(n)}(x,y) + (1 - p_n) \hat{\pi}_{XY}^{(n)}(x,y)\). Define \(U\) as a Bernoulli random variable \(U\) with \(P_U(1) = p_n\). Define

\[
Q_{XY|W}^{(n)}(x,y,w,u) = \begin{cases} p_n \hat{\pi}_{XY}^{(n)}(x,y) P_{W|X}^{(n)}(w|x,y) & \text{if } u = 1 \\ (1 - p_n) \hat{\pi}_{XY}^{(n)} (x,y) 1 \{ w = (x,y) \} & \text{if } u = 0, \end{cases}
\]

(278)

where \(P_{W|X}^{(n)}\) denotes an optimal distribution attaining \(C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY}^{(n)}).\) Obviously, \(Q_{XY}^{(n)} = \pi_{XY}\), and \(X \to (W,U) \to Y\) under \(Q^{(n)}\). Therefore, we have

\[
C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY}) = \inf_{P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} : P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}} I(XY; W)
\]

(279)

\[
\leq I_{Q^{(n)}}(XY; WU) \leq H(\pi_{XY}) - H_{Q^{(n)}}(XY|WU). \tag{280}
\]

(281)

\[
= H(\pi_{XY}) - p_n H_{Q^{(n)}}(XY|W, U = 1) - (1 - p_n) H_{Q^{(n)}}(XY|W, U = 0)
\]

(282)

\[
= H(\pi_{XY}) - p_n H_{P^{(n)}}(XY|W)
\]

(283)

\[
= H(\pi_{XY}) - p_n H \left( \hat{\pi}_{XY}^{(n)} \right) + p_n I_{P^{(n)}}(XY; W).
\]

(284)

Taking limits and using (276) and the fact that \(p_n \to 1\) as \(n \to \infty\), we have

\[
C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \lim \inf_{n \to \infty} I_{P^{(n)}}(XY; W) = \lim \inf_{n \to \infty} C_{Wyner}(\hat{\pi}_{XY}^{(n)}). \tag{285}
\]

(286)

Combining (270) and (285) gives us the desired result.

**APPENDIX F**

**PROOF OF COROLLARY 3**

In this section, we extend the proof in Appendix E to the continuous distribution case by combining it with the discretization technique and dyadic decomposition results in [8].

To prove Corollary 3, we only need to prove \(\hat{C}_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY}) \geq C_{Wyner}(\pi_{XY})\). To this end, similar to (253), we introduce a random variable

\[
V_d := 1 \{ (X, Y) \in [-d, d]^2 \}.
\]

(286)
Similarly to (264), we define $\tilde{P}_{MX^nY^n} := P_{MX^nY^n|V}(m,x^n,y^n|1)$. Then $\tilde{P}_{MX^nY^n} = \tilde{P}_M \tilde{P}_{X^n|M} \tilde{P}_{Y^n|M}$, i.e., $X^n \to M \to Y^n$ forms a Markov chain under $\tilde{P}$. The conclusions similar to (265) and (269) hold. Then consider that

$$
\bar{C}_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \frac{\inf_{d \to \infty} I(XY;W)}{q_d} \leq \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \frac{1}{q_d} \left( I(XY;W) + I(XY;W|V) - I(XY;W|V) \right)
$$

(277)

$$
\geq \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \frac{1}{q_d} \left( I(XY;W) - I(XY;W|V) \right)
$$

(278)

$$
\geq \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \frac{1}{q_d} \left( I(XY;W) - I(XY;W|V) \right)
$$

(279)

$$
\geq \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \inf_{\epsilon > 0} \frac{1}{q_d} \left( I(XY;W) - I(XY;W|V) \right)
$$

(280)

(290)

where (290) follows from that by Pinsker’s inequality $|P_{XY} - \pi_{XY}| \leq \sqrt{2D(P_{XY})} \leq \sqrt{2}$, we have

$$
q_d = P_{XY}([-d,d]^2) \in \pi_{XY}([-d,d]^2) + [-\sqrt{2\epsilon}, \sqrt{2\epsilon}];
$$

(295)

and (291) follows from (295) and the fact that

$$
q_d D \left( P_{XY|V=1} || \pi_{XY}|V=1 \right) \leq D \left( P_{XY|V=1} || \pi_{XY}|V=1 \right)
$$

(296)

$$
\leq D \left( P_{XY} || \pi_{XY} \right) + D \left( P_{V} || \pi_{V} \right)
$$

(297)

$$
= D \left( P_{XY} \right)
$$

(298)

$$
\left( D \right)
$$

(299)

(299)

$$
\pi_{XY}^{(d)}(x,y) := \frac{1}{p_d} \pi_{XY}(x,y) 1 \{ (x,y) \in [-d,d]^2 \} = \pi_{XY}|V=1.
$$

(300)

where $p_d := \pi_{XY}([-d,d]^2) \to 1$ as $d \to \infty$. Then given an integer $n > 0$, we define $\Delta := \frac{d}{n}$, and we quantize $X,Y$ as $A := \left[ \frac{\Lambda}{\Delta} \right], B := \left[ \frac{\Lambda}{\Delta} \right]$. The induced distribution $\pi_{AB}^{(n)}(a,b) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \int_{\Delta(a,b)+[0,\Delta)^2} \pi_{XY}(x,y)dx dy \{ (a,b) \in [-n, n-1]^2 \}.

By adding an independent uniform vector $(U,V) \sim \text{Unif}(0,1)^2$ to $(A,B)$ with $(A,B) \sim \pi_{AB}^{(n)}$, we get a continuous distribution $\Delta(A,B) + (U,V) \sim \pi_{AB}^{(n)}(x,y) := \frac{1}{\Delta^2} \pi_{AB}^{(n)} \left( \left[ \frac{x}{\Delta} \right], \left[ \frac{y}{\Delta} \right] \right)$. Then for $(x,y) \in \text{supp}(\pi_{XY})$,

$$
\pi_{XY}^{(n)}(x,y) = \frac{1}{\Delta^2} \pi_{AB}^{(n)} \left( \left[ \frac{x}{\Delta} \right], \left[ \frac{y}{\Delta} \right] \right)
$$

(301)

$$
= \frac{\Delta^2}{\Delta^2} \int_{\Delta(a,b)+[0,\Delta)^2} \pi_{XY}(x,y)dx dy \{ (x,y) \in [-d,d)^2 \}
$$

(302)

$$
= \frac{\Delta^2}{\Delta^2} \int_{\Delta(a,b)+[0,\Delta)^2} \pi_{XY}(x,y)dx dy \{ (x,y) \in [-d,d)^2 \}
$$

(303)

$$
\leq \sup_{(x,y) \in [-d,d)^2} \pi_{XY}(x,y)
$$

(304)

where (303) follows by the mean value theorem, and it holds for some $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \Delta \left( \left[ \frac{\Lambda}{\Delta} \right], \left[ \frac{\Lambda}{\Delta} \right] \right) + [0,\Delta)^2$.

**Lemma 11.** Assume $\pi_{XY}$ is differentiable. Then for any $(x,y), (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in [-d,d)^2$ satisfying $|x - \hat{x}|, |y - \hat{y}| \leq \Delta$, we have

$$
\exp(-\Delta L_d) \leq \frac{\pi_{XY}(x,y)}{\pi_{XY}(\hat{x}, \hat{y})} \leq \exp(\Delta L_d),
$$

(305)

where $L_d$ is defined in (56).
where \((306)\) holds for some \((\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\) on the line segment joining \((\hat{x}, \hat{y})\) and \((x, y)\). By symmetry, \(\log \pi_{XY}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \leq \log \pi_{XY}(x, y) + \Delta L_d\) also holds.

Using Lemma 11, we obtain

\[
\frac{\pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y)}{\pi_{XY}(x, y)} \leq \frac{1}{p_d} \exp(\Delta L_d) = \exp(\Delta L_d - \log p_d).
\]

Define

\[
\epsilon'_n := \Delta L_d - \log p_d + \delta_n
\]

for some positive sequence \(\delta_n \to 0\) as \(n \to \infty\), which will be specified later. Then \((398)\) implies

\[
\sup_{x, y} \frac{\pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y)}{\pi_{XY}(x, y)} \leq e^{\epsilon'_n - \delta_n},
\]

i.e.,

\[
e^{\epsilon'_n} \frac{\pi_{XY}(x, y)}{\pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y)} \geq e^{\delta_n}
\]

for all \((x, y) \in [-d, d]^2\).

We construct a new distribution

\[
\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y) := \frac{e^{\epsilon'_n} \pi_{XY}(x, y) - \pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y)}{e^{\epsilon'_n} - 1}.
\]

Hence \(\pi_{XY}\) can be written as a mixture distribution \(\pi_{XY}(x, y) = e^{-\epsilon'_n} \tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y) + \left(1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n}\right) \tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y)\). Furthermore, by \((312)\), we have

\[
\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y) \geq e^{-\epsilon'_n} \pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y) = e^{-\epsilon'_n - 1} \Delta \pi_{AB}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{x}{\Delta} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{y}{\Delta} \right\rfloor\right).\]

Define \(U\) as a Bernoulli random variable \(U\) with \(P_U(1) = e^{-\epsilon'_n}\). Let \(\lfloor z \rfloor_n := z\), if \(z \in [-n, n - 1]\); \(n\), if \(z > n\); and \(- (n + 1)\), otherwise. Define the truncation operation on integers. Define

\[
Q^{(n)}_{XY|WU}(x, y, w, u) := \begin{cases} e^{-\epsilon'_n} \pi_{XY}(x, y) P^{(n)}_{W|AB}(w \mid \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\Delta} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{y}{\Delta} \right\rfloor) \pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y) & \text{if } u = 1, \\ \left(1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n}\right) \tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(x, y) P^{(n)}_{W|XY}(w \mid x, y, w, u) & \text{if } u = 0, \end{cases}
\]

where \(P^{(n)}_{W|AB}\) denotes an optimal distribution attaining \(C^{(n)}_{W\rightarrow AB}(\pi_{AB})\), and

\[
\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(x', y' \mid w_1) := \frac{\pi_{XY}(x', y') I_{w_1} \pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x', y')}{\pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x', y')} \delta_{w_1} = \frac{\pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x', y') I_{w_1} \pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x', y')} {\pi^{(n)}_{XY}(x', y')} I_{w_1}
\]

for \(w_1 \in \{- (n + 1), n\}^2\). In fact, the whole space \(\mathbb{R}^2\) is partitioned into 9 subregions by the lines \(x = \pm d\) and \(y = \pm d\). One of them corresponds to \(R_0 := [-d, d]^2\), and the others, labeled by \(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_8\), constitute \(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus [-d, d]^2\). Any subregion \(R_k\), \(0 \leq k \leq 8\) can be expressed as \(R_k = I_1^k \times I_2^k\) where \(I_1^k := (\tilde{L}_d, -\tilde{L}_d) \setminus [-d, d] \cup \{\pm \Delta\}\). Note that \((X, Y) \in R_0\) corresponds to \(W_1 = \{- (n + 1), n\}^2\), and \((X, Y) \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{8} R_k\) corresponds to the case that the first or the second component of \(W_1\) is \(-(n + 1)\) or \(n\). According to the definition of \(\pi^{(n)}_{XY|W_1}\), for the subregion \(R_0\), we have

\[
\widetilde{\pi}_{XY}(\cdot \mid W_1) = \frac{\pi_{XY}(\cdot \mid I_1^k \times I_2^k)}{\pi^{(n)}_{XY}(\cdot \mid I_1^k \times I_2^k)} \delta_{W_1} = \delta_{W_1} \Delta(a, b) + [0, \Delta)^2 \text{ for } (a, b) \in [-n, n - 1]^2; \text{ and for the subregion } R_k, 1 \leq k \leq 8, \text{ we have } \pi^{(n)}_{XY|W_1}(\cdot \mid w_1) = \pi_{XY}(\cdot \mid R_k) = \pi^{(n)}_{XY}(\cdot \mid R_k) \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq 8, \text{ where the first or the second component of } w_1 \text{ is } -(n + 1) \text{ or } n.\]

By the following lemma, we know that \(\pi^{(n)}_{XY}\) is log-concave.
Lemma 12 (Invariance of Log-Concavity). If a pdf $P_{Z^n}$ is log-concave, then for any $0 \leq a < \inf_z P_{Z^n}(z^n)$, $P_{Z^n} - a$ is log-concave as well.

The proof of Lemma 12 is deferred to Appendix F.A.

Since $\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}$ is log-concave, the dyadic decomposition scheme in [8] can be applied to $\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}$. Such a scheme realizes an exact generation of joint distribution $\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} | W_1, | 1 | W_1)$ as long as the rate $R \geq I_{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} | W_1, | 1 | W_1)} (X; Y) + 24 \log 2$ nats/symbol. Hence $H_{\hat{\rho}^{(n)}} (W_2 | W_1 = w_1) = C_{\text{Exact}}(\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} | W_1, | 1 | W_1)) \leq I_{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} | W_1, | 1 | W_1)} (X; Y) + 24 \log 2$ nats/symbol for $w_1 \in [-(n + 1), n]^2$. For any square $J_3 \Delta = \Delta(a, b) + [0, \Delta)^2$ in $R_0$ with $(a, b) \in [-n, n - 1]^2$, we have that

$$I_{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}} (X; Y | (X, Y) \in J_3 \Delta) = \int_{J_3 \Delta} \hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (x, y | J_3 \Delta) \log \frac{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (x, y | J_3 \Delta)}{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (x | J_3 \Delta)} \frac{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (y | J_3 \Delta)}{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (y | J_3 \Delta)} \, dx \, dy$$

(317)

$$\leq \sup_{(x, y) \in J_3 \Delta} \log \frac{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (x, y | J_3 \Delta)}{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (x | J_3 \Delta)} + \frac{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (y | J_3 \Delta)}{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (y | J_3 \Delta)}$$

(318)

$$\leq \sup_{(x, y) \in J_3 \Delta} \log \frac{e^{e^n_\pi_{XY}} \pi_1 \pi_{AB} (a, b) - \frac{1}{e^n_\pi_{AB}} \pi_{AB} (a, b)}{e^{e^n_\pi_{XY}} \pi_1 \pi_{AB} (a, b) - \frac{1}{e^n_\pi_{AB}} \pi_{AB} (a, b)}$$

(319)

$$\leq 2 \sup_{(x, y) \in J_3 \Delta} \frac{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (x, y | J_3 \Delta)}{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (x | J_3 \Delta)} + \frac{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (y | J_3 \Delta)}{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (y | J_3 \Delta)}$$

(320)

where by the mean value theorem, (320) holds for some $(x', y'), (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in J_3 \Delta$; (323) follows from (392); (324) follows from (398); and in (325) $o(1)$ denotes a term tending to zero as $e^{e^n_\pi_{XY}} \Delta L_n, \delta_n \to 0$. Through introducing the positive sequence $\delta_n$, the denominators in equations after (321) are ensured to be positive. This is the reason why we introduce $\delta_n$ in (310).

On the other hand, for subregions $R_k = I_{k}^{(1)} \times I_{k}^{(2)}$, $1 \leq k \leq 8$, we have $\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} (\cdot | R_k) = \pi_{XY} (\cdot | I_k^{(1)} \times I_k^{(2)})$. Hence

$$I_{\hat{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}} (X; Y | (X, Y) \in R_k) = I_{\pi} (X; Y | (X, Y) \in I_k^{(1)} \times I_k^{(2)})$$

(321)

Now we bound the RHS of (328) by using the following lemma.

Lemma 13. Assume $\pi_{XY}$ is an absolutely continuous distribution such that $\lim_{x \to \pm \infty} \pi_X (x) = \lim_{x \to \pm \infty} \pi_Y (x) = \lim_{y \to \pm \infty} \pi_Y (y) = 0$. For $A, B \in \{ L_d, L_\delta, L_d' \}$, we have

$$I_{\pi} (X; Y | (X, Y) \in A \times B) \leq \Upsilon_{\pi} (A, B)$$

(322)

where

$$\Upsilon_{\pi} (A, B) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi_{XY} (A \times B)} (I_{\pi} (X; Y) + o(1)) & A = B = L_d \\ \frac{1}{\pi_{XY} (A \times B)} o(1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(323)

with $o(1)$ denoting a term tending to zero as $d \to \infty$. 

The proof of Lemma 13 is deferred to Appendix F-B.

It is easy to verify that a log-concave pdf satisfies the conditions prescribed in Lemma 13. Hence by Lemma 13, we have

\[ I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}}(X;Y| (X,Y) \in R_k) \leq \Upsilon_{\pi} \left( I_1^{(k)}, I_2^{(k)} \right). \]  

(331)

Applying the dyadic decomposition scheme in [8] to the distribution \( \tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY} \), we have that the exact common information

\[ T_{\text{Exact}}(\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}| (X,Y) \in R_k) \leq I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}}(X;Y| (X,Y) \in R_k) + 24 \log 2 \]

(332)

\[ \leq \Upsilon_{\pi} \left( I_1^{(k)}, I_2^{(k)} \right) + 24 \log 2. \]  

(333)

According to the definition of \( Q^{(n)}_{XY} \), we have \( Q^{(n)}_{XY} = \pi_{XY} \), and \( X \to (W,U) \to Y \) under \( Q^{(n)} \). Similarly to the countable case, we obtain that

\[ C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) = \inf_{P_W P_X|W P_Y|W: P_{X,Y} = \pi_{XY}} I(XY;W) \]

\[ \leq I_{Q^{(n)}}(XY;W) \]

\[ = I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}}(XY;W) + e^{-\epsilon'_n} I_{Q^{(n)}}(XY;W|U = 1) + \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) I_{Q^{(n)}}(XY;W|U = 0) \]

\[ \leq H(U) + e^{-\epsilon'_n} I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}}(XY;W) + \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) H_{Q^{(n)}}(W_1|W_2|U = 0). \]

(334)

(335)

(336)

(337)

Since \( \epsilon'_n \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \), the first term in (337) is bounded as \( H(U) = H(\epsilon^{-\epsilon'_n}) \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \). For the second term in (337),

\[ e^{-\epsilon'_n} I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}}(XY;W) = e^{-\epsilon'_n} I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}}(AB;W) \]

\[ \leq C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{AB}) \]

\[ = C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{AB}) \]

\[ \leq C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}), \]

(338)

(339)

(340)

(341)

where (340) follows by Corollary 2, and (341) follows by the data processing inequality.

We bound the last term in (337) as

\[ H_{Q^{(n)}}(W_1|W_2|U = 0) \]

\[ = H_{Q^{(n)}}(W_1|U = 0) + H_{Q^{(n)}}(W_2|W_1, U = 0) \]

\[ \leq H_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}}(W_1) + \sum_{w_1} \tilde{\pi}^{(n)}(w_1) \left( I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}|W_1(\cdot|w_1)}(X;Y) + 24 \log 2 \right) \]

\[ \leq 2 \log(2n + 2) + I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}|\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{X|Y}}(X;Y|W_1) + 24 \log 2. \]

(342)

(343)

(344)

On the other hand,

\[ \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) I_{\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}|\tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{X|Y}}(X;Y|W_1) \]

\[ = \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) \tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(\cdot,-d,d)^2 \left( \frac{4\Delta L_d - 2 \log p_d}{\delta_n} + o(1) \right) \]

\[ + \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) \sum_{k=1}^{8} \tilde{\pi}^{(n)}_{XY}(R_k) \Upsilon_{\pi} \left( I_1^{(k)}, I_2^{(k)} \right) \]

\[ \leq \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) \left( \frac{4\Delta L_d - 2 \log p_d}{\delta_n} + o(1) \right) + \sum_{k=1}^{8} \pi_{XY}(R_k) \Upsilon_{\pi} \left( I_1^{(k)}, I_2^{(k)} \right) \]

\[ = \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) \left( \frac{4\Delta L_d - 2 \log p_d}{\delta_n} + o(1) \right) + o(1) \]

(345)

(346)

(347)

Substituting these into (337) gives us

\[ C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \inf \left\{ C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) + \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon'_n} \right) \left[ 2 \log(2n + 2) + 24 \log 2 + \frac{4\Delta L_d - 2 \log p_d}{\delta_n} + o(1) \right] + o(1) \right\} \]

\[ = \lim_{n \to \infty} \inf \left\{ C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) + \left( 1 - e^{-\Delta L_d - \log p_d + \delta_n} \right) \left[ 2 \log(2n + 2) + \frac{4\Delta L_d - 2 \log p_d}{\delta_n} \right] \right\}. \]  

(348)

(349)
Set $\delta_n = 2\Delta L_d - \log p_d$, then to ensure the RHS of (349) is no larger than $\lim \inf_{d \to \infty} C_{\text{Wyner}}\left(\pi^{(d)}_{XY}\right)$, we only require
\[
\left(1 - e^{-\left(3\Delta L_d - 2\log p_d\right)}\right) \log n \to 0,
\]
i.e.,
\[
(3\Delta L_d - 2\log p_d) \log n \to 0.
\]
By the assumption, there exists a sequence $\Delta_d$ such that $\Delta_d = e^{-\alpha\left(\frac{\epsilon}{n}\right)}$ and $\Delta_d = o\left((dL_d)^{-\alpha}\right)$ for some $\alpha > 1$. Here $\epsilon_d = 1 - p_d$ and $\Delta = \frac{d}{n}$ is set to $\Delta_d$. Hence (351) is satisfied, which implies that
\[
C_{\text{Wyner}}(\pi_{XY}) \leq \lim \inf_{d \to \infty} C_{\text{Wyner}}\left(\pi^{(d)}_{XY}\right).
\]

A. Proof of Lemma 12

Denote $\mathbf{H}(f(z^n))$ as the Hessian matrix of a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ at $z^n$. Then by simple calculation, we have
\[
\mathbf{H}(\log P_{Z^n}(z^n)) = \frac{1}{P_{Z^n}(z^n)} \left[ P_{Z^n}(z^n) \mathbf{H}(P_{Z^n}(z^n)) - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right] \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^T \right],
\]
where $\frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) := \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1} P_{Z^n}(z^n), \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} P_{Z^n}(z^n), ..., \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right)^T$ denotes the column vector of the first-order partial derivatives of $P_{Z^n}$. Similarly,
\[
\mathbf{H}(\log (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)) = \frac{1}{(P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)^2} \left[ (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a) \mathbf{H}(P_{Z^n}(z^n)) - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right] \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^T \right]
\]
To prove $\log (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)$ is log-concave, we only need to show that $\mathbf{H}(\log (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a))$ is negative semidefinite, i.e.,
\[
t^\top \mathbf{H}(\log (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)) t \leq 0
\]
for any vector $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

By the assumption that $P_{Z^n}$ is log-concave (or equivalently, $\mathbf{H}(\log P_{Z^n}(z^n))$ is negative semidefinite), we have that
\[
t^\top \mathbf{H}(\log P_{Z^n}(z^n)) t \leq 0,
\]
i.e.,
\[
t^\top \left[ P_{Z^n}(z^n) \mathbf{H}(P_{Z^n}(z^n)) - \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right] \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^T \right] t \leq 0.
\]
Hence
\[
t^\top \mathbf{H}(P_{Z^n}(z^n)) t \leq \frac{t^\top \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^2}{P_{Z^n}(z^n)}.
\]
Then we get the following bound on $t^\top \mathbf{H}(\log (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)) t$.
\[
t^\top \mathbf{H}(\log (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)) t = \frac{1}{(P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)^2} \left[ (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a) t^\top \mathbf{H}(P_{Z^n}(z^n)) t - \left[ t^\top \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^2 \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{(P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)^2} \left[ (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a) \frac{t^\top \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^2}{P_{Z^n}(z^n)} - \left[ t^\top \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^2 \right]
\]
\[
\leq -a \frac{t^\top \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial z^n} P_{Z^n}(z^n) \right]^2}{(P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)^2 P_{Z^n}(z^n)}
\]
\[
\leq 0.
\]
Hence $\log (P_{Z^n}(z^n) - a)$ is concave, which completes the proof.
B. Proof of Lemma 13

Consider that

\[
I_\pi (X;Y) = \int_{A \times B} \pi_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{\pi_{XY}(x,y)\pi_{XY}(A \times B)}{\pi_X(x)\pi_{Y|X}(B|x)\pi_Y(y)\pi_{X|Y}(A|y)} \, dx \, dy
\]

(363)

\[
= \frac{1}{\pi_{XY}(A \times B)} \left\{ \int_{A \times B} \pi_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{\pi_{XY}(x,y)}{\pi_X(x)\pi_Y(y)} \, dx \, dy + \log \pi_{XY}(A \times B) \right\}
\]

(364)

\[
\leq Y_\pi (A,B)
\]

(365)

where (365) follows from the facts that \(\log B\). Proof of Lemma 13

\[
\left| -\pi_X(x)\pi_{Y|X}(B|x) \log \pi_{Y|X}(B|x) \right| \leq e^{-1} \pi_X(x)
\]

(367)

pointwise,

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{A \times B} \pi_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{\pi_{XY}(x,y)}{\pi_X(x)\pi_Y(y)} \, dx \, dy = \begin{cases} I_\pi (X;Y) & A = B = \mathcal{L}_d \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

(366)

as well as the following arguments. For all \(B \in \{ \mathcal{L}_d, \mathcal{L}_d^+, \mathcal{L}_d^- \}\),

\[
-\pi_X(x)\pi_{Y|X}(B|x) \log \pi_{Y|X}(B|x) \to 0
\]

(369)

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} -\int_{A} \pi_X(x)\pi_{Y|X}(B|x) \log \pi_{Y|X}(B|x) \, dx = 0.
\]

(370)

Similarly,

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} -\int_{B} \pi_Y(y)\pi_{X|Y}(A|y) \log \pi_{X|Y}(A|y) \, dy = 0.
\]

APPENDIX G

PROOF OF LEMMA 2

The proof techniques used in this section are similar to those used in Appendix E.

Assume \((P_M, P_{X^n|M}, P_{Y^n|M})\) is a sequence of fixed-length codes with rate \(R\) that generates \(P_{X^nY^n}\) such that \(D_\infty (P_{X^nY^n}||\pi_{XY}^n) \to 0\), where \(P_M\) is the uniform distribution on \([1: e^nR]\). Similarly to (253), we introduce a random variable

\[
V := 1 \left\{ (X^n, Y^n) \in \mathcal{A}_x^n (\pi_X) \times \mathcal{A}_y^n (\pi_Y) \right\}.
\]

(371)

Similarly to (264), we define \(\tilde{P}_{M_X^nY^n} := P_{M_X^nY^n|V}(x, y^n|1)\). Then \(\tilde{P}_{M_X^nY^n} = \tilde{P}_M \tilde{P}_{X^n|M} \tilde{P}_{Y^n|M}\), i.e., \(X^n \to M \to Y^n\) forms a Markov chain under \(\tilde{P}\). On the other hand,

\[
R = H(M) \geq H(M|V) \geq P_V(1)H(M|V = 1) = P_V(1)H(\tilde{P}_M)
\]

(372)

and

\[
D_\infty (\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n}||\pi_{XY}^n) = D_\infty (P_{X^nY^n|V = 1}||\pi_{XY}^n)
\]

(373)

\[
= \log \sup_{(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{A}_x^n (\pi_X) \times \mathcal{A}_y^n (\pi_Y)} \frac{P_{X^nY^n} (x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{XY}^n (x^n, y^n)} - \log P_V(1)
\]

(374)

\[
\leq D_\infty (P_M ||\pi_{XY}^n) - \log P_V(1).
\]

(375)

We now prove Lemma 2 by a argument similar as that in Appendix A. According to the definition of \(D_\infty\), \(D_\infty (P_{X^nY^n}||\pi_{XY}^n) \leq \epsilon_n\) implies \(D_\infty (\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n}||\pi_{XY}^n) \leq \epsilon_n - \log P_V(1), i.e., \sup_{x^n, y^n} \frac{P_{X^nY^n}(x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n)} \leq P_V(1) := e^{-\epsilon_n}. Define \(\tilde{P}_X^nY^n := \frac{e^{-\epsilon_n} \tilde{P}_{X^nY^n} - \tilde{P}_X^nY^n (x^n, y^n)}{e^{-\epsilon_n} - \tilde{P}_X^nY^n (x^n, y^n)}\), then obviously \(\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n} (x^n, y^n)\) is a distribution. Hence \(\tilde{\pi}_{XY}^n\) can be written as a mixture distribution \(\pi_{XY}^n (x^n, y^n) = e^{-\epsilon_n} P_{X^nY^n} (x^n, y^n) + (1 - e^{-\epsilon_n}) \tilde{P}_{X^nY^n} (x^n, y^n)\). The encoder first generates a Bernoulli random variable \(U\) with \(P_U(1) = e^{-\epsilon_n}\), compresses it with bits \(\leq H(e^{-\epsilon_n}) + 1\), and transmits it to the two generators. If
$U = 1$, then the encoder and two generators use the synthesis codes \( \tilde{P}_X, \tilde{P}_Y | M \) with rate $H(\tilde{P}_M)$ to generate $\tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n}$. If $U = 0$, then the encoder generates $(X^n, Y^n) \sim \tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n}$, and uses a variable-length compression code with rate
\[
\frac{1}{n} \left( H(\tilde{P}_X) + H(\tilde{P}_Y) \right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( H(\tilde{P}_X(V)) + H(\tilde{P}_Y(V)) \right) + \tilde{P}_V(0) \left( H(\tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n} | V = 0) + 1 \right) \tag{376}
\]
to generate $\tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n}$. The distribution generated by such a mixed code is $e^{-\epsilon_n} \tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n} (x^n, y^n) + \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n} (x^n, y^n)$, i.e., $\pi_{XY} (x^n, y^n)$. The total code rate is no larger than
\[
\frac{1}{n} \left( H(\tilde{P}_X(V)) + H(\tilde{P}_Y(V)) \right) = \frac{1}{n} \log \left| A_{\pi_X}^{(n)} (\pi_X) \times A_{\pi_Y}^{(n)} (\pi_Y) \right| - H(\pi_X) + H(\pi_Y)
\]
\[
H(\tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n} | V = 0) = \log \pi_V(0) - \frac{1}{\pi_V(0)} \sum_{(x^n, y^n) \notin A_{\pi_X}^{(n)} (\pi_X) \times A_{\pi_Y}^{(n)} (\pi_Y)} \pi_{XY} (x^n, y^n) \log \pi_{XY} (x^n, y^n) \tag{382}
\]
where (384) follows since the $\epsilon$-weakly jointly typical set of $\pi_{XY}$ belongs to $A_{\pi_X}^{(n)} (\pi_X) \times A_{\pi_Y}^{(n)} (\pi_Y)$. Hence to ensure (377) converges to $R$, we only require
\[
\left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \tilde{P}_V(0) \frac{\epsilon \left( H(\pi_{XY}) + 1 - \epsilon + o(1) \right)}{\pi_V(0)} \to 0. \tag{388}
\]
According to the definitions of $\tilde{P}_{X^n Y^n}$ and $V$, we know $\tilde{P}_V(0) = \frac{e^{\epsilon_n} \pi_V(0)}{e^{\epsilon_n - 1}}$. Hence
\[
\left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \tilde{P}_V(0) \frac{\epsilon \left( H(\pi_{XY}) + 1 - \epsilon + o(1) \right)}{\pi_V(0)} = \pi_V(0) \frac{\epsilon \left( H(\pi_{XY}) + 1 - \epsilon + o(1) \right)}{\pi_V(0)} = \epsilon \left( H(\pi_{XY}) + 1 - \epsilon + o(1) \right) \to 0 \tag{389}
\]

by choosing $\epsilon$ arbitrarily small. This completes the proof.

**APPENDIX H**

**Proof of Lemma 3**

Some proof techniques used in this section are similar to those used in Appendix F. By respectively scaling $X, Y$, we can obtain a bivariate source with $E \left[ X^2 \right] = E \left[ Y^2 \right] = 1$. Hence without loss of generality, we assume $\pi_{XY}$ satisfying $E \left[ X^2 \right] = E \left[ Y^2 \right] = 1$. Define an $n$-ball with radius $\sqrt{n (1 + \epsilon)}$ as
\[
B_{\epsilon}^{(n)} := \left\{ x^n \in \mathbb{R}^n : \| x^n \| \leq \sqrt{n (1 + \epsilon)} \right\} \tag{390}
\]
Note that $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}$ is a high probability set for any memoryless source with unit second moment, i.e., $\pi^n_X(\mathcal{B}^{(n)})$, $\pi^n_Y(\mathcal{B}^{(n)}) \to 1$. Hence $\pi^n_{XY}(\mathcal{B}^{(n)} \times \mathcal{B}^{(n)}) \to 1$. Obviously, $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}$ is contained in the $n$-cube $\mathcal{L}_{e,n}^n$ with $\mathcal{L}_{e,n}$ defined in (63). Hence $\pi^n_{XY}(\mathcal{L}_{e,n}) \to 1$.

Assume $\Delta_n$ is a decreasing positive sequence such that $\Delta_n \to 0$ and $n\Delta_n \mathcal{L}_{e,n} \to 0$. By Lemma 11, we have that for any $(x,y), (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \mathcal{L}_{e,n}$ satisfying $|x - \hat{x}|, |y - \hat{y}| \leq \Delta_n$,

$$\frac{\pi^n_{XY}(x,y)}{\pi^n_{XY}(\hat{x},\hat{y})} \leq \exp(\Delta_n L_{e,n}).$$

(391)

Hence for $(x^n, y^n), (\hat{x}^n, \hat{y}^n) \in \mathcal{L}_{e,n} \times \mathcal{L}_{e,n}$, satisfying $|x_i - \hat{x}_i|, |y_i - \hat{y}_i| \leq \Delta_n$, we have

$$\frac{\pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n)}{\pi^n_{XY}(\hat{x}^n,\hat{y}^n)} \leq \exp(n\Delta_n L_{e,n}).$$

(392)

Assume $(P_M, P_{X^n|M}, P_{Y^n|M})$ is a sequence of fixed-length codes with rate $R$ that generates $P_{X^nY^n}$ such that $\epsilon_n := D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n}\|\pi^n_{XY}) \to 0$, where $P_M$ is the uniform distribution on $[1 : e^nR]$. Similar to (371), we introduce a random variable $V = 1 \{ (X^n, Y^n) \in \mathcal{L}_{e,n}^n \}$. (393)

We define $\tilde{P}_{MX^nY^n} := P_M P_{X^n|M} P_{Y^n|M}$, i.e., $X^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y^n$ forms a Markov chain under $\tilde{P}$, (372) and (375) still hold. Define $[z] := \Delta_n \frac{z^n}{\Delta_n}$ as componentwise quantization operation of a vector $z$ with step $\Delta_n$ (for simplicity, we set $\Delta_n$ such that $\sqrt{n(1 + \epsilon)}$ is a multiple of $\Delta_n$). Define $U^n, V^n \sim $ Unif $([0, \Delta_n]^n)$ are mutually independent, and also independent of $[X^n], [Y^n]$. Then

$$\sup_{x^n,y^n} \frac{\tilde{P}_{[X^n]+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n}(x^n,y^n)}{\pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n)} \leq \exp(n\Delta_n L_{e,n}) \sup_{x^n,y^n} \frac{\tilde{P}_{[X^n]+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n}(x^n,y^n)/\Delta_n}{\pi^n_{XY}(\hat{x}^n,\hat{y}^n)}$$

(394)

$$= \exp(n\Delta_n L_{e,n}) \sup_{[x^n],[y^n]} \frac{\tilde{P}_{[X^n]+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n}([[x^n],[y^n]])}{\pi^n_{XY}([[\hat{x}^n],[\hat{y}^n]])}$$

(395)

$$\leq \exp(n\Delta_n L_{e,n}) \sup_{x^n,y^n} \frac{\tilde{P}_{[X^n]+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n}(x^n,y^n)}{\pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n)}$$

(396)

$$\leq \exp(n\Delta_n L_{e,n} + D_\infty(P_{X^nY^n}\|\pi^n_{XY}) - \log P_V(1))$$

(397)

$$= \exp(n\Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n)$$

(398)

where $(\hat{x}^n, \hat{y}^n)$ in (394) is a point in $([x^n],[y^n]) + [0, \Delta_n]^n$ such that $\pi^n_{XY}([[\hat{x}^n],[\hat{y}^n]]) = \pi^n_{XY}([[x^n],[y^n]])/\Delta_n$ (the existence of such a point follows from the mean value theorem), (394) follows from (392), (396) follows from the data processing inequality, and (397) follows from (375). Define

$$\epsilon'_n := n\Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n$$

(399)

for some positive sequence $\delta_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, which will be specified later. Then (398) implies for all $(x^n,y^n) \in \mathcal{L}_{e,n}^n$,

$$e^{\epsilon'_n}\pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n) \geq e^{\delta_n}.$$

(400)

Define $\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n} := e^{\epsilon'_n}\pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n) - e^{\epsilon'_n-1}\tilde{P}_{[X^n]+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n}(x^n,y^n)$, then obviously $\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n} = (x^n,y^n)$ is a distribution. Hence $\pi^n_{XY}$ can be written as a mixture distribution $\pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n) = e^{\epsilon'_n-1}\tilde{P}_{[X^n]+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n}(x^n,y^n) + (1 - e^{\epsilon'_n-1})\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n} = e^{\epsilon'_n-1}\tilde{P}_{[X^n]+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n}(x^n,y^n) + e^{\epsilon'_n-1}\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n}$. In fact, the whole space $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is partitioned into $3^{2n}$ subregions by $2n$ hyperplanes $x_i = \pm \sqrt{n(1 + \epsilon)}$ and $y_j = \pm \sqrt{n(1 + \epsilon)}$, $1 \leq i \leq 2n$. One of them corresponds to $R_0 := \mathcal{L}_{e,n}$, and the others, labeled by $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_{3^{2n}-1}$, constitute $\mathbb{R}^{2n}\setminus\mathcal{L}_{e,n}$. Any subregion $R_k$, $0 \leq k \leq 3^{2n} - 1$ can be expressed as $R_k = (I^{(k)})^{2n} := I^{(k)}_1 \times I^{(k)}_2 \times \ldots \times I^{(k)}_{2n}$ where $I^{(k)}_i = \mathcal{L}_{e,n} := (-\infty, -\sqrt{n(1 + \epsilon)})$, $L_{e,n}$, or $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}_{e,n} := (\sqrt{n(1 + \epsilon)}, +\infty)$, $1 \leq i \leq 2n$. Observe that for any subregion $R_k$, $1 \leq k \leq 3^{2n} - 1$, $\tilde{P}_{X^n,Y^n|R_k} = \pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n) (I^{(k)})^{2n} = \prod_{i=1}^{2n} \pi_X(x_i,y_i|I^{(k)}_i \times I^{(k)}_{i+n})$, i.e., $(X_i,Y_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ are i.i.d. under the distribution $\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n}$. By derivations similar to (371)-(327), we obtain that for any $2n$-cubed $I^{(k)}_{2n} := \prod_{i=1}^{2n} ([\hat{x}_i, \hat{x}_i + \Delta_n] \times [\hat{y}_i, \hat{y}_i + \Delta_n]) \subseteq R_0$, and for distribution $\tilde{P}_{X^nY^n}$,

$$I \tilde{P}_{X^nY^n}(X^n,Y^n) \in I^{(k)}_{2n} \leq 4(n\Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n) / \delta_n + o(1).$$

(401)
By Lemma 12, \( \widehat{P}_{X^n|Y^n} \) is log-concave. Hence the dyadic decomposition scheme in [8] realizes exactly generating \( Z^m \) in a distributed way as long as the rate \( R \geq I(D)(Z^m) + m^2 + 9 \log 2 \) bits/symbol, where the dual total correlation

\[
I(D)(Z^m) := h(Z^m) - \sum_{i=1}^{m} h\left(Z_i | Z_i^{i-1}Z_{i+1}^{n}\right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{m} h\left(Z_i | Z_i^{i-1}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} h\left(Z_i | Z_i^{i-1}Z_{i+1}^{n}\right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{m} I\left(Z_i; Z_{i+1}^n \mid Z_i^{i-1}\right)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} I\left(Z_i; Z_{i+1}^n \mid Z_i^{i-1}\right) + 4\log 2
\]

That is, the exact common information \( T_{\text{Exact}}(\pi Z^m) \leq I(D)(Z^m) + m^2 + 9 \log 2 \) bits/symbol.

Substituting \( \widehat{P}_{X^n|Y^n}(X^n,Y^n) \in I_{\Delta_n}^2 \) into the dual total correlation, we have

\[
I_{\widehat{P}}(X^n,Y^n) := I_{\widehat{P}}(X^n,Y^n) \in I_{\Delta_n}^2
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} I_{\widehat{P}}(X_i^n,X_{i+1}^n) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} I_{\widehat{P}}(Y_{i}^n,Y_{i+1}^n) + 4\log 2
\]

\[
\leq 2\Delta_n \log 2
\]

Now we consider the subregions \( R_k \), \( 1 \leq k \leq 3^m - 1 \). Since \( (X_i,Y_i) \), \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) are i.i.d. under the distribution \( \widehat{P}(|R_k) \), we have

\[
I_{\widehat{P}}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in R_k) = I_{\pi}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in I_{\pi}^{(k)} \times I_{\pi}^{(k)}
\]

By Lemma 13, we further have

\[
I_{\widehat{P}}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in R_k) \leq I_{\pi}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in I_{\pi}^{(k)}
\]

For \( m = 2 \), the dyadic decomposition scheme in [8] realizes exactly generating \( Z^2 \) in a distributed way as long as the rate \( R \geq I(Z_1;Z_2) + 24 \log 2 \) nats/symbol. Applying this to the distribution \( \widehat{P}_{X^n,Y^n}(X^n,Y^n) \in R_k \), we have that the exact common information

\[
T_{\text{Exact}}(\widehat{P}_{X^n,Y^n}(X^n,Y^n) \in R_k) \leq I_{\widehat{P}}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in R_k) + 24 \log 2
\]

\[
\leq I_{\pi}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in I_{\pi}^{(k)} + 24 \log 2
\]

Since \( \widehat{P}_{X^n,Y^n}(X^n,Y^n) \in R_k \) is a product distribution,

\[
T_{\text{Exact}}(\widehat{P}_{X^n,Y^n}(X^n,Y^n) \in R_k) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I_{\pi}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in R_k) + 24 \log 2
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I_{\pi}(X_i^n,Y_i^n) \in I_{\pi}^{(k)} + 24 \log 2
\]

We now prove Lemma 3 by an argument similar as that in Appendix A. The encoder first generates a Bernoulli random variable \( U \) with \( P_U(1) = e^{-\epsilon_n} \), compresses it with rate \( \frac{1}{n} \log \left( H(e^{-\epsilon_n}) + 1 \right) \), and transmits it to the two generators. If \( U = 1 \), then the encoder and two generators use the synthesis codes \( \widehat{P}_{X^n|M}, \widehat{P}_{Y^n|M} \) with rate \( H(P_M) \) to generate \( \widehat{P}_{X^n,Y^n} \). Then by quantizing \( X^n,Y^n \) and adding uniform random variables to them, the generators obtain \( \widehat{P}_{X^n,Y^n} \). If \( U = 0 \), then the encoder generates \( X^n,Y^n \) uses \( \frac{1}{n} \log \left( \frac{4n(1+\epsilon)}{\Delta_n} \right)^n \) rate to encode the index of the 2n-cube or the subregion \( R_k \) that \( (X^n,Y^n) \) belongs to, and uses the dyadic decomposition scheme in [8] to generate \( \widehat{P}_{X^n,Y^n}(X^n,Y^n) \in I_{\Delta_n}^2 \) with rate \( I_{\widehat{P}}(X^n,Y^n) \in I_{\Delta_n}^2 + 4\log 2 \) nats.

The distribution
generated by such a mixed code is $e^{-\epsilon_n} \tilde{P}_{X^n+U^n,[Y^n]+V^n} (x^n, y^n) + \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \tilde{P}_{X^n,Y^n} (x^n, y^n)$, i.e., $\pi^n_{XY} (x^n, y^n)$. The total code rate is no larger than

$$\frac{1}{n} \left( H(e^{-\epsilon_n}) + 1 \right) + e^{-\epsilon_n} H(\tilde{P}_M)$$

$$+ \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \left\{ \log \left( \frac{\sqrt{n(1+\epsilon)}}{\Delta_n} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \log (3^{2n} - 1) \right\}$$

$$+ \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{2n} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{2n}} \tilde{P}_{X^n,Y^n} \left( \mathcal{I}_{2n} \right) \left( I_{D}^{(P)} (X^n,Y^n| (X^n, Y^n) \in \mathcal{I}_{2n}^2) + 4n + 18 (\log 2) \log (2n) \right)$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^{3^{2n}-1} \tilde{P}_{X^n,Y^n} (R_k) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_x \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) + 4 \log 2 \right\}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \left( H(e^{-\epsilon_n}) + 1 \right) + e^{-\epsilon_n} H(\tilde{P}_M)$$

$$+ \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \left\{ \log \left( \frac{9 \sqrt{n(1+\epsilon)}}{\Delta_n} \right) + 2 \left( \frac{4 (n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V (1) + \epsilon_n)}{\delta_n} + o(1) \right) + 4n + 18 (\log 2) \log (2n) \right\}$$

$$+ \sum_{k=1}^{3^{2n}-1} \pi^n_{XY} (R_k) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_x \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) + 4 \log 2 \right\}$$

(414)

$$+ \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \left\{ \log \left( \frac{\sqrt{n(1+\epsilon)}}{\Delta_n} \right) + \frac{8 (n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V (1) + \epsilon_n)}{\delta_n} + 4n \right\} + o(1),$$

(415)

where (414) follows since $\pi^n_{XY} (R_k) = \left( 1 - e^{-\epsilon_n} \right) \tilde{P}_{X^n,Y^n} (R_k)$, and (415) follows since by symmetry,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{3^{2n}-1} \pi^n_{XY} (R_k) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_x \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) + 4 \log 2 \right\}$$

(416)

$$= \pi^n_{XY} (R_k) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_x \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) + 4 \log 2 \right\}$$

(417)

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{3^{2n}-1} \pi^n_{XY} (R_k) \left\{ \gamma_x \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) 1 \left\{ \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) \neq (\mathcal{L}_{e,n},\mathcal{L}_{e,n}) \right\} \right\}$$

(418)

$$+ \frac{1}{\pi_{XY}(\mathcal{L}_{e,n})} \left( \mathcal{L}_{XY}(X;Y) + o(1) \right) + 24 \log 2$$

(419)

and on the other hand,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{3^{2n}-1} \pi^n_{XY} (R_k) \gamma_x \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) 1 \left\{ \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) \neq (\mathcal{L}_{e,n},\mathcal{L}_{e,n}) \right\}$$

(420)

$$= \pi^n_{XY}(x^n,y^n) \sum_{k=1}^{3^{2n}-1} 1 \left\{ (x^n,y^n) \in \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)} \right)^{2n} \right\} \gamma_x \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) 1 \left\{ \left( I_{\delta}^{(k)},I_{n+1}^{(k)} \right) \neq (\mathcal{L}_{e,n},\mathcal{L}_{e,n}) \right\}$$

(421)
Hence the proof is complete. That is, \( \epsilon = o(1) \). Then we only require \( n \Delta_n L_{e,n} \rightarrow 0 \) and \( \epsilon'_{n} \rightarrow 0 \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \). On the other hand, \( H(\bar{M}) \leq \frac{R}{P_V(1)} \).

Hence to ensure (415) converges to \( R \), we only require

\[
\frac{\sqrt{n}(1 + \epsilon)}{\Delta_n} + \frac{8(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n)}{\delta_n} + 4n \rightarrow 0.
\]

(428) is equivalent to

\[
\left( 1 - e^{-(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1)) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n} \right) \left( \log \frac{\sqrt{n}(1 + \epsilon)}{\Delta_n} + \frac{8(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n)}{\delta_n} + 4n \right) \rightarrow 0.
\]

Set \( \delta_n = n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n \), then we only require

\[
(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n) (4n - \log \Delta_n) \rightarrow 0.
\]

Observe that \( \pi_V(0) \rightarrow 0 \) exponentially fast, and by the data processing inequality, \( P_V(0) \leq \pi_V(0) e^{\epsilon_n} \rightarrow 0 \) exponentially fast. Hence if \( n \Delta_n L_{e,n} \rightarrow 0 \), then \( \epsilon'_{n} \rightarrow 0 \).

Here (419) follows since \( \sum_{k=1}^{2^n - 1} \pi^n_{XY}(R_k) = o(1) \), and (421) follows since we add \( L_{e,n}^{2^n} \) into the set that the summation is taken over.

Observe that \( \pi_V(0) \rightarrow 0 \) exponentially fast, and by the data processing inequality, \( P_V(0) \leq \pi_V(0) e^{\epsilon_n} \rightarrow 0 \) exponentially fast. Hence if \( n \Delta_n L_{e,n} \rightarrow 0 \), then \( \epsilon'_{n} \rightarrow 0 \). On the other hand,

\[
H(\bar{M}) \leq \frac{R}{P_V(1)}.
\]

Hence to ensure (415) converges to \( R \), we only require

\[
n \Delta_n L_{e,n} \rightarrow 0
\]

\[
\left( 1 - e^{-(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1)) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n} \right) \left( \log \frac{\sqrt{n}(1 + \epsilon)}{\Delta_n} + \frac{8(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n)}{\delta_n} + 4n \right) \rightarrow 0.
\]

(428) is equivalent to

\[
\left( 1 - e^{-(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1)) + \epsilon_n + \delta_n} \right) \left( \log \frac{\sqrt{n}(1 + \epsilon)}{\Delta_n} + \frac{8(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n)}{\delta_n} + 4n \right) \rightarrow 0.
\]

Set \( \delta_n = n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n \), then we only require

\[
(n \Delta_n L_{e,n} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n) (4n - \log \Delta_n) \rightarrow 0.
\]

Observe that \( \pi_V(0) \rightarrow 0 \) exponentially fast, and by the data processing inequality, \( -\log P_V(1) = -\log (1 - P_V(0)) \sim P_V(0) \rightarrow 0 \) exponentially fast. Set \( \Delta_n = \frac{1}{(n \Delta_n)^2} \), then \( n \Delta_n L_{e,n} \rightarrow 0 \) and

\[
\left( \frac{1}{(n \Delta_n)^2} - \log P_V(1) + \epsilon_n \right) (4n + 3 \log n + 3 \log L_{e,n})
\]

\[
\sim \left( \frac{1}{(n \Delta_n)^2} + P_V(0) + \epsilon_n \right) (4n + \log L_{e,n})
\]

\[
= (P_V(0) + \epsilon_n) (4n + \log L_{e,n}) + o(1)
\]

\[
= P_V(0) \log L_{e,n} + \epsilon_n (4n + \log L_{e,n}) + o(1).
\]

Then we only require

\[
P_V(0) \log L_{e,n} \rightarrow 0
\]

\[
\epsilon_n (n + \log L_{e,n}) \rightarrow 0.
\]

That is, \( \epsilon_n = o \left( \frac{1}{n \log L_{e,n}} \right) \) and \( \log L_{e,n} \) is sub-exponentially growing in \( n \). These are the assumptions given in the lemma. Hence the proof is complete.

**APPENDIX I**

**PROOF OF THEOREM 8**

In this section, we extend the proof in Appendix A-B to the Gaussian case by combining it with discretization techniques.
Define $Q_W = \mathcal{N}(0, \rho), Q_{X|W}(\cdot|w) = \mathcal{N}(w, 1 - \rho), Q_{Y|W}(\cdot|w) = \mathcal{N}(w, 1 - \rho)$. Then $Q_{XY} = \pi_{XY}$. For $\epsilon > 0$, we define the distributions

\[
P_{W^n}(w^n) \propto Q^n_W(w^n) 1\{w^n \in \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_2(Q_W)\},
\]
\[
P_{X^n|W^n}(x^n|w^n) \propto Q^n_{X|W}(x^n|w^n) 1\{x^n \in \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e(Q_{WX}|w^n)\},
\]
\[
P_{Y^n|W^n}(y^n|w^n) \propto Q^n_{Y|W}(y^n|w^n) 1\{y^n \in \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e(Q_{WY}|w^n)\}.
\]

According to the definition of weakly typical sets,

\[
\mathcal{A}^{(n)}_2(Q_W) = \left\{w^n \in \mathbb{R}^n : \left\|w^n\right\|^2 \frac{1}{n\rho} - 1 \leq \epsilon \right\}
\]

and

\[
\mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e(Q_{WX}) = \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e(Q_{WY}) = \left\{(w^n, x^n) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} : \left\|w^n\right\|^2 \frac{1}{n\rho} - 1 \leq 2\epsilon, \left\|x^n\right\|^2 \frac{1}{n(1 - \rho)} - 1 \leq 2\epsilon, \left|\left\|w^n\right\|^2 \frac{1}{n\rho} + \left\|x^n - w^n\right\|^2 \frac{1}{n(1 - \rho)} - 2\right| \leq 2\epsilon \right\}.
\]

Hence for $(w^n, x^n) \in \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e(Q_{WX})$,

\[
\left\|x^n - w^n\right\|^2 \frac{1}{n(1 - \rho)} - 1 \leq 4\epsilon
\]

and

\[
\frac{1}{n}(x^n - w^n)^T w^n = \frac{1}{2n} \left(\left\|w^n\right\|^2 + \left\|x^n - w^n\right\|^2 - \left\|x^n\right\|^2\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho (1 + 4\epsilon) + (1 - \rho) (1 + 4\epsilon) - (1 - 2\epsilon) = (3 - \rho) \epsilon.
\]

We set $C = \{W^n(m)\}_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n}$ with $W^n(m), m \in \mathcal{M}_n$ drawn independently for different $m$’s and according to the same distribution $P_{W^n}$ such that $I_{W^n}$. Upon receiving $W^n(M)$, the two generators respectively use random mappings $P_{X^n|W^n}$ and $P_{Y^n|W^n}$ to generate $X^n$ and $Y^n$. For a sequence of positive numbers $\{\Delta_n\}$, we quantize $X^n$ and $Y^n$ as $[X]^n = \Delta_n \frac{X^n}{\Delta_n}$ and $[Y]^n = \Delta_n \frac{Y^n}{\Delta_n}$. Define $\mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e \times \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e := \left(\Delta\mathcal{Z}^n \cap \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e\right) \times \left(\Delta\mathcal{Z}^n \cap \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_e\right)$. Define $U^n, V^n \sim \text{Unif} (I_{\Delta_n}^n)$ with $I_{\Delta_n}^n = [0, \Delta_n]^n$ are mutually independent, and also independent of $[X]^n, [Y]^n$. For such a code, we have the following Gaussian version of distributed Rényi-covering lemma.

**Lemma 14 (Distributed Rényi-Covering).** For the random code described above, if

\[
R > \frac{1}{2} \log \left[\frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho}\right] + \frac{\rho}{1 + \rho},
\]

then there exists some $\alpha, \epsilon > 0$ and some positive sequence $\{\Delta_n\}$ such that

\[
\mathbb{P}_{C} \left(D_\infty(P_{[X]^n+U^n,[Y]^n+V^n|C}, \pi_{XY}^n) \leq \epsilon^{-n\alpha}\right) \to 1
\]

doubly exponentially fast.

This lemma implies that there exists a sequence of codebooks $\{c_n\}$ with rate $R$ such that $D_\infty(P_{[X]^n+\epsilon U^n,[Y]^n+\epsilon V^n|C}, \pi_{XY}^n) \leq \epsilon^{-n\alpha}$ as long as $R > \frac{1}{2} \log \left[\frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho}\right] + \frac{\rho}{1 + \rho}$. This completes the proof of $T_\infty(\pi_{XY}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[\frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho}\right] + \frac{\rho}{1 + \rho}$. Hence what we need to do is to prove Lemma 14. The proof is provided in the following.

**Proof of Lemma 14:** Assume $\epsilon > 0$ is a number such that

\[
R > (1 + \epsilon) \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \left[\frac{1 + \rho}{1 - \rho}\right] + \frac{\rho}{1 + \rho}\right) + 3\epsilon.
\]


For brevity, in the following we denote $M = e^{nR}$. According to the definition of the Rényi divergence, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
e^{D_{\infty}}(P_{X^n|Y^n}||\pi_{X|Y}^n) &= \sup_{(x^n,y^n) \in [A_n^{(n)}] \times [A_n^{(n)}]} \frac{P_{X^n|Y^n}(x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{X|Y}^n(x^n, y^n)} \\
&= \sup_{(x^n,y^n) \in [A_n^{(n)}] \times [A_n^{(n)}]} g_{X^n|Y^n}(x^n, y^n|C_n),
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
g_{X^n|Y^n|C_n}(x^n, y^n|C_n) := \sum_{m \in M_n} \frac{g_{X^n|Y^n|W^n}(x^n, y^n|w^n)(m)}{M}
\]

with

\[
g_{X^n|Y^n|W^n}(x^n, y^n|w^n) := \frac{P_{X^n|W^n}(x^n|w^n) P_{Y^n|W^n}(y^n|w^n)}{\pi_{X|Y}^n(x^n, y^n)}.
\]

By the data processing inequality,

\[
\sup_{(x^n,y^n) \in [A_n^{(n)}] \times [A_n^{(n)}]} g_{X^n|Y^n|W^n}(x^n, y^n|w^n) \leq \sup_{(x^n,y^n) \in A_n^{(n)} \times A_n^{(n)}} g_{X^n,Y^n|W^n}(x^n, y^n|w^n).
\]

Define

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta_{0,n} &:= 1 - Q_{W}^{(n)}\left(A_{2}^{(n)}(Q_{W})\right) \\
\delta_{1,n} &:= 1 - \inf_{w^n \in A_{2}^{(n)}(Q_{W})} Q_{X|W}^{(n)}\left(A_{1}^{(n)}(Q_{W,X})|w^n\right) \\
\delta_{2,n} &:= 1 - \inf_{w^n \in A_{2}^{(n)}(Q_{W})} Q_{Y|W}^{(n)}\left(A_{1}^{(n)}(Q_{W,Y})|w^n\right).
\end{align*}
\]

By the large deviation theory, we know that $\delta_{0,n}, \delta_{1,n}, \delta_{2,n} \to 0$ exponentially fast. On the other hand, similar to (144), we can show that for $w^n \in A_{2}^{(n)}(Q_{W})$,

\[
g_{X^n,Y^n|W^n}(x^n, y^n|w^n) := \frac{P_{X^n|W^n}(x^n|w^n) P_{Y^n|W^n}(y^n|w^n)}{\pi_{X,Y}^n(x^n, y^n)}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \delta_{1,n})(1 - \delta_{2,n})} e^{4n\epsilon - nh(X|W) - nh(Y|W) + n \log 2 \pi \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} + \frac{n(1+2\epsilon) - \rho}{1-\rho^2} (x^n\top y^n)}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \delta_{1,n})(1 - \delta_{2,n})} e^{4n\epsilon - nh(X|W) - nh(Y|W) + n \log 2 \pi \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} + \frac{n(1+2\epsilon) - \rho}{1-\rho^2} [n(1+2\epsilon) - \rho(t_{n}^{m} - \rho(t_{n}^{m} - 2n(3-\rho)\epsilon)]}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \delta_{1,n})(1 - \delta_{2,n})} e^{4n\epsilon - nh(X|W) - nh(Y|W) + n \log 2 \pi \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} + \frac{n(1+2\epsilon) - \rho(3-\rho)(1+4\epsilon) - 2n(3-\rho)\epsilon)}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(1 - \delta_{1,n})(1 - \delta_{2,n})} e^{6 - 10\rho \epsilon - nh(X|W) - nh(Y|W) + n \log 2 \pi \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} + \frac{n(1-\rho)(1+2\epsilon)}{1-\rho^2}}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{(1 - \delta_{1,n})(1 - \delta_{2,n})} e^{\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1+2\epsilon}{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{6 - 10\rho \epsilon}{1-\rho^2}}
\]

\[
= \beta_n,
\]

where (458) follows from (444). Combining (452) and (462), we obtain

\[
\sup_{(x^n,y^n) \in [A_n^{(n)}] \times [A_n^{(n)}]} g_{X^n|Y^n|W^n}(x^n, y^n|w^n) \leq \beta_n.
\]
Continuing (449), we get for any $\epsilon' > 0$,

$$
\mathbb{P}_{c_n} \left( e^{D_{\infty}(P_{X^n}|Y^n)\|\pi_{X|Y}^n) \geq 1 + \epsilon' } \right)
$$

$$
\leq \mathbb{P}_{c_n} \left( \sup_{(x^n, y^n) \in [A^{(n)}] \times [A^{(n)}]} \frac{g(X^n|Y^n|C_{n}) (x^n, y^n|C_{n})}{1 + \epsilon'} \right)
$$

$$
\leq \left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right] \times \left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right] \sup_{(x^n, y^n) \in [A^{(n)}] \times [A^{(n)}]} \mathbb{P}_{c_n} \left( \frac{g(X^n|Y^n|C_{n}) (x^n, y^n|C_{n})}{1 + \epsilon'} \right)
$$

(464)

(465)

where (465) follows from the union bound. If the probability vanishes doubly exponentially fast, and $\left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right] \times \left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right]$ is growing much slower than doubly exponentially fast. Hence, $\max_{x^n, y^n} g(x^n, y^n|C_{n}) < 1 + \epsilon'$ with high probability as $n \to \infty$. To this end, we use the Bernstein inequality [35] to bound the probability. Define $I_{A}^{n} := (0, \Delta)^{n}$. Observe that $g(x^n, y^n|W^n(m))$, $m \in A_{\alpha}$ are i.i.d. random variables with mean

$$
\mu_{\epsilon, n} := \mathbb{E}_{W^n} \left[ g(X^n|Y^n|W^n) (x^n, y^n|W^n) \right]
$$

$$
= \int Q_{W}^{n}(w^n) 1 \left\{ w^n \in A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right\} \frac{Q_{W}^{(n)} \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right) (Q_{W})}{Q_{W}^{(n)} \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right) (Q_{W})}
$$

$$
\times \frac{Q_{X}^{(n)} \left( x^n \right) 1 \left\{ x^n \in A \left( x^n \right) \right\}}{Q_{X}^{(n)} \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right) \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right)} \int Q_{W}^{n}(w^n) 1 \left\{ w^n \in A \left( x^n \right) \right\} \frac{Q_{W}^{(n)} \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right) \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right) (Q_{W})}{Q_{W}^{(n)} \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right) \left( A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right) (Q_{W})}
$$

$$
\times \pi_{XY}^{n} (x^n, y^n)
$$

(466)

(467)

(468)

(469)

and variance

$$
\text{Var}_{W^n} \left[ g(X^n|Y^n|W^n) (x^n, y^n|W^n) \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{W^n} \left[ g(X^n|Y^n|W^n) (x^n, y^n|W^n)^2 \right]
$$

$$
\leq \beta_{n} \mu_{\epsilon, n}.
$$

(470)

(471)

Here (468) follows by the following inequality. For two functions $f(x) \geq 0, g(x) > 0$,

$$
\frac{\int f(x) dx}{\int g(x) dx} \leq \sup_{x} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}.
$$

(472)

Following steps similar to (154)-(158) (but with the exponent of $\mu_{n} - 1$ derived by the large deviation theory, instead of the method of types), we get that there exists $c'_{n}$ exponentially fast such that (465) with $\epsilon'$ replaced by $c'_{n}$ converges to zero doubly exponentially fast, as long as $\left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right] \times \left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right]$ is growing slower than doubly exponentially fast. Hence

$$
\mathbb{P}_{c_n} \left( e^{D_{\infty}(P_{X^n}|Y^n)\|\pi_{X|Y}^n) \geq 1 + c'_{n} } \right) \to 0
$$

(473)

doubly exponentially fast, as long as $\left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right] \times \left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right]$ is growing slower than doubly exponentially fast. Obviously, (473) implies there exists a codebook such that $D_{\infty}(P_{X^n}|Y^n)\|\pi_{X|Y}^n) \to 0$ exponentially fast.

On the other hand, as shown in Remark 8, for the Gaussian source, 

$$
L_{\epsilon,n} = \frac{\sqrt{n} \left( 1 + \epsilon \right)}{1 - \rho}.
$$

(474)

Similarly to (392), for $(x^n, y^n) \in \left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right] \times \left[ A_{\alpha}^{(n)} \right] \subseteq L_{\epsilon,n} \times L_{\epsilon,n}$, and $|x_i - \hat{x}_i|, |y_i - \hat{y}_i| \leq \Delta_n, \forall i$, we have

$$
\frac{\pi_{XY}^{n} (x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{XY}^{n} (\hat{x}^n, \hat{y}^n)} \leq \exp \left( n \Delta_n L_{\epsilon,n} \right).
$$

(475)
Set $\Delta_n = \frac{e^{-n\delta}}{n^{\sqrt{n(1+e)}}}$ for some $\delta > 0$, then
\[
\left| \left[ A^{(n)} \right] \times \left[ A^{(n)} \right] \right| = \left( \frac{\sqrt{n(1+e)}}{\Delta_n} \right)^{2n} = \left( \frac{n^2(1+e)}{(1-\rho)e^{-n\delta}} \right)^{2n} = e^{2n^2\delta + 2n \log \frac{n^2(1+e)}{1-\rho}},
\]
which grows much slower than doubly exponentially fast. Hence the doubly exponential convergence of (473) is guaranteed.

Define $U^n, V^n \sim \text{Unif} \left( I_{\Delta_n}^n \right)$ with $I_{\Delta_n} = [0, \Delta_n]^n$ are mutually independent, and also independent of $[X^n], [Y^n]$. Then
\[
e^{D_{\infty}(P_{X^n|Y^n}||\pi_{XY}^n)} = \sup_{x^n,y^n} \frac{P_{X^n|Y^n}(x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{XY}(x^n, y^n)} \leq \sup_{x^n,y^n} \frac{P_{X^n|Y^n}(x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n)} = \exp(n \Delta_n L_{e,n}) e^{D_{\infty}(P_{X^n}||\pi_{X}^n)}
\]
and hence
\[
D_{\infty}(P_{X^n|Y^n}||\pi_{XY}^n) \leq n \Delta_n L_{e,n} + D_{\infty}(P_{X^n}||\pi_{X}^n) \rightarrow 0
\]
exponentially fast.
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