

# Non-Coherent Active Device Identification for Massive Random Access

Jyotish Robin, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Elza Erkip, *Fellow, IEEE*

## Abstract

Massive Machine-Type Communications (mMTC) is a key service category in the current generation of wireless networks featuring an extremely high density of energy and resource-limited devices with sparse and sporadic activity patterns. In order to enable random access in such mMTC networks, base station needs to identify the active devices while operating within stringent access delay constraints. In this paper, an energy efficient active device identification protocol is proposed in which active devices transmit On-Off Keying (OOK) modulated preambles jointly and base station employs non-coherent energy detection avoiding channel estimation overheads. The minimum number of channel-uses required by the active user identification protocol is characterized in the asymptotic regime of total number of devices  $\ell$  when the number of active devices  $k$  scales as  $k = \Theta(1)$  along with an achievability scheme relying on the equivalence of activity detection to a group testing problem. Several practical schemes based on Belief Propagation (BP) and Combinatorial Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (COMP) are also proposed. Simulation results show that BP strategies outperform COMP significantly and can operate close to the theoretical achievability bounds. In a partial-recovery setting where few misdetections are allowed, BP continues to perform well.

## Index Terms

Massive machine-type communication (mMTC), massive random access, active device identification, IoT, group testing.

Jyotish Robin and Elza Erkip are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, NYU Tandon School of Engineering, 6 MetroTech Center, Brooklyn, NY 11201 USA. (e-mail: jyotish.robin@nyu.edu).

## I. INTRODUCTION

Sixth generation (6G) wireless communication networks are expected to serve a myriad of smart sensing applications involving massive machine-type communications (mMTC) as in Internet of Things (IoT). In contrast to the traditional cellular systems, mMTC has to tackle a novel set of technical challenges posed by the diversity in data traffic patterns and application-specific constraints in machine-centric communications [1]. Typically, mMTC networks are comprised of sensors, tracking devices, actuators, etc., which engage in the monitoring and recording of critical information. These mMTC devices often need to support dynamic service requirements such as variable payload sizes, data security and delay constraints while reliably operating on low duty cycles and stringent energy budget constraints to enhance efficiency [2]. Machine-type applications naturally lead to a sparse and sporadic data traffic since only a small subset of devices are active at any given time instant [3]. Moreover, since the payload size is small and data transmissions are infrequent, On-Off Keying (OOK) based modulation schemes are known to be energy efficient as the devices can save energy during off-slots [4]–[6]. Furthermore, in the context of green communication, there has been a renewed interest in OOK modulation schemes for serving low-rate and high-reliability applications [7].

Another key distinction of mMTC systems w.r.t. cellular systems is that they are more prone to security threats since they are composed of simple nodes with limited computational capabilities [8]. Hence, it is critical to maintain data security and provide robustness against malicious attacks such as jamming, spoofing and denial-of-service [9]. To combat malicious jamming attacks, spread-spectrum techniques, viz., direct sequence spread spectrum and frequency hopping spread spectrum (FHSS), have been considered for commercial wireless networks [10]. Specifically, FHSS approaches are more suitable in IoT scenarios due to their scalability and superior resilience to narrow band interference [11]. For example, many mMTC architectures rely on fast frequency hopping where each symbol experiences independent fading to enhance

communication security against jamming attacks [12], [13].

In mMTC networks, the BS faces the challenging task of successfully decoding data packets transmitted by a random unknown active subset of sensors. In fact, efficiently identifying the active devices is a critical part of many Random Access (RA) architectures [14]–[16] as misidentifications can lead to data losses which significantly impact critical IoT environments [17]. In this paper, our focus is on this key problem of active device identification in mMTC networks which are operating under stringent requirements in terms of latency, data rates, reliability, energy consumption, and security/privacy. In dense mMTC networks, traditional grant-based random access strategies result in excessive preamble collisions drastically increasing the signaling overheads and transmission delays [18]. On the other hand, grant-free random access suffers from severe co-channel interference caused by the non-orthogonality of preambles [19]. Thus, active device identification is a more intricate problem in massive mMTC systems than traditional cellular systems and requires novel strategies.

Several recent works [20]–[24] exploit the sporadic device activity pattern to employ compressed sensing techniques such as Approximate Message Passing (AMP) [20]–[23] and sparse graph codes [24] to detect active users. In AMP based approaches, preamble sequences are typically generated from i.i.d. Gaussian distributions and the activity detection performance in massive user settings can be characterized using state evolution [23]. Senel *et al.* in [25] proposed an activity detection scheme by using symmetric Bernoulli pilot sequences under the assumption of state evolution. In [26], an RA protocol for short packet transmission was presented by viewing activity detection as a group testing (GT) problem. Our previous works in [27], [28] address the activity detection problem taking into account the access delay and energy constraints. Chen *et al.* in [29], [30] proposed a novel many-access channel (MnAC) model for systems with many transmitters and a single receiver in which the number of transmitters grows with the blocklength. Another related work is [31] where the problem of designing unsourced massive random access architectures for an AWGN random access channel with random fading gains unknown to the

receiver is discussed.

Most of the existing literature assumes either a Gaussian channel or a block-fading channel model where the channel remains static in each block in which channel state information (CSI) can be accurately obtained at the BS through the use of pilots before activity detection. For secure mMTC networks such as the FHSS systems mentioned before, a more accurate channel model would incorporate fast fading where reliable channel estimates cannot be obtained [32].

In this paper, unlike the coherent detection approaches, we focus on efficiently detecting the active devices in an mMTC system using a threshold-based energy detection which is a low-complex energy efficient non-coherent method [33], [34]. Active devices in the network transmit their OOK modulated unique preambles synchronously and BS performs energy detection. Our aim is estimate the set of active devices reliably using the binary energy detector outputs corresponding to the joint OOK preamble transmissions without CSI knowledge. Note that our framework can accommodate a massive number of users since we are not constrained to orthogonal preambles. In addition, as preambles are designed independently for each user, new users can be added without network-wide changes thereby promoting scalability.

The above framework for recovering the sparse set of active devices using binary measurements can be viewed as an instance of the well known GT problem [35]. In essence, GT aims to identify a small number of “defective” items within a large population by performing tests on pools of items. A test is classified as positive if the pool contains at least one defective, and negative if it contains no defectives. Though connection between GT and RA has previously been exploited in the literature [36]–[40], the channel models used are often too simplistic or unrealistic for many secure mMTC networks such as the one using FHSS techniques to ensure data security. In our paper, we bridge this gap by incorporating a fast fading channel to the GT model. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that integrates an OOK modulated preamble signaling at the sensors, a fast fading channel model and a non-coherent threshold-based energy detection at the BS for identifying the sparsely active devices in an mMTC network.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel non-coherent activity detection strategy for secure energy-constrained mMTC networks in which active devices jointly transmit their OOK-modulated preambles and the BS uses a non-coherent energy detection strategy to identify the active devices.
- We use information theoretic tools to characterize the minimum user identification cost, defined as the minimum number of channel-uses required to identify the active users [29], [41]. Using results from GT [35], we derive an achievable minimum user identification cost for our activity detection framework in the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime as well as a valid lower bound in the general sub-linear regime where  $k = \Theta(\ell^\alpha); 0 \leq \alpha < 1$  which is shown to be tight when  $\alpha = 0$ . Here,  $k$  denotes the number of active devices whereas  $\ell$  denotes the total number of devices.
- We present and study several practical schemes for active device identification in the non-coherent OOK setting based on Noisy-Combinatorial Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (N-COMP) and Belief Propagation (BP) techniques [42], [43]. We also present the performance gap incurred by these practical strategies in comparison to our theoretical characterization of minimum user identification cost. We show that BP can come very close, and with some practical relaxations such as partial recovery where few misdetections and false positives are allowed, can even exceed the theoretical bounds.

The remainder of this work is structured as follows. In Section II, we define the system model for the problem of active device identification in an mMTC network and establish its equivalence to a GT problem. In addition, we formally define the key metric of interest, viz, the minimum user identification cost. In Section III, we derive the minimum user identification cost for the non-coherent many-access channel (MnAC) with  $\ell$  total and  $k$  active devices by viewing active device identification as a decoding problem in an equivalent point-to-point communication channel. Moreover, we present a decoder achieving the minimum user identification cost in the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime which has severe computational complexity. In Section IV, we present several




Fig. 1: Non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -Many Access Channel.

practical strategies for user identification under the constraints of exact recovery and partial recovery and compare them against the minimum user identification cost. Section V concludes the paper.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

### A. Network model

Consider an mMTC network consisting of  $\ell$  users belonging to the set  $\mathcal{D} = \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ . Among the  $\ell$  users, only a subset of  $k$  are active and wants to access the channel. We assume that the value of  $k$  is periodically estimated at the BS and hence known *a-priori* [44]. The active user set denoted by  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$  is assumed to be randomly chosen among all  $\binom{\ell}{k}$  subsets of size  $k$  from  $\mathcal{D}$  and is unknown to the BS. The BS aims to identify the active user set  $\mathcal{A}$  in a time-efficient manner so that they could be allocated required resources for prompt channel access.

Taking into account sparse user activity, we focus on the asymptotic regime where  $\ell$  can be unbounded while the number of active users scale as  $k = \Theta(\ell^\alpha)$ ;  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ . This is consistent with the notion of Many Access channel (MnAC) model introduced by Chen *et al.* [29] with




Fig. 2: Non-coherent (7, 2)-MnAC and its equivalence to GT. Users 3 and 6 are assumed to be active.

the difference that instead of our combinatorial setting with  $k$  active users, [29] considers the setting where each user can be active probabilistically.

For purposes of activity detection, each user  $i$  is assigned an i.i.d binary preamble  $\mathbf{X}^i \triangleq (X_1^i, X_2^i, \dots, X_n^i) \in \{0, \sqrt{P}\}^n$  of length  $n$  generated via a Bernoulli process with probability  $q_i$ ,  $\forall i \in \mathcal{D}$ . The sampling probability vector is defined as  $\mathbf{q} := (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_\ell)$ . We use  $\mathcal{P}$  to denote the entire set of preambles. During activity detection, the active users transmit their OOK-modulated preamble in a time-synchronized manner over  $n$  channel-uses with power  $P$  during the ‘On’ symbols. The received symbol  $S_t$  during the  $t^{\text{th}}$  channel-use is

$$S_t = (\boldsymbol{\beta} \circ \mathbf{h}_t) \cdot \mathbf{X}_t + W_t, \forall t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^\ell)$  is the vector representing the  $t^{\text{th}}$  preamble entries of the  $\ell$  users and  $\mathbf{h}_t = (h_t^1, \dots, h_t^\ell)$  is the vector of channel coefficients of the  $\ell$  users during the  $t^{\text{th}}$  channel-use where  $h_t^i$ 's are i.i.d  $\mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma^2)$ ,  $\forall i \in \mathcal{D}, \forall t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The AWGN noise vector  $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, \dots, W_n)$  is composed of i.i.d entries,  $W_t \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, \sigma_w^2)$  and is independent of  $\mathbf{h}_t \forall t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell)$  represents the activity status such that  $\beta_i = 1$ , if  $i^{\text{th}}$  user is active; 0 otherwise.  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \circ \mathbf{h}_t$  denotes the element-wise product between the vectors  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  and

$\mathbf{h}_t$ .

We assume that there is no CSI available at the BS since we are operating in a fast fading scenario such as FHSS or mobile IoT environments [32], [45]. i.e.,  $\mathbf{h}_t, \forall t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is unknown *a-priori*. Hence, the BS employs non-coherent detection [7] as shown in Fig. 1. During the  $t^{\text{th}}$  channel use, the envelope detector processes  $S_t$  to obtain  $Y_t = |S_t|$ , the envelope of  $S_t$ . Thresholding after envelope detection produces a binary output  $Z_t$  such that

$$Z_t = 1 \text{ if } |S_t|^2 > \gamma; \text{ else } Z_t = 0. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\gamma$  represents a pre-determined threshold parameter.

Here onwards, we use the terminology *non-coherent*  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC to refer to the constrained version of  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC channel model described above where devices are limited by OOK preamble transmissions and base station is limited by non-coherent energy detection.

### B. Problem formulation

Given the preambles  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{X}^i : i \in \mathcal{D}\}$  and the vector  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  of channel outputs, BS aims to identify the set of active users  $\mathcal{A}$ , alternatively the vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ , during the activity detection phase. We use the following definitions:

**Definition 1. Activity detection:** For a given set of preambles  $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{X}^i : i \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , an activity detection function  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^\ell$  is a deterministic rule that maps the binary valued channel outputs  $\mathbf{Z}$  to an estimate  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  of the activity status vector such that the Hamming weight of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  is  $k$ .

**Definition 2. Probability of erroneous identification:** For an activity detection function  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , probability of erroneous identification  $\mathbb{P}_e^{(\ell)}$  is defined as

$$\mathbb{P}_e^{(\ell)} := \frac{1}{\binom{\ell}{k}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \beta_i = k} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \boldsymbol{\beta}). \quad (3)$$



**Definition 3. Minimum user identification cost [29]:** *The minimum user identification cost is said to be  $n(\ell)$  if for every  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , there exists a preamble of length  $n_0 = (1 + \epsilon)n(\ell)$  such that the probability of erroneous identification tends to 0 as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ , whereas the error probability is strictly bounded away from 0 if  $n_0 = (1 - \epsilon)n(\ell)$ .*

Note that the minimum user identification cost  $n(\ell)$  is a function of the number of users  $\ell$  and is defined based on its asymptotic behaviour as  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ .

Our goal is to characterize  $n(\ell)$  of the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC which would be indicative of the time-efficiency of BS in identifying the active users.

### C. GT model for active device identification

GT problem [35] is a sparse inference problem where the objective is to identify a sparse set of *defective* items from a large set of items by performing tests on groups of items. In the error-free scenario, each group test produces a binary output where a **1** corresponds to the inclusion of at least one defective in the group being tested whereas a **0** indicates that the tested group of items excludes all defectives. The tests need to be devised such that the defective set of items can be recovered using the binary vector of test outcomes with a minimum number of tests. On a high level, GT models can be classified as adaptive and non-adaptive models. In adaptive GT, the previous test results can be used to design the future tests. In non-adaptive setting, all group tests are designed independent of each other.

To draw the equivalence between active device identification in the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC and GT, we can consider the devices in the mMTC network as items and the active devices as defective items. Each channel-use  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  corresponds to a group test in which a randomly chosen subset of devices engage in joint transmission of ‘On’ symbols, if active. The random selection of devices during the  $n$  testing instances is based on the binary preambles  $\mathbf{X}^i \in \{0, \sqrt{P}\}^n, \forall i \in \mathcal{D}$ . The BS measures received energy during each channel-use and produces a binary 0-1 output  $Z_t$  as in (2). These 1-bit energy measurements at the receiver side corresponds

to the group test results.

In summary, the random binary preambles and the binary energy measurements renders active device identification as a GT problem where testing corresponds to energy detection on the received signal envelope. This is illustrated in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. Note that active device identification in non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC is a noisy GT problem since channel noise and fading can probabilistically lead to a 0 or 1 energy detector output even in the presence or absence of active devices respectively. Moreover, our framework corresponds to non-adaptive GT since the testing/grouping pattern is based on predefined binary preambles and is not updated based on the GT results of previous channel-uses. We will observe in Section III that the GT model can be leveraged to provide an achievability scheme to the minimum user identification cost for the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC when  $\alpha = 0$ , ie.,  $k = O(1)$  and a corresponding lower bound when  $\alpha \neq 0$ .

### III. MINIMUM USER IDENTIFICATION COST

In this section, we derive the minimum user identification cost for the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC in the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime as presented in Theorem 1. First, we provide an equivalent characterization of the active device identification problem in the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC by viewing it as a decoding problem in a point-to-point vector input - scalar output channel whose inputs correspond to the active users as shown in Fig. 3. Thereafter, we derive the maximum rate of the equivalent channel by exploiting its cascade structure. Then, we use GT theory [35], [46] to relate the maximum rate with the minimum user identification cost of non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC. Here onwards, we drop the subscript  $t$  denoting channel-use index. All logarithms are in base 2.

#### A. Equivalent Channel Model

The aim of active device identification in non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC is to identify the set of active devices based on the binary detector output vector  $\mathbf{Z}$  and the preamble set  $\mathcal{P}$ . This can be

alternatively viewed as a decoding problem in a traditional point to point communication channel as follows: The source message is the activity status vector  $\beta$  denoting the set of active users  $\mathcal{A}$  and the codebook is the entire set of preambles  $\mathcal{P}$ . Given  $\beta$  for an active set  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ , the codeword becomes the corresponding subset of preambles  $\{\mathbf{X}^i : i \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . Note that since the preambles for each user  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  are independently designed using a  $Bern(q_i)$  random variable, our equivalent channel model has the additional constraint that the only tunable parameters available for codebook design are the sampling probabilities  $\{q_i : i \in \mathcal{D}\}$ . Hence, identifying active devices reduces to the problem of decoding messages in this equivalent constrained channel. Clearly, the minimum user identification cost for the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC is at least the number of channel-uses required to communicate the set of active users; i.e.,  $\log \binom{\ell}{k}$  bits of information over this equivalent constrained point-to-point channel. We formally setup this equivalent channel model below.

Considering the channel in Fig. 1, since the set of active users is  $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ , the input to the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC is  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (X^{a_1}, \dots, X^{a_k})$ . Thus, the signal at the input of envelope detector is  $S = \sqrt{P} \sum_{m=1}^k h^{a_m} + W$ . Let  $V = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k X^{a_i}}{\sqrt{P}}$  denote the Hamming weight of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  which is the number of active users transmitting ‘On’ signal during the particular channel-use we have at hand. Thus, conditioned on  $V = v$ ,  $U := |S|^2$  follows an exponential distribution given by

$$f_{U|V}(u|v) = \frac{1}{v\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2} e^{-\frac{u}{v\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}, u \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

As evident from (2) and (4), we have  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow V \rightarrow Z$ , i.e., the transition probability  $p(z | \tilde{\mathbf{x}}, v)$  is only dependent on the channel input  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (X^{a_1}, X^{a_2}, \dots, X^{a_k})$  through its Hamming weight  $V$ . Also, since  $f_{U|V}$  is an exponential distribution,  $p_v := p(Z = 0 | V = v)$  can be expressed as

$$p_v = 1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{v\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}. \quad (5)$$

Similarly,  $\Pr(Z = 1 | V = v) = 1 - p_v$ . Note that  $p_v$  is a strictly decreasing function of  $v$  where  $v \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$  assuming w.l.o.g. positive values for  $\sigma^2, \sigma_w^2$  and  $\gamma$ .




Fig. 3: Equivalent channel with only the active users of the  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC as inputs.

Thus, the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC can be equivalently viewed as a traditional point-to-point communication channel whose input is the active user set as in Fig. 3. Moreover, this equivalent channel can be modeled as a cascade of two channels; the first channel computes the Hamming weight  $V$  of the input  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  whereas the second channel translates the Hamming weight  $V$  into a binary output  $Z$  depending on the fading statistics ( $\sigma^2$ ), noise variance ( $\sigma_w^2$ ) of the wireless channel and the non-coherent detector threshold  $\gamma$ . We exploit this cascade channel structure to establish the minimum user identification cost  $n(\ell)$  for the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC.

### B. Maximum rate of the equivalent channel

**Lemma 1.** For a given fading statistics  $\sigma^2$ , noise variance  $\sigma_w^2$ , and non-coherent detector threshold  $\gamma$  for the  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC, the maximum rate of the equivalent point-to-point channel in Fig. 3 is

$$C = \max_{(\gamma, q_{sp})} h\left(E\left[e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right]\right) - E\left[h\left(e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right)\right] \quad (6)$$

where  $E(\cdot)$  denotes expectation w.r.t  $V$ ,  $h(x) = -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$  is the binary entropy function and  $q_{sp}$  denotes the optimal sampling probability used for i.i.d preamble generation across all users.

*Proof:* The equivalent point-to-point communication channel in Fig. 3 has two tunable

parameters, viz, the sampling probability vector  $\mathbf{q} = \{q_{a_1} \dots q_{a_k}\}$  at the user side and the non-coherent detector threshold  $\gamma$  at the BS. Thus, the maximum rate of this equivalent channel between the binary vector input  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  and binary scalar output  $Z$  is

$$C = \max_{(\gamma, \mathbf{q})} I(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; Z) \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{q} = \{q_{a_1} \dots q_{a_k}\}$  are sampling probabilities of independent Bernoulli processes that users  $\{a_1 \dots a_k\}$  employ for preamble generation, i.e.,  $X^{a_i} \sim \text{Bern}(q_{a_i})$  such that  $X^{a_i} \perp X^{a_j} \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}; i \neq j$ .

Symmetry of the problem with respect to the entries of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  and concavity of  $I(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}; Z)$  as a function of  $p(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$  suggest that for optimality we need  $q_{a_1} = \dots q_{a_k} = q_{sp}$ . Thus,  $V$  follows Binomial distribution denoted by  $V \sim \text{Bin}(k, q_{sp})$ . Using (7),  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \rightarrow V \rightarrow Z$  and that  $V$  is a deterministic function of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ , we have

$$C = \max_{(\gamma, q_{sp})} I(V; Z) \text{ where } V \sim \text{Bin}(k, q_{sp}). \quad (8)$$

We can write  $H(Z) = h(q_s)$  where  $q_s$  is

$$q_s = E \left( e^{-\frac{\gamma}{i\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}} \right) = \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} (1 - q_{sp})^{k-i} (q_{sp})^i \times e^{-\frac{\gamma}{i\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}. \quad (9)$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(Z | V) &= \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} (1 - q_{sp})^{k-i} (q_{sp})^i \times h \left( e^{-\frac{\gamma}{i\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}} \right) \\ &= E \left[ h \left( e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Thus, jointly optimizing over  $\gamma$  and  $q_{sp}$ , the maximum rate is given by

$$C = \max_{(\gamma, q_{sp})} h \left( E \left[ e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}} \right] \right) - E \left[ h \left( e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}} \right) \right],$$

completing the proof. ■

Note that the minimum user identification cost  $n(\ell)$  for the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC, must obey  $n(\ell) \geq \frac{\log \binom{\ell}{k}}{C}$ . However, we cannot directly claim that  $n(\ell)$  exactly matches the number of

channel-uses required to send  $\log \binom{\ell}{k}$  bits of information over the equivalent channel at maximum rate  $C$ . The reason is that the effective codeword corresponding to a user set  $\mathcal{A}$  is the subset of preambles  $\{\mathbf{X}^i : i \in \mathcal{A}\}$  indexed by the set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Thus, the effective codewords of different user sets are potentially dependent due to overlapping preambles. This is in contrast to the independent codeword assumptions typical to channel capacity analysis thereby rendering the traditional random coding approach ineffective. We close this gap by making use of the equivalence of active device identification and GT to propose a decoding scheme achieving the minimum user identification cost as presented below.

### C. Minimum user identification cost

**Theorem 1.** *The minimum user identification cost  $n(\ell)$  of the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC with  $k = \Theta(1)$  is given by*

$$n(\ell) = \frac{k \log(\ell)}{\max_{(\gamma, q_{sp})} h\left(E\left[e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right]\right) - E\left[h\left(e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right)\right]}$$

where  $E(\cdot)$  denotes the expectation w.r.t  $V \sim \text{Bin}(k, q_{sp})$ ,  $q_{sp}$  is the sampling probability for i.i.d preamble generation and  $\gamma$  denotes the threshold for non-coherent energy detection.

*Proof:* Using standard capacity arguments [47] along with Lemma 1, it is evident that user identification cost in the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC must obey  $n(\ell) \geq \frac{\log \binom{\ell}{k}}{C}$  where  $C$  is as given in Lemma 1. Thus, in the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime we have

$$n(\ell) \geq \frac{k \log(\ell)}{\max_{(\gamma, q_{sp})} h\left(E\left[e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right]\right) - E\left[h\left(e^{-\frac{\gamma}{V\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right)\right]}. \quad (11)$$

Next, we present a decoder as shown in Algorithm 1 which can achieve the equality in (11) relying on classical thresholding techniques in information theory [48]. Due to the equivalence of active user identification and GT, we use an adaptation of the GT decoding strategy in [46] to the context of user identification in non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC.

The algorithm operates as follows: Given the set of preambles  $\mathcal{P}$  and the detector outputs  $\mathbf{Z}$ , the decoder exhaustively searches for an approximate maximum likelihood (ML) size- $k$  set from

---

**Algorithm 1** Decoder achieving the minimum user identification cost in the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime.

---

- 1: **Given:** Set of preambles,  $\mathcal{P} \triangleq \{\mathbf{X}^i : i \in \mathcal{D}\}$ ; Energy detector outputs:  $\mathbf{Z} \triangleq (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ ;  
 $k$ : Number of active devices.
  - 2: **Initialize:** Set of all size- $k$  subsets of  $\mathcal{D}$  denoted by  $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \dots, \mathcal{K}_{\binom{\ell}{k}}\}$ ; Estimate of activity status vector denoted by  $\hat{\beta} = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times \ell}$ ;  $\mathcal{A}_{est} = \Phi$ .
  - 3: **for**  $i = 1 : |\mathcal{S}|$  **do**
  - 4:      $\hat{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{K}_i$ .
  - 5:     Number of threshold tests passed,  $n_t = 0$ .
  - 6:     **Threshold testing:**
  - 7:     **for**  $j = 1 : k$  **do**
  - 8:         **Partition:**  $\Lambda^{\{j\}} = \left\{ (\mathcal{I}^0, \mathcal{I}^1) : \mathcal{I}^0 \cap \mathcal{I}^1 = \emptyset, \mathcal{I}^0 \cup \mathcal{I}^1 = \hat{\mathcal{A}}, |\mathcal{I}^0| = j, |\mathcal{I}^1| = k - j \right\}$
  - 9:         **Set threshold values:**  $\eta_j = \log_2 \frac{\rho}{k \binom{k}{j} \binom{\ell-k}{j}}$ ,  $\forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  for some  $\rho > 0$ .
  - 10:         **if**  $\log_2 \left( \frac{p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}(I_0), \mathbf{x}(I_1))}{p(\mathbf{z}|\mathbf{x}(I_1))} \right) > \eta_j$ ,  $\forall (I_0, I_1) \in \Lambda^{\{j\}}$  **then**
  - 11:              $n_t = n_t + \binom{k}{j}$ .
  - 12:         **end if**
  - 13:     **end for**
  - 14:     **if**  $n_t = 2^k - 1$  **then**  $\mathcal{A}_{est} = \mathcal{A}_{est} \cup \hat{\mathcal{A}}$ .
  - 15:     **end if**
  - 16: **end for**
  - 17: **if**  $|\mathcal{A}_{est}| = k$  **then**
  - 18:     The estimated active device set is  $\mathcal{A}_{est}$ .
  - 19:      $\hat{\beta} : \hat{\beta}_i = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{A}_{est}$ .
  - 20: **else if**  $|\mathcal{A}_{est}| = 0$  OR  $|\mathcal{A}_{est}| > 1$  **then**
  - 21:     Declare **error**.
  - 22: **end if**
-

all possible  $\binom{\ell}{k}$  subsets. The decoder declares  $\mathcal{A}^*$  as the active set iff

$$p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}(\mathcal{A}^*)) > p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}(\hat{\mathcal{A}})); \quad \forall \hat{\mathcal{A}} \neq \mathcal{A}^*, \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}(\mathcal{A})$  denotes  $\{\mathbf{x}^{a_i} : a_i \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . The corresponding activity status vector is  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^* : \beta_i = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{A}^*$ . We perform this search through a series of threshold tests for each candidate set  $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{S}$ . For each  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ , we consider a partition  $(\mathcal{I}^0, \mathcal{I}^1)$  of the candidate active set into its overlap and difference with the true active set as in step (6). i.e.,  $\mathcal{I}^1 := \mathcal{A} \cap \hat{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathcal{I}^0 := \hat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}$ . Then, we perform  $2^k - 1$  threshold tests as below.

$$\log_2 \left( \frac{p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}(\mathcal{I}^0), \mathbf{x}(\mathcal{I}^1))}{p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}(\mathcal{I}^1))} \right) > \eta_s, \forall (\mathcal{I}^0, \mathcal{I}^1) \text{ partitions of } \hat{\mathcal{A}},$$

for predetermined thresholds  $\eta_s$  where  $s := |\mathcal{I}^0| \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Here, we used  $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{G})$  to denote  $\{\mathbf{x}^{a_i} : a_i \in \mathbf{G}\}$ .

We declare  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$  as the active user set if it is the only set passing all threshold tests. An error occurs if the active user set fails at least one of the tests in (13) or an incorrect set passes all the tests. As shown in [46], using a set of thresholds given by  $\eta_s = \log \frac{\rho}{k \binom{k}{s} \binom{\ell-k}{s}}$  for some  $\rho > 0$ , we can upper bound  $\mathbb{P}_e^{(\ell)}$  as

$$\mathbb{P}_e^{(\ell)} \leq \sum_{s=1}^k \binom{k}{s} \mathbb{P} \left( \log \left( \frac{p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}(\mathcal{I}^0), \mathbf{x}(\mathcal{I}^1))}{p(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{x}(\mathcal{I}^1))} \right) \leq \log \frac{\rho}{k \binom{k}{s} \binom{\ell-k}{s}} \right) + \rho.$$

Since preamble design uses i.i.d Bernoulli random variables, using concentration inequalities [35] for the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime, we can achieve  $\mathbb{P}_e^{(\ell)} \rightarrow 0$ , with  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$  as long as  $n(\ell)$  obeys

$$n(\ell) \geq \max_{s=1, \dots, k} \frac{\log \binom{\ell-k}{s}}{I(\mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^0_s); Z | \mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^1_s))} (1 + o(1)). \quad (13)$$

Here,  $\mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^0_s) := \{\mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^0) : |\mathcal{I}^0| = s\}$  and  $\mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^1_s) := \{\mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^1) : |\mathcal{I}^1| = s\}$ . Using the asymptotic expression  $\log \binom{\ell-k}{s} = s \log \ell + O(1)$  in the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime implies

$$n(\ell) \geq \max_{s=1, \dots, k} \frac{s \log \ell}{I(\mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^0_s); Z | \mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^1_s))} (1 + o(1)). \quad (14)$$

We can rewrite  $I_s := I(\mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^0_s); Z | \mathbf{X}(\mathcal{I}^1_s))$  as

$$I_s = \sum_{j=k-s+1}^k \left( H(\mathbf{X}(j)) - H(\mathbf{X}(j) | Z, \mathbf{X}(1, 2, \dots, j-1)) \right). \quad (15)$$



Note that  $\frac{I_s}{s}$  attains its minimum when  $s = k$  since conditioning reduces entropy [47]. Thus, when  $k = \Theta(1)$ , (14) simplifies to

$n(\ell) \geq \frac{k \log(\ell)}{I(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{Z})} (1 + o(1))$ . Using the maximum rate of the equivalent channel  $C$  in Lemma 1, we can conclude that, our proposed decoder has  $\mathbb{P}_e^{(\ell)} \rightarrow 0$  with  $\ell \rightarrow \infty$  as long as

$$n(\ell) \geq \frac{k \log(\ell)}{\max_{(\gamma, q_{sp})} h\left(E\left[e^{-\frac{\gamma}{v\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right]\right) - E\left[h\left(e^{-\frac{\gamma}{v\sigma^2 P + \sigma_w^2}}\right)\right]} (1 + o(1)),$$

completing the proof. ■

**Remark 1.** Note that  $\frac{k(1-\alpha)\log_2(\ell)}{C}$  where  $C$  is as given in Lemma 1 is a valid lower bound for  $k = \Theta(\ell^\alpha); 0 \leq \alpha < 1$ . This is because user identification requires communicating at least  $\log_2 \binom{\ell}{k} = k \log_2 \frac{\ell}{k} + O(k)$  bits which corresponds to at least  $\frac{k(1-\alpha)\log_2(\ell)}{C}$  number of channel-uses. As shown in Theorem 1, this lower bound is tight when  $k = \Theta(1)$  or  $\alpha = 0$ .

**Remark 2.** The minimum user identification cost  $n_0(\ell)$  for a Gaussian MnAC with average power constraint  $P_{av}$  as described by Chen *et al.* in [29] obeys

$$n_0(\ell) = \frac{k \log(\ell)}{\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + kP_{av})} < n(\ell),$$

where  $n(\ell)$  is as given in Theorem 1. This is because  $C$  in Lemma 1 is smaller than  $\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + kP_{av})$  where  $P_{av} := q_{sp}^* P$ , with  $q_{sp}^*$  being the optimal  $q_{sp}$  in Theorem 1. Clearly, the user identification in a Gaussian MnAC requires lesser number of channel uses due to the fact that the model does not incorporate fading and is not constrained to OOK signaling and non-coherent detection as in our non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC.

#### IV. PRACTICAL SCHEMES FOR USER IDENTIFICATION

The decoder achieving the minimum user identification cost presented in Algorithm 1 is practically infeasible as its implementation requires exhaustive search over all candidate active user sets of size  $k$ . In this section, we present several practical schemes for active user identification in a non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC by viewing it as a decoding problem in an equivalent point to point

communication channel as illustrated in Section III.A. Our proposed schemes are primarily based on N-COMP and BP algorithms, which although have been extensively studied for compressed sensing problems [42], [49], [50], were not used in the context of non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC setting. We are also interested in evaluating how close our proposed practical algorithms can come to achieving the theoretical minimum user identification cost presented in Theorem 1.

In addition to exact recovery (Def. 2), we consider the performance of our proposed strategies under a partial recovery criterion where instead of identifying all the  $k$  active devices correctly, we are willing to tolerate some amount of misclassifications where an inactive is declared as active and vice-versa. We formally define the partial recovery setting as follows.

**Definition 4.**  $\zeta\%$ -*partial recovery*: For a true active set  $\mathcal{A}$  and an estimated active set  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ , consider an error event  $E_1$  defined as

$$E_1 := \left\{ \left| \hat{\mathcal{A}}^c \cap \mathcal{A} \right| > k \left( 1 - \frac{\zeta}{100} \right) \right\}. \quad (16)$$

We have  $\zeta\%$ -partial recovery, if

$$\mathbb{P}_{e,\zeta}^{(\ell)} := P(E_1) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \ell \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_{e,\zeta}^{(\ell)}$  denotes the probability of error for  $\zeta\%$ -partial recovery. Probability of successful identification for  $\zeta\%$ -recovery is defined as  $\mathbb{P}_{succ,\zeta}^{(\ell)} := 1 - \mathbb{P}_{e,\zeta}^{(\ell)}$ .

The error event  $E_1$  considers if the fraction of true active devices in  $\mathcal{A}$  that are misdetected exceeds  $(1 - \frac{\zeta}{100})$ . Note that since our proposed strategies output a set of size  $k$ , both false positives and misdetections occur in equal numbers. Thus, the error event  $E_1$  in (16) is essentially equivalent to  $\left\{ \left| \hat{\mathcal{A}}^c \cap \mathcal{A} \right| > k \left( 1 - \frac{\zeta}{100} \right) \cup \left| \hat{\mathcal{A}} \cap \mathcal{A}^c \right| > k \left( 1 - \frac{\zeta}{100} \right) \right\}$ . Moreover, when  $\zeta = 100$ , the partial recovery setting boils down to our original setting of exact recovery given in Def. 2. The case when the number of active users  $k$  is unknown at the BS will be discussed in Section IV.C.

### A. N-COMP based user identification

N-COMP is a decoding strategy for noisy GT proposed by Chan *et al.* in [42]. The basic idea is to declare an item to be defective or non-defective based on the fraction of positive tests they participate in [51]. This significantly simplifies the run-time and storage requirements in comparison to the optimal exhaustive search strategy in Algorithm 1. As established in Section III, the active device identification framework in non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC can be viewed as a GT problem. This motivates us to study the performance of N-COMP approach in identifying active devices in the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC. Note that in the existing literature, the N-COMP GT decoder was primarily analyzed in the context of symmetric noise models wherein errors in test results are equally likely [7], [52]. In contrast, the active device identification problem as modeled by the equivalent channel in Fig.3 has an asymmetric noise and hence requires further investigations to validate its performance. Another work which considers N-COMP GT decoder is [49] where the focus is on the problem of neighbor discovery in a wireless sensor network rather than the massive random access setting considered in this paper.

Let  $\mathcal{G}_i := \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n X_t^i}{\sqrt{P}}$  denote the Hamming weight of  $\mathbf{X}^i$ , the binary preamble assigned to user  $i$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{G}_i$  indicates the number of channel uses in which the user  $i$  transmits ‘On’ symbols if it is in active state. Let  $\mathcal{R}_i := \frac{\sum_{t=1}^n X_t^i Z_t}{\sqrt{P}}$  denote the number of these channel uses in which the received energy at the detector exceeds a predetermined threshold. In N-COMP based user identification, our strategy is to classify the  $k$  users with highest value for  $\frac{\mathcal{R}_i}{\mathcal{G}_i}$  as active.

We conducted simulations of the N-COMP strategy to analyze the number of channel-uses required for identifying the active devices successfully. We considered two different success criterion, viz, exact recovery in which all active devices are to be correctly identified and 90% recovery ( $\zeta = 90$ ) in which we require atleast 90% of the active devices to be correctly identified. In other words, with 90% recovery, we are willing to tolerate upto 10% of false positives and false negatives. Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 show how the probability of successful identification varies





Fig. 4: NCOMP: Exact recovery for (1000, 25)-MnAC. Fig. 5: NCOMP: 90% recovery for (1000, 25)-MnAC.

with the number of channel-uses for  $\ell = 1000$  users with  $k = 25$ . We considered different values for the SNR (defined as  $\frac{P\sigma^2}{\sigma_w^2}$ ) ranging from 0 dB to 10 dB. As expected, with increase in SNR, N-COMP decoding performance gets better leading to a faster identification of active devices in the network. From Fig. 5, one can infer that relaxing the success criteria to 90% recovery improves the probability of successful identification significantly.

### B. BP based user identification

BP is an efficient method for solving sparse inference problems by iteratively propagating messages over the edges of the factor graph [43]. BP is known to produce good approximations to the marginals of the posterior distribution of the variables in the factor graph. In wireless communications, BP is well known in the context of iterative decoding for Turbo and LDPC codes [50]. BP is also used in GT decoding, which is essentially a Boolean sparse inference problem [53], [54]. In [53], the authors considered BP based GT decoding under a noise model that combines the addition and dilution models. In the context of mMTC, BP has been previously studied as a means for unsourced random access the users share the same codebook and the

decoder is only required to provide an unordered list of user messages [55].

Recognizing the suitability of BP in sparse recovery problems including GT, we aim to employ a BP based strategy for the problem of active device identification in the non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC. In BP based user identification, we estimate the set of active devices by approximately performing bitwise-MAP detection through message passing on a bipartite graph with devices on one side and the binary energy measurements on the other side [53]. In contrast to the previous studies in [53], our noise model as given in (5) incorporating channel fading effects and non-coherent detection at the BS side is more intricate. Note that in [31], Polyanskiy proposed an alternating BP scheme as a candidate practical solution for random access in a quasi-static fading multiple access channel where each user's transmissions are attenuated by random fading gains, unknown to the receiver. However, [31] considers iterative coding scheme based on LDPC codes and slow fading scenarios whereas our work focus on energy-efficient OOK signaling in a fast fading non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC.

To identify the activity status vector  $\beta$  using the binary vector of energy detector outputs  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ , BP relies on an approximate Maximum A posteriori Probability (MAP) based decoding where instead of maximizing the posterior as a function of all the  $\beta_i$ 's, we use the marginals of the posterior distribution. i.e.,  $\hat{\beta}_i = \arg \max_{\beta_i \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{P}(\beta_i | \mathbf{Z})$ . This approximation drastically reduces the search space corresponding to the original MAP optimization.  $\hat{\beta}_i$  can be rewritten as

$$\hat{\beta}_i = \arg \max_{\beta_i \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{\sim \beta_i} \left[ \prod_{t=1}^n p(Z_t | \beta) \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} p(\beta_j) \right]. \quad (17)$$

Eqn. (17) can be approximately computed using loopy BP based on a bipartite graph with  $\ell$  devices at one side and the  $n$  energy detector outputs at the other side. The priors  $p(\beta_j)$ 's are initialized to  $\frac{k}{\ell}$  and updated through message passing in further iterations. Note that

$$p(Z_t | \beta) = p(Z_t | V), \quad (18)$$

since  $Z_t$  depends on  $\beta$  only through  $V$  (defined in Section III.A), the number of active devices





Fig. 6: Exact recovery: (1000, 25)-MnAC at SNR = 10 dB. Fig. 7: 90% recovery: (1000, 25)-MnAC at SNR = 10 dB.

transmitting ‘On’ symbols during the  $t^{\text{th}}$  channel-use. This symmetry as illustrated in our equivalent channel model in Fig.3 is key in guaranteeing an efficient computation of BP message update rules [53]. We employ BP with Soft Thresholding (BP-ST) in which we classify the  $k$  users with the highest marginals as active. Similar to the NCOMP strategy, we observed that BP-ST decoding performance shows improvement with SNR (plots are omitted for brevity).

In Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, we compare the probability of successful identification in a (1000, 25)-MnAC at SNR = 10 dB for BP-ST and NCOMP strategies under the two success criterion, viz, exact and 90% recovery. As evident, BP shows significant performance gains over NCOMP which translates to faster identification of active devices. Moreover, the curves indicate that if we are willing to relax the success criterion by setting  $\zeta$  to a lower value like 90%, both strategies tend to perform better while maintaining the relative order in terms of probability of successful identification. Although N-COMP significantly lags behind BP, owing to its simplicity and non-iterative nature, it still can be used in applications where run-time and hardware complexity is a critical factor.

In Fig. 8, we compare the minimum user identification cost in Theorem 1 with the performance




Fig. 8: Minimum user identification cost vs BP-ST for (1000, 25)-MnAC.

of BP-ST. Evidently, the gap between the BP-ST curve and the minimum user identification cost reduces notably in the high SNR regime. We also observe that BP can approach and even exceed the minimum user identification cost if we relax the success criterion slightly to 90% recovery by allowing room for a small number of misdetections.

### C. BP-based user identification when $k$ is unknown

Since simulation results indicate that BP is more efficient compared to NCOMP, we restrict our focus to BP in this section. To take into account the uncertainty associated with the size  $\hat{k}$  of the estimated active set  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ , we consider an alternate definition for the error event different from (16) as below.

**Definition 5.**  $\zeta\%$ - *Partial recovery with unknown  $k$* : For a true active set  $\mathcal{A}$  and an estimated active set  $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ , consider an error event  $E_2$  defined as

$$E_2 := \left\{ k(1 - \sigma) \leq \hat{k} \leq k(1 + \sigma) \right\}^c \cup E_1, \quad (19)$$

where  $E_1$  is as given in (16). We have  $\zeta\%$ -partial recovery with unknown  $k$ , if

$$\mathbb{P}_{e,\zeta}^{(\ell)} := P(E_2) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \ell \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_{e,\zeta}^{(\ell)}$  denotes the probability of error for  $\zeta\%$ -partial recovery. Probability of successful identification for  $\zeta\%$ -recovery is defined as  $\mathbb{P}_{succ,\zeta}^{(\ell)} := 1 - \mathbb{P}_{e,\zeta}^{(\ell)}$ .

Note that  $\mathbb{P}(E_2) \geq \mathbb{P}(E_1)$  due to the first term  $\left\{k(1 - \sigma) \leq \hat{k} \leq k(1 + \sigma)\right\}^c$  in (19). It implies that in addition to  $E_1$ , if the estimated active set has a size deviating from the size of the true active set by more than a fraction of  $\sigma$ , we declare an error. In the case when  $k$  is known *a priori*, we can set  $\sigma = 0$  and (19) simplifies to (16).

We consider the performance of several loopy BP based strategies for non-coherent active user identification when  $k$  is unknown as follows:

- BP with Symmetric Hard Thresholding (BP-SHT) : Here, we classify user  $i$  as active if the estimate of  $\mathbb{P}(\beta_i = 1 | \mathbf{Z})$  exceeds  $\frac{1}{2}$ .
- BP with Asymmetric Hard Thresholding (BP-AHT) : Here, we threshold the posterior probability  $\mathbb{P}(\beta_i = 1 | \mathbf{Z})$  at a value  $\eta \neq \frac{1}{2}$  allowing more flexibility in controlling false positives and misdetections.

In our simulations, we set  $\sigma = 0.1$  allowing upto 10% deviation in the value of  $\hat{k}$  w.r.t  $k$ . Firstly, similar to NCOMP and BP-ST, we observed that the performance of BP-SHT and BP-AHT also show an increasing trend with SNR (plots omitted for brevity). Hence, here onwards, we focus on a particular SNR value (10 dB) for convenience.

In Fig. 9, we compare the exact recovery ( $\zeta = 100$ ) performance of different BP strategies in terms of how the probability of successful identification varies with the number of channels at an SNR of 10 dB. Clearly, BP-ST demonstrates superior performance in comparison to BP-SHT and BP-AHT due to the fact that BP-ST has the knowledge of  $k$  at its disposal which enables better decoding. The corresponding comparison curves for the 90% recovery case ( $\zeta = 90$ ) is shown in Fig. 10. Similar to the exact recovery case, BP-ST performs better than






Fig. 9: Comparison of various BP algorithms for exact recovery in  $(1000, 25)$ -MnAC at SNR = 10 dB.




Fig. 10: Comparison of various BP algorithms for 90% recovery in  $(1000, 25)$ -MnAC at SNR = 10 dB.

the other two strategies. However, the gap between the different strategies is less pronounced for 90% recovery implying that the lack of knowledge of  $k$  is less crucial in partial-recovery scenarios.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed an active device identification framework for non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC in which, during each channel-use the active devices engage in joint on-off preamble transmission and base station measures the received energy using a threshold-based binary energy detector. We have demonstrated that the active device identification problem in non-coherent  $(\ell, k)$ -MnAC can be modeled as a decoding problem in a constrained point-to-point communication channel. Exploiting this equivalence, we have evaluated the performance of our proposed scheme in terms of the minimum user identification cost - the minimum number of channel-uses required for reliable active user identification. Specifically, we have established a lower bound for the minimum user identification cost in the  $k = \Theta(\ell^\alpha)$  which is tight in the  $k = \Theta(1)$  regime. We have also illustrated an achievability scheme for  $k = \Theta(1)$  based on an approximate ML decoding approach. Considering the computational complexity of this achievability scheme, we have proposed several practical strategies for device identification based on NCOMP and BP strategies. We have also considered various scenarios in our simulations including partial recovery of active devices and unknown number of active devices. Through several numerical simulations, we have established that BP based strategies can outperform NCOMP strategies significantly in terms of the user identification cost. In fact, it was noted that if we are willing to tolerate a few number of misdetections, BP performance can even surpass the minimum user identification cost.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Dawy, W. Saad, A. Ghosh, J. G. Andrews, and E. Yaacoub, "Toward massive machine type cellular communications," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 120–128, 2017.
- [2] A. Ali, W. Hamouda, and M. Uysal, "Next generation M2M cellular networks: challenges and practical considerations," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 18–24, 2015.
- [3] G. Gui, M. Liu, F. Tang, N. Kato, and F. Adachi, "6G: Opening new horizons for integration of comfort, security, and intelligence," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 126–132, 2020.
- [4] A. Mezghani and J. A. Nossek, "Power efficiency in communication systems from a circuit perspective," in *2011 IEEE International Symposium of Circuits and Systems (ISCAS)*, 2011, pp. 1896–1899.
- [5] D. Sundman, M. M. Lopez, and L. R. Wilhelmsson, "Partial on-off keying - a simple means to further improve iot performance," in *2018 Global Internet of Things Summit (GIoTS)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.

- [6] X. Guo, L. Shangguan, Y. He, J. Zhang, H. Jiang, A. A. Siddiqi, and Y. Liu, "Efficient ambient lora backscatter with on-off keying modulation," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 641–654, 2022.
- [7] P. Zhang, F. M. J. Willems, and L. Huang, "Investigations of noncoherent OOK based schemes with soft and hard decisions for WSNs," in *2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2011, pp. 1702–1709.
- [8] W. Zhou, Y. Jia, A. Peng, Y. Zhang, and P. Liu, "The effect of iot new features on security and privacy: New threats, existing solutions, and challenges yet to be solved," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1606–1616, 2019.
- [9] D. Mendez Mena, I. Papapanagiotou, and B. Yang, "Internet of things: Survey on security," *Information Security Journal: A Global Perspective*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 162–182, 2018.
- [10] G.-Y. Chang, J.-F. Huang, and Z.-H. Wu, "A frequency hopping algorithm against jamming attacks under asynchronous environments," in *2014 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2014, pp. 324–329.
- [11] L. Oliveira, J. J. P. C. Rodrigues, S. A. Kozlov, R. A. L. Rabêlo, and V. H. C. d. Albuquerque, "Mac layer protocols for internet of things: A survey," *Future Internet*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/11/1/16>
- [12] A. Mpiziopoulos, D. Gavalas, G. Pantziou, and C. Konstantopoulos, "Defending wireless sensor networks from jamming attacks," in *2007 IEEE 18th International Symposium on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications*, 2007, pp. 1–5.
- [13] M. Letafati, A. Kuhestani, H. Behroozi, and D. W. K. Ng, "Jamming-resilient frequency hopping-aided secure communication for internet-of-things in the presence of an untrusted relay," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 19, no. 10, pp. 6771–6785, 2020.
- [14] O. Y. Bursalioglu, Z. Li, C. Wang, and H. Papadopoulos, "Efficient C-RAN random access for IoT devices: Learning links via recommendation systems," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Communications Workshops (ICC Workshops)*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [15] "Physical layer procedures-TS 36.213," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Tech. Rep., Sept. 2017.
- [16] X. Shao, X. Chen, D. W. K. Ng, C. Zhong, and Z. Zhang, "Cooperative activity detection: Sourced and unsourced massive random access paradigms," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 6578–6593, 2020.
- [17] F. Al-Turjman, "Price-based data delivery framework for dynamic and pervasive IoT," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 42, pp. 299–316, 2017.
- [18] Y. Wu, X. Gao, S. Zhou, W. Yang, Y. Polyanskiy, and G. Caire, "Massive access for future wireless communication systems," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 148–156, 2020.
- [19] J. Choi, J. Ding, N.-P. Le, and Z. Ding, "Grant-Free random access in machine-type communication: Approaches and challenges," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, pp. 1–8, 2021.
- [20] Z. Chen, F. Sahrabi, and W. Yu, "Multi-cell sparse activity detection for massive random access: Massive MIMO versus cooperative MIMO," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 18, no. 8, 2019.
- [21] Z. Chen and W. Yu, "Massive device activity detection by approximate message passing," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2017, pp. 3514–3518.
- [22] L. Liu, E. G. Larsson, W. Yu, P. Popovski, C. Stefanovic, and E. de Carvalho, "Sparse signal processing for grant-free massive connectivity: A future paradigm for random access protocols in the internet of things," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 88–99, 2018.
- [23] M. Bayati and A. Montanari, "The dynamics of message passing on dense graphs, with applications to compressed sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 764–785, 2011.
- [24] X. Li, S. Pawar, and K. Ramchandran, "Sub-linear time compressed sensing using sparse-graph codes," in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2015, pp. 1645–1649.
- [25] K. Senel and E. G. Larsson, "Grant-free massive MTC-enabled massive mimo: A compressive sensing approach," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 66, no. 12, pp. 6164–6175, 2018.
- [26] H. A. Inan, P. Kairouz, and A. Ozgur, "Sparse group testing codes for low-energy massive random access," in *2017 55th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2017, pp. 658–665.
- [27] J. Robin and E. Erkip, "Sparse activity discovery in energy constrained multi-cluster IoT networks using group testing," in *ICC 2021 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [28] —, "Access delay constrained activity detection in massive random access," in *2021 IEEE 22nd International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, 2021, pp. 191–195.

- [29] X. Chen, T.-Y. Chen, and D. Guo, "Capacity of Gaussian many-access channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 6, pp. 3516–3539, 2017.
- [30] X. Chen and D. Guo, "Gaussian many-access channels: definition and symmetric capacity," in *2013 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, 2013, pp. 1–5.
- [31] S. S. Kowshik, K. Andreev, A. Frolov, and Y. Polyanskiy, "Energy efficient random access for the quasi-static fading MAC," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2019, pp. 2768–2772.
- [32] I. Abou-Faycal, M. Trott, and S. Shamai, "The capacity of discrete-time memoryless Rayleigh-fading channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1290–1301, 2001.
- [33] K. Witrisal, G. Leus, G. J. Janssen, M. Pausini, F. Troesch, T. Zasowski, and J. Romme, "Noncoherent ultra-wideband systems," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 48–66, 2009.
- [34] L. Jing, E. De Carvalho, P. Popovski, and O. Martínez, "Design and performance analysis of noncoherent detection systems with massive receiver arrays," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 19, pp. 5000–5010, 2016.
- [35] M. Aldridge, O. Johnson, and J. Scarlett, *Group Testing: An Information Theory Perspective*, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8926588>
- [36] T. Berger, N. Mehravari, D. Towsley, and J. Wolf, "Random multiple-access communication and group testing," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 769–779, 1984.
- [37] D. Kurtz and M. Sidi, "Multiple access algorithms via group testing for heterogeneous population of users," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 36, no. 12, pp. 1316–1323, 1988.
- [38] J. Wolf, "Born again group testing: Multiaccess communications," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 185–191, 1985.
- [39] H. A. Inan, S. Ahn, P. Kairouz, and A. Ozgur, "A group testing approach to random access for short-packet communication," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2019, pp. 96–100.
- [40] A. Dyachkov and V. Rykov, "Survey of superimposed code theory," *Problems of Control and Information Theory*, vol. 12, pp. 229–242, 01 1983.
- [41] J. Robin and E. Erkip, "Capacity bounds and user identification costs in Rayleigh-fading many-access channel," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2021, pp. 2477–2482.
- [42] C. L. Chan, P. H. Che, S. Jaggi, and V. Saligrama, "Non-adaptive probabilistic group testing with noisy measurements: Near-optimal bounds with efficient algorithms," in *2011 49th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, Sep. 2011, pp. 1832–1839.
- [43] D. Baron, S. Sarvotham, and R. G. Baraniuk, "Bayesian compressive sensing via belief propagation," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 269–280, 2010.
- [44] T. Vercauteren, A. L. Toledo, and X. Wang, "Batch and sequential Bayesian estimators of the number of active terminals in an IEEE 802.11 network," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 437–450, 2007.
- [45] A. Hazmi, J. Rinne, and M. Valkama, "Feasibility study of IEEE 802.11ah radio technology for IoT and M2M use cases," in *2012 IEEE Globecom Workshops*, 2012, pp. 1687–1692.
- [46] G. K. Atia and V. Saligrama, "Boolean compressed sensing and noisy group testing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1880–1901, March 2012.
- [47] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory (Wiley Series in Telecommunications and Signal Processing)*. USA: Wiley-Interscience, 2006.
- [48] A. Feinstein, "A new basic theorem of information theory," *Transactions of the IRE Professional Group on Information Theory*, vol. 4, 1954.
- [49] Jun Luo and Dongning Guo, "Neighbor discovery in wireless ad hoc networks based on group testing," in *2008 46th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2008, pp. 791–797.
- [50] R. McEliece, D. MacKay, and J.-F. Cheng, "Turbo decoding as an instance of pearl's "belief propagation" algorithm," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 140–152, 1998.
- [51] G. Atia and V. Saligrama, "Noisy group testing: An information theoretic perspective," in *2009 47th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2009, pp. 355–362.
- [52] C. L. Chan, S. Jaggi, V. Saligrama, and S. Agnihotri, "Non-adaptive group testing: Explicit bounds and novel algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 3019–3035, 2014.
- [53] D. Sejdinovic and O. Johnson, "Note on noisy group testing: Asymptotic bounds and belief propagation reconstruction," in *2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, 2010, pp. 998–1003.

- [54] Y. Hara and K. Kasai, "Sparse group quantitative pcr testing by belief propagation," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2980–2984.
- [55] V. K. Amalladinne, A. K. Pradhan, C. Rush, J.-F. Chamberland, and K. R. Narayanan, "Unsourced random access with coded compressed sensing: Integrating amp and belief propagation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2384–2409, 2022.