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#### Abstract

We consider the problem of soft-covering with constant composition superposition codes and characterize the optimal soft-covering exponent. A double-exponential concentration bound for deviation of the exponent from its mean is also established. We demonstrate an application of the result to achieving the secrecy-capacity region of a broadcast channel with confidential messages under a per-codeword cost constraint. This generalizes the recent characterization of the wiretap channel secrecy-capacity under an average cost constraint, highlighting the potential utility of the superposition soft-covering result to the analysis of coding problems.


## I. Introduction

Finding its roots in Wyner's seminal paper [1], soft-covering (also known as channel resolvability [2]) is by now an ubiquitous tool in information theory. It refers to the problem of simulating a target distribution by passing a uniformly chosen codeword through a noisy channel. Simulation can be attained to any desired accuracy, typically measured by the total variation (TV) distance or the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence, provided that the coding rate exceeds the channel input-output mutual information. The ability to simulate distributions turns out useful in various applications, including physical layer security [3]-[9], channel synthesis [10], lossy compression [11], covert communication [12], [13], and privacy [14].

Motivated by applications to multiuser scenarios with input cost constraints, we study soft-covering by superposition codes, whose inner and outer layer codewords are chosen uniformly from a constant composition ensemble [15]. We characterize the optimal soft-covering exponent, i.e., the maximum asymptotic exponential rate of the expected TV distance between the distribution induced by the codebook and a target (average) distribution. We further establish a double exponential concentration bound for the probability of deviation of this TV distance from its mean. The soft-covering results are leveraged to establish the the secrecy-capacity region of a broadcast channel (BC) with confidential messages under a per-codeword cost constraint. The capacity region recovers the secrecy-capacity of a cost constrained (CC) wiretap channel as a special case, whose characterization was recently shown in [9] to require two auxiliaries in general, even under a less stringent per-message cost constraint.

[^0]
## A. Background

The bulk of soft-covering literature focuses on single-layer random codebooks. The fundamental limit of the codebook size needed to achieve soft-covering was established in [2] for the TV distance. Lower bounds on the soft-covering exponents achievable over memoryless channels under the TV distance and the KL divergence were obtained in [3]. The TV lower bound was further improved in [10], where extensions of softcovering to more general channels was also considered. Softcovering in the quantum context was first explored in [16], [17], with the latter pointing out that it also holds for KL divergence (see also [18]). Double exponential concentration bounds on the deviation of KL divergence or TV distance from their means were obtained in [5], [19] and [20], respectively. More recently, [21] and [22] characterized exact soft-covering exponents with respect to (w.r.t.) KL divergence and TV distance, respectively. While the above works mostly focus on the i.i.d. ensemble, soft-covering for constant composition codebooks were studied in [21] under KL divergence and in [22] under TV distance. To the best of our knowledge, the only extensions of the soft-covering phenomena to superposition codes were given in [10] and [8], both of which focus on i.i.d. codebooks and derive achievable rates as well as concentration inequalities, but not exact exponents.

## B. Notation

We use standard notation (cf. e.g., [9]). In particular, for a countable $\mathcal{X}$, the letter-typical set of $n$-lengthed sequences w.r.t. a probability mass function (PMF) $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\delta>0$ is

$$
\mathcal{T}_{\delta}^{(n)}(P):=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{n}:\left|\nu_{\mathbf{x}}(x)-P(x)\right| \leq \delta P(x), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}\right\}
$$

where $\nu_{\mathbf{x}}(x):=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{x_{i}=x\right\}}$ is the empirical PMF of sequence $\mathrm{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{n}$. The set of all $n$-types over an alphabet $\mathcal{X}$ is $\mathcal{P}_{n}(\mathcal{X}):=\cup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{n}} \nu_{\mathbf{x}}(x)$. An $n$-type variable, i.e., a random variable with PMF $P$ for some $P \in \mathcal{P}_{n}(\mathcal{X})$, is denoted using an overbar notation, e.g. $\bar{X}$. For $P_{\bar{X}, \bar{Y}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{X}}\right):=\left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{n}: \nu_{\mathbf{x}}=P_{\bar{X}}\right\}$, and for $\mathbf{x} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{X}}\right)$, $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{X}, \bar{Y}} \mid \mathbf{x}\right):=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{n}: \nu_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}=P_{\bar{X}, \bar{Y}}\right\}$. The KullbackLeibler (KL) divergence and the TV between $P$ and $Q$ are represented by $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}(P \| Q)$ and $\delta_{\mathrm{TV}}(P, Q)$, respectively. The Rényi divergence of order $\alpha \in(0,1) \cup(1, \infty)$ between $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\alpha}(P \| Q):=(\alpha-1)^{-1} \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P(x)^{\alpha} Q(x)^{1-\alpha}\right)
$$

with $\lim _{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \mathrm{D}_{\alpha}(P \| Q)=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}(P \| Q)$. For $P_{X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $P_{Y \mid X}, Q_{Y \mid X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y} \mid \mathcal{X})$, the conditional $\alpha$-Rényi divergence is $\mathrm{D}_{\alpha}\left(P_{Y \mid X} \| Q_{Y \mid X} \mid P_{X}\right):=\mathbb{E}_{P_{X}}\left[\mathrm{D}_{\alpha}\left(P_{Y \mid X}(\cdot \mid X) \| Q_{Y \mid X}(\cdot \mid X)\right)\right]$.
Finally, we follow the convention that when the set over which summation/product/supremum is taken is not specified, it is assumed to be over all possible values.

## II. SOFT-COVERING VIA CONSTANT COMPOSITION SUPERPOSITION CODES

We first describe constant composition superposition codes. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a joint PMF $P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}:=P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}$, where $P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \in \mathcal{P}_{m}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V})$ and $P_{Z \mid \bar{V}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z} \mid \mathcal{V})$. For $n \in\{m \mathbb{N}\}$, let $\mathbb{B}_{U}=\left\{\mathbf{U}(i), i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}\right\},\left|\mathcal{I}_{n}\right|=\left\lceil e^{n R_{1}}\right\rceil$, be a random inner layer codebook such that each codeword $\mathbf{U}(i), i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, is a sequence of length $n$ chosen independently according to $\operatorname{Unif}\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}}\right)\right)$. For a fixed realization $\mathcal{B}_{U}$ of $\mathbb{B}_{U}$ and each $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, let $\mathbb{B}_{V}(i):=\left\{\mathbf{V}(i, j), j \in \mathcal{J}_{n}\right\},\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|=\left\lceil e^{n R_{2}}\right\rceil$, denote a collection of $n$-length random sequences, each chosen independently according to $\operatorname{Unif}\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)\right)$. Set $\mathbb{B}_{V}:=$ $\left\{\mathbb{B}_{V}(i), i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}\right\}$, denote the random superposition codebook by $\mathbb{B}:=\left\{\mathbb{B}_{U}, \mathbb{B}_{V}\right\}$ and let $\mathcal{B}$ denote its realization. The set of all such codebooks is $\mathfrak{B}$.

Given a fixed $\mathcal{B} \in \mathfrak{B}$, an inner layer codeword $\mathbf{u}(i), i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, is chosen uniformly at random; then, $\mathbf{v}(i, j), j \in \mathcal{J}_{n}$, is uniformly chosen from the corresponding outer layer codebook and is transmitted over the channel $P_{Z \mid V}^{\otimes n}$. This gives rise to the following induced distribution

$$
\begin{align*}
P_{I, \mathbf{U}, J, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Z}}^{(\mathcal{B})}(i, \mathbf{u}, j, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}) & =P_{I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right)}(i, \mathbf{u}) P_{J, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Z} \mid I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{V}\right)}(j, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \mid i, \mathbf{u}) \\
& =\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}(i)\}}}{\left|\mathcal{I}_{n}\right|} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}(i, j)\}}}{\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|} P_{Z \mid V}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{v}) \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

The goal of soft-covering is to approximate the induced conditional output distribution $P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{(\mathcal{B})}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}(i))$ by the target distribution

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)):=\frac{1}{\left|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)\right|} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)} P_{Z \mid V}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{v}) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$ and on average. Proximity is measured in TV:

$$
\begin{align*}
\theta(\mathcal{B}, i) & :=\delta_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{(\mathcal{B})}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}(i)), P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}(i))\right) \\
\bar{\theta}(\mathcal{B}) & :=\delta_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right)} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{V}\right)}, P_{I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right)} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}\right) \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

The following theorem provides an exact characterization of the soft-covering exponent for the above setup.

Theorem 1 (Soft-covering exponent) For any $R_{1} \geq 0, R_{2}>$ $I_{P}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}-\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\bar{\theta}(\mathbb{B})]= & \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}-\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\theta(\mathbb{B}, i)] \\
& =S\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right),  \tag{4}\\
S\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right): & =\min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}} \| P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right)} \\
& +0.5\left[R_{2}-I_{P}(\bar{V} ; \bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})\right]^{+} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

and $\mu$ is the PMF of $\mathbb{B}$ induced by the above codebook construction (see (13)). In particular, for $R_{2}>I_{P}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, there exists $\gamma>0$ such that for all $n \in\{m \mathbb{N}\}$ sufficiently large and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\theta(\mathbb{B}, i)]=\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\bar{\theta}(\mathbb{B})] \leq e^{-n \gamma} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The next theorem states a double exponential concentration bound for $\bar{\theta}(\mathbb{B})$ about its mean.
Theorem 2 (Concentration bound) If $R_{2}>I_{P}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, then there exist positive constants $\gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}>0$ such that for all sufficiently large $n$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{P}_{\mu}\left(\theta(\mathbb{B}, i)>e^{-n \gamma_{1}}\right)=\mathbb{P}_{\mu}\left(\bar{\theta}(\mathbb{B})>e^{-n \gamma_{1}}\right) \leq e^{-e^{n \gamma_{2}}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following lemma which provides a variational characterization of the optimal soft-covering exponent in terms of Rényi divergence is useful in the proof of Theorem 1.

## Lemma 1 (Dual characterization) It holds that

$$
\begin{align*}
& S\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right) \\
& \quad=\max _{\lambda \in[1,2]} \frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda}\left(R_{2}-\operatorname{minD}_{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}}\left(P_{Z \mid \bar{V}} \| Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}} \mid P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}\right)\right) . \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Consequently, if $R_{2}>I_{P}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, then $S\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right)>0$.
The proofs of all the above results are given in Section IV.

## III. SECRECY-Capacity of Cost-Constrained Broadcast Channel with Confidential Messages

Let $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ be finite sets, $b \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathrm{C}: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a real-valued non-negative function. The $\left(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}, P_{Y, Z \mid X}, \mathrm{C}, b\right) \mathrm{CC} \mathrm{BC}$ with confidential messages is shown in Fig. 1, where $P_{Y, Z \mid X}$ is the channel transition kernel, $C$ is the cost function and $b$ is the cost constraint. This is the setup from [23] but with a cost constraint on the channel input. The common message to both the receivers is denoted by $M_{0}$ and the private message to Receiver 1 by $M_{1}$, each taking values in $\mathcal{M}_{0, n}=\left[1: 2^{n R_{0}}\right]$ and $\mathcal{M}_{1, n}=\left[1: 2^{n R_{1}}\right]$, respectively. We consider a per-codeword cost constraint:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{n}\left(\mathbf{X}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)\right) \leq b \text { a.s., } \forall\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $\mathbf{X}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \sim f_{n}\left(\cdot \mid m_{0}, m_{1}\right)$ is the encoder output, and $\mathrm{C}_{n}(\mathbf{x}):=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{C}\left(x_{i}\right)$ is the $n$-fold extension of C . We henceforth assume $b \geq \mathrm{c}_{\min }:=\min \{\mathrm{C}(x): x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Decoder 1 outputs the estimates $\left(M_{0}, \hat{M}_{1}\right)$ using $g_{n}: \mathcal{Y}^{n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{0, n} \times$ $\mathcal{M}_{1, n}$, while Decoder 2 outputs $\check{M}_{0}$ from $h_{n}: \mathcal{Z}^{n} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{0, n}$.

A rate tuple $\left(R_{0}, R_{1}\right)$ is said to be achievable if for every $\epsilon>0$ and sufficiently large $n$, there exists an ( $n, R_{0}, R_{1}$ ) code $c_{n}=\left(f_{n}, g_{n}, h_{n}\right)$ that satisfies (9) and $\max \left\{e_{1}\left(c_{n}\right), e_{2}\left(c_{n}\right), \ell_{\text {sem }}\left(c_{n}\right)\right\} \leq \epsilon$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \ell_{\text {sem }}\left(c_{n}\right):=\max _{P_{M_{0}, M_{1}}} I\left(M_{1} ; \mathbf{Z}\right), \\
& e_{1}\left(c_{n}\right):=\max _{m_{0}, m_{1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} f_{n}\left(\mathbf{x} \mid m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \sum_{\mathbf{y}: g_{n}(\mathbf{y}) \neq\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)} P_{Y \mid X}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{x}), \\
& e_{2}\left(c_{n}\right):=\max _{m_{0}, m_{1}} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} f_{n}\left(\mathbf{x} \mid m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \sum_{\mathbf{z}: h_{n}(\mathbf{z}) \neq m_{0}} P_{Z \mid X}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{x})
\end{aligned}
$$



Fig. 1: The CC BC with transition kernel $P_{Y, Z \mid X}$.

The secrecy-capacity region $\mathcal{R}(b)$ of a per-codeword CC BC with confidential messages under semantic security (see [24]) and maximal error-probability criteria is the closure of achievable $\left(R_{0}, R_{1}\right)$ set. We use Theorems 1-2 to characterize $\mathcal{R}(b)$.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be finite sets. For any $P_{U, V, X} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X})$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}\left(P_{U, V, X}\right)$ be the set of $\left(R_{0}, R_{1}\right) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2}$ satisfying

$$
\begin{align*}
& R_{0} \leq \min \left\{I_{P}(U ; Y), I_{P}(U ; \bar{Z})\right\}  \tag{10a}\\
& R_{1} \leq I_{P}(V ; Y \mid U)-I_{P}(V ; Z \mid U) \tag{10b}
\end{align*}
$$

where $P_{U, V, X, Y, Z}=P_{U, V, X} P_{Y, Z \mid X}$. Set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\mathcal{R}}(b):=\cup_{P_{U, V, X} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathrm{C}, b)} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}\left(P_{U, V, X}\right), \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $U, V$, are auxiliaries with $|\mathcal{U}| \leq|\mathcal{X}|+2,|\mathcal{V}| \leq|\mathcal{X}|^{2}+$ $4|\mathcal{X}|+2$, and
$\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{C}, b):=\left\{P_{U, V, X}: P_{U, V, X}=P_{U, V} P_{X \mid V}, \mathbb{E}_{P}[\mathrm{C}(X)] \leq b\right\}$.
Theorem 3 (Capacity region) It holds that $\mathcal{R}(b)=\hat{\mathcal{R}}(b)$.
The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Section IV-C. The achievability of $\left(R_{0}, R_{1}\right) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}(b)$ relies on superposition coding, while the converse adapts the classic BC with confidential messages converse to accommodate the cost constraint.

## IV. Proofs

## A. Proof of Theorem 1

The proof is a generalization of [22, Theorem 2] to constantcomposition superposition codebooks. We first prove the $\geq$ implication in (4). Denoting the set of all possible values of $\mathbb{B}_{U}, \mathbb{B}_{V}$, and $\mathbb{B}$ by $\mathfrak{B}_{U}, \mathfrak{B}_{V}$, and $\mathfrak{B}$, respectively, the codebook construction induces a PMF $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B})$, given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu(\mathcal{B})=\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}}\left|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}}\right)\right|^{-1}\left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{n}}\left|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)\right|^{-1}\right) . \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote the $\mathbb{B}_{U}$ and $\mathbb{B}_{V}$ marginals of $\mu$ by $\mu_{\mathbb{B}_{U}}$ and $\mu_{\mathbb{B}_{V}}$, respectively. For a fixed $\mathcal{B}_{U}$, we use the shorthand $\mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}[\cdot]$ for the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mu}\left[\cdot \mid \mathbb{B}_{U}=\mathcal{B}_{U}\right]$.

We define several quantities used throughout the proof. Fix $\mathcal{B}_{U}$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, henceforth, and let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}) \\
& := \begin{cases}\frac{1}{\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|} \sum_{j=1}^{\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|} \frac{P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{V}(i, j))}{P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i))}, & \text { if } P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i))>0, \\
1, & \text { otherwise },\end{cases} \\
& L^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}):=\mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[L^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $L^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})=1$. For $(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{T}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}}\right)$, set
$\tilde{L}_{P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}}}:=\frac{1}{\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|} \frac{P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{v})}{P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i))}$,
$N_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}):=\left|j \in \mathcal{J}_{n}: \mathbf{V}(i, j) \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}\right)\right|$,
$W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}):=\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|^{-1} \tilde{L}_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}} N_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})$,
$W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}):=\mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})\right]$.
Lastly, for $\mathbf{u} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}}\right)$ and $\mathbf{V} \sim \operatorname{Unif}\left(\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}\right)\right)$, define
$q_{\bar{U} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}):=\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{V} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}\right)\right)$,
$F\left(\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|, P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}\right):=\min \left\{2 q_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}),\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}} q_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z})\right\}$.
We have the following lemma.
Lemma 2 (Bounds on intermediate quantities)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[\left|W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{\left(\mathbb{B} \mathbb{B}_{V}\right.}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})-W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})\right|\right] \\
& \leq\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right| \tilde{L}_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}} F\left(\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|, P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}\right)  \tag{14}\\
& q_{\bar{U} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}) \leq(n+1)^{|\mathcal{U}||\mathcal{V}|} e^{-n I(\bar{V} ; \bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})}  \tag{15}\\
& q_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}) \geq(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{U}||\mathcal{V} \|||\mathcal{Z}|} e^{-n I(\bar{V} ; \bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})} . \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof: The proof of (14) follows similar to that of [22, Lemma 3] and is omitted. To establish (15) and (16), note that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}\right) \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)$, which implies $q_{\bar{U} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})=\left|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z}\right)\right|\left|\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)\right|^{-1}$.
The claims then follows from [15, Lemma 2.5].
Continuing, for $(i, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{I}_{n} \times \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}}\right)$ such that $\mathbf{u}(i)=\mathbf{u}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \rho\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}, i\right):=\mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[\theta\left(\left\{\mathcal{B}_{U}, \mathbb{B}_{V}\right\}, i\right)\right] \\
& =\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}^{n}} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)) \mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[\left|L^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})-1\right|\right] \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n}(\mathcal{Z} \mid \mathcal{U})} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)) \\
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[\left|L^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})-L^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})\right|\right] \\
& =\sum_{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}} \in \mathcal{P}_{n}(\mathcal{Z} \mid \mathcal{U})} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)) \\
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[\left|\sum_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}} W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})-W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})\right|\right] \\
& =\sum_{\substack{P_{\bar{Z}, \bar{V} \mid \bar{U}} \in \\
\mathcal{P}_{n}(\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{V} \mid \mathcal{U})}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)) \\
& \mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[\left|W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})-W_{P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})\right|\right] \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{P_{\bar{Z}, \bar{V} \mid \bar{U}}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}^{\otimes n}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{v}) F\left(\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|, P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{P_{\bar{Z}, \bar{V} \mid \bar{U}}} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}} \mid \mathbf{u}(i)\right)} e^{n \mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{V}}, \bar{Z}}\left[\log P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right]} F\left(\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|, P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\leq}(n+1)^{\frac{3}{2}|\mathcal{U}||\mathcal{V}||\mathcal{Z}|} \max _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} e^{n\left(H(\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})+\mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{V}, \bar{Z}}}\left[\log P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right]\right)} \\
& (n+1)^{|\mathcal{U}||\mathcal{V}|} e^{-n I_{P}(\bar{V} ; \bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})} e^{-n \frac{1}{2}\left[R_{2}-I_{P}(\bar{V} ; \bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})\right]^{+}} \\
& =: S_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right) \text {, } \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

where (a) follows since $L^{*}(\mathbf{u}(i), \mathbf{z})=1$; (b) is due to (14) in Lemma 2; (c) follows from [15, Lemma 2.2], the definition of $F\left(\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|, P_{\bar{V} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{Z}}\right)$ and (15)-(16) in Lemma 2. Thus, noting that $\rho\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}, i\right)$ is independent of $i$ and $\mathcal{B}_{U}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{\rho}\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right) & :=\mathbb{E}_{\mu \mid \mathcal{B}_{U}}\left[\delta_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right)} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathbb{B}_{V}\right)}, P_{I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right)} P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}\right)\right] \\
& =\mathbb{E}_{P_{I, \mathbf{U}}^{\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right)}}\left[\rho\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}, I\right)\right] \leq S_{n}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right) \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

Taking limit and combining the resulting terms yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty}-\frac{1}{n} \log \left(\tilde{\rho}\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}\right)\right) \geq S\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right) \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, taking expectation w.r.t. $\mu_{\mathbb{B}_{U}}$ on both sides of (17) and (18), followed by limits leads to (4). Eqn. (6) then follows from Lemma 1.

The converse proof follows by fixing $\mathcal{B}_{U},(I, \mathbf{U})=$ $(i, \mathbf{u}(i))$, and adapting the optimality argument of softcovering exponent for single-layer codebooks from [22]. We omit further details due to space constraints.

## B. Proof of Theorem 2

Fix $\mathcal{B}_{U}=\left\{\mathbf{u}(i), i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}\right\}$. Since $\rho\left(\mathcal{B}_{U}, i\right)$ is independent of $\mathcal{B}_{U}$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, we denote it simply by $\rho$. From [22, Lemma $2]^{1}$, it follows that for any $t, R_{2}>0$,

$$
\mathbb{P}_{\mu}\left(\theta\left(\left\{\mathcal{B}_{U}, \mathbb{B}_{V}\right\}, i\right)-\rho \geq t \mid \mathbb{B}_{U}=\mathcal{B}_{U}\right) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} e^{n R_{2}} t^{2}}
$$

Taking expectation w.r.t. to $\mu_{\mathbb{B}_{U}}$, for any $i \in \mathcal{I}_{n}$, we have

$$
\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\bar{\theta}(\mathbb{B}) \geq t+\rho)=\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\theta(\mathbb{B}, i) \geq t+\rho) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} e^{n R_{2}} t^{2}}
$$

Since $\rho \leq e^{-n \gamma}$ for $\gamma>0$, by (19) and Lemma 1, if $R_{2}>$ $I_{P}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, then taking $t=e^{-n \bar{\gamma}}$ for some $0<\bar{\gamma}<\gamma$ yields

$$
\mathbb{P}_{\mu}\left(\theta(\mathbb{B}, i) \geq 2 e^{-n \bar{\gamma}}\right)=\mathbb{P}_{\mu}\left(\bar{\theta}(\mathbb{B}) \geq 2 e^{-n \bar{\gamma}}\right) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} e^{n\left(R_{2}-2 \bar{\gamma}\right)}}
$$

Choosing $\bar{\gamma}>0$ such that $R_{2}>2 \bar{\gamma}>0$ (possible since $R_{2}>0$ by assumption) yields the desired result.

## C. Proof of Theorem 3

We first prove $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(b) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(b)$. By continuity of mutual information and the expected cost constraint in $P$, it suffices to show that $\left(R_{0}, R_{1}\right) \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}(b)$ is achievable, for any $b>\mathrm{c}_{\text {min }}$.

Coding scheme: Fix $\epsilon>0$ and a PMF $P_{U, V, X, Y, Z}:=$ $P_{U, V} P_{X \mid V} P_{Y, Z \mid X}$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{P}[\mathrm{C}(X)]<b$. Fix $\epsilon^{\prime} \in(0, b-$ $\left.\mathbb{E}_{P}[\mathrm{C}(X)]\right)$. Choose $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and $Q_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} \in \mathcal{P}_{l}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V})$ such that $\delta_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(P_{U, V, X, Y, Z}, Q_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, X, Y, Z}\right)<\epsilon^{\prime}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{Q}[\mathrm{C}(X)]-$ $\mathbb{E}_{P}[\mathrm{C}(X)]<\epsilon^{\prime}$, where $Q_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, X, Y, Z}=Q_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{X \mid V} P_{Y, Z \mid X}$. This is possible since $\cup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}_{l}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V})$ is dense in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V})$.

Let $n \in\{l \mathbb{N}\}$. Consider the random superposition codebook $\mathbb{B}:=\left\{\mathbb{B}_{U}, \mathbb{B}_{V}\right\}$ constructed in Theorem 1 , with $\mathcal{M}_{0, n}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{1, n} \times \mathcal{J}_{n}$ in place of $\mathcal{I}_{n}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{n}$, respectively. Let $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B})$ denote the PMF induced by codebook construction as given in (13) with $Q_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}$ in place of $P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}$. Given a codebook $\mathcal{B}$ and messages $\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)=\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)$, the encoder chooses

[^1]an index pair $j$ uniformly at random from $\mathcal{J}_{n}$, and transmits $\mathbf{X}=f_{n}\left(\cdot \mid m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \sim P_{X \mid V}^{\otimes n}\left(\cdot \mid \mathbf{v}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, j\right)\right)$.

Given $\mathbf{y}$, Decoder 1 looks for a unique tuple $\left(\hat{m}_{0}, \hat{m}_{1}, \hat{j}\right) \in$ $\mathcal{M}_{0, n} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n} \times \mathcal{J}_{n}$ such that $\left(\mathbf{u}\left(\hat{m}_{0}\right), \mathbf{v}\left(\hat{m}_{0}, \hat{m}_{1}, \hat{j}\right), \mathbf{y}\right) \in$ $\mathcal{T}_{\delta}^{(n)}\left(Q_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Y}\right)$, for some $\delta>0$. If such a unique tuple exists, it sets $g_{n}(\mathbf{y})=\left(\hat{m}_{0}, \hat{m}_{1}\right)$; else, $g_{n}(\mathbf{y})=(1,1)$. Given $\mathbf{z}$, Decoder 2 looks for a unique index $\check{m}_{0} \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}$ such that $\left(\mathbf{u}\left(\check{m}_{0}\right), \mathbf{z}\right) \in \mathcal{T}_{\delta}^{(n)}\left(Q_{\bar{U} Z}\right)$, and sets $h_{n}(\mathbf{z})=\check{m}_{0}$ if its exists; else, $h_{n}(\mathbf{z})=1$. Denote the joint PMF induced by the code $c_{n}=\left(f_{n}, g_{n}, h_{n}\right)$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{B}$ by $P_{M_{0}, M_{1}, J, \mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}, \hat{M}_{0}, \check{M}_{0}, \hat{M}_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})}$.

Cost Analysis: Since for any $\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, j\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n} \times$ $\mathcal{J}_{n}, \mathbf{v}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, j\right) \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(Q_{\bar{V}}\right)$ and $\mathbf{X} \sim P_{X \mid V}^{\otimes n}$,

$$
\mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{X} \mid \mathbf{V}}^{(\mathcal{B})}\left(\cdot \mid \mathbf{v}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, j\right)\right)}\left[\mathrm{C}_{n}(\mathbf{X})\right]=\mathbb{E}_{Q_{X}}[\mathrm{C}(X)]<b
$$

It follows that for some $\gamma^{\prime}>0$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{P_{\mathbf{X}}^{(\mathbb{B})}}\left[C_{n}(\mathbf{X})\right]\right] \leq b-\gamma^{\prime}
$$

Error probability analysis: Under conditions stated in the lemma below, the expected maximal error-probability over $\mathbb{B}_{n}$ decays exponentially with $n$. The proof is standard, and omitted due to space constraints.
Lemma 3 (Error-probability bound) If $\left(R_{0}, R_{1}, R_{2}\right) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{3}$ satisfy $R_{0}<I_{Q}(\bar{U} ; Z), R_{1}+R_{2}<I_{Q}(\bar{V} ; Y \mid \bar{U}), R_{0}+R_{1}{ }^{+}$ $R_{2}<I_{Q}(\bar{U}, \bar{V} ; Y)$, then there exists a $\zeta(\delta)>0$ such that
$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}}\left[\mathbb{P}_{P^{(\mathbb{B})}}\left(\left(\hat{M}_{0}, \hat{M}_{1}\right) \neq\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)\right)+\mathbb{P}_{P^{(\mathbb{B})}}\left(\check{M}_{0} \neq M_{0}\right)\right] \leq e^{-n \zeta(\delta)}$.
Security analysis: For $\mathbf{u} \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(Q_{\bar{U}}\right)$, recall the distribution $P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}(\mathbf{z} \mid \mathbf{u})$ from (2). Note that $\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}}\left[P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{(\mathbb{B})}\right]=\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}}\left[P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid M_{0}, M_{1}, \mathbf{U}}^{(\mathbb{B})}\right]=P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}$. Following steps leading to $\left[9\right.$, Eqns. (31)-(34)] with $P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}$ in place of $P_{Z!U}^{\otimes n}$, it follows that for $\ell_{\text {sem }}\left(c_{n}\right) \xrightarrow[n]{\longrightarrow} 0$ to hold, it is sufficient that there exists $\mathcal{B}$ satisfying $\max _{m_{0}, m_{1}} \tilde{\theta}\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \leq e^{-n \gamma_{1}}$, where $\tilde{\theta}\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right):=$ $\delta_{\mathbf{T V}}\left(P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid M_{0}, M_{1}, \mathbf{U}}^{(\mathcal{B})}\left(\cdot \mid m_{0}, m_{1}, \mathbf{u}\left(m_{0}\right)\right), P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}\left(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}\left(m_{0}\right)\right)\right) . \quad$ This existence is implied by the following lemma.
Lemma 4 (Security bound) If $R_{2}>I_{Q}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, then there exists $\gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}>0$ such that for all sufficiently large $n$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{P}_{\bar{\mu}}\left(\max _{\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)} \tilde{\theta}\left(\mathbb{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right)>e^{-n \gamma_{1}}\right) \leq e^{-e^{n \gamma_{2}}} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

The proof of (20) easily follows from (7) via the union bound by noting that $\left|\mathcal{M}_{0, n}\right| \leq e^{n R_{0}}$ and $\left|\mathcal{M}_{1, n}\right| \leq e^{n R_{1}}$.

Following the expurgation steps detailed in steps 1-3 in the proof of [9, Theorem 1] yields the existence of $\mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime}, \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}, \mathcal{B}, f_{n}, g_{n}$ such that $\left|\mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime}\right| \geq \frac{e^{n R_{0}}}{4(n+2)},\left|\mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}\right| \geq$ $\frac{e^{n R_{1}}}{4(n+2)}$ and for all $\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathbb{E}_{P^{(\mathcal{B})}}\left[\mathrm{C}_{n}(\mathbf{X}) \mid\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)=\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)\right] \leq\left(1+n^{-1}\right)^{2} b^{\prime}  \tag{21}\\
& \mathbb{P}_{P^{(\mathcal{B})}}\left(\left(\hat{M}_{0}, \hat{M}_{1}\right) \neq\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \mid\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)=\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)\right) \\
& +\mathbb{P}_{P^{(\mathcal{B})}}\left(\check{M}_{0} \neq m_{0} \mid M_{0}=m_{0}\right) \leq 4(n+2)^{2} e^{-n \zeta(\delta)},  \tag{22}\\
& \max _{\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}} \tilde{\theta}\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \leq e^{-n \gamma_{1}} . \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

The final step is to replace $f_{n}$ by $\tilde{f}_{n}$ to satisfy the percodeword cost constraint, where, for $\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, \mathbf{x}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime} \times$ $\mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime} \times \mathcal{T}_{\delta}^{(n)}\left(Q_{X}\right)$, the definition of $\tilde{f}_{n}$ is
$\tilde{f}_{n}\left(\mathbf{x} \mid m_{0}, m_{1}\right):=\frac{\sum_{j} P_{X \mid V}^{\otimes n}\left(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{v}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, j\right)\right)}{\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right| \eta_{n}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, \delta\right)}$,
$\eta_{n}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, \delta\right):=\frac{1}{\left|\mathcal{J}_{n}\right|} \sum_{j} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}_{\delta}^{(n)}\left(Q_{X}\right)} P_{X \mid V}^{\otimes n}\left(\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{v}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, j\right)\right)$,
and $\tilde{f}_{n}\left(\mathbf{x} \mid m_{0}, m_{1}\right)=0$, otherwise. Since $\mathbf{v}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, j\right) \in$ $\hat{\mathcal{T}}_{n}\left(Q_{\bar{V}}\right)$, [15, Lemma 2.12] implies ${ }^{2}$ that for any $\delta>0$, there is $\tilde{\gamma}_{n} \rightarrow 0$ such that $\eta_{n}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, \delta\right) \geq 1-\tilde{\gamma}_{n}$ for all $\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)$ $\in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}$. The typical average lemma [25] and definition of $\tilde{f}_{n}$ then yield $\mathrm{C}_{n}\left(\mathbf{X}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)\right)<b$, with probability one for all $\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}$, provided $\delta$ is sufficiently small.

Let $\tilde{P}^{(\mathcal{B})}$ denote $P^{(\mathcal{B})}$ with $f_{n}$ replaced by $\tilde{f}_{(\mathcal{B})}$. Slightly abusing notation, we use the shorthands $p_{m_{0}, m_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})}$ and $\tilde{p}_{m_{0}, m_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})} \quad$ for $\quad P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid M_{0}, M_{1}, \mathbf{U}}^{(\mathcal{B})}\left(\cdot \mid m_{0}, m_{1}, \mathbf{u}\left(m_{0}\right)\right) \quad$ and $\tilde{P}_{\mathbf{Z} \mid M_{0}, M_{1}, \mathbf{U}}^{(\mathcal{B})}\left(\cdot \mid m_{0}, m_{1}, \mathbf{u}\left(m_{0}\right)\right)$, respectively, and define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta^{\prime}\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right) & :=\delta_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(p_{m_{0}, m_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})}, \tilde{p}_{m_{0}, m_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})}\right) \\
\kappa\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right) & :=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(\tilde{p}_{m_{0}, m_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})} \| p_{m_{0}, m_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, for all $\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{P}^{(\mathcal{B})}}\left(\left(\hat{M}_{0}, \hat{M}_{1}\right) \neq\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \mid\left(M_{0}, M_{1}\right)=\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)\right) \\
& +\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{P}^{(\mathcal{B})}}\left(\check{M}_{0} \neq m_{0} \mid M_{0}=m_{0}\right) \\
& \leq 4(n+2)^{2}\left(1-\tilde{\gamma}_{n}\right)^{-1} e^{-n \zeta(\delta)}, \\
& \max _{\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime} \times \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}} \delta_{\mathrm{TV}}\left(\tilde{p}_{m_{0}, m_{1}}^{(\mathcal{B})}, P_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{U}}^{*}\left(\cdot \mid \mathbf{u}\left(m_{0}\right)\right)\right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \max _{\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)} \tilde{\theta}\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right)+\max _{\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)} \theta^{\prime}\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \max _{\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)} \tilde{\theta}\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right)+2^{-1 / 2} \max _{\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)} \kappa\left(\mathcal{B}, m_{0}, m_{1}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} e^{-n \gamma_{1}}-\log \left(1-\tilde{\gamma}_{n}\right) \text {, }
\end{aligned}
$$

where (a) is via triangle inequality for TV metric; (b) is due to Pinsker's inequality; and (c) follows from $\eta_{n}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}, \delta\right) \geq$ $1-\tilde{\gamma}_{n}$ and (23). Thus, for sufficiently large $n$, we have shown the existence of $\mathcal{B}$ and a $\left(n, R_{0}-\frac{1}{n} \log (4 n+8), R_{1}-\right.$ $\left.\frac{1}{n} \log (4 n+8)\right)$ code $c_{n}=\left(\tilde{f}_{n}, g_{n}, h_{n}\right)^{n}$ with message sets $\mathcal{M}_{0, n}^{\prime}, \mathcal{M}_{1, n}^{\prime}$, such that $\max \left\{e_{1}\left(c_{n}\right), e_{2}\left(c_{n}\right), \ell_{\text {sem }}\left(c_{n}\right)\right\} \leq \epsilon$, and with probability one

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{C}_{n}\left(\mathbf{X}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)\right)\right] \leq\left(1+n^{-1}\right)^{2} b^{\prime}<b
$$

provided $R_{0}, R_{1}, R_{2}$ satisfy the constraints in Lemma 3 and 4.
Eliminating $R_{2}$ via the Fourier-Motzkin elimination [26] yields $R_{0}<I_{Q}(\bar{U} ; Z), R_{1}<I_{Q}(\bar{V} ; Y \mid \bar{U})-I_{Q}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, $R_{0}+R_{1}<I_{Q}(\bar{U}, \bar{V} ; Y)-I_{Q}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$. Since $\epsilon^{\prime}$ is arbitrary, continuity of mutual information implies that $\left(R_{0}, R_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{R}(b)$ provided the above constraints hold with $P$ in place of $Q$. The

[^2]proof is completed by noting that the resulting rate region is equivalent to $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(b)$ and $\mathcal{R}(b)$ is a closed set by definition.

Next, we show the converse by relaxing the constraints to weak secrecy, i.e., $I\left(M_{1} ; Z\right) \leq n \epsilon$ and average error probability. Accordingly, we may assume without loss of generality that $P_{M}=\bar{P}_{M}$. By noting that the probability of error of $M_{0}$ at Decoder 2 and that of $M_{1}$ at Decoder 1 is less than $\epsilon$, an application of Fano's inequality and the semantic security constraint [27] yields

$$
\begin{align*}
& H\left(M_{1} \mid M_{0}, \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq H\left(M_{1} \mid \mathbf{Y}\right) \leq 1+\epsilon n R_{1},  \tag{24}\\
& I\left(M_{1} ; \mathbf{Z} \mid M_{0}\right)=I\left(M_{1}, M_{0} ; Z\right)-I\left(M_{0} ; Z\right) \\
& =I\left(M_{1} ; Z\right)+I\left(M_{0} ; Z \mid M_{1}\right)-I\left(M_{0} ; Z\right) \\
& =I\left(M_{1} ; Z\right)+H\left(M_{0} \mid M_{1}\right)-H\left(M_{0} \mid M_{1}, Z\right)-H\left(M_{0}\right) \\
& \quad+H\left(M_{0} \mid Z\right) \\
& \quad \leq I\left(M_{1} ; Z\right)+H\left(M_{0} \mid Z\right) \leq n \epsilon+1+\epsilon n R_{0} . \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

Then, defining $\epsilon_{n}=2+\epsilon n\left(1+R_{1}+R_{0}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& n R_{1}=H\left(M_{1}\right) \\
& =H\left(M_{1} \mid M_{0}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I\left(M_{1} ; \mathbf{Y} \mid M_{0}\right)+1+\epsilon n R_{1} \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} I\left(M_{1} ; \mathbf{Y} \mid M_{0}\right)-I\left(M_{1} ; \mathbf{Z} \mid M_{0}\right)+\epsilon_{n} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(M_{1} ; Y_{i} \mid M_{0}, Y^{i-1}\right)-I\left(M_{1} ; Z_{i} \mid M_{0}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right)+\epsilon_{n} \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(M_{1} ; Y_{i} \mid M_{0}, Y^{i-1}\right)-I\left(M_{1} ; Z_{i} \mid M_{0}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right)+\epsilon_{n} \\
& +I\left(Z_{i+1}^{n} ; Y_{i} \mid M_{0}, M_{1}, Y^{i-1}\right)-I\left(Y^{i-1} ; Z_{i} \mid M_{0}, M_{1}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right) \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(M_{1}, Z_{i+1}^{n} ; Y_{i} \mid M_{0}, Y^{i-1}\right)-I\left(M_{1}, Y^{i-1} ; Z_{i} \mid M_{0}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right) \\
& \quad+\epsilon_{n} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
(d) \\
= \\
i=1 \\
n
\end{array} I\left(M_{1} ; Y_{i} \mid M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right)-I\left(M_{1} ; Z_{i} \mid M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right) \\
& \quad+\epsilon_{n} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(M_{1}, M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n} ; Y_{i} \mid M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right)+\epsilon_{n} \\
& \quad-I\left(M_{1}, M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n} ; Z_{i} \mid M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(e)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(V_{i} ; Y_{i} \mid U_{i}\right)-I\left(V_{i} ; Z_{i} \mid U_{i}\right)+\epsilon_{n} \\
& \stackrel{(f)}{=} n\left(I\left(V_{Q} ; Y_{Q} \mid U_{Q}, Q\right)-I\left(V_{Q} ; Z_{Q} \mid U_{Q}, Q\right)\right)+\epsilon_{n},
\end{align*}
$$

where
(a) follows from (24);
(b) is because of (25);
(c) and (d) use the Csiszár-sum identity [25];
(e) is due to the auxiliary random variable identification $U_{i}=$ $\left(M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right)$ and $V_{i}=\left(M_{1}, M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n}\right) ;$
(f) uses $Q \sim \operatorname{Unif}[1: n]$ independent of all other r.v.'s;

Also, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
n R_{0} & \leq H\left(M_{0}\right) \leq I\left(M_{0} ; Y^{n}\right)+1+\epsilon n R_{0} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(M_{0} ; Y_{i} \mid Y^{i-1}\right)+1+\epsilon n R_{0} \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(M_{0}, Y^{i-1}, Z_{i+1}^{n} ; Y_{i} \mid\right)+1+\epsilon n R_{0} \\
& =n I\left(U_{Q}, Q ; Y_{Q}\right)+1+\epsilon n R_{0} . \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

Similarly, it follows that

$$
\begin{align*}
n R_{0} & \leq H\left(M_{0}\right) \leq I\left(M_{0} ; Z^{n}\right)+1+\epsilon n R_{0} \\
& =n I\left(U_{Q}, Q ; Z_{Q}\right)+1+\epsilon n R_{0} . \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

Then, defining $U=\left(U_{Q}, Q\right), V=V_{Q}, X=X_{Q}$ and noting that $U-V-X-Y_{Q}$ form a Markov chain with $P_{Y_{Q} \mid X}=P_{Y \mid X}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{C}\left(X_{Q}\right)\right]=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{C}\left(X_{i}\right)\right] \leq b \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

since the code satisfies the per-message cost constraint, it follows from (26)-(28) that
$R_{1} \leq I(V ; Y \mid U)-I(V ; Z \mid U)+\frac{2}{n(1-\epsilon)}+\frac{\epsilon\left(1+R_{0}\right)}{1-\epsilon}$,
$R_{0} \leq \min \{I(U ; Y), I(U ; Z)\}+\frac{1}{n(1-\epsilon)}$.
For any given $\delta>0, \frac{2}{n(1-\epsilon)}+\frac{\epsilon\left(1+R_{0}\right)}{1-\epsilon}$ may be made smaller than $\delta$ by taking $n$ large enough and $\epsilon$ sufficiently small. The proof of the converse is then completed via the definition of secrecy-capacity region being a closed set.

Remark 1 (Channel input type) In the proof of Theorem 3, we fixed the joint type of the inner and outer layers of the superposition codebook, without restricting the type of the channel input x . However, scenarios in which a fixed type of x is desired (cf. [28]-[30]) can be handled within our framework by identifying $\bar{V}=\left(\bar{V}^{\prime}, \bar{X}\right)$ for some $\bar{V}^{\prime}$, where $P_{\bar{X}}$ is the desired channel input type, and setting $\mathbf{X}=f_{n}\left(\cdot \mid m_{0}, m_{1}\right)=\mathbf{x}\left(m_{0}, m_{1}\right)$.

## D. Proof of Lemma 1

We extend [22, Proposition 2] to superposition codes. Set $\tilde{S}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}}, R_{2}\right):=\frac{1}{2}\left[R_{2}-I_{P}(\bar{V} ; \bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})\right]$, and observe:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, Z}, R_{2}\right) \\
& :=\min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}} \| P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left[R_{2}-I_{P}(\bar{V} ; \bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})\right]^{+} \\
& =\min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} \max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}} \| P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right)+\lambda \tilde{S}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}}, R_{2}\right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}} \| P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right)+\lambda \tilde{S}^{2}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}}, R_{2}\right) \\
& =\max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} \frac{\lambda R_{2}}{2}+(1-0.5 \lambda) \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}} \| P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right) \\
& \quad+0.5 \lambda\left[-H_{P}(\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})-\mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{V}, \bar{Z}}}\left[\log P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right]\right] \\
& \quad \begin{array}{l}
\stackrel{(b)}{=} \max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} \frac{\lambda R_{2}}{2}+(1-0.5 \lambda) \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}} \| P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right)
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
&+0.5 \lambda\left[\max _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} \mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}\left[\log Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}\right]-\mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{V}, \bar{Z}}}\left[\log P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right]\right] \\
&= \max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} \max _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} 0.5 \lambda R_{2}+(1-0.5 \lambda) \\
& {\left[\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}} \| P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}} P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}\right)-\frac{\lambda}{2-\lambda} \mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}, \bar{Z}}}\left[\log \frac{P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}}{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}}\right]\right] } \\
&= \max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \max _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} \mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}}\left[\min _{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{KL}}\left(P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}(\cdot \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}) \| P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}(\cdot \mid \bar{V})\right)\right. \\
&\left.-\lambda(2-\lambda)^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U}, \bar{V}}}\left[\log \frac{P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}}{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}}\right]\right](1-0.5 \lambda)+0.5 \lambda R_{2} \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{=} \max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \max _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} \frac{\lambda R_{2}}{2}-(1-0.5 \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}}\left[\log \mathbb{E}_{P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}}\left[\frac{P_{Z \mid \bar{V}}^{\frac{\lambda}{2-\lambda}}}{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}^{2-\lambda}}\right]\right] \\
& \stackrel{(d)}{=} \max _{\lambda \in[0,1]} \max _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} \frac{\lambda R_{2}}{2}-0.5 \lambda \mathrm{D}_{\frac{2}{2-\lambda}}\left(P_{Z \mid \bar{V}} \| Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}} \mid P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}\right) \\
&= \max _{\lambda \in[1,2]}(1-\lambda-1)\left(R_{2}-\min _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} \mathrm{D}_{\lambda}\left(P_{Z \mid \bar{V}} \| Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}} \mid P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}\right)\right), \quad(30) \tag{30}
\end{align*}
$$

where $(a)$ follows from from the minimax theorem; $(b)$ follows since $H_{P}(\bar{Z} \mid \bar{U})=\min _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} \mathbb{E}_{P_{\bar{U}, \bar{Z}}}\left[-\log Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}\right] ;(c)$ is due to [22, Lemma 20]; and (d) follows from the definition of Rényi divergence of order $\alpha$. Next, note that

$$
\lim _{\lambda \rightarrow 1} \min _{Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}}} \mathrm{D}_{\lambda}\left(P_{Z \mid \bar{V}} \| Q_{Z \mid \bar{U}} \mid P_{\bar{U}, \bar{V}}\right)=I_{P}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U}) .
$$

Thus, if $R_{2}>I_{P}(\bar{V} ; Z \mid \bar{U})$, there exists a $\lambda \in(1,2]$ such that RHS of (30) is strictly positive. This completes the proof.
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[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Although [22, Lemma 2] is stated for the case of memoryless channels, the proof based on McDiarmid's inequality shows that the double exponential bound holds more generally.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ This step utilizes the constant composition nature of superposition codes.

