

Generalized Degrees of Freedom for Network-Coded Cognitive Interference Channel

Song-Nam Hong, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Giuseppe Caire, *Fellow, IEEE*

Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

(e-mail: {songnamh, caire}@usc.edu)

Abstract

We study a two-user cognitive interference channel (CIC) where one of the transmitters (primary) has knowledge of a linear combination (over an appropriate finite field) of the two information messages. We refer to this channel model as Network-Coded CIC, since the linear combination may be the result of some linear network coding scheme implemented in the backbone wired network. First, we focus on a finite-field Network-Coded CIC and characterize the capacity region of this channel using *distributed zero-forcing precoding* for achievability. Then, we extend this scheme using the Compute-and-Forward (CoF) framework, and present a novel scheme named Precoded CoF (PCoF) for Gaussian Network-Coded CIC. Our main contribution is the characterization of the generalized degrees of freedom (GDoF) for the Gaussian Network-Coded CIC. For achievability, we use PCoF and Dirty Paper Coding (DPC), based on nested lattice codes. As a consequence of the GDoF characterization, we show that knowing “mixed data” (linear combinations of the information messages) provides a *multiplicative* gain for the Gaussian CIC, if the power ratio of signal-to-noise (SNR) to interference-to-noise (INR) is larger than certain threshold. For example, when $\text{SNR} = \text{INR}$, the Network-Coded cognition yields a 100% gain over the classical Gaussian CIC. Finally, numerical results are provided in order to show that the proposed scheme performs well in the range of finite SNRs.

Index Terms

Cognitive Interference Channel, Nested Lattice Codes, Compute and Forward, Generalized Degrees of Freedom.

I. INTRODUCTION

Interference is one of the fundamental factors that deteriorate the performance of modern communication systems. The two-user interference channel (IC) is a fundamental information-theoretic model to study this issue. Although the exact characterization of the IC capacity region is a long-standing open problem, even for the Gaussian channel case, much progress has been made toward understanding this channel [1]–[3]. Most notably, the capacity region of the two-user Gaussian IC was characterized within 1 bit, by using superposition coding with an appropriate power allocation of the private and common message codewords, and by providing a new upper bounding technique [2].

Transmitters or receivers, in many practical communication systems, are not isolated, and they can share certain amount of information (i.e., information messages, channel state information, and so on). For example, in a cloud base station architecture, small base stations (BSs) are spatially distributed over a certain area, and connected to the infrastructure networks via wired backhaul [4]–[8]. Cooperation among transmitters or receivers can mitigate interferences by forming distributed MIMO systems. One special case of particular interest is the two-user Cognitive Interference Channel (CIC), where one of the transmitters (referred to as “cognitive”) has knowledge of both information messages to the two users, while the other (referred to as “primary”) has knowledge of the message destined to its intended receiver only. This model is relevant under certain assumptions on the underlying wired backbone network connecting the two transmitters. For example, in the case of *unidirectional cooperation*, the primary transmitter sends its message to the cognitive transmitter via an a wired link of infinite capacity. Another example is the asymmetric situation shown in Figs. 1 and 2, where one transmitter (cognitive) has larger wired backhaul capacity, and therefore is able to observe both messages. Fig. 2 is representative of a heterogenous network consisting of a cellular BS and home BS (e.g., a femtocell access point). The cellular BS is connected to the data router, which generates both messages, via a high capacity link supporting rate $2R_0$ and the home BS is connected to the same data router via lower capacity link supporting only rate R_0 . In this case, the data router sends two information messages to the cellular BS and the one message to the home BS. The CIC has been extensively investigated in the literature. The capacity region of the strong interference regime was characterized in [9]. When the interference at the primary receiver is weak, the




Fig. 1. Application of cognitive interference channel (CIC). When routing is used over the wired network, the primary transmitter observes the one of information messages. Yet, when RLNC is used over the wired network, the primary transmitter receives the mixed data (i.e., linear combination of information messages).




Fig. 2. Heterogenous network model as an application of cognitive interference channel (CIC). In the classical CIC, the data router sends the one of information messages to the primary transmitter (i.e., $L(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = \mathbf{w}_2$). However, in the Network-Coded CIC, the data router forwards the “mixed data” to the primary transmitter (i.e., $L(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2) = \mathbf{w}_1 \oplus \mathbf{w}_2$).

capacity region was characterized in [10]–[12]. Recently, the capacity region for Gaussian CIC was approximately characterized within 1.87 bits, regardless of channel parameters [12].

For wired networks, routing is generally optimal only for a single source, multiple intermediate nodes, and a single destination [13]. Yet, it cannot achieve the maximum throughput in the more

general case of multiple sources and multiple destinations (multi-source multicasting). In this case, it is well-known that by allowing intermediate nodes to forward functions of the incoming messages (Network Coding), the capacity of multi-source multicasting relay networks can be achieved and coincides with the min-cut max-flow bound [14]. Random linear network coding (RLNC) is of particular interest for its practical simplicity. In this case, intermediate nodes forward linear combinations of the incoming messages by randomly and independently choosing the coefficients from an appropriate finite-field [15]. Assuming that RLNC is used over the wired network, in this paper we introduce the Network-Coded CIC as a generalization of the classical CIC, where the primary transmitter knows a linear combination of the information messages (referred to as “mixed data”). This is motivated in Fig. 1 by introducing RLNC instead of just routing in the backbone network. Also, notice that this idea is particularly relevant to the heterogeneous network model of Fig. 2, where the data router provides mixed data (i.e., $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2$) to the home BS without violating the backhaul capacity constraint of R_0 . Since delivering mixed data at the primary transmitter has the same cost (in terms of backhaul capacity) than delivering a single message, a natural question arises: *Does mixed data at the primary transmitter provide capacity increase “for free” for cognitive interference channel?*

This paper contributes to the subject in the following ways. We characterize the capacity region of finite-field Network-Coded CIC using distributed zero-forcing precoding. We show that this region is equivalent to the capacity region of a finite-field vector broadcast channel. That is, the unidirectional cooperation yields the same performance of full cooperation as long as the primary transmitter knows the mixed message rather than its own individual message only. Thus, we can conclude that mixed data at the primary transmitter is definitely useful for the finite-field model. Motivated by this success, we present a novel scheme nicknamed *Precoded Compute-and-Forward* (PCoF) for Gaussian Network-Coded CIC. CoF makes use of nested lattice codes, such that each receiver can reliably decode a linear combination with integer coefficient of the interfering codewords. Thank to the fact that lattice are modules over the ring of integers, this linear combination translates directly into a linear combination of the information messages defined over a suitable finite-field. Finally, the “interference” in the finite-field domain is completely eliminated by distributed zero forcing precoding (over finite-field). This scheme can be thought of as a distributed approach of Reverse CoF (RCoF), recently proposed in [7], [8] for the downlink of distributed antenna systems. It is well known that the performance of CoF is




Fig. 3. The generalized degrees-of-freedom (GDoF) of the two-user Gaussian Network-Coded cognitive interference channel (CIC). For the interference regimes with $\rho \geq 1/2$, the gap between the Network-Coded CIC and CIC becomes arbitrarily large as SNR and INR goes to infinity. This shows that mixed data at the primary transmitter can provide the unbounded gain.

deteriorated by the non-integer penalty (i.e., the residual “self-interference” due to the fact that the channel coefficients take on non-integer values in practice). We introduce an “Aligned” PCoF by scaling transmission signal by appropriate constants in order to create more favorable channel for CoF receiver mapping. Numerical result shows that Aligned PCoF yields very satisfactory performance in the moderate SNR regime.

A final novel contribution of this paper is to approximately characterize the sum capacity of Gaussian Network-Coded CIC in terms of the sum Generalized Degrees of Freedom (GDoF) [2] of the Gaussian Network Coded CIC. This is enabled by properly using the Aligned PCoF and Dirty Paper Coding (DPC). As a consequence of the GDoF analysis, we show that Network-Coded cognition can provide *multiplicative* gain in cognitive interference channels. The sum GDoF is defined as

$$d_{\text{sum}}(\rho) = \lim_{\text{SNR}, \text{INR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_{\text{sum}}}{\log \text{SNR}}, \quad (1)$$

where $\rho = \frac{\log \text{INR}}{\log \text{SNR}}$, SNR denotes the signal-to-noise ratio for the direct links and INR denotes the interference-to-noise ratio of the cross links. As shown in Fig. 3, the gain of Network-Coded

cognition becomes arbitrary large as SNR and INR go to infinity as long as $\rho \geq 1/2$ (i.e., except the weak interference regime). Namely, if $\rho \geq 1/2$, the performance gap between the Network-Coded CIC and the classical CIC becomes unbounded. For example, when $\rho = 1$ (i.e., SNR = INR), Network-Coded cognition provides 100% gain over classical cognition. As an application to the heterogenous network of Fig. 2, if the data router has knowledge of the dB power ratio of direct-link to cross-link (i.e., ρ), it can send $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_2$ if $\rho \leq 1/2$ and $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2$, if $\rho > 1/2$. In this case, the sum GDoF achieved is given by

$$d_{\text{sum}}(\rho) = \begin{cases} 2 - \rho, & \rho < 1/2 \\ 1 + \rho, & \rho \geq 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II we define the system model, summarize some definitions on lattices and lattice coding, and review CoF. In Section III we characterize the capacity region of finite-field Network-Coded CIC and present the Aligned PCoF, as a natural extension of finite-field scheme, for Gaussian Network-Coded CIC. In section IV, we derive an achievable rate region of Gaussian Network-Coded CIC, based on Aligned PCoF and DPC. We characterize the sum GDoF the Gaussian Network-Coded CIC in Section V. Some concluding remarks are provided in Section VI.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we provide some basic definitions and results which will be extensively used in the sequel.

A. System Model

A two-user Gaussian Network-Coded CIC consists of a Gaussian interference channel where transmitter 1 (the cognitive transmitter) knows both user 1 and user 2 information messages (or, equivalently, two linearly independent linear combinations thereof) and transmitter 2 (the primary transmitter) only knows only one linear combination of the messages. Without loss of generality, we assume that the cognitive transmitter knows $(\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1, \underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2)$, and the primary transmitter has $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2$, where $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$ denotes the information message desired at receiver ℓ , at rate R_ℓ bit/symbol, for $\ell = 1, 2$. We assume that if $R_{\ell_1} \neq R_{\ell_2}$ then the lowest rate message is zero-padded such that both messages have a common length, given by $r = \max\{nR_{\ell_1}, nR_{\ell_2}\}$,

where n denotes the coding block length. A block of n channel uses of the discrete-time complex baseband two-user IC is described by

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}}_1 = h_{11}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 + h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_1 \quad (3)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}}_2 = h_{21}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 + h_{22}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_2, \quad (4)$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{z}}_\ell \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times 1}$ contains i.i.d. Gaussian noise samples $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ and $h_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$ denotes the channel coefficients, assumed to be constant over the whole block of length n and known to all nodes. Also, we have a power constraint, given by $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[\|\underline{\mathbf{x}}_\ell\|^2] \leq \text{SNR}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the ℓ_2 -norm. Each receiver ℓ observes the channel output $\underline{\mathbf{y}}_\ell$ and produces an estimate $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{w}}}_\ell$ of the desired message $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_\ell$. We say that receiver ℓ is in error whenever $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{w}}}_\ell \neq \underline{\mathbf{w}}_\ell$. A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is achievable if there exists a family of codebooks with codewords satisfying the power constraint, and corresponding decoding functions such that the average decoding error probability satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{w}}}_\ell \neq \underline{\mathbf{w}}_\ell) = 0$, for all $\ell = 1, 2$.

B. Nested Lattice Codes

Let $\mathbb{Z}[j]$ be the ring of Gaussian integers and p be a prime. Let \oplus denote the addition over \mathbb{F}_q with $q = p^2$, and let $g : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the natural mapping of \mathbb{F}_q onto $\{a + jb : a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_p\} \subset \mathbb{C}$. We recall the nested lattice code construction given in [16]. Let $\Lambda = \{\underline{\mathbf{x}} = \underline{\mathbf{z}}\mathbf{T} : \underline{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{Z}^n[j]\}$ be a lattice in \mathbb{C}^n , with full-rank generator matrix $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\underline{\mathbf{c}} = \underline{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{G} : \underline{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^r\}$ denote a linear code over \mathbb{F}_q with block length n and dimension r , with generator matrix \mathbf{G} . The lattice Λ_1 is defined through ‘‘construction A’’ (see [17] and references therein) as

$$\Lambda_1 = p^{-1}g(\mathcal{C})\mathbf{T} + \Lambda, \quad (5)$$

where $g(\mathcal{C})$ is the image of \mathcal{C} under the mapping g (applied component-wise). It follows that $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_1 \subseteq p^{-1}\Lambda$ is a chain of nested lattices, such that $|\Lambda_1/\Lambda| = p^{2r}$ and $|p^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda_1| = p^{2(n-r)}$.

For a lattice Λ and $\underline{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we define the lattice quantizer $Q_\Lambda(\underline{\mathbf{r}}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\underline{\mathbf{x}} \in \Lambda} \|\underline{\mathbf{r}} - \underline{\mathbf{x}}\|^2$, the Voronoi region $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda = \{\underline{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathbb{C}^n : Q_\Lambda(\underline{\mathbf{r}}) = \underline{\mathbf{0}}\}$ and $[\underline{\mathbf{r}}] \bmod \Lambda = \underline{\mathbf{r}} - Q_\Lambda(\underline{\mathbf{r}})$. For Λ and Λ_1 given above, we define the lattice code $\mathcal{L} = \Lambda_1 \cap \mathcal{V}_\Lambda$ with rate $R = \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{L}| = \frac{r}{n} \log q$. Construction A provides a *natural labeling* of the codewords of \mathcal{L} by the information messages $\underline{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$. Notice that the set $p^{-1}g(\mathcal{C})\mathbf{T}$ is a *system of coset representatives* of the cosets of Λ in Λ_1 . Hence, the natural labeling function $f : \mathbb{F}_q^r \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ is defined by $f(\underline{\mathbf{w}}) = p^{-1}g(\underline{\mathbf{w}}\mathbf{G})\mathbf{T} \bmod \Lambda$.

C. Compute-and-Forward

We recall here the CoF scheme of [16]. Consider the two-user Gaussian multiple access channel defined by

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}} = \sum_{k=1}^2 h_k \underline{\mathbf{x}}_k + \underline{\mathbf{z}}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{h} = [h_1, h_2]^\top$ and the elements of $\underline{\mathbf{z}}$ are i.i.d. $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. All users make use of the same nested lattice codebook $\mathcal{L} = \Lambda_1 \cap \mathcal{V}_\Lambda$, where Λ has *second moment* $\sigma_\Lambda^2 \triangleq \frac{1}{n \text{Vol}(\mathcal{V})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} \|\underline{\mathbf{r}}\|^2 d\underline{\mathbf{r}} = \text{SNR}$. Each user k encodes its information message $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_k \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$ into the corresponding codeword $\underline{\mathbf{t}}_k = f(\underline{\mathbf{w}}_k)$ and produces its channel input according to

$$\underline{\mathbf{x}}_k = [\underline{\mathbf{t}}_k + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_k] \pmod{\Lambda}, \quad (7)$$

where the *dithering sequences* $\underline{\mathbf{d}}_k$'s are mutually independent across the users, uniformly distributed over \mathcal{V}_Λ , and known to the receiver. The decoder's goal is to recover a linear combination $\underline{\mathbf{v}} = [\sum_{k=1}^2 a_k \underline{\mathbf{t}}_k] \pmod{\Lambda}$ with *integer coefficient vector* $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, a_2]^\top \in \mathbb{Z}^2[j]$. Since Λ_1 is a $\mathbb{Z}[j]$ -module (closed under linear combinations with Gaussian integer coefficients), then $\underline{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathcal{L}$. Letting $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{v}}}$ be decoded codeword (for some decoding function which in general depends on \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{a}), we say that a computation rate R is achievable for this setting if there exists sequences of lattice codes \mathcal{L} of rate R and increasing block length n , such that the decoding error probability satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{v}}} \neq \underline{\mathbf{v}}) = 0$.

In the scheme of [16], the receiver computes

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\underline{\mathbf{y}}} &= \left[\alpha \underline{\mathbf{y}} - \sum_{k=1}^2 a_k \underline{\mathbf{d}}_k \right] \pmod{\Lambda} \\ &= [\underline{\mathbf{v}} + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha)] \pmod{\Lambda}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where

$$\underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha) = \sum_{k=1}^2 (\alpha h_k - a_k) \underline{\mathbf{x}}_k + \alpha \underline{\mathbf{z}} \quad (9)$$

denotes the *effective noise*, including the non-integer self-interference (due to the fact that $\alpha h_k \notin \mathbb{Z}[j]$ in general) and the additive Gaussian noise term. The scaling, dither removal and modulo- Λ operation in (8) is referred to as the *CoF receiver mapping* in the following. By minimizing the




Fig. 4. Distributed zero-forcing precoding for finite-field Network-Coded CIC. Differently from RLNC, the cognitive transmitter carefully chooses the coefficients of linear combination according to the channel coefficients q_{ij} 's.

variance of $\mathbf{z}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha)$ with respect to α , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma^2(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}) &= \min_{\alpha} \sigma_{z_{\text{eff}}}^2(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha) \\
 &= \text{SNR} \left(\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 - \frac{\text{SNR} |\mathbf{h}^H \mathbf{a}|^2}{1 + \text{SNR} \|\mathbf{h}\|^2} \right) \\
 &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{a}^H (\text{SNR}^{-1} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{h}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{a}
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where (a) follows from the matrix inversion lemma [18]. Since α is uniquely determined by \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{a} , it will be omitted in the following, for the sake of notation simplicity. From [16], we know that by applying lattice decoding to $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ given in (8) the following computation rate is achievable:

$$R(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{a}, \text{SNR}) = \log^+ \left(\frac{\text{SNR}}{\mathbf{a}^H (\text{SNR}^{-1} \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{h}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{a}} \right), \tag{11}$$

where $\log^+(x) \triangleq \max\{\log(x), 0\}$. The optimization of \mathbf{a} in order to yield the highest rate can be efficiently done using the complex LLL algorithm, possibly followed by Phost or Schnorr-Euchner enumeration of the non-zero lattice points in a sphere centered at the origin, with radius equal to the shortest vector found by complex LLL (see Algorithm 1 in [8]).

III. CAPACITY REGION FOR FINITE-FIELD NETWORK-CODED CIC

In order to build an intuition for Gaussian channel, we consider the corresponding finite-field model and show that *distributed zero-forcing precoding* achieves the capacity of finite-field

Network-Coded CIC. A block of n channel uses of the discrete-time finite-field IC is described by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \underline{\mathbf{y}}_1 \\ \underline{\mathbf{y}}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 \\ \underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \underline{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_1 \\ \underline{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_\ell \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ contains i.i.d. additive noise samples, and $q_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_q$ is the (i, j) -th element of \mathbf{Q} , denoting the channel coefficients from transmitter j to receiver i , assumed to be constant over the whole block of length n and known to all nodes.

Theorem 1: If $\det(\mathbf{Q}) \neq 0$ and $q_{11}, q_{21} \neq 0$, the capacity region of the finite-field Network-Coded CIC is the set of all rate pairs (R_1, R_2) such that

$$R_\ell \leq \log q - H(\zeta_\ell) \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2. \quad (13)$$

Proof: We first derive a simple upper bound by assuming the full transmitter cooperation. In this case, this model reduces to the finite-field vector broadcast channel. A trivial upper-bound on the broadcast capacity region is given by [19]:

$$R_\ell \leq \max_{P_{X_1, X_2}} I(X_1, X_2; Y_\ell) \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2 \quad (14)$$

This is the capacity of the single-user channel with transition probability $P_{Y_\ell|X_1, X_2}$. Due to the additive noise nature of the channel, we have $I(X_1, X_2; Y_\ell) = H(Y_\ell) - H(\zeta_\ell)$. Furthermore, $H(Y_\ell) \leq \log q$ and this upper bound is achieved by letting $(X_1, X_2) \sim \text{Uniform over } \mathbb{F}_q^2$. This bound coincides with (13).

Next, we derive an achievable rate using distributed zero-forcing precoding technique. Without loss of generality, it is assumed that $H(\zeta_1) \leq H(\zeta_2)$. We use two nested linear codes $\mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1$ where \mathcal{C}_ℓ has rate $R_\ell = \frac{r_\ell}{n} \log q$. Let $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_2$ be the zero-padded information messages to common length r_1 . The detailed procedures of distributed zero forcing technique is as follows (see Fig. 4).

- The cognitive transmitter produces the codewords $\underline{\mathbf{c}}_1 = \underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \mathbf{G}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{c}}_2 = \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2 \mathbf{G}$, and transmits the precoded codeword $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 = b_1 \underline{\mathbf{c}}_1 \oplus b_2 \underline{\mathbf{c}}_2$ with some coefficients $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q$
- The primary transmitter produces the codeword $\underline{\mathbf{c}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{c}}_2 = (\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2) \mathbf{G}$ and transmits the precoded codeword $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 = b_3 (\underline{\mathbf{c}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{c}}_2)$ with coefficient b_3 . The b_1, b_2 , and b_3 will be determined later on.

- Receiver 1 observes the $\underline{\mathbf{y}}_1$, given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\mathbf{y}}_1 &= q_{11}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 \oplus q_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 \oplus \underline{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_1 \\ &= \lambda_{11}\underline{\mathbf{c}}_1 \oplus \lambda_{12}\underline{\mathbf{c}}_2 \oplus \underline{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_1\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{11} = (q_{11}b_1 \oplus q_{12}b_3)$ and $\lambda_{12} = (q_{11}b_2 \oplus q_{12}b_3)$.

- Receiver 2 observes the $\underline{\mathbf{y}}_2$, given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\mathbf{y}}_2 &= q_{21}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 \oplus q_{22}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 \oplus \underline{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_2 \\ &= \lambda_{22}\underline{\mathbf{c}}_2 \oplus \lambda_{21}\underline{\mathbf{c}}_1 \oplus \underline{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_2\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{22} = (q_{21}b_2 \oplus q_{22}b_3)$ and $\lambda_{21} = (q_{21}b_1 \oplus q_{22}b_3)$.

The goal is to find a precoding vector $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, b_3)^\top$ to cancel interference at both receivers (i.e., such that $\lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = 0$), while preserving the desired codewords (i.e., such that $\lambda_{11}, \lambda_{22} \neq 0$). Equivalently, we want to find a non-zero vector \mathbf{b} to satisfy the following conditions:

- Condition 1 (*canceling the interferences*)

$$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0} \tag{15}$$

where

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & q_{11} & q_{12} \\ q_{21} & 0 & q_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

- Condition 2 (*preserving the desired signals*)

$$\det(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B}) = \lambda_{11}\lambda_{22} \neq 0 \tag{17}$$

where

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} b_1 & b_2 \\ b_3 & b_3 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

Since $\text{Rank}(\mathbf{C}) \leq 2$, there exist non-zero vectors $\mathbf{b}^* \in \text{Null}(\mathbf{C})$ that satisfies Condition 1. Since \mathbf{Q} has full rank, Condition 2 is equivalent to requiring that \mathbf{B} has rank 2, i.e., that $b_3(b_1 - b_2) \neq 0$. In short, we have to find the conditions for which a vector \mathbf{b} in the null-space of \mathbf{C} satisfies $b_3 \neq 0$ and $b_1 \neq b_2$. Assuming $q_{11} \neq 0$ and $q_{21} \neq 0$, we have that $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ yields

$$b_2 = -\frac{q_{12}}{q_{11}}b_3, \quad b_1 = -\frac{q_{22}}{q_{21}}b_3.$$

Using this in the expression of \mathbf{B} , we find that $\det(\mathbf{B}) \neq 0$ if we choose $b_3 \neq 0$ and if

$$-\frac{q_{12}}{q_{11}} + \frac{q_{22}}{q_{21}} = \frac{-q_{12}q_{21} + q_{11}q_{22}}{q_{11}q_{21}} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{Q})}{q_{11}q_{21}} \neq 0$$

By assumption, the above condition is always true, therefore we conclude that a vector \mathbf{b}^* satisfying Conditions 1 and 2 can always be found. In this case, the precoded channel decouples into two parallel additive noise channels

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}}_1 = \lambda_{11}\underline{\mathbf{c}}_1 \oplus \underline{\zeta}_1 \quad (19)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}}_2 = \lambda_{22}\underline{\mathbf{c}}_2 \oplus \underline{\zeta}_2, \quad (20)$$

for which rates $R_\ell \leq \log q - H(\zeta_\ell)$ are clearly achievable by linear coding [20]. \blacksquare

Remark 1: The capacity region of finite-field Network-Coded CIC under the assumptions of Theorem 1 is equivalent to the capacity region of the corresponding finite-field vector broadcast channel. In other words, partial cooperation and full cooperation yield the same performance if the primary transmitter knows the mixed message. \diamond

Remark 2: It is interesting to notice that if $q_{11} = 0$ and $\det(\mathbf{Q}) \neq 0$, then $q_{21}, q_{12} \neq 0$. This implies that \mathbf{b} in the null space of \mathbf{C} takes on the form $(0, b_2, 0)^\top$ for some $b_2 \neq 0$. If $q_{21} = 0$ and $\det(\mathbf{Q}) \neq 0$, then $q_{11}, q_{22} \neq 0$. This implies that \mathbf{b} in the null space of \mathbf{C} takes on the form $(b_1, 0, 0)^\top$ for some $b_1 \neq 0$. In both cases, $\det(\mathbf{B}) = 0$ and interference cannot be removed without eliminating the useful signal at one of the two receivers. \diamond

The observation in the above remark is strengthened by the following unfeasibility result:

Lemma 1: Perfect channel decoupling is not possible if the conditions of Theorem 1 do not hold.

Proof: We will show that if the conditions of Theorem 1 are not satisfied, then it is not possible to achieve the sum rate of two perfectly decoupled channels, i.e., the sum rate is lower than $2 \log q - (H(\tilde{\zeta}_1) + H(\tilde{\zeta}_2))$. We employ the upper bounds derived in Appendix A such as

$$\min\{R_1, R_2\} \leq \min\{I(X_1; Y_1|X_2), I(X_1; Y_2|X_2)\} \quad (21)$$

$$\max\{R_1, R_2\} \leq \max\{I(X_1, X_2; Y_1), I(X_1, X_2; Y_2)\} = \log q - \min\{H(\zeta_1), H(\zeta_2)\}. \quad (22)$$

Notice that the sum rate is equal to $\min\{R_1, R_2\} + \max\{R_1, R_2\}$. When $q_{11} = 0$, the receiver 1 observes the $Y_1 = q_{12}X_2 \oplus \zeta_1$. Then, we have that $\min\{R_1, R_2\} = 0$ since $I(X_1; Y_1|X_2) = H(Y_1|X_2) - H(Y_1|X_1, X_2) = 0$. Using (21) and (22), we have that $R_1 + R_2 \leq \log q -$

$\min\{H(\zeta_1), H(\zeta_2)\}$. Similarly when $q_{21} = 0$, i.e, $Y_2 = q_{22}X_2 \oplus \zeta_2$, the $\min\{R_1, R_2\} = 0$ is also zero because of $I(X_1; Y_2|X_2) = 0$. Thus, we have that $R_1 + R_2 \leq \log q - \min\{H(\zeta_1), H(\zeta_2)\}$. In both cases, the sum rates are strictly less than $2\log q - (H(\tilde{\zeta}_1) + H(\tilde{\zeta}_2))$. ■

A. Aligned Precoded Compute-and-Forward

Motivated by the above result, we present a novel scheme named *Precoded Compute-and-Forward* (PCoF) for Gaussian Network-Coded CIC. Using CoF decoding, each receiver can reliably decode an integer linear combination of the lattice codewords sent by transmitters. Provided that the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied, the ‘‘interference’’ in the finite-field domain can be completely eliminated by distributed zero-forcing precoding over the finite-field. In order to achieve different coding rates while preserving the lattice $\mathbb{Z}[j]$ -module structure, we use a *family* of nested lattices $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_2 \subseteq \Lambda_1$, obtained by a nested construction A as described in [16, Sect. IV.A]. In particular, we let $\Lambda_\ell = p^{-1}g(\mathcal{C}_\ell)\mathbf{T} + \Lambda$ with $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^n[j]\mathbf{T}$ and with \mathcal{C}_ℓ denoting the linear code over \mathbb{F}_q with $q = p^2$ generated by the first r_ℓ rows of a common generator matrix \mathbf{G} , with $r_2 \leq r_1$. The corresponding nested lattice codes are given by $\mathcal{L}_\ell = \Lambda_\ell \cap \mathcal{V}_\Lambda$, and have rate $R_\ell = \frac{r_\ell}{n} \log q$. We let $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2]^\top \in \mathbb{Z}[j]^{2 \times 2}$, where \mathbf{a}_ℓ denotes the integer coefficients vector used at receiver ℓ for the modulo- Λ receiver mapping (see (8)), and we let $\mathbf{Q} = g^{-1}([\mathbf{A}] \bmod p\mathbb{Z}[j]) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{2 \times 2}$. For the time being, it is assumed that $\det(\mathbf{Q}), q_{11}, q_{21} \neq 0$ over \mathbb{F}_q . PCoF proceeds as follows:

- The cognitive transmitter has $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_2$.
- The cognitive and primary transmitters produce the precoded messages:

$$\underline{\mathbf{u}}_1 = b_1 \underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus b_2 \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2 \quad (23)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{u}}_2 = b_3 (\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2) \quad (24)$$

where $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ is a non-zero vector $\mathbf{b} \in \text{Null}(\mathbf{C})$ as defined in (16).

- Each transmitter ℓ produces the lattice codeword $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_\ell = f(\underline{\mathbf{u}}_\ell) \in \mathcal{L}_1$ (the densest lattice code) and transmits the channel inputs $\underline{\mathbf{x}}_\ell = [\underline{\mathbf{v}}_\ell + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_\ell] \bmod \Lambda$, where *dithering sequences* $\underline{\mathbf{d}}_\ell$'s are mutually independent across the transmitters, uniformly distributed over \mathcal{V}_Λ , and known to the receivers.

Because of linearity, the precoding and the encoding over the finite-field commute. Therefore, we can write

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 = g(b_1)\underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 + g(b_2)\underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (25)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 = g(b_3)\underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 + g(b_3)\underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (26)$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{t}}_\ell = f(\underline{\mathbf{w}}_\ell)$. As shown in the proof of Theorem 1, the chosen precoding vector $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ satisfies the Condition 2 such as

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{11}, \lambda_{22}) \text{ for some } \lambda_{11}, \lambda_{22} \neq 0 \quad (27)$$

where \mathbf{B} is defined in (18).

Each receiver ℓ applied the CoF receiver mapping as in (8), with integer coefficients vector \mathbf{a}_ℓ and scaling factor α_ℓ , yielding

$$\hat{\underline{\mathbf{y}}}_\ell = \left[\mathbf{a}_\ell^\top \begin{bmatrix} \underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 \\ \underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 \end{bmatrix} + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{h}_\ell, \mathbf{a}_\ell, \alpha_\ell) \right] \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (28)$$

$$= \left[\mathbf{a}_\ell^\top g(\mathbf{B}) \begin{bmatrix} \underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 \\ \underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 \end{bmatrix} + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{h}_\ell, \mathbf{a}_\ell, \alpha_\ell) \right] \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (29)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left[([\mathbf{a}_\ell^\top g(\mathbf{B})] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]}) \begin{bmatrix} \underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 \\ \underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 \end{bmatrix} + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{h}_\ell, \mathbf{a}_\ell, \alpha_\ell) \right] \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (30)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} [g(\lambda_{\ell\ell})\underline{\mathbf{t}}_\ell + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{h}_\ell, \mathbf{a}_\ell, \alpha_\ell)] \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (31)$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $[p\underline{\mathbf{t}}] \pmod{\Lambda} = \underline{\mathbf{0}}$ for any codeword $\underline{\mathbf{t}} \in \lambda_\ell$ and (b) is due to the following result:

Lemma 2: Let $\mathbf{Q} = g^{-1}([\mathbf{A}] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]})$. If $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{11}, \lambda_{22})$ then we have

$$[\mathbf{A}g(\mathbf{B})] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]} = \text{diag}(g(\lambda_{11}), g(\lambda_{22})). \quad (32)$$

Proof: Using $[\mathbf{A}] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]} = g(\mathbf{Q})$, we have:

$$[\mathbf{A}g(\mathbf{B})] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]} = [([\mathbf{A}] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]})g(\mathbf{B})] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]} \quad (33)$$

$$= [g(\mathbf{Q})g(\mathbf{B})] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]} \quad (34)$$

$$= [g(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{B})] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]} \quad (35)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} [g(\text{diag}(\lambda_{11}, \lambda_{22}))] \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}[j]} \quad (36)$$

$$= \text{diag}(g(\lambda_{11}), g(\lambda_{22})) \quad (37)$$

where (a) follows from lemma assumption. ■

From [16], we know that by applying lattice decoding to $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_\ell$, each receiver ℓ can decode the desired messages if

$$R_\ell \leq R(\mathbf{h}_\ell, \mathbf{a}_\ell, \text{SNR}). \quad (38)$$

In addition we introduce an ‘‘Aligned’’ PCoF in order to alleviate the impact of non-integer penalty. In this scheme, each transmitter ℓ scales its signal by some constant $\beta_\ell \in \mathcal{P}$ where $\mathcal{P} = \{\beta_\ell \in \mathbb{C} : \|\beta_\ell\| \leq 1\}$. This choice of β_ℓ guarantees the power constraint of transmitted signals. Then, the effective channel matrix induced is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = [\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_2]^\top = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1 h_{11} & \beta_2 h_{12} \\ \beta_1 h_{21} & \beta_2 h_{22} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (39)$$

Theorem 2: Aligned PCoF applied to Gaussian Network-Coded CIC with $\mathbf{H} = [h_{ij}]^\top \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ achieves the rate pairs (R_1, R_2) such that

$$R_\ell \leq \log^+ \left(\frac{\text{SNR}}{\mathbf{a}_\ell^\text{H} (\text{SNR}^{-1} \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_\ell \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_\ell^\text{H})^{-1} \mathbf{a}_\ell} \right) \quad (40)$$

for any full rank matrix $\mathbf{A} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2]^\top$ with $a_{11}, a_{21} \neq 0$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{P}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_\ell = [\beta_1 h_{\ell 1}, \beta_2 h_{\ell 2}]$. ■

IV. AN ACHIEVABLE RATE REGION FOR GAUSSIAN NETWORK-CODED CIC

It was shown in Section III that the distributed zero-forcing precoding is optimal for finite-field Network-Coded CIC. In Gaussian channel, however, the channel coefficients are not integers and hence Aligned PCoF may not be optimal due to the non-integer penalty. Using the fact that the cognitive transmitter has non-causal information of the primary transmitter signal, it can totally eliminate the known interference at its own intended receiver by using DPC. Also, we can remove the non-integer penalty at receiver 2 using Aligned PCoF by carefully choosing the β . In other words, Aligned PCoF cannot simultaneously remove the non-integer penalty at both receivers while it can *completely* cancel it at one receiver.

We let $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, a_2] \in \mathbb{Z}[j]^2$ denote the integer coefficients vector used at receiver 2 for the modulo- Λ receiver mapping (8), and we let $q_\ell = g^{-1}(a_\ell \bmod p\mathbb{Z}[j])$. Again, it is assumed that $q_1, q_2 \neq 0$ over \mathbb{F}_q . The proposed achievability scheme proceeds as follows (see Fig. 5):




Fig. 5. Encoding and decoding structures of proposed scheme. The cognitive transmitter performs the DPC and the primary transmitter performs the PCoF.

- The primary transmitter produces the lattice codeword $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 = f(\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2)$ and transmits the following channel inputs:

$$\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 = [\underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_2] \pmod{\Lambda}. \quad (41)$$

- The cognitive transmitter produces the precoded message $b\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1$ where $b \in \mathbb{F}_q$ is given by

$$q_1 b \oplus q_2 = 0 \Rightarrow b = (q_1)^{-1}(-q_2) \quad (42)$$

where $(q_1)^{-1}$ denotes the multiplicative inverse of q_1 and $(-q_2)$ denotes the additive inverse of q_2 .

- The cognitive transmitter performs DPC using the known interference signal $h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2$ to get:

$$\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 = [\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 - \alpha_1(h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2) + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1] \pmod{\Lambda}, \quad (43)$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 = f(b\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1)$. The known interference signal is in fact generated by using the knowledge of the message $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1 \oplus \underline{\mathbf{w}}_2$, the dense lattice codebooks, and the dithering sequence $\underline{\mathbf{d}}_2$ (see Fig. 5). The $\underline{\mathbf{d}}_\ell$'s are mutually independent across the transmitters, uniformly distributed over \mathcal{V}_Λ , and known to all nodes.

Because of linearity, the precoding and the encoding over the finite-field commute. Therefore, we can write

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 = g(b)\underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (44)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 = \underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 + \underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 \pmod{\Lambda} \quad (45)$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 = f(\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1)$ and $\underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 = f(\underline{\mathbf{w}}_2)$. Receivers 1 and 2 observe the $\underline{\mathbf{y}}_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{y}}_2$:

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}}_1 = h_{11}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 + h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_1 \quad (46)$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{y}}_2 = h_{21}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 + h_{22}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_2. \quad (47)$$

Receiver 1 computes $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{y}}}_1 = [\alpha_1 \underline{\mathbf{y}}_1 - \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1] \bmod \Lambda$. Then the resulting channel is a mod- Λ additive noise channel as

$$\hat{\underline{\mathbf{y}}}_1 = [\alpha_1 [h_{11}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_1 + h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_1] - \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1] \bmod \Lambda \quad (48)$$

$$= [\alpha_1 [h_{11}\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 - \alpha_1 h_{11}(h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2) + h_{11}\underline{\mathbf{d}}_1 + h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_1] - \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1] \bmod \Lambda \quad (49)$$

$$= [\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 - (1 - \alpha_1 h_{11})\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \alpha_1(1 - \alpha_1 h_{11})h_{12}\underline{\mathbf{x}}_2 - (1 - \alpha_1 h_{11})\underline{\mathbf{d}}_1 + \alpha_1 \underline{\mathbf{z}}_1] \bmod \Lambda \quad (50)$$

$$= [\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 - (1 - \alpha_1 h_{11})\underline{\mathbf{d}}_1 + \alpha_1 \underline{\mathbf{z}}_1] \bmod \Lambda. \quad (51)$$

The variance of effective noise is defined as $\sigma^2(\alpha_1) = (1 - \alpha_1 h_{11})^H (1 - \alpha_1 h_{11}) \text{SNR} + \alpha_1^H \alpha_1$.

Since this is quadratic in α_1 , it can be uniquely minimized by setting its first derivative to zero:

$$\frac{d\sigma^2(\alpha_1)}{d\alpha_1} = 2\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_1 |h_{11}|^2 \text{SNR} - 2h_{11}^H \text{SNR} = 0. \quad (52)$$

We solve this to get $\alpha_{1,\text{MMSE}} = \frac{\text{SNR} h_{11}^H}{1 + |h_{11}|^2 \text{SNR}}$ and plug back into $\sigma^2(\alpha_{1,\text{MMSE}})$:

$$\sigma^2(\alpha_{1,\text{MMSE}}) = \frac{\text{SNR}}{1 + |h_{11}|^2 \text{SNR}}. \quad (53)$$

Finally, receiver 1 decodes the desired message $\underline{\mathbf{w}}_1$ if

$$R_1 \leq \log(1 + |h_{11}|^2 \text{SNR}). \quad (54)$$

Letting $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = [h_{21}, h_{22} - \alpha_{1,\text{MMSE}} h_{12} h_{21}]$, receiver 2 applies the CoF receiver mapping as in (8), with integer coefficients vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{Z}[j]^2$ and scaling factor α_2 , yielding

$$\hat{\underline{\mathbf{y}}}_2 = [\alpha_2 \underline{\mathbf{y}}_2 - a_1 \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1 - a_2 \underline{\mathbf{d}}_2] \bmod \Lambda \quad (55)$$

$$= [\alpha_2 (h_{21} [\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 - \alpha_{1,\text{MMSE}} h_{12} (\underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_2)] + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1) + h_{22} (\underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_2) - a_1 \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1 - a_2 \underline{\mathbf{d}}_2] \bmod \Lambda \quad (56)$$

$$= [\alpha_2 (h_{21} [\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1] + (h_{22} - \alpha_{1,\text{MMSE}} h_{12} h_{21}) (\underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{d}}_2)) - a_1 \underline{\mathbf{d}}_1 - a_2 \underline{\mathbf{d}}_2] \bmod \Lambda \quad (57)$$

$$= \left[\mathbf{a}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \underline{\mathbf{v}}_1 \\ \underline{\mathbf{v}}_2 \end{bmatrix} + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha_2) \right] \bmod \Lambda \quad (58)$$

$$= \left[\left(\mathbf{a}^\top \begin{bmatrix} g(b) & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \bmod p\mathbb{Z}[j] \right) \begin{bmatrix} \underline{\mathbf{t}}_1 \\ \underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 \end{bmatrix} + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha_2) \right] \bmod \Lambda \quad (59)$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} [[a_2] \bmod p\mathbb{Z}[j]] \underline{\mathbf{t}}_2 + \underline{\mathbf{z}}_{\text{eff}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha_2) \bmod \Lambda \quad (60)$$

where (a) follows from the fact that the b is chosen to satisfy the (42), i.e., $a_1g(b) + a_2 \bmod p\mathbb{Z}[j] = 0$.

From [16], we know that by applying lattice decoding to $\hat{\underline{y}}_2$, receiver 2 can decode its messages if

$$R_2 \leq R(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{a}, \text{SNR}). \quad (61)$$

As introduced in Section III, we can employ the Aligned PCoF to mitigate the non-integer penalty at receiver 2, where the primary transmitter only scales its signal by some constant $\beta \in \mathcal{P}$. In this way, the rate R_1 in (64) is preserved, and the rate R_2 can be rewritten as a function of $\beta \in \mathcal{P}$ as:

$$R_2(\beta) = R(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{a}, \text{SNR}), \quad (62)$$

where now we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \left[h_{21}, \beta \left(h_{22} - \frac{\text{SNR}}{1 + \|h_{11}\|^2 \text{SNR}} h_{11}^H h_{12} h_{21} \right) \right], \quad (63)$$

for some $\beta \in \mathcal{P}$. Hence, we have proved the following:

Theorem 3: Aligned PCoF and DPC applied to Gaussian Network-Coded CIC with $\mathbf{H} = [h_{ij}] \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ achieves the rate pairs (R_1, R_2) such that

$$R_1 \leq \log(1 + \|h_{11}\|^2 \text{SNR}) \quad (64)$$

$$R_2 \leq \log^+ \left(\frac{\text{SNR}}{\mathbf{a}^H (\text{SNR}^{-1} \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{h}} \tilde{\mathbf{h}}^H)^{-1} \mathbf{a}} \right) \quad (65)$$

for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}[j]^2$ with $a_1, a_2 \neq 0$ and any $\beta \in \mathcal{P}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ is given in (63). \blacksquare

Example 1: We evaluate the performance of proposed schemes with respect to their average achievable sum rates. We computed the *ergodic* sum rates by Monte Carlo averaging with respect to the channel realizations with $h_{ij} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. Also, we considered the performance of full-cooperation (i.e., vector broadcast channel with sum-power constraint) as a simple upper bound. The capacity of this channel can be computed using the efficient algorithm provided in [21], based on Lagrangian duality. In Fig. 6, Aligned PCoF shows the satisfactory performance in the moderate SNRs (i.e., $\text{SNR} < 20$ dB). Yet, this scheme seems to suffer from the non-integer penalty at high SNRs, having a larger gap with Aligned PCoF and DPC. It is noticeable that Aligned PCoF and DPC almost achieves the performance of full-cooperation within a constant gap.




Fig. 6. Average sum rates for Gaussian Network-Coded CIC with channel coefficients $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$.

V. GENERALIZED DEGREES OF FREEDOM

In the high SNR regime, a useful proxy for the performance of wireless networks is provided by the sum Degree-of-Freedom (DoF), which is the pre-log factor (multiplexing gain) in the expression of the sum capacity in terms of SNR. In this section we study the symmetric Generalized DoF (GDoF) as introduced in [2], which is a more refined proxy for the high-SNR performance, capturing the relative strength of direct and interference links. We considering the following channel model:

$$\underline{y}_1 = h_{11}\sqrt{\text{SNR}}\underline{x}_1 + h_{12}\sqrt{\text{INR}}\underline{x}_2 + \underline{z}_1 \quad (66)$$

$$\underline{y}_2 = h_{21}\sqrt{\text{INR}}\underline{x}_1 + h_{22}\sqrt{\text{SNR}}\underline{x}_2 + \underline{z}_2 \quad (67)$$

where $h_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$ are bounded non-zero constants independent of SNR, INR, \underline{z}_ℓ is the i.i.d. Gaussian noise $\sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$, and $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[\|\underline{x}_\ell\|^2] \leq 1$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. The channel is parameterized by SNR and INR, both growing to infinity. The way these parameters grow to infinity is defined by $\rho > 0$, given by

$$\rho = \frac{\log \text{INR}}{\log \text{SNR}}, \quad (68)$$

i.e., by letting $\text{INR} = \text{SNR}^\rho$ as $\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty$.

The sum GDoF is defined by

$$d_{\text{sum}}(\rho) = \lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_{\text{sum}}}{\log \text{SNR}}. \quad (69)$$

The main result of this section is given by:

Theorem 4: For the Gaussian Network-Coded CIC, the sum symmetric GDoF is given by

$$d_{\text{sum}}(\rho) = 1 + \rho. \quad (70)$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

In order to demonstrate the benefit gain of the mixed message at the primary transmitter, we compare the sum GDoF of Gaussian IC and Gaussian CIC. The GDoF of Gaussian IC is computed in [2], and it is given by

$$d_{\text{sum}}(\rho) = \begin{cases} 2(1 - \rho), & 0 \leq \rho < \frac{1}{2} \\ 2\rho, & \frac{1}{2} \leq \rho < \frac{2}{3} \\ 2 - \rho, & \frac{2}{3} \leq \rho < 1 \\ \rho, & 1 \leq \rho < 2 \\ 2, & \rho \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (71)$$

Also, from the constant gap result in [12], we can immediately compute the GDoF of Gaussian CIC such as

$$d_{\text{sum}}(\rho) = \begin{cases} 2 - \rho, & \rho \leq 1 \\ \rho, & \rho > 1. \end{cases} \quad (72)$$

The GDoFs of three channels are plotted in Fig. 3.

It is also immediate to observe that the sum GDoF of full-cooperation is given by $d_{\text{sum}} = 2 \times \max\{1, \rho\}$. In this case, the upper bound can be obtained from the 2×2 MIMO capacity with full CSI, and an easily analyzable achievable scheme consists of employing simple linear precoding given by $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}^{-1}$, where

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } \rho \leq 1 \text{ and } \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ for } \rho > 1. \quad (73)$$

Based on the above results, we can conclude that network-coded CIC achieves the same GDoF of full-cooperation when $\rho = 1$, and is strictly worse than full cooperation when $\rho > 1$ or $\rho < 1$. Further, the network-coded CIC is better than the conventional CIC when $\rho \geq 1/2$ and better than the non-cognitive IC when $\rho \geq 1/3$.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We investigated a two-user cognitive interference channel (CIC), in the case where the “primary” transmitter knows a linear combination of the information messages. First, we characterized the capacity region of the finite-field Network Coded CIC, based on the *distributed zero-forcing precoding* technique. We extended this scheme to the Gaussian case by using the framework of Compute-and-Forward (CoF). Our new proposed scheme is referred to as Precoded CoF (PCoF). Further, we introduced “Aligned” PCoF where each transmitter scales its signal by some constant, in order to create more favorable channel for the integer-forcing CoF receiver mapping. We also provided an achievability technique that combines DPC with Aligned PCoF, and argued that this scheme does not suffer from integer penalty and is able to achieve the cooperative vector broadcast channel outer bound (full cooperation of transmitters). Finally, the proposed combination of Aligned PCoF and Dirty Paper Coding, based on nested lattice codes, allowed us to characterize the sum generalized degrees-of-freedom of the Gaussian Network-Coded CIC. In particular, our result shows the surprising fact that, in certain regimes of the SNR/INR scaling region, network-coded cognition yields an unbounded gain (i.e., multiplicative gain) in the Gaussian CIC, with respect to the classical cognitive transmitter model.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF THEOREM 4

A. Achievable scheme

For the achievability of GDoF, we employ the Aligned PCoF and DPC, and provide a specific β for the alignment scheme. The achievable rate for any β is given in Theorem 3. It is immediately shown that the achievable GDoF of the cognitive transmitter is 1, obtained by

$$d_1(\rho) = \lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1 + \|h_{11}\|^2 \text{SNR})}{\log \text{SNR}} = 1. \quad (74)$$

In this proof, we will show that the primary transmitter can achieve the ρ GDoF by carefully determining the β . Recall that the effective channel for Aligned PCoF is given by

$$\mathbf{h} = [h_{21}\sqrt{\text{INR}}, h_{22}\sqrt{\text{SNR}} - h\text{INR}] \quad (75)$$

where $h = \frac{\text{SNR}}{1 + \|h_{11}\|^2 \text{SNR}} h_{11}^H h_{12} h_{21}$. The channel coefficients can be rewritten in the following way:

$$\mathbf{h} = \text{SNR}^{\rho/2} [h_{21}, \tilde{h}_{22}] \quad (76)$$

where $\tilde{h}_{22} = h_{22}\text{SNR}^{(1-\rho)/2} - h\text{SNR}^{\rho/2}$. For the Aligned PCoF, we determine the $\beta^* = \frac{h_{21}}{h_{22}\gamma}$, where $\gamma \geq 1$ is an integer with

$$\gamma = \left\lceil \left\| \frac{h_{21}}{\tilde{h}_{22}} \right\| \right\rceil \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (77)$$

This guarantees that $\beta^* \in \mathcal{P}$ (i.e., satisfying the power constraint) and creates a kind of ‘‘aligned’’ channel coefficients:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \text{SNR}^{\rho/2}[h_{21}, \beta\tilde{h}_{22}] = \text{SNR}^{\rho/2}[h_{21}, h_{21}/\gamma]. \quad (78)$$

Letting $\alpha = \frac{\gamma}{h_{21}\text{SNR}^{\rho/2}}$, $a_1 = \gamma$, and $a_2 = 1$, the effective noise in (9) is obtained by

$$\mathbf{z}_{\text{eff}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{a}, \alpha) = (\alpha\text{SNR}^{\rho/2}h_{21} - a_1)\mathbf{x}_1 + (\alpha\text{SNR}^{\rho/2}h_{21}/\gamma - a_2)\mathbf{x}_2 + \alpha\mathbf{z}_2 \quad (79)$$

$$= \frac{\gamma}{h_{21}\text{SNR}^{\rho/2}}\mathbf{z}_2. \quad (80)$$

This shows that non-integer penalty is completely eliminated. Also, we can use the zero forcing precoding over \mathbb{F}_q since the integer coefficients a_1 and a_2 are non-zero. From this, we have the lower bound on the achievable rate of Aligned PCoF as

$$\max_{\beta} R_2(\beta) \geq R_2(\beta^*) = \rho \log(\|h_{21}\|^2\text{SNR}) - 2 \log(\gamma). \quad (81)$$

The lower and upper bounds on γ is given by

$$1 \leq \gamma \leq 1 + \left\| \frac{h_{21}}{h_{22}\text{SNR}^{(1-\rho)/2} - h\text{SNR}^{\rho/2}} \right\|. \quad (82)$$

Notice that γ converges to 1 as $\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty$ since its upper bound converges to 1. Finally, the achievable GDoF of the primary transmitter is derived as

$$d_2(\rho) = \lim_{\text{SNR}, \text{INR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\max_{\beta} R_2(\beta)}{\log \text{SNR}} \geq \lim_{\text{SNR}, \text{INR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_2(\beta^*)}{\log \text{SNR}} = \rho. \quad (83)$$

From (74) and (83), the achievable sum GDoF is $1 + \rho$.

B. Converse

For given rates R_1 and R_2 , we define $R_{\text{sym}} = \min\{R_1, R_2\}$ and $\tilde{R} = \max\{R_1, R_2\} - R_{\text{sym}}$. Then, the messages W_1 and W_2 can be rewritten in the following way. If $R_1 > R_2$ then $W_1 = (M_1, \tilde{M})$ and $W_2 = (M_2, \mathbf{0})$. In the reverse case, we have that $W_1 = (M_1, \mathbf{0})$ and $W_2 = (M_2, \tilde{M})$. In both cases, the primary transmitter knows the linear combination, $W_1 \oplus W_2 = (M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M})$. Notice that $H(M_1) = H(M_2) = R_{\text{sym}}$ and $H(\tilde{M}) = \tilde{R}$. From the well-known Crypto Lemma [22], the $M_1 \oplus M_2$ is statistically independent of M_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$. In this proof, we derive the

upper bounds on R_{sym} and $R_{sym} + \tilde{R}$. Then the summation of two bounds becomes the upper bound on $R_1 + R_2$.

First, we derive the upper bound on the symmetric rate R_{sym} as

$$\begin{aligned}
nR_{sym} &= H(M_1) = H(M_1|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) \\
&= H(M_1|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) - H(M_1|Y_1^n, M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) + H(M_1|Y_1^n, M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} I(M_1; Y_1^n|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= h(Y_1^n|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) - h(Y_1^n|M_1, M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= h(Y_1^n|X_2^n) - h(Y_1^n|X_1^n, X_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= I(X_1^n; Y_1^n|X_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&\leq n(\log(1 + \|h_{11}\|^2\text{SNR}) + \epsilon_n)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the Fano's inequality and data processing inequality as

$$H(M_1|Y_1^n, M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) \leq H(M_1|Y_1^n) \leq H(M_1|\hat{M}_1) \leq n\epsilon_n. \quad (84)$$

Similarly, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
nR_{sym} &= H(M_2) = H(M_2|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) \\
&= H(M_2|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) - H(M_2|Y_2^n, M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) + H(M_2|Y_2^n, M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) \\
&\leq I(M_2; Y_2^n|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= h(Y_2^n|M_1 \oplus M_2, \tilde{M}) - h(Y_2^n|M_1 \oplus M_2, M_2, \tilde{M}) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= h(Y_2^n|X_2^n) - h(Y_2^n|X_1^n, X_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&= I(X_1^n; Y_2^n|X_2^n) + n\epsilon_n \\
&\leq n(\log(1 + \|h_{21}\|^2\text{INR}) + \epsilon_n).
\end{aligned}$$

From the above, we have the upper bound on R_{sym} as

$$R_{sym} \leq \min\{\log(1 + \|h_{11}\|^2\text{SNR}), \log(1 + \|h_{21}\|^2\text{INR})\}. \quad (85)$$

The upper bound on R_ℓ can be computed as

$$nR_\ell \leq H(W_\ell) \quad (86)$$

$$= H(W_\ell) - H(W_\ell|Y_\ell^n) + H(W_\ell|Y_\ell^n) \quad (87)$$

$$\leq I(W_\ell; Y_\ell^n) + n\epsilon_n \quad (88)$$

$$= h(Y_\ell^n) - h(Y_\ell^n|W_\ell) + n\epsilon_n \quad (89)$$

$$\leq h(Y_\ell^n) - h(Y_\ell^n|W_1, W_2) + n\epsilon_n \quad (90)$$

$$= n(I(X_1^n, X_2^n; Y_\ell^n) + \epsilon_n) \quad (91)$$

$$\leq n(1 + \log(\|h_{\ell 1}\|^2 \text{SNR} + \|h_{\ell 2}\|^2 \text{INR}) + \epsilon_n). \quad (92)$$

Since $R_{sym} + \tilde{R} = \max\{R_1, R_2\}$, we have:

$$R_{sym} + \tilde{R} \leq \max\{\log(1 + \|h_{11}\|^2 \text{SNR} + \|h_{12}\|^2 \text{INR}), \log(1 + \|h_{21}\|^2 \text{SNR} + \|h_{22}\|^2 \text{INR})\}. \quad (93)$$

Using (85), (93), and $\text{INR} = \text{SNR}^\rho$, we have the upper bounds in the asymptotic case:

$$\lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_{sym}}{\log \text{SNR}} \leq \min\{1, \rho\} \quad (94)$$

$$\lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_{sym} + \tilde{R}}{\log \text{SNR}} \leq \max\{1, \rho\}. \quad (95)$$

Finally we have the upper bound on the sum GDoF as

$$d_{\text{sum}} = \lim_{\text{SNR} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2R_{sym} + \tilde{R}}{\log \text{SNR}} \leq 1 + \rho. \quad (96)$$

This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Kramer, "Review of rate regions for interference channels," in *proceedings of International Zurich Seminar on Communications*, Zurich, Switzerland, Feb. 2006.
- [2] R. Etkin, D. N. C. Tse, and H. Wang, "Gaussian interference channel capacity to within one bit," *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, vol. 54, pp. 5534-5562, Dec. 2008.
- [3] E. Telatar and D. Tse, "Bounds on the capacity region of a class of interference channel," in *proceedings of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Nice, France, Jun 2007.
- [4] T. Flanagan, "Creating cloud base stations with TI's KeyStone multicore architecture," *Texas Instruments White Paper* Oct., 2011.
- [5] Y. Lin, L. Shao, Z. Zhu, Q. Wang and R. K. Sankar, "Wireless network cloud: Architecture and system requirements," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 54, pp. 4:1 - 4:12, 2010.

- [6] I. Maric', B. Bostjancic, and A. Goldsmith, "Resource allocation for constrained backhaul in picocell networks," in *Proceedings of Information Theory and Application Workshop*, pp. 1-6, La Jolla, CA, USA, Feb. 2011.
- [7] S. Hong and G. Caire, "Reverse Compute and Forward: A Low-Complexity Architecture of Downlink Distributed Antenna System," in *proceedings of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Cambridge, MA, Jul. 2012.
- [8] S.-N. Hong and G. Caire, "Lattice Coding Strategies for Cooperative Distributed Antenna Systems," *submitted to IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, Oct. 2012. [Online] Available:<http://arxiv.org/abs/1210.0160>.
- [9] I. Maric, R. D. Yates, and G. Kramer, "Capacity of interference channels with partial transmitter cooperation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 53, pp. 3536-3548, Oct. 2007.
- [10] W. Wu, S. Vishwanath, and A. Arapostathis, "Capacity of a class of cognitive radio channels: Interference channels with degraded message sets," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 53, pp. 4391-4399, Nov. 2007.
- [11] A. Jovicic and P. Viswanath, "Cognitive radio: An information-theoretic perspective," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 3945-3958, Sept. 2009.
- [12] S. Rini, D. Tuninetti, and N. Devroye, "The Capacity Region of Gaussian Cognitive Radio Channels to within 1.87 bits," in *proceedings of IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Cairo, Egypt, Jan. 2010.
- [13] L. R. Ford and D. R. Fulkerson, "Maximal flow through a network," *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 8, pp. 399-404, 1956.
- [14] R. Ahlswede, N. Cai, S.-Y. R. Li, and R. W. Yeung, "Network information flow," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, pp. 371-381, Feb. 2003.
- [15] T. Ho, M. Medard, R. Koetter, D. R. Karger, M. Effros, J. Shi, and B. Leong, "A Random Linear Network Coding Approach to Multicast," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 4413-4430, Oct. 2006.
- [16] B. Nazer and M. Gastpar, "Compute-and-Forward: Harnessing Interference through Structured Codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, pp. 6463-6486, Oct. 2011.
- [17] U. Erez and R. Zamir, "Achieving $\frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \text{SNR})$ on the AWGN channel with lattice encoding and decoding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 50, pp. 2293-2314, Oct. 2004.
- [18] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [19] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, "Network Information Theory," Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [20] R. L. Dobrushin, "Asymptotic optimality of group and systematic codes for some channels," *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, vol. 8, pp. 47-59, 1963.
- [21] H. Hoon, H. Papadopoulos, and G. Caire, "MIMO broadcast channel optimization under general linear constraint," in *Proceedings of IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Austin, Tx, Jun 2010.
- [22] G. D. Forney, Jr, "On the role of MMSE estimation in approaching the information-theoretic limits of linear Gaussian channels: Shannon meets Wiener," in *proceedings of Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, Monticello, IL, 2003.