

On the Performance of Linear Slepian-Wolf Codes for Correlated Stationary Memoryless Sources

Shengtian Yang and Peiliang Qiu

Department of Information Science & Electronic Engineering,

Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China

Email: yangshengtian@zju.edu.cn; qiupl@zju.edu.cn

Abstract

We derive an upper bound on the average MAP decoding error probability of random linear SW codes for arbitrary correlated stationary memoryless sources defined on Galois fields. By using this tool, we analyze the performance of SW codes based on LDPC codes and random permutations, and show that under some conditions, all but diminishingly small proportion of LDPC encoders and permutations are good enough for the design of practical SW systems when the coding length is very large.

1 Introduction

Among various types of coding problems of correlated sources, the separate coding problem for correlated sources (usually called the Slepian-Wolf (SW) coding problem) is typical and basic. It was first solved by Slepian and Wolf in [1]. In their paper, Slepian and Wolf proved that there exists a pair of encoders such that separate coding can achieve the same compression performance as joint source coding when the correlated sources are stationary and memoryless. It is a very surprising result and is now usually called the Slepian-Wolf (SW) theorem. The SW theorem was later generalized by Cover to the setting of stationary and ergodic sources [2], and Miyake and Kanaya further established the SW theorem for general sources with information-spectrum methods [3]. The corresponding universal coding problem was also investigated in depth, e.g., Csiszár and Körner [4], Csiszár [5], Oohama and Han [6], and Uyematsu [7], and type theory plays an important role in the research of universal SW coding problems. In [5], Csiszár proved the existence of universal linear SW codes for stationary memoryless sources. It is a very inspiring fact for the design of SW coding systems. However till now, most research in theory except [8] and [9] used pure random coding techniques that are non-constructive.

This work was supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant NSFC-60472079 and by the Chinese Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education under Grant 2004-0335099.

In contrast to the progress in theory, the development of sensor networks greatly spurred the design of practical SW systems recently, so how to construct good SW codes has been the main topic in practice. A practical constructive framework was formulated in [10] based on coset coding of linear codes. In the early work, many SW coding schemes based on asymmetric codes were proposed, that is, they compress one source, while the other source is assumed to be perfectly known at the decoder side and is used as side information, and furthermore some schemes are designed only for specific correlation models. As a result, even equipped with the best channel codes, such schemes can only approach the corner points on the achievable rate region of specific correlated sources. In theory, any achievable rate pair may be achieved by “time sharing” of corner points, but it might not be practical in certain scenarios. Recently, new progress has been made in practical SW code designs that can approach any point in the achievable rate region of arbitrary correlated sources without using the “time sharing” method, e.g., [11–14], and a series of new methods are applied, such as channel code partitioning, source-splitting, iterative decoding using the joint distribution, and so on. However, the problem of designing good symmetric SW codes for arbitrary sources still needs further investigation.

This paper attempts to theoretically solve the problem in part. In [15], we developed a new method to upper-bound the average probability of maximum a posteriori (MAP) decoding error of SW codes for general sources, which was inspired by Gallager’s method in channel coding [16–18]. Because almost all of the constructed SW codes are based on linear channel codes and hence are all linear SW codes, we go further to investigate the performance of linear SW codes in this paper. We first introduce some necessary definitions and notations in Section 2, and some previous results in [15] are also listed for reference. Then in Section 3, we derive an upper bound on the average probability of MAP decoding error of linear SW codes for arbitrary correlated stationary memoryless sources (SMS), and as an example, the performance of SW codes based on LDPC codes and random permutations is analyzed.

2 Definitions, Notations and Previous Results

A general correlated source in the information-spectrum theory [19] is defined as an infinite sequence

$$\mathbf{XY} = \{X^n Y^n = (X_1^{(n)} Y_1^{(n)}, X_2^{(n)} Y_2^{(n)}, \dots, X_n^{(n)} Y_n^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$$

of n -dimensional random variables $X^n Y^n$ where each component random variable $X_i^{(n)} Y_i^{(n)} \equiv (X_i^{(n)}, Y_i^{(n)})$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) takes values in a finite product space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. Analogously, we can define the general sources \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} . We also denote the sample space and sample sequence of the n -dimensional random variables $X^n Y^n$, X^n and Y^n by $\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$, \mathcal{X}^n , \mathcal{Y}^n and $x^n y^n$, x^n , y^n respectively. For a correlated stationary memoryless source, the notation may be simplified by only considering a random variable $XY \equiv (X, Y)$, and the random sequence $X^n Y^n$ is generated by repeated independent drawings of XY . For convenience, we also use the notations $P_X(x)$ and $P_{X|Y}(x|y)$ to substitute for $\Pr\{X = x\}$ and $\Pr\{X = x|Y = y\}$ respectively.

The Slepian-Wolf coding system based on MAP decoding can be stated as follows. The source outputs X^n and Y^n are separately encoded into $\phi_n(X^n)$ and $\psi_n(Y^n)$ respectively, and the MAP decoder observe them to reproduce the most probable estimates $\hat{X}^n\hat{Y}^n$ of X^nY^n , where $\phi = \{\phi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\psi = \{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ are the encoder sequence pair defined by

$$\phi_n : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_n = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{L}_n|\}, \quad \psi_n : \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_n = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{M}_n|\}.$$

The rates of ϕ_n and ψ_n are defined as $R(\phi_n) \equiv \ln |\mathcal{L}_n|/n$ and $R(\psi_n) \equiv \ln |\mathcal{M}_n|/n$ respectively. Throughout this paper, the unit of information is nat. The MAP decoder sequence map $\text{map}_n = \{\text{map}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is defined by

$$\text{map}_n(l, m) \equiv \arg \max_{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n} \Pr\{X^n Y^n = x^n y^n | X^n Y^n \in \phi_n^{-1}(l) \times \psi_n^{-1}(m)\},$$

where $l \in \mathcal{L}_n$, $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$. An equivalent form is

$$\text{map}_n(l, m) = \arg \max_{x^n y^n \in \phi_n^{-1}(l) \times \psi_n^{-1}(m)} P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n).$$

The MAP decoding error probability is

$$P_e^{(n)}(\phi_n, \psi_n) \equiv \Pr\{\hat{X}^n \hat{Y}^n \neq X^n Y^n\} = \Pr\{\text{map}_n(\phi_n(X^n), \psi_n(Y^n)) \neq X^n Y^n\}.$$

A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is *achievable* if there exists an encoder sequence pair (ϕ, ψ) satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_e^{(n)}(\phi_n, \psi_n) = 0$, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} R(\phi_n) \leq R_1$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} R(\psi_n) \leq R_2$. The achievable rate region is defined as the set of all achievable rate pair (R_1, R_2) .

In [15], we have proved the following two theorems.

Theorem 1 For a given pair of random encoders Φ_n and Ψ_n (independent of $X^n Y^n$), if the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\Phi_n(x^n) = \Phi_n(\hat{x}^n)\} &\leq \alpha_n |\mathcal{L}_n|^{-1}, \quad \Pr\{\Psi_n(y^n) = \Psi_n(\hat{y}^n)\} \leq \beta_n |\mathcal{M}_n|^{-1}, \\ \Pr\{\Phi_n(x^n) = \Phi_n(\hat{x}^n), \Psi_n(y^n) = \Psi_n(\hat{y}^n)\} &\leq \gamma_n |\mathcal{L}_n|^{-1} |\mathcal{M}_n|^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

are satisfied for any unequal $x^n, \hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ and $y^n, \hat{y}^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n$, where α_n, β_n and γ_n are nonnegative real numbers, then the average MAP decoding error probability satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} E[P_e^{(n)}(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)] &\leq \exp\{-nJ_1^{(n)}(R(\Phi_n) - \ln \alpha_n/n)\} + \exp\{-nJ_2^{(n)}(R(\Psi_n) - \ln \beta_n/n)\} \\ &\quad + \exp\{-nJ_3^{(n)}(R(\Phi_n) + R(\Psi_n) - \ln \gamma_n/n)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_i^{(n)}(R) &\equiv \max_{0 \leq \rho_i \leq 1} \{\rho_i R - J_{i0}^{(n)}(\rho_i)\}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \\ J_{10}^{(n)}(\rho_1) &\equiv \frac{1}{n} \ln \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} \right)^{1+\rho_1}, \\ J_{20}^{(n)}(\rho_2) &\equiv \frac{1}{n} \ln \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} \left(\sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n} P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_2)} \right)^{1+\rho_2}, \\ J_{30}^{(n)}(\rho_3) &\equiv \frac{1}{n} \ln \left(\sum_{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n} P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_3)} \right)^{1+\rho_3}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2 For a correlated general source \mathbf{XY} , we obtain the following properties of the functions $J_i^{(n)}(R)$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } R > \bar{H}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y}), \text{ then } nJ_1^{(n)}(R) &\rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \text{If } R > \bar{H}(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}), \text{ then } nJ_2^{(n)}(R) &\rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \text{If } R > \bar{H}(\mathbf{XY}), \text{ then } nJ_3^{(n)}(R) &\rightarrow \infty, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{H}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})$, $\bar{H}(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X})$ and $\bar{H}(\mathbf{XY})$ are the spectral (conditional) sup-entropy rates defined in the information-spectrum theory [19]. (We also analyzed the properties of the functions $J_{i0}^{(n)}(\rho_i)$ when n is fixed. They are increasing and convex, and their derivatives at $\rho_i = 0$ just equal to $\frac{1}{n}H(X^n|Y^n)$, $\frac{1}{n}H(Y^n|X^n)$ and $\frac{1}{n}H(X^nY^n)$.)

To analyze the performance of linear SW codes, we still need some definitions of linear codes. We first assume that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are Galois fields $GF(q_1)$ and $GF(q_2)$, then the linear encoder sequence pair (ϕ, ψ) is defined as two linear mapping sequences $\phi_n : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{ln}$ and $\psi_n : \mathcal{Y}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{mn}$. A linear encoder ϕ_n is a parity check matrix related to a linear channel code defined by $C_{\phi_n} = \{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n | \phi_n(x^n) = 0^{ln}\}$. A linear channel code can be well characterized by the code's spectrum. The *spectrum* of a code C_{ϕ_n} is defined as $\{S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\phi_n})\}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X})}$, where $S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\phi_n})$ is the number of codewords of type \mathbf{u} in C_{ϕ_n} , and the *type* $\mathbf{u} = \{u_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{X}}$ of a sequence (or codeword) $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is a q_1 -dimensional vector of integers such that u_i is the number of occurrence of the symbol i in x^n . We denote the set of all possible types of the sequences of length n in \mathcal{X}^n by $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and define $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X}) \equiv \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \{\text{type}(0^n)\}$. The spectrum of a linear encoder ϕ_n is defined as the spectrum of C_{ϕ_n} , and the average spectrum of a random encoder Φ_n is expressed as $\{E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})]\}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X})}$. Similar notations also apply to the encoder ψ_n and the two dimensional encoder (ϕ_n, ψ_n) . In the latter case, we denote the spectrum of (ϕ_n, ψ_n) by $\{S_{\mathbf{w}}(C_{(\phi_n, \psi_n)})\}_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})}$ where $\mathbf{w} = \{w_{i,j}\}_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$. Furthermore, we define the projections $\pi_1 : \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X})$ and $\pi_2 : \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{Y})$ by setting $\pi_1(\mathbf{w}) = \{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{Y}} w_{i,j}\}_{i \in \mathcal{X}}$ and $\pi_2(\mathbf{w}) = \{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{X}} w_{i,j}\}_{j \in \mathcal{Y}}$ respectively. We also define the injection $\iota_1 : \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ by setting $\iota_1(\mathbf{u})_{i,0} = u_i$ and $\iota_1(\mathbf{u})_{i,j} = 0$ for $j \neq 0$, and the injection $\iota_2 : \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ is defined analogously. By the above notations, we define $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \equiv \pi_1^{-1}(\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X})) \cap \pi_2^{-1}(\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{Y}))$.

From now on, we always assume that the correlated source is stationary and memoryless, and hence it can be denoted by the random variable XY . We introduce the notation $\mathbf{B}(XY) = \{B_{i,j}(XY)\}_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ defined by

$$B_{i,j}(XY) = \sum_{xy \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{P_{XY}(xy)P_{XY}((x+i)(y+j))}.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$B_{i,j}(XY) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{xy \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} P_{XY}(xy)} \sqrt{\sum_{xy \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} P_{XY}((x+i)(y+j))} = 1.$$

with equality if and only if $P_{XY}(xy)$ takes the same value for every coset of the cyclic additive subgroup generated by (i, j) . Given a type $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, we further define

$$[\mathbf{B}(XY)]^{\mathbf{w}} \equiv \prod_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} [B_{i,j}(XY)]^{w_{i,j}}.$$

3 Performance of Linear SW Codes

Now we begin to state and prove the main result of the paper. It may be regarded as an enhanced version of Theorem 1 under extra assumptions of sources and encoders.

Theorem 3 *For a correlated stationary memoryless source XY and a given pair of random linear encoders Φ_n and Ψ_n (independent of the source), the average MAP decoding error probability satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} E[P_e^{(n)}(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)] &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})][\mathbf{B}(XY)]^{\iota_1(\mathbf{u})} + \exp\{-n\tilde{J}_1(R(\Phi_n) - \ln \alpha_n/n)\} \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in V} E[S_{\mathbf{v}}(C_{\Psi_n})][\mathbf{B}(XY)]^{\iota_2(\mathbf{v})} + \exp\{-n\tilde{J}_2(R(\Psi_n) - \ln \beta_n/n)\} \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in W} E[S_{\mathbf{w}}(C_{(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)})][\mathbf{B}(XY)]^{\mathbf{w}} + \exp\{-n\tilde{J}_3(R(\Phi_n) + R(\Psi_n) - \ln \gamma_n/n)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where U , V and W are subsets of $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X})$, $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}_i(R) &\equiv \max_{0 \leq \rho_i \leq 1} \{\rho_i R - \tilde{J}_{i0}(\rho_i)\}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \\ \tilde{J}_{10}(\rho_1) &\equiv \ln \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{XY}(xy)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} \right)^{1+\rho_1}, \\ \tilde{J}_{20}(\rho_2) &\equiv \ln \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{XY}(xy)^{1/(1+\rho_2)} \right)^{1+\rho_2}, \\ \tilde{J}_{30}(\rho_3) &\equiv \ln \left(\sum_{xy \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} P_{XY}(xy)^{1/(1+\rho_3)} \right)^{1+\rho_3}, \\ \alpha_n &= \max_{\mathbf{u} \in U^c} \frac{E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})]q_1^{l_n}}{\binom{n}{\mathbf{u}}}, \quad \beta_n = \max_{\mathbf{v} \in V^c} \frac{E[S_{\mathbf{v}}(C_{\Psi_n})]q_2^{m_n}}{\binom{n}{\mathbf{v}}}, \\ \gamma_n &= \max_{\mathbf{w} \in W^c} \frac{E[S_{\mathbf{w}}(C_{(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)})]q_1^{l_n}q_2^{m_n}}{\binom{n}{\mathbf{w}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $U^c \equiv \mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X}) \setminus U$, $V^c \equiv \mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{Y}) \setminus V$, $W^c \equiv \mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \setminus W$, and $\binom{n}{\mathbf{t}} \equiv n! / \prod_i t_i$. (Note that the functions $\tilde{J}_{i0}(\rho_i)$ are virtually another form of the functions $J_{i0}^{(n)}(\rho_i)$.)

Proof: To prove the theorem, we need to consider the following error events of MAP decoding:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1(\phi_n, \psi_n) &\equiv \{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n | \exists \hat{x}^n \neq x^n, \\ &\text{s.t. } \phi_n(\hat{x}^n) = \phi_n(x^n), P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n) \geq P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)\}, \\ E_2(\phi_n, \psi_n) &\equiv \{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n | \exists \hat{y}^n \neq y^n, \\ &\text{s.t. } \psi_n(\hat{y}^n) = \psi_n(y^n), P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n \hat{y}^n) \geq P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)\}, \\ E_3(\phi_n, \psi_n) &\equiv \{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n | \exists \hat{x}^n \neq x^n, \exists \hat{y}^n \neq y^n, \\ &\text{s.t. } \phi_n(\hat{x}^n) = \phi_n(x^n), \psi_n(\hat{y}^n) = \psi_n(y^n), P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n \hat{y}^n) \geq P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for any permutation $\delta_n \in S_n$ (S_n denotes the symmetric group on n letters), the random sequence $X^n Y^n$ generated by SMSs and the permuted random sequence $\delta_n(X^n Y^n)$ have the same distribution, i.e., $\delta_n(X^n Y^n) \stackrel{d}{=} X^n Y^n$, where $\delta_n(x^n y^n) \equiv (x_{\delta_n(1)} y_{\delta_n(1)}, \dots, x_{\delta_n(n)} y_{\delta_n(n)})$, we consider a random permutation Δ_n which is drawn independently with uniform probability from S_n and set $\hat{\Phi}_n = \Phi_n \circ \Delta_n$ and $\hat{\Psi}_n = \Psi_n \circ \Delta_n$. Then the average MAP decoding error probability can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E[P_e^{(n)}(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)] &= E[P_e^{(n)}(\hat{\Phi}_n, \hat{\Psi}_n)] \leq E\left[\sum_{i=1}^3 \Pr\{X^n Y^n \in E_i(\hat{\Phi}_n, \hat{\Psi}_n)\}\right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n} P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n) E[1_{E_i(\hat{\Phi}_n, \hat{\Psi}_n)}(x^n y^n)] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The last equality follows from the fact that random encoders are independent of the correlated source, where $1_{E_i(\hat{\Phi}_n, \hat{\Psi}_n)}(x^n y^n)$ is the indicator function. We first upper-bound the first term in the summation of (1).

Inspired by the methods in [16] and [18], we consider the similar inequality

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{E_1(\hat{\phi}_n, \hat{\psi}_n)}(x^n y^n) &\leq \frac{\sum_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n) \in U} \sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n)} 1_{\hat{\phi}_n^{-1}(\hat{\phi}_n(x^n))}(\hat{x}^n)}{\sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)}} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\sum_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n) \in U^c} P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} 1_{\hat{\phi}_n^{-1}(\hat{\phi}_n(x^n))}(\hat{x}^n)}{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)}} \right)^{\rho_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho_1 \in [0, 1]$. Then by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[1_{E_1(\hat{\phi}_n, \hat{\psi}_n)}(x^n y^n)] &\leq \frac{\sum_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n) \in U} \sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n)} \Pr\{\hat{\Phi}_n(\hat{x}^n) = \hat{\Phi}_n(x^n)\}}{\sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)}} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\sum_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n) \in U^c} P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} \Pr\{\hat{\Phi}_n(\hat{x}^n) = \hat{\Phi}_n(x^n)\}}{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)}} \right)^{\rho_1}. \end{aligned}$$

To go on the proof, we calculate the probability $\Pr\{\hat{\Phi}_n(\hat{x}^n) = \hat{\Phi}_n(x^n)\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\hat{\Phi}_n(\hat{x}^n) = \hat{\Phi}_n(x^n)\} &= \sum_{\phi_n} P_{\Phi_n}(\phi_n) \sum_{\delta_n} P_{\Delta_n}(\delta_n) \Pr\{\phi_n(\delta_n(\hat{x}^n - x^n)) = 0^{l_n}\} \\ &= \sum_{\phi_n} P_{\Phi_n}(\phi_n) \frac{S_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n)}(C_{\phi_n}) \prod_i \text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n)_i!}{n!} \\ &= \frac{E[S_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n)}(C_{\Phi_n})]}{\binom{n}{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E[1_{E_1(\hat{\phi}_n, \hat{\psi}_n)}(x^n y^n)] \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n) \in U} \sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n)} E[S_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n)}(C_{\Phi_n})] / \binom{n}{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n)}}{\sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\frac{\sum_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n) \in U^c} P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} E[S_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n - x^n)}(C_{\Phi_n})]}{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)}} \right)^{\rho_1} \\
& \leq \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})] \binom{n}{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \sum_{\text{type}(\tilde{x}^n) = \mathbf{u}} \sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}((x^n + \tilde{x}^n) y^n)}}{\sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)}} \\
& \quad + \alpha_n^{\rho_1} q_1^{-\rho_1 l_n} \left(\frac{\sum_{\hat{x}^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{X^n Y^n}(\hat{x}^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)}}{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)}} \right)^{\rho_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the first term in (1) can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n} P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n) E[1_{E_1(\hat{\Phi}_n, \hat{\Psi}_n)}(x^n y^n)] \\
& \leq \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})] \binom{n}{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \sum_{\text{type}(\tilde{x}^n) = \mathbf{u}} \sum_{x^n y^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n} \sqrt{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n) P_{X^n Y^n}((x^n + \tilde{x}^n) y^n)} \\
& \quad + \alpha_n^{\rho_1} q_1^{-\rho_1 l_n} \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \left(\sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n y^n)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} \right)^{1+\rho_1} \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})] \binom{n}{\mathbf{u}}^{-1} \sum_{\text{type}(\tilde{x}^n) = \mathbf{u}} \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{xy \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{P_{XY}(xy) P_{XY}((x + \tilde{x}_i) y)} \\
& \quad + \alpha_n^{\rho_1} q_1^{-\rho_1 l_n} \sum_{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{XY}(xy_i)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} \right)^{1+\rho_1} \\
& = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})] \prod_{i \in \mathcal{X}} [B_{i,0}(XY)]^{u_i} + \alpha_n^{\rho_1} q_1^{-\rho_1 l_n} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{XY}(xy)^{1/(1+\rho_1)} \right)^{n(1+\rho_1)} \\
& = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})] [\mathbf{B}(XY)]^{u_1(\mathbf{u})} + \exp\{-n[\rho_1(R(\Phi_n) - \ln \alpha_n/n) - \tilde{J}_{10}(\rho_1)]\},
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the stationary memoryless property of the source and the usual arithmetic rule for multiplying products of sums. By maximizing the error exponent of the second term over $\rho_1 \in [0, 1]$, we get the tightest upper bound. The next two terms in (1) can be bounded analogously and hence the theorem is proved. \square

Remark 1 *If the encoders Φ_n and Ψ_n are mutually independent and $\Psi_n \circ \delta_n \stackrel{d}{=} \Psi_n$ for any permutation $\delta_n \in S_n$, it can be shown that the induced encoders $\hat{\Phi}_n$ and $\hat{\Psi}_n$ are also mutually independent, and by (2) we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{E[S_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n \hat{y}^n)}(C_{(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)})]}{\binom{n}{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n \hat{y}^n)}} & = \Pr\{\hat{\Phi}_n(x^n) = \hat{\Phi}_n(x^n + \tilde{x}^n), \hat{\Psi}_n(y^n) = \hat{\Psi}_n(y^n + \tilde{y}^n)\} \\
& = \Pr\{\hat{\Phi}_n(x^n) = \hat{\Phi}_n(x^n + \tilde{x}^n)\} \Pr\{\hat{\Psi}_n(y^n) = \hat{\Psi}_n(x^n + \tilde{x}^n)\} \\
& = \frac{E[S_{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n)}(C_{\Phi_n})]}{\binom{n}{\text{type}(\hat{x}^n)}} \cdot \frac{E[S_{\text{type}(\hat{y}^n)}(C_{\Psi_n})]}{\binom{n}{\text{type}(\hat{y}^n)}},
\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{E[S_{\mathbf{w}}(C_{(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)})]}{\binom{n}{\mathbf{w}}} = \frac{E[S_{\pi_1(\mathbf{w})}(C_{\Phi_n})]}{\binom{n}{\pi_1(\mathbf{w})}} \cdot \frac{E[S_{\pi_2(\mathbf{w})}(C_{\Psi_n})]}{\binom{n}{\pi_2(\mathbf{w})}}.$$

Since it can be easily shown that $E[S_{\mathbf{w}}(C_{(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)})] \leq E[S_{\pi_1(\mathbf{w})}(C_{\Phi_n})]E[S_{\pi_2(\mathbf{w})}(C_{\Psi_n})]$ for mutually independent Φ_n and Ψ_n , as a byproduct, we have $\binom{n}{\mathbf{w}} \leq \binom{n}{\pi_1(\mathbf{w})} \binom{n}{\pi_2(\mathbf{w})}$.

Note that a pair of deterministic encoders can be regarded as a pair of mutually independent random encoders, hence for two deterministic encoder ϕ_n and ψ_n we have

$$\frac{E[S_{\mathbf{w}}(C_{(\phi_n, \psi_n \circ \hat{\Delta}_n)})]}{\binom{n}{\mathbf{w}}} = \frac{E[S_{\pi_1(\mathbf{w})}(C_{\phi_n})]}{\binom{n}{\pi_1(\mathbf{w})}} \cdot \frac{E[S_{\pi_2(\mathbf{w})}(C_{\psi_n})]}{\binom{n}{\pi_2(\mathbf{w})}},$$

where $\hat{\Delta}_n$ is another independent random permutation with uniform distribution.

Remark 2 For asymmetric codes, for example, assume that the sequence generated by Y is compressed by an identity matrix, then the upper bound on the average MAP decoding error probability may be reduced to

$$\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U} E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\Phi_n})][\mathbf{B}(XY)]^{\iota_1(\mathbf{u})} + \exp\{-n\tilde{J}_1(R(\Phi_n) - \ln \alpha_n/n)\},$$

because for any type $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{Y})$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{T}'_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, $E[S_{\mathbf{v}}(C_{\Psi_n})] = E[S_{\mathbf{w}}(C_{(\Phi_n, \Psi_n)})] = 0$, and $\beta_n = \gamma_n = 0$.

Now, we will use Theorem 3 to analyze the performance of SW codes based on LDPC codes. We consider the regular LDPC ensemble over $GF(q)$ presented in [18, Section IV], which is an extension of the binary construction obtained from regular bipartite graphs. In short, it is done by constructing (c, d) regular bipartite graphs over $GF(q)$ in which there are n variable nodes on the left side of the graph, each associated with symbols in $GF(q)$ and of degree c , l check nodes on the right, each of degree d satisfying $nc = ld$, and nc edges connecting the variable nodes and check nodes, each labelled with a nonzero symbol in $GF(q)$. An ensemble of (c, d) regular graphs is defined as follows. Define two orders (from 1 to nc) for the edges originating from variable nodes and the edges originating from check nodes respectively. Then for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, nc\}$, the i -th edge on the left is associated with the $\hat{\Delta}_n(i)$ -th edge on the right, and is independently labelled with a random, uniformly distributed symbol $g \in GF(q) \setminus \{0\}$, where $\hat{\Delta}_n$ is an independent, uniformly distributed random permutation. The bipartite graph can then be mapped to a parity check matrix as follows. Element $A_{i,j}$ in the matrix, corresponding to the i -th check node and the j -th variable node, is set to the $GF(q)$ sum of all labels g corresponding to edges connecting the two nodes. Therefore, we define a random (c, d) regular LDPC encoder Φ_n over $GF(q)$ as the parity check matrix ensemble obtained from the above ensemble of (c, d) regular graphs. Clearly, the rate $R(\Phi_n)$ is $\frac{c}{d} \ln q$. We now state the theorem on the performance of LDPC encoders.

Theorem 4 Let XY be a correlated stationary memoryless source and let ϵ be an arbitrary positive number. Suppose $q_1, q_2 > 2$ and $c_1, c_2 \geq 3$. Then for d_1 and d_2 large enough, the mutually independent (c_1, d_1) regular LPDC encoder Φ_n over $GF(q_1)$ and (c_2, d_2) regular LPDC encoder Ψ_n over $GF(q_2)$ (both independent of the source) satisfy

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr\left\{-\frac{1}{n} \ln P_e^{(n)}(\Phi_n, \Psi_n) \geq J\right\} = 1$$

for any $J < \min\{\tilde{J}_1(R_1 - \epsilon), \tilde{J}_2(R_2 - \epsilon), \tilde{J}_3(R_1 + R_2 - \epsilon)\}$, where $R_1 = \frac{c_1}{d_1} \ln q_1$ and $R_2 = \frac{c_2}{d_2} \ln q_2$.

The proof of Theorem 4 is omitted here, and it applies the result in Remark 1 and the methods used in the proof of [18, Theorem 9] and [20, Theorem 6]. Analogously, we also obtain the theorem on the performance of SW codes based on deterministic linear encoders and random permutations.

Theorem 5 *For a correlated stationary memoryless source XY and a given pair of deterministic linear encoder sequences $\phi = \{\phi_n\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and $\psi = \{\psi_n\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr\left\{-\frac{1}{n} \ln P_e^{(n)}(\phi_n, \psi_n \circ \hat{\Delta}_n) \geq J\right\} = 1$$

for any $J < \min\{\tilde{J}_1(R_1 - \epsilon_1), \tilde{J}_2(R_2 - \epsilon_2), \tilde{J}_3(R_1 + R_2 - \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)\}$, where $\hat{\Delta}_n$ is an independent random permutation with uniform distribution, R_1 and R_2 are the asymptotic rates of the encoder sequences ϕ and ψ respectively (We suppose that the rates of the encoder sequences converge), and

$$\epsilon_1 = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{X})} \frac{E[S_{\mathbf{u}}(C_{\phi_n})]q_1^{l_n}}{\binom{n}{\mathbf{u}}}, \quad \epsilon_2 = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathcal{Y})} \frac{E[S_{\mathbf{v}}(C_{\psi_n})]q_2^{m_n}}{\binom{n}{\mathbf{v}}}.$$

4 Conclusions

From the viewpoint of coding theory, the results we have obtained are still not satisfactory. However, these results do imply some interesting facts that may be helpful to applications.

First, Theorem 4 tells us that if the parameters d and n are large enough, all but a diminishingly small proportion of the regular LDPC encoders can achieve asymptotically vanishing probability of MAP decoding error for any rate pair in the achievable rate region of the correlated SMS.

Second, Theorem 5 tells us that if n is sufficiently large, most permutations are good enough to help us build perfect SW systems based on a small number of good encoders, i.e., encoders satisfying $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0$. Following this idea, we may prepare a set of good encoders with different rates, and in a sensor network, allocate for each node an encoder with the required rate and a permutation that may be randomly generated by some seed allocated for the node. The feasibility of such a scheme still remains to be verified in practice.

Third, the extension of all the results in this paper to an arbitrary source number is immediate. The method in [9] is partly similar to our method, but for SMSs, our results are stronger than theirs.

References

- [1] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf, "Noiseless coding of correlated information sources," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 471–480, July 1973.

- [2] T. M. Cover, "A proof of the data compression theorem of Slepian and Wolf for ergodic sources," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 226–228, Mar. 1975.
- [3] S. Miyake and F. Kanaya, "Coding theorems on correlated general sources," *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, vol. E78-A, no. 9, pp. 1063–1070, Sept. 1995.
- [4] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, "Towards a general theory of source networks," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 155–165, Mar. 1980.
- [5] I. Csiszár, "Linear codes for sources and source networks: Error exponents, universal coding," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 585–592, July 1982.
- [6] Y. Oohama and T. S. Han, "Universal coding for the Slepian-Wolf data compression system and the strong converse theorem," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1908–1919, Nov. 1994.
- [7] T. Uyematsu, "Universal coding for correlated sources with memory," in *Proc. CWIT 2001*, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 2001.
- [8] —, "An algebraic construction of codes for slepian-wolf source networks," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 3082–3088, Nov. 2001.
- [9] J. Muramatsu, T. Uyematsu, and T. Wadayama, "Low density parity check matrices for coding of correlated sources," in *Proc. ISIT 2003*, Yokohama, Japan, June 2003, p. 173.
- [10] S. S. Pradhan, "Distributed source coding using syndromes (DISCUS)," Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, fall 2001.
- [11] V. Stanković, A. D. Liveris, Z. Xiong, and C. N. Georghiades, "Design of Slepian-Wolf codes by channel code partitioning," in *Proc. DCC 2004*, Snowbird, UT, Mar. 2004, pp. 302–311.
- [12] T. P. Coleman, A. H. Lee, M. Médard, and M. Effros, "On some new approaches to practical Slepian-Wolf compression inspired by channel coding," in *Proc. DCC 2004*, Snowbird, UT, Mar. 2004, pp. 282–291.
- [13] D. Schonberg, K. Ramchandran, and S. S. Pradhan, "Distributed code constructions for the entire Slepian-Wolf rate region for arbitrarily correlated sources," in *Proc. DCC 2004*, Snowbird, UT, Mar. 2004, pp. 292–301.
- [14] J. Li, Z. Tu, and R. S. Blum, "Slepian-Wolf coding for nonuniform sources using turbo codes," in *Proc. DCC 2004*, Snowbird, UT, Mar. 2004, pp. 312–321.
- [15] S. Yang and P. Qiu, "A new proof of the Slepian-Wolf theorem and performance analysis of non-random codes," *Acta Electronica Sinica (in Chinese)*, submitted.
- [16] R. G. Gallager, "A simple derivation of the coding theorem and some applications," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 3–8, Jan. 1965.
- [17] N. Shulman and M. Feder, "Random coding techniques for nonrandom codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 6, pp. 2101–2104, Sept. 1999.
- [18] A. Bennatan and D. Burshtein, "On the application of LDPC codes to arbitrary discrete-memoryless channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 417–437, Mar. 2004.
- [19] T. S. Han, *Information-Spectrum Methods in Information Theory*. Berlin: Springer, 2003.
- [20] G. Miller and D. Burshtein, "Bounds on the maximum-likelihood decoding error probability of low-density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 2696–2710, Nov. 2001.