

Blind Interference Alignment for MapReduce: Exploiting Side-information with Reconfigurable Antennas

Yuxiang Lu, Syed A. Jafar

Center for Pervasive Communications and Computing (CPCC)

University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697

*Email: {yuxiang.lu, syed}@uci.edu **

Abstract

In order to explore how blind interference alignment (BIA) schemes may take advantage of side-information in computation tasks, we study the degrees of freedom (DoF) of a K user wireless network setting that arises in full-duplex wireless MapReduce applications. In this setting the receivers are assumed to have reconfigurable antennas and channel knowledge, while the transmitters have neither, i.e., the transmitters lack channel knowledge and are only equipped with conventional antennas. The central ingredient of the problem formulation is the message structure arising out of MapReduce, whereby each transmitter has a subset of messages that need to be delivered to various receivers, and each receiver has a subset of messages available to it in advance as side-information. The challenge resides in both achievability and converse arguments. Unlike conventional BIA where alignments occur only within the symbols of the same message (intra-message) the new achievable scheme also requires inter-message alignments, as well as an outer MDS (maximum distance separable) code structure. The scheme emerges from two essential ideas: 1) understanding the DoF of a K user vector broadcast channel with groupcast messages, and 2) a mapping of messages from the broadcast setting to the MapReduce setting that makes use of inter-message alignment. On the converse side, whereas prior BIA converse bounds relied only on a compound channel argument, in the new setting our converse bounds also require a statistical equivalence assumption.

*The results of this work were presented in part at the Asilomar Conference 2023.

1 Introduction

Accelerating trends towards distributed computation [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] create new paradigms for re-assessing the capacity of communication networks. One distinguishing aspect of communication networks in the context of distributed computation is the abundance of *side-information*, arising naturally as a file is typically processed at multiple computation nodes [1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] at intermediate stages of computation. For wireless networks, that are typically interference-limited, side-information can be especially useful if it enables new robust interference management schemes, e.g., interference alignment (IA) constructions that avoid the need for precise channel state information at the transmitters (CSIT).

High precision CSIT requirements have been the bane of many otherwise promising interference alignment schemes. For example, consider a $K \times K$ wireless network, i.e., a wireless network with K transmitters and K receivers, each equipped with only a single transmit/receive antenna. If there are K independent messages to be delivered, one each from every transmitter to its corresponding receiver, then this is called the K user interference channel. It is known that the K user interference channel has $K/2$ degrees of freedom under perfect CSIT, that can be achieved by interference alignment schemes [17]. However, in sharp contrast, if the CSIT is limited to finite precision then it is also known that the DoF value collapses to 1, which is achievable with trivial orthogonal access schemes [18].

The principle of blind interference alignment (BIA) stands out in this regard due to its minimal CSIT requirements. Introduced originally in [19] to take advantage of naturally occurring channel coherence patterns, BIA was shown in [20] to be much more powerful when used in conjunction with reconfigurable antennas, especially at the receivers. This is because blindly switching between different antenna modes at the receivers in pre-determined patterns creates predictable, and therefore exploitable, channel coherence patterns. Even though CSIT is lacking, BIA schemes can be surprisingly powerful. For example, consider again the $K \times K$ wireless network but suppose now that there is an independent message from every transmitter to every receiver. This setting is called an X network [21]. In the X network, if the receivers are equipped with reconfigurable antennas then, even though the transmitters are blind, BIA schemes achieve $K^2/(2K - 1)$ DoF [22]. Not only is this more than the $K/2$ DoF of the K user interference channel, this is also the maximum DoF value that is possible with *perfect* CSIT in an X network. Thus, from a DoF standpoint, reconfigurable antennas at the receivers are sufficient to unlock the full advantages of interference alignment, with no need for expensive CSIT. Indeed, the advantages of BIA schemes have been explored in a variety of settings that include the MISO BC and X-channel [20, 23], two-cell Z interference MIMO channel [24], cellular networks [25], topological interference management framework [26], non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA) [27], and various interference networks [28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33]. A survey by Menon and Selvaprabhu is available in [34].

While BIA schemes overcome a critical hurdle by minimizing the need for CSIT, they introduce new challenges of their own. Among these are the need for reconfigurable antennas, the need for X message sets (such that each transmitter has independent messages for multiple receivers and each receiver desires independent messages from multiple transmitters), the need for long/perfect coherence intervals, and the need to translate the DoF advantage to finite SNRs. From an information theoretic standpoint, progress on the last two issues, i.e., imperfect coherence and finite SNR performance, with a few notable exceptions, is hindered by their limited analytical tractability, and may perhaps benefit in the future from the powerful machinery of deep neural networks to explore these high dimensional optimizations. The technological burden of implementing re-




Figure 1: (a) A MapReduce network with $\mathbf{A} = (A_3, A_4)$, $\mathbf{B} = (B_2, B_4)$, $\mathbf{C} = (C_2, C_3)$, $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, D_4)$. (b) A corresponding vector BC setting with groupcast messages (BCGM). In both settings, receivers possess reconfigurable antennas and channel knowledge. In both settings no CSIT is assumed. Receivers in the MapReduce network also have side-information, while no side-information is available to the receivers in the BCGM setting.

configurable antennas is becoming less of a concern with continued advances in reconfigurable intelligent surfaces [35], and by association, reconfigurable antenna technology [36, 37]. In terms of the need for X message sets, as communication networks are increasingly used in service of computation tasks, the changes favor BIA schemes as well. When groups of nodes engage in a distributed computation task, partially processed data needs to be constantly exchanged between them. A prime example of this is the MapReduce setting [1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. The resulting information flows resemble X networks more than interference networks[9, 38], which suits the strengths of BIA schemes. Interestingly, computation networks such as MapReduce also introduce an aspect that is thus far relatively unexplored in the BIA context — the presence of side-information. This is the question that motivates our work in this paper. How can BIA schemes — based on blind transmitters and reconfigurable receive antennas — optimally take advantage of the message and side-information structures of a MapReduce setting? In search for sharp fundamental limits, we will focus primarily on the DoF question, i.e., high SNR performance with idealized coherence models. The concerns of imperfect coherence and finite SNR performance are extremely important, but require a different approach that is beyond the scope of this work.

1.1 A Motivating Example

Similar to [7, 8, 12], let us consider MapReduce over a full-duplex wireless network with K users. There are $N_r = \binom{K}{r}$ independent files (super-messages), each available as common information to a distinct subset of r users. Each file is partitioned into $K - r$ independent subfiles (messages), that are to be delivered, one each, to the remaining $K - r$ users. An example is illustrated in Fig. 1 with $K = 4, r = 2$, so that we have 4 users and $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ independent super-messages, labeled as $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{F}$ in the figure, each comprised of $K - r = 4 - 2 = 2$ partitions, to be delivered, one each, to the remaining two users. For example, $\mathbf{A} = (A_3, A_4)$ is already available to Users 1, 2 and the partition A_3 is desired by User 3 while A_4 is desired by User 4. The physical channel model is similar to a K user interference channel, but since each user is both a transmitter and a receiver under full-duplex operation, the same initial set of messages is assumed to be initially available to Transmitter k and Receiver k (since they are co-located). Channel state information at the receivers is assumed to be perfect. No CSIT is assumed at the transmitters. While

the transmitters and receivers are co-located, there are several reasons for this assumed disparity of CSI. Even with full-duplex operation it is not uncommon to use separate antennas exclusively for transmitting and receiving, so the channel from Transmitter k to Receiver k' is not necessarily identical to the channel from Transmitter k' to Receiver k . Thus a user may have CSIR but not CSIT. More importantly, however, we wish to avoid fragile schemes that rely strongly on CSIT, and one way to do so is by imposing the assumption of no CSIT on the channel model, which forces the DoF study towards robust solutions, in particular BIA schemes. To facilitate BIA, we assume that the receivers are equipped with reconfigurable antennas. The absence of CSIT, the presence of reconfigurable antennas, and the availability of side-information are the main distinguishing features of our work compared to prior works in [7, 8, 12, 20]. In [7, 8] perfect CSIT is assumed, and no reconfigurable antennas are involved. In [12], imperfect CSIT is assumed and no reconfigurable antennas are involved. Prior works on BIA [20, 34] do not explore the availability of side-information.

The technical contributions of this work are two-fold. The first is to determine the type of interference alignment that is needed. Conventional BIA solutions, that consider no side-information, align symbols of the same message with each other (intra-message alignment), at receivers where the message is not desired. In the presence of side-information, as we show in this work, DoF optimal schemes need not only intra-message alignment, but also *inter-message* alignment. In order to solve this problem, as our first contribution, we will establish a connection between the MapReduce problem and a corresponding instance of a vector broadcast channel with groupcast messages (BCGM). In the BCGM, just like MapReduce, we have reconfigurable antennas at the receivers, and no CSIT. Unlike the MapReduce setting, however, the BCGM setting has no side-information at the receivers, and a groupcast message structure, i.e., the same message may be desired by multiple receivers. Fig. 1(b) shows the corresponding BCGM setting for the MapReduce example that is shown in Fig. 1(a). The mapping from one setting to the other will be specified later in this work. With this mapping we are left with the task of finding the DoF of the BCGM setting, which is still non-trivial, but more tractable because this problem has fewer parameters. Our second key contribution is to establish the DoF of the BCGM setting. This will require both new coding schemes and new converse bounds.

This paper is organized as follows. We start with the BCGM setting in Section 2. The BCGM problem formulation is presented in Section 2.1, the DoF result for BCGM appears as Theorem 1 in Section 2.2, illustrative examples are provided in Sections 2.3 and 2.4, and a general coding scheme for BCGM is presented in Section 2.5 as proof of achievability for Theorem 1. Section 3 is devoted to the MapReduce setting. The MapReduce problem is formalized in Section 3.1, an intermediate setting between BCGM and MapReduce, called Unicast with Side Information (USI) is introduced in Section 3.2 to explore how the alignments in the BCGM setting can be determined by the mapping of messages across settings, the DoF of the USI setting are stated as Theorem 2 in Section 3.3, the achievability of Theorem 2 is proved in Section 3.4, with an example provided in Section 3.4.2, and the DoF result for MapReduce is obtained as Corollary 1 in Section 3.5. The converse proofs are provided in Appendix B, with the converse of Theorem 1 appearing in Section B.1 and the converse of Theorem 2 appearing in Section B.2. Section 4 concludes the paper.

Notation: For integers a, b where $a \leq b$, define $[a : b] = \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$. Also, let $[b] = [1 : b]$ for $b \geq 1$. For any set $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|\mathcal{A}|}\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, we have $a_i < a_{i+1}, \forall i \in [|\mathcal{A}|]$, i.e., any set of integers is an ordered set and we use $\mathcal{A}(i)$ to denote the i^{th} element of \mathcal{A} , i.e., $\mathcal{A}(i) = a_i$. We say $\mathcal{A} < \mathcal{B}$ if $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{A}|$ and $\exists i \in [|\mathcal{A}|]$ s.t. $\forall j \in [i - 1], \mathcal{A}(j) < \mathcal{B}(j)$ while $\mathcal{A}(i) = \mathcal{B}(i)$. For example, $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, 5\} < \mathcal{B} = \{1, 3, 4\}$ since $\mathcal{A}(1) = \mathcal{B}(1)$ and $\mathcal{A}(2) < \mathcal{B}(2)$. Let $\binom{[K]}{G} = \{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{\binom{K}{G}}\}$ be

the ordered set that consists of all the $\binom{K}{G}$ subsets with cardinality G of $[K]$, i.e., $\forall i \in [\binom{K}{G}], \mathcal{S}_i \subset [K], |\mathcal{S}_i| = G$, and $\mathcal{S}_1 < \mathcal{S}_2 < \dots < \mathcal{S}_{\binom{K}{G}}$. Let $(\cdot)^\top$ be the transpose operation. For a matrix \mathbf{A} , let $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{A},:}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{:, \mathcal{B}}$ be the sub-matrices of \mathbf{A} that consist of the rows and columns, whose indices are in \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} respectively, of \mathbf{A} . $\text{rk}(\mathbf{A})$ returns the rank of matrix \mathbf{A} , and $\text{col-span}(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the subspace spanned by the columns of \mathbf{A} . For matrices \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} with same number of rows, let $\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}$ denote the matrix generated by putting columns of \mathbf{B} right to \mathbf{A} . For a vector \mathbf{v} , let $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the sub-vector of \mathbf{v} with entries of \mathbf{v} whose indices are in \mathcal{A} . Let $\mathbf{0}_{r \times c}$ (resp. $\mathbf{1}_{r \times c}$) be the $r \times c$ all zero (resp. one) matrix and r, c will be clear according to the context if not explicitly specified. We use $\text{MDS}_{r \times c} \subset \mathbb{C}^{r \times c}, r < c$ to denote the set of all $r \times c$ matrices whose submatrix of any r columns is invertible. Let \mathbf{I}_M denote the $M \times M$ identity matrix and let \mathbf{e}_M^i be the i^{th} row of \mathbf{I}_M . Throughout the paper, \otimes stands for the Kronecker product. For any integer a , we define $\langle a \rangle_M \triangleq \tilde{a} \in [1 : M]$ s.t. $(a - \tilde{a}) \bmod M = 0$. This definition is similar to that of modulo operation, just that when the input is multiples of M , the output is M instead of 0. For a vector \mathbf{a} , $\langle \mathbf{a} \rangle_M$ means applying the function element-wise to all entries of \mathbf{a} .

2 Broadcast with Groupcast Messages (BCGM)

2.1 Problem Formulation

A BCGM setting is parameterized by a tuple (K, G, M) . There is a transmitter (Tx) that is equipped with M conventional antennas, and K receivers (Rx's) each of which is equipped with a single *reconfigurable* antenna that is capable of switching among M independent modes. Over the t^{th} channel use, $t \in \mathbb{N}$, the scalar signal received by Rx- k is expressed as,


$$y_k(t) = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(t)]}(t) \mathbf{x}(t) + z_k(t), \quad \forall k \in [K], \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(t)]}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times M}$ is the $1 \times M$ channel vector corresponding to receive-antenna mode $m_k(t) \in [M]$ chosen by Rx- k at time t , $\mathbf{x}(t) = [x_1(t) \ \dots \ x_M(t)]^\top$ is the $M \times 1$ vector of symbols sent from the M transmit-antennas, and $z_k(t)$ is the zero-mean unit variance circularly symmetric complex AWGN at Rx- k at time t . The transmit power for each antenna is limited to P , i.e., $E[|x_m(n)|^2] \leq P$ for all $m \in [M]$. An i.i.d. block fading model is assumed, with coherence time T_c . The channel vector $\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]}(t)$ associated with the m^{th} mode of Rx- k , $m \in [M], k \in [K]$, is drawn i.i.d. uniform according to $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ (Rayleigh fading)¹ at the beginning of each coherence block, and remains constant for the T_c consecutive channel-uses corresponding to that block, after which it changes to another i.i.d. realization for the next block. Mathematically,

$$\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]}(t) = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \left(\left\lceil \frac{t}{T_c} \right\rceil \right), \quad \forall m \in [M], \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2)$$

Note that an Rx can switch among its M modes in any chosen switching pattern, so even within a coherence block, the channel seen by an Rx will vary according to the selected switching pattern. We will assume that $T_c \gg K$. Perfect channel state information at the receivers (CSIR) is assumed. No channel state information at the transmitter (CSIT) is assumed beyond the channel distribution. Next we specify the messages to be transmitted, and define the group size G .

¹The results generalize to any continuous distribution.



$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \{1, 2\}, \mathcal{S}_2 = \{1, 3\}, \mathcal{S}_3 = \{1, 4\}, \mathcal{S}_4 = \{2, 3\}, \mathcal{S}_5 = \{2, 4\}, \mathcal{S}_6 = \{3, 4\}$$

$$W_1 = A, W_2 = B, W_3 = C, W_4 = D, W_5 = E, W_6 = F$$

Figure 2: ($K = 4, G = 2, M = 2$) BCGM Example.

There are $N_g = \binom{K}{G}$ independent messages W_1, W_2, \dots, W_{N_g} each of which is desired by a distinct group of G Rx's out of the K Rxs. The set of N_g groups of Rx's is the set of all size- G subsets of $[K]$,

$$\binom{[K]}{G} = \{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{N_g}\}. \quad (3)$$

Then $\forall n \in [N_g]$, message W_n will be groupcast to the G Rx's in group \mathcal{S}_n . For any $k \in [K]$, let \mathcal{V}_k denote the indices of all the messages desired by Rx- k , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{V}_k = \{n \mid n \in [N_g] \text{ s.t. } k \in \mathcal{S}_n\}. \quad (4)$$

The set of messages desired by Rx- k , $k \in [K]$ is defined as

$$\text{DE}_k^{\text{BCGM}} = \{W_n \mid n \in \mathcal{V}_k\}. \quad (5)$$

Note that the number of messages desired by any Rx- k , $k \in [K]$, or equivalently, the number of cardinality- G subsets of $[K]$ that contains k , is

$$\nu_g = |\mathcal{V}_k| = \binom{K-1}{G-1} = GN_g/K, \quad \forall k \in [K]. \quad (6)$$

Fig. 1(b) shows a simple ($K = 4, G = 3, M = 2$) setting with $N_g = \binom{4}{3} = 4$ messages, labeled as A, B, C, D for convenience. Each message is desired by $G = 3$ Rx's, and each Rx desires $\nu_g = 3$ messages.

For any message W_n , let $|W_n(P)|$ denote its alphabet size. For codewords spanning \mathbb{T} channel uses, the rate associated with message W_n is $R_n^{\text{BCGM}}(P) \triangleq \frac{\log |W_n(P)|}{\mathbb{T}}$. A rate tuple

$$\mathbf{R}^{\text{BCGM}} = (R_1^{\text{BCGM}}(P), R_2^{\text{BCGM}}(P), \dots, R_{N_g}^{\text{BCGM}}(P)) \quad (7)$$

is achievable if there exists a sequence (indexed by \mathbb{T}) of coding schemes with the specified rates, such that the probability of error $P_e \rightarrow 0$ as $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \infty$ for the decoding of every message at each of its intended receivers. The capacity region $\mathcal{C}^{\text{BCGM}}(P)$ is the closure of the set of all achievable rate tuples. A DoF tuple

$$\mathbf{d}^{\text{BCGM}} = (d_1^{\text{BCGM}}, d_2^{\text{BCGM}}, \dots, d_{N_g}^{\text{BCGM}})$$

is achievable if

$$\exists \mathbf{R}^{\text{BCGM}} \in \mathcal{C}^{\text{BCGM}}(P) \text{ s.t. } d_n^{\text{BCGM}} = \lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_n^{\text{BCGM}}(P)}{\log(P)}, \quad \forall n \in [N_g]. \quad (8)$$

The DoF region $\mathcal{D}^{\text{BCGM}}$ is defined as the closure of the set of all achievable DoF tuples. A sum-DoF value d_{Σ}^{BCGM} is said to be achievable if there exists $\mathbf{d}^{\text{BCGM}} \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{BCGM}}$ s.t. $d_{\Sigma}^{\text{BCGM}} = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} d_n^{\text{BCGM}}$ and the sum-DoF of a BCGM setting $d_{\Sigma}^{\text{BCGM},*}$ is the largest achievable sum-DoF.

2.2 Result: Sum-DoF of the BCGM Setting

The sum-DoF value of the BCGM setting is characterized in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *The sum-DoF of the (K, G, M) BCGM setting is,*

$$d_{\Sigma}^{\text{BCGM},*} = \frac{N_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}. \quad (9)$$

The achievability of Theorem 1 will be proved in the remainder of this section, starting with a few illustrative examples to introduce the main ideas of the construction. The converse will be deferred to Appendix B.1.

2.3 Example 1: BIA Scheme for the $(K = 4, G = 3, M = 2)$ Setting shown in Fig. 1(b)

For this simple toy example, the BIA precoding scheme operates over 7 channel uses corresponding to the 7 columns shown in Fig. 3. The first 2 rows show the signals transmitted from the 2 transmit antennas, and the last 4 rows show the signals received by each of the 4 users. Noise is omitted for simplicity. Blue color indicates that the reconfigurable antenna at the Rx is in mode-1, while red indicates mode-2. The vectors $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_3$ are generic 1×4 vectors, say the rows of any

	$t = 1$	$t = 2$	$t = 3$	$t = 4$	$t = 5$	$t = 6$	$t = 7$	
Tx Antenna 1: x_1	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1[A^1 B^1 C^1 D^1]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2[A^1 B^1 C^1 D^1]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3[A^1 B^1 C^1 D^1]^\top$	A^1	B^1	C^1	D^1	
Tx Antenna 2: x_2	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1[A^2 B^2 C^2 D^2]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2[A^2 B^2 C^2 D^2]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3[A^2 B^2 C^2 D^2]^\top$	A^2	B^2	C^2	D^2	
Rx-1: y_1	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1[a^{1,[1]} \dots d^{1,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2[a^{1,[1]} \dots d^{1,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3[a^{1,[1]} \dots d^{1,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{1,[2]}$	$b^{1,[2]}$	$c^{1,[2]}$	$d^{1,[1]}$	$\rightarrow A, B, C$
Rx-2: y_2	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1[a^{2,[1]} \dots d^{2,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2[a^{2,[1]} \dots d^{2,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3[a^{2,[1]} \dots d^{2,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{2,[2]}$	$b^{2,[2]}$	$c^{2,[1]}$	$d^{2,[2]}$	$\rightarrow A, B, D$
Rx-3: y_3	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1[a^{3,[1]} \dots d^{3,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2[a^{3,[1]} \dots d^{3,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3[a^{3,[1]} \dots d^{3,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{3,[2]}$	$b^{3,[1]}$	$c^{3,[2]}$	$d^{3,[2]}$	$\rightarrow A, C, D$
Rx-4: y_4	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1[a^{4,[1]} \dots d^{4,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2[a^{4,[1]} \dots d^{4,[1]}]^\top$	$\boldsymbol{\lambda}_3[a^{4,[1]} \dots d^{4,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{4,[1]}$	$b^{4,[2]}$	$c^{4,[2]}$	$d^{4,[2]}$	$\rightarrow B, C, D$

Figure 3: The Precoding Scheme for $(4, 3, 2)$ BCGM setting.

3×4 matrix, such that all of its 3×3 submatrices are full rank. For ease of exposition let us choose a Vandermonde structure,

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2 \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & 4 & 9 & 16 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

Each message is comprised of two symbols, e.g., $A = (A^1, A^2)$. Consider time slot $t = 2$. As shown in Fig. 3, Tx Antenna 1 sends x_1 which is a generic linear combination of the symbols A^1, B^1, C^1, D^1 , with the coefficients specified by the vector λ_2 , i.e., $x_1(2) = A^1 + 2B^1 + 3C^1 + 4D^1$. Simultaneously, Tx Antenna 2 sends the same linear combination of the symbols A^2, B^2, C^2, D^2 , i.e., $x_2(2) = A^2 + 2B^2 + 3C^2 + 4D^2$. For Rx- i , let $a^{i,[m_i]} = \mathbf{h}_i^{[m_i]}(A^1, A^2)^T$ denote the dot product of the $A = (A^1, A^2)$ vector and the 1×2 channel vector $\mathbf{h}_i^{[m_i]}$ that is seen by Rx- i , who has chosen mode m_i . Similarly, define $b^{i,[m_i]}, c^{i,[m_i]}, d^{i,[m_i]}$ as the dot products of the same channel vector with B, C, D vectors respectively. Then in time slot $t = 2$, where according to Fig. 3 all receivers have chosen mode 1 (blue), we note that the signal received by Rx- i is $y_i(2) = \lambda_2(a^{i,[1]}, b^{i,[1]}, c^{i,[1]}, d^{i,[1]})^T = a^{i,[1]} + 2b^{i,[1]} + 3c^{i,[1]} + 4d^{i,[1]}$. Recall that noise is omitted for this intuitive explanation. Consider Rx-1, who wants messages A, B, C . It will receive its interfering symbol $d^{1,[1]}$ separately again in time slot $t = 7$ according to the scheme specified in Fig. 3, so it can cancel the interference from all first 3 time slots, leaving it with 3 linear equations in $a^{1,[1]}, b^{1,[1]}, c^{1,[1]}$. Since λ_i are fixed parameters of the coding scheme known to everyone, Rx-1 is able to solve $a^{1,[1]}, b^{1,[1]}, c^{1,[1]}$. Also note that since all receivers have full knowledge of their own received channels, it follows that from the two generic linear combinations $a^{1,[1]}$ (solved), $a^{1,[2]}$ (received at time slot 4), the desired message symbols A^1, A^2 can be recovered by Rx-1 almost surely (within bounded noise distortion that is inconsequential for DoF). Recovery of all desired symbols by other receivers can be similarly verified in Fig. 3. The BIA principle is evident in the last 4 columns of Fig. 3. During these time slots, each receiver switches to mode-2 when desired symbols are being transmitted, so that it receives a linear combination of the desired symbols that is different from what was received in mode-1, i.e., new information, and switches back to mode-1 when undesired symbols (interference) is being transmitted, so that it can recover the previously seen interference separately and cancel it from other time slots. The restriction of interference symbols to the same antenna mode constitutes interference alignment, giving the scheme its DoF advantage. The need of the λ_i parameters is a distinctive and important aspect of the scheme.

2.4 Example 2: BIA Scheme for a $(K = 3, G = 2, M = 3)$ BCGM

While the preceding example is appealing for its simplicity, the general case poses a few additional challenges that are not encountered in the previous example. To facilitate the understanding of the general scheme, let us introduce one more example, chosen to be as simple as possible, while allowing us to illustrate the remaining key considerations, before we proceed to the general proof of achievability.

2.4.1 Conventional BIA solution for $(K = 3, G = 1, M = 3)$

It will be useful to start with the conventional BIA solution from [20, Section III.C.3)] corresponding to $(K = 3, G = 1, M = 3)$ as a baseline upon which we can build the solution to the groupcast setting. This setting is shown below.




Figure 4: ($K = 3, G = 1, M = 3$) Example.

Following the construction in [20], let each message be comprised of $L = M \times (M - 1)^{N_g - 1} = 3 \times 4 = 12$ streams of symbols. Corresponding to message A , let 'a' denote its 12 symbol block as follows,

$$A \rightarrow \mathbf{a} = [\underbrace{A^1 A^2 A^3}_{\mathbf{a}^{1\top}} \mid \underbrace{A^4 A^5 A^6}_{\mathbf{a}^{2\top}} \mid \underbrace{A^7 A^8 A^9}_{\mathbf{a}^{3\top}} \mid \underbrace{A^{10} A^{11} A^{12}}_{\mathbf{a}^{4\top}}]^\top \quad (11)$$

i.e., the 12 symbols are divided into 4 blocks, each with length $M = 3$. Message B, C are encoded into \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} and divided into 4 blocks similarly. Also, for any $k \in [3], l \in [4], m \in [3]$, let us define

$$a^{k,l,[m]} = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \mathbf{a}^l, \quad b^{k,l,[m]} = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \mathbf{b}^l, \quad c^{k,l,[m]} = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \mathbf{c}^l \quad (12)$$

as the mode- m linear combination of the l^{th} block of A, B, C at Rx- k respectively.

The scheme in [20] requires 20 time slots for 12 streams of symbols of all messages to be transmitted to all the destinations. Over the 20 time slots, the transmitter sends

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(1) \\ \mathbf{x}(2) \\ \mathbf{x}(3) \\ \mathbf{x}(4) \\ \mathbf{x}(5) \\ \mathbf{x}(6) \\ \mathbf{x}(7) \\ \mathbf{x}(8) \\ \mathbf{x}(9) \\ \mathbf{x}(10) \\ \mathbf{x}(11) \\ \mathbf{x}(12) \\ \mathbf{x}(13) \\ \mathbf{x}(14) \\ \mathbf{x}(15) \\ \mathbf{x}(16) \\ \mathbf{x}(17) \\ \mathbf{x}(18) \\ \mathbf{x}(19) \\ \mathbf{x}(20) \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{V}_A} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} A^1 \\ A^2 \\ A^3 \\ A^4 \\ A^5 \\ A^6 \\ A^7 \\ A^8 \\ A^9 \\ A^{10} \\ A^{11} \\ A^{12} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{a}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{V}_B} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} B^1 \\ B^2 \\ B^3 \\ B^4 \\ B^5 \\ B^6 \\ B^7 \\ B^8 \\ B^9 \\ B^{10} \\ B^{11} \\ B^{12} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{b}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{V}_C} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} C^1 \\ C^2 \\ C^3 \\ C^4 \\ C^5 \\ C^6 \\ C^7 \\ C^8 \\ C^9 \\ C^{10} \\ C^{11} \\ C^{12} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{c}} \quad (13)$$

Note that in $\mathbb{V}_A, \mathbb{V}_B, \mathbb{V}_C$, the symbols \mathbf{I} are $M \times M = 3 \times 3$ identity matrices and the symbols $\mathbf{0}$ are all-zero matrices of the same size. Within the first 8 time slots (marked with blue), in each

channel use, one block each of A, B, C is chosen, added together, and sent over the 3 antennas of the transmitter. Within the last 12 time slots, however, a block of only one message is sent at a time. Let us label the top part of $\mathbb{V}_A, \mathbb{V}_B, \mathbb{V}_C$, that is marked with blue, as $\mathbf{T}_A, \mathbf{T}_B, \mathbf{T}_C$ respectively, and the bottom parts as $\mathbf{U}_A, \mathbf{U}_B, \mathbf{U}_C$ respectively. Thus, during the first 8 time slots, the transmitter broadcasts

$$\mathbf{T}_A \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{T}_B \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{T}_C \mathbf{c}. \quad (14)$$

Let the switching pattern of Rx-1 be $\mathbf{m}_1 = [m_1(1) \ m_1(2) \ \cdots \ m_1(20)]$. After the first 8 time slots, Rx- k obtains,

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1(1) \\ y_1(2) \\ y_1(3) \\ y_1(4) \\ y_1(5) \\ y_1(6) \\ y_1(7) \\ y_1(8) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(1)]} \mathbf{a}^1 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(2)]} \mathbf{a}^1 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(3)]} \mathbf{a}^2 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(4)]} \mathbf{a}^2 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(5)]} \mathbf{a}^3 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(6)]} \mathbf{a}^3 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(7)]} \mathbf{a}^4 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(8)]} \mathbf{a}^4 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(1)]} \mathbf{b}^1 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(2)]} \mathbf{b}^2 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(3)]} \mathbf{b}^1 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(4)]} \mathbf{b}^2 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(5)]} \mathbf{b}^3 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(6)]} \mathbf{b}^4 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(7)]} \mathbf{b}^3 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(8)]} \mathbf{b}^4 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(1)]} \mathbf{c}^1 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(2)]} \mathbf{c}^2 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(3)]} \mathbf{c}^3 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(4)]} \mathbf{c}^4 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(5)]} \mathbf{c}^1 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(6)]} \mathbf{c}^2 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(7)]} \mathbf{c}^3 \\ \mathbf{h}_1^{[m_1(8)]} \mathbf{c}^4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a^{1,1,[m_1(1)]} \\ a^{1,1,[m_1(2)]} \\ a^{1,2,[m_1(3)]} \\ a^{1,2,[m_1(4)]} \\ a^{1,3,[m_1(5)]} \\ a^{1,3,[m_1(6)]} \\ a^{1,4,[m_1(7)]} \\ a^{1,4,[m_1(8)]} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} b^{1,1,[m_1(1)]} \\ b^{1,2,[m_1(2)]} \\ b^{1,1,[m_1(3)]} \\ b^{1,2,[m_1(4)]} \\ b^{1,3,[m_1(5)]} \\ b^{1,4,[m_1(6)]} \\ b^{1,3,[m_1(7)]} \\ b^{1,4,[m_1(8)]} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c^{1,1,[m_1(1)]} \\ c^{1,2,[m_1(2)]} \\ c^{1,3,[m_1(3)]} \\ c^{1,4,[m_1(4)]} \\ c^{1,1,[m_1(5)]} \\ c^{1,2,[m_1(6)]} \\ c^{1,3,[m_1(7)]} \\ c^{1,4,[m_1(8)]} \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

In [20], the switching pattern is specified as $m_1(1), m_1(2), \dots, m_1(8) = 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2$, thus (15) becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} a^{1,1,[1]} \\ a^{1,1,[2]} \\ a^{1,2,[1]} \\ a^{1,2,[2]} \\ a^{1,3,[1]} \\ a^{1,3,[2]} \\ a^{1,4,[1]} \\ a^{1,4,[2]} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} b^{1,1,[1]} \\ b^{1,2,[2]} \\ b^{1,1,[1]} \\ b^{1,2,[2]} \\ b^{1,3,[1]} \\ b^{1,4,[2]} \\ b^{1,3,[1]} \\ b^{1,4,[2]} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c^{1,1,[1]} \\ c^{1,2,[2]} \\ c^{1,3,[1]} \\ c^{1,4,[2]} \\ c^{1,1,[1]} \\ c^{1,2,[2]} \\ c^{1,3,[1]} \\ c^{1,4,[2]} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

For the desired message A of Rx-1, we note that 2 distinct mode linear combinations of all blocks occur in the received signal, while for the undesired messages B, C , each block appears only as a one-mode linear combination in the received signal (intra-message alignment). For example, the first block of A is transmitted over time slots 1, 2 and received under different modes 1, 2 respectively. However, the first block of B that transmitted over time slots 1, 3 is received under the same mode 1. Thus, to recover A , Rx-1 needs to subtract the interfering linear combinations of blocks of B, C from (16) to recover 2 modes linear combination of each block of A , and furthermore download the mode-3 linear combination of each block of A , i.e., Rx-1 needs the following symbols,

$$a^{1,1,[3]}, a^{1,2,[3]}, a^{1,3,[3]}, a^{1,4,[3]}, b^{1,1,[1]}, b^{1,2,[2]}, b^{1,3,[1]}, b^{1,4,[2]}, c^{1,1,[1]}, c^{1,2,[2]}, c^{1,3,[1]}, c^{1,4,[2]} \quad (17)$$

These symbols are obtained over the last 12 time slots, where

$$\mathbf{U}_A \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{U}_B \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{U}_C \mathbf{c} \quad (18)$$

is broadcast. During the last 12 time slots, Rx-1 switches its antenna to mode-3 when blocks of A are broadcast, switches to mode-1 when the first and third blocks of B, C are broadcast, and switches to mode-2 when the second and fourth blocks of B, C are broadcast. The construction of [20] is thus complete.

2.4.2 BIA scheme for the BCGM setting with $(K = 3, G = 2, M = 3)$

Now consider the $(K = 3, G = 2, M = 3)$ BCGM setting shown in Fig. 5 with $N_g = 3, \nu_g = 1$.




Figure 5: $(K = 3, G = 2, M = 3)$ BCGM Example.

Following the construction of [20], during the first 8 time slots, we again let the transmitter send $\mathbf{T}_A \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{T}_B \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{T}_C \mathbf{c}$, so that (15) is received after the first 8 time slots. However, this time the design of the switching pattern is a bit more challenging. Note that both A and B are Rx-1's desired messages. Intuitively, in (15), we hope that only *one* mode linear combination of each block of the undesired message C (interference) occurs (intra-message alignment) similar to the previous example, while *two* distinct mode linear combinations of each block of both A, B also occur. To align the interference, we need,

$$m_1(1) = m_1(5), m_1(2) = m_1(6), m_1(3) = m_1(7), m_1(4) = m_1(8) \quad (19)$$

since block-1 of C is sent over time slots 1 and 5; block-2 of C is sent over time slots 2 and 6; \dots , and block-4 of C is sent over time slots 4 and 8.

Meanwhile, to make sure that each block of A is received with 2 distinct modes, we want

$$m_1(1) \neq m_1(2), m_1(3) \neq m_1(4), m_1(5) \neq m_1(6), m_1(7) \neq m_1(8) \quad (20)$$

since block-1 of A is sent over time slots 1 and 2, \dots , and block-4 of A is sent over time slots 7 and 8. At the same time, to make sure that each block of B is also received with 2 modes, we want

$$m_1(1) \neq m_1(3), m_1(2) \neq m_1(4), m_1(5) \neq m_1(7), m_1(6) \neq m_1(8) \quad (21)$$

since block-1 of B is sent over time slots 1 and 3, \dots , and block-4 of B is sent over time slots 6 and 8.

One feasible solution that satisfies all the three constraints in (19) to (21) is

$$(m_1(1), m_1(2), \dots, m_1(8)) = (1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1) \quad (22)$$

With this switching pattern, Rx- k obtains,

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1(1) \\ y_1(2) \\ y_1(3) \\ y_1(4) \\ y_1(5) \\ y_1(6) \\ y_1(7) \\ y_1(8) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a^{1,1,[1]} \\ a^{1,1,[2]} \\ a^{1,2,[2]} \\ a^{1,2,[1]} \\ a^{1,3,[1]} \\ a^{1,3,[2]} \\ a^{1,4,[2]} \\ a^{1,4,[1]} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} b^{1,1,[1]} \\ b^{1,2,[2]} \\ b^{1,1,[2]} \\ b^{1,2,[1]} \\ b^{1,3,[1]} \\ b^{1,4,[2]} \\ b^{1,3,[2]} \\ b^{1,4,[1]} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} c^{1,1,[1]} \\ c^{1,2,[2]} \\ c^{1,3,[2]} \\ c^{1,4,[1]} \\ c^{1,1,[1]} \\ c^{1,2,[2]} \\ c^{1,3,[2]} \\ c^{1,4,[1]} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

Note that Rx-1 needs $c^{1,1,[1]}, c^{1,2,[2]}, c^{1,3,[2]}, c^{1,4,[1]}$ to eliminate the interference from message C in (23). However, even if the interference is eliminated, dimensions of A and B are still aligned. To separate A, B , we let the transmitter use another 8 time slots to send,

$$\mathbf{T}_A \mathbf{a} + 2\mathbf{T}_B \mathbf{b} + 3\mathbf{T}_C \mathbf{c}, \quad (24)$$

meanwhile, Rx-1 repeats the same switching pattern

$$(m_1(9), m_1(10), \dots, m_1(16)) = (1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1), \quad (25)$$

and thus obtains,

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1(9) \\ y_1(10) \\ y_1(11) \\ y_1(12) \\ y_1(13) \\ y_1(14) \\ y_1(15) \\ y_1(16) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a^{1,1,[1]} \\ a^{1,1,[2]} \\ a^{1,2,[2]} \\ a^{1,2,[1]} \\ a^{1,3,[1]} \\ a^{1,3,[2]} \\ a^{1,4,[2]} \\ a^{1,4,[1]} \end{bmatrix} + 2 \begin{bmatrix} b^{1,1,[1]} \\ b^{1,2,[2]} \\ b^{1,1,[2]} \\ b^{1,2,[1]} \\ b^{1,3,[1]} \\ b^{1,4,[2]} \\ b^{1,3,[2]} \\ b^{1,4,[1]} \end{bmatrix} + 3 \begin{bmatrix} c^{1,1,[1]} \\ c^{1,2,[2]} \\ c^{1,3,[2]} \\ c^{1,4,[1]} \\ c^{1,1,[1]} \\ c^{1,2,[2]} \\ c^{1,3,[2]} \\ c^{1,4,[1]} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Again, the same $c^{1,1,[1]}, c^{1,2,[2]}, c^{1,3,[2]}, c^{1,4,[1]}$ are needed to eliminate the interference. They will be downloaded in the future. For now, suppose they are already available to Rx-1, thus after eliminating the interference, stacking a row (e.g., the first row) of (23) and the same row of (26) together, Rx-1 finds,

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_1(1) - c^{1,1,[1]} \\ y_1(9) - 3c^{1,1,[1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a^{1,1,[1]} \\ b^{1,1,[1]} \end{bmatrix} \quad (27)$$

Due to the invertibility of the 2×2 matrix, $a^{1,1,[1]}, b^{1,1,[1]}$ can be recovered. Similarly, $a^{1,l,[1]}, a^{1,l,[2]}, b^{1,l,[1]}, b^{1,l,[2]}$ can be recovered for arbitrary $l \in [4]$.

Therefore, the remaining task for Rx-1 is to obtain the desired symbols $a^{1,l,[3]}, b^{1,l,[3]}$ for all $l \in [4]$ and to obtain the interfering symbols $c^{1,1,[1]}, c^{1,2,[2]}, c^{1,3,[2]}, c^{1,4,[1]}$. This is again done by letting the transmitter broadcast $\mathbf{U}_A \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{U}_B \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{U}_C \mathbf{c}$ and letting Rx-1's switching pattern be 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 1, 2, 2, 1 during the last 12 time slots.

Overall, in the $8 + 8 + 12 = 28$ time slots, the broadcast information is as follows.

$$\mathbf{X} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1T}_A \\ \mathbf{1T}_A \\ \mathbf{U}_A \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{V}_A} \mathbf{a} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1T}_B \\ 2\mathbf{T}_B \\ \mathbf{U}_B \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{V}_B} \mathbf{b} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1T}_C \\ 3\mathbf{T}_C \\ \mathbf{U}_C \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{V}_C} \mathbf{c} \quad (28)$$

It is not difficult to verify that following the same considerations, during the first 8 time slots, the switching pattern of Rx-2 and Rx-3 can be chosen as,

$$m_2(1), m_2(2), \dots, m_2(8) = 1, 2, 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 1 \quad (29)$$

$$m_3(1), m_3(2), \dots, m_3(8) = 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1 \quad (30)$$

The switching pattern of the remaining time slots can be found accordingly. This completes the BIA construction for this BCGM example.

Remark 1. Due to the iterative structure of $\mathbf{T}_A, \mathbf{T}_B, \mathbf{T}_C$, the switching patterns $(m_k(1), m_k(2), \dots, m_k(8))$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$ can be found iteratively. For example, for Rx-2, the fact that message A is desired determines $m_2(1) \neq m_2(2)$ which can be set as 1, 2, respectively. The fact that B is undesired, and the fact that same blocks of B are sent over $t = 1, 2$ and $t = 3, 4$ determines $m_2(3) = 1, m_2(4) = 2$ as a repetition of $m_2(1), m_2(2)$. The status of message C as a desired message and the fact that same blocks of C are sent over $t = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and $t = 5, 6, 7, 8$ determines $m_2(5) = 2 = \langle m_2(1) + 1 \rangle_2, m_2(6) = 1 = \langle m_2(2) + 1 \rangle_2, m_2(7) = 2 = \langle m_2(3) + 1 \rangle_2, m_2(8) = 1 = \langle m_2(4) + 1 \rangle_2$ by shifting the switching pattern over the first 4 time slots as a whole. Similarly, for Rx-3, the fact that A is undesired determines $m_3(1) = m_3(2) = 1$. The desired status of message B determines $m_3(3) = m_3(4) = 2$ by shifting $m_3(1), m_3(2)$ as a whole. The desired status of C determines $m_3(5), \dots, m_3(8)$ by shifting $m_3(1), \dots, m_3(4)$ as a whole.

This idea of shifting or repeating switching patterns according to whether a message is desired or not is quite important for designing the switching pattern for the general problem.

2.5 Theorem 1: Proof of Achievability

Will consider precoding over \mathbb{T}_p channel uses where $\mathbb{T}_p \ll \mathbb{T}_c$. Thus for any $m \in [M]$, we write $\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]}(t)$ as $\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]}$ since it is a constant vector during the \mathbb{T}_p channel uses. In our description of the scheme in Section 2.5.1, we will ignore the AWGN for simplicity. In Section 2.5.2 we will show that with AWGN, the sum-DoF value $\frac{N_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}$ is achievable.

2.5.1 BIA Precoding Scheme for General (K, G, M) BCGM

Recall that a (K, G, M) BCGM problem has $N_g = \binom{K}{G}$ messages and each receiver desires $\nu_g = \binom{K-1}{G-1}$ messages. The scheme only depends on N_g and ν_g . The precoding structure will be closely related to that of the unicast problem in [20] with N_g messages (or equivalently N_g Rx's). The main building blocks of our precoding scheme are specified as follows.

1. $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \{\lambda_{i,j}\}_{i \in [\nu_g], j \in [N_g]} \in \text{MDS}_{\nu_g \times N_g}$ whose first row is $\mathbf{1}_{1 \times M^2}$.
2. Same as [20], for any $n \in [N_g]$, message W_n is encoded into $L = M\ell$ independent streams, where $\ell = (M-1)^{N_g-1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\underbrace{W_n^1 \ W_n^2 \ \dots \ W_n^M}_{\triangleq \mathbf{w}_n^{1\top}} \mid \underbrace{W_n^{M+1} \ W_n^{M+2} \ \dots \ W_n^{2M}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{w}_n^{2\top}} \mid \dots \right. \\ & \left. \dots \mid \underbrace{W_n^{(\ell-1)M+1} \ W_n^{(\ell-1)M+2} \ \dots \ W_n^{(\ell-1)M+M}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{w}_n^{\ell\top}} \right]^\top \triangleq \mathbf{w}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{M\ell \times 1} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The streams of symbols are partitioned into ℓ blocks $\mathbf{w}_n^l \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times 1}, \forall l \in [\ell]$. For any $n \in [N_g], k \in [K], l \in [\ell], m \in [M]$, let $w_n^{k,l,[m]}$ be the *mode- m linear combination* of the ℓ^{th} block of message W_n at Rx- k , defined by Rx- k 's channel vector while operating in mode- m , i.e.,

$$w_n^{k,l,[m]} = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \mathbf{w}_n^l. \quad (32)$$

²Actually, we only need $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ to be a $\nu_g \times N_g$ MDS matrix. We add the restriction that the first row should be all 1 for ease of presenting the scheme

3. For any $n \in [N_g]$, define a function $f_n(t): [(M-1)\ell] \rightarrow [\ell]$ such that,

$$f_n(t) \triangleq \left\lfloor \frac{t-1}{(M-1)^n} \right\rfloor (M-1)^{n-1} + \langle t \rangle_{(M-1)^{n-1}}, \quad (33)$$

and a matrix $\mathbf{\Pi}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{(M-1)\ell \times \ell}$ where

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_n = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_\ell^{f_n(1)} \\ \mathbf{e}_\ell^{f_n(2)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{e}_\ell^{f_n((M-1)\ell)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (34)$$

4. For any $n \in [N_g]$, let $\mathbf{T}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{M(M-1)\ell \times M\ell}$ be the collection of the precoding matrices for message W_n over the first $(M-1)\ell$ time slots, where

$$\mathbf{T}_n = \mathbf{\Pi}_n \otimes \mathbf{I}_M. \quad (35)$$

For any $t \in [(M-1)\ell]$ the M antennas of the transmitter broadcast the vector,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t) &= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \left(\mathbf{T}_n \right)_{[(t-1)M+1:tM],:} \mathbf{w}_n \\ &= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} (\mathbf{e}_\ell^{f_n(t)} \otimes \mathbf{I}_M) \mathbf{w}_n = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \mathbf{w}_n^{f_n(t)} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

This simply means that **at time slot t , only the M symbols of the $(f_n(t))^{th}$ block of message W_n are transmitted**, and each one of the M symbols is sent from a distinct antenna. Note that by this definition, \mathbf{T}_n is exactly the same as the first $M(M-1)\ell$ rows of the precoding matrix for message W_n in the (N_g, M) unicast problem studied in [20].

5. For any $k \in [K]$, Rx- k 's switching pattern $\mathbf{p}_k = (p_k(1), p_k(2), \dots, p_k((M-1)\ell))$ for the first $(M-1)\ell$ time slots that is specified by Algorithm 1.

Let us first analyze the signal produced at Rx- k because of the precoding structure and switching pattern specified thus far, over the first $(M-1)\ell$ time slots. The full precoding structure and switching pattern for the remaining time slots will be specified subsequently.

At time slot $t \in [(M-1)\ell = (M-1)^{N_g}]$, the receiver Rx- $k \in [k]$, operating in mode- $p_k(t)$, receives

$$\begin{aligned} y_k(t) &= \mathbf{h}_k^{p_k(t)} \mathbf{x}(t) \stackrel{(36)}{=} \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \mathbf{h}_k^{p_k(t)} \mathbf{w}_n^{f_n(t)} \stackrel{(32)}{=} \sum_{n \in [N_g]} w_n^{k, f_n(t), [p_k(t)]} \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} w_n^{k, f_n(t), [p_k(t)]}}_{\text{desired}} + \underbrace{\sum_{n \in [N-g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k} w_n^{k, f_n(t), [p_k(t)]}}_{\text{interference}}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

input : \mathcal{V}_k that denotes Rx- k 's desired messages
output: Rx- k 's switching pattern \mathbf{p}_k
if $1 \notin \mathcal{V}_k$ **then**
 | $p_k(1), p_k(2), \dots, p_k(M-1) \leftarrow \mathbf{1}_{1 \times (M-1)}$;
else
 | $p_k(1), p_k(2), \dots, p_k(M-1) \leftarrow [1 \ 2 \ 3 \ \dots \ M-1]$;
end
 $n \leftarrow 2$;
while $n \leq N_g$ **do**
 | $i \leftarrow 1$;
 | **if** $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$ **then**
 | **while** $i \leq M-2$ **do**
 | $p_k\left(i(M-1)^{n-1} + 1\right), p_k\left(i(M-1)^{n-1} + 2\right), \dots, p_k\left((i+1)(M-1)^{n-1}\right) \leftarrow$
 | $\langle p_k(1) + i \rangle_{M-1}, \langle p_k(2) + i \rangle_{M-1}, \dots, \langle p_k\left((M-1)^{n-1}\right) + i \rangle_{M-1}$;
 | $i \leftarrow i + 1$;
 | **end**
 | **else**
 | **while** $i \leq M-2$ **do**
 | $p_k\left(i(M-1)^{n-1} + 1\right), p_k\left(i(M-1)^{n-1} + 2\right), \dots, p_k\left((i+1)(M-1)^{n-1}\right) \leftarrow$
 | $p_k(1), p_k(2), \dots, p_k\left((M-1)^{n-1}\right)$;
 | $i \leftarrow i + 1$;
 | **end**
 | **end**
 | $n \leftarrow n + 1$;
end

Algorithm 1: Rx- k 's switching pattern for $t \in [(M-1)\ell]$

Thus, during the first $(M - 1)\ell$ time slots, the transmitter sends

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}((M - 1)\ell) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \mathbf{T}_n \mathbf{w}_n = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_n \otimes \mathbf{I}_M \mathbf{w}_n, \quad (38)$$

and Rx- k receives,

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_k(1) \\ \vdots \\ y_k((M - 1)\ell) \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k, f_n(1), [p_k(1)]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k, f_n((M-1)\ell), [p_k((M-1)\ell)]} \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{desired}} + \underbrace{\sum_{n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k} \begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k, f_n(1), [p_k(1)]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k, f_n((M-1)\ell), [p_k((M-1)\ell)]} \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{interference}}. \quad (39)$$

For ease of studying the property of the received signal, fixing any $n \in [N_g]$, let us represent $t \in [(M - 1)\ell = (M - 1)^{N_g}]$ and $l \in [\ell = (M - 1)^{N_g - 1}]$ as

$$t = t_n^{h,i,j} = h(M - 1)^n + i(M - 1)^{n-1} + j \quad (40)$$

$$l = l_n^{h,j} = h(M - 1)^{n-1} + j \quad (41)$$

$$\text{where } h \in [0 : (M - 1)^{N_g - n} - 1], i \in [0 : M - 2], j \in [(M - 1)^{n-1}]. \quad (42)$$

One can verify that,

$$f_n(t_n^{h,i,j}) = h(M - 1)^{n-1} + j = l_n^{h,j} \implies f_n(t_n^{h,0,j}) = f_n(t_n^{h,1,j}) = \dots = f_n(t_n^{h,M-2,j}) = l_n^{h,j}. \quad (43)$$

With these representations, we have the following lemma regarding \mathbf{p}_k and $y_k(1), \dots, y_k((M - 1)\ell)$.

Lemma 1. For $k \in [K]$, $n \in [N_g]$, the switching pattern \mathbf{p}_k satisfies

$$\forall h \in [0 : (M - 1)^{N_g - n} - 1], j \in [(M - 1)^{n-1}] \begin{cases} p_k(t_n^{h,0,j}) = p_k(t_n^{h,1,j}) = \dots = p_k(t_n^{h,M-2,j}) \triangleq m_{k,n}^{l=l_n^{h,j}} \in [M - 1] & n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k \\ p_k(t_n^{h,i,j}) = \underbrace{\left\langle p_k(t_n^{h,0,j}) + i \right\rangle}_{\triangleq m_{k,n}^{l=l_n^{h,j}}} \quad , \forall i \in [0 : M - 2] & n \in \mathcal{V}_k \end{cases}, \quad (44)$$

Proof. See Appendix A. ■

Thus, in $[y_k(1) \dots y_k((M - 1)\ell)]^\top$ specified in (39), for any $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$, $M - 1$ modes of linear combination $w_n^{k,l,[1]}, w_n^{k,l,[2]}, \dots, w_n^{k,l,[M-1]}$ occur in the desired part for any block $l \in [\ell]$, while for any $n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k$, only mode- $m_{k,n}^l$ linear combination $w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}$ occurs in the interference part for the block $l \in [\ell]$. Mathematically,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{w_n^{k, f_n(1), [p_k(1)]}, \dots, w_n^{k, f_n((M-1)\ell), [p_k((M-1)\ell)]}\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}\}_{l \in [\ell]}, & \forall n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k \\ \{w_n^{k,l,[1]}, w_n^{k,l,[2]}, \dots, w_n^{k,l,[M-1]}\}_{l \in [\ell]}, & \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k \end{cases}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

To cancel the interference in (39), for each block (M symbols) of an undesired message, Rx- k only needs *one* mode linear combination (intra-message alignment). Specifically, Rx- k needs,

$$w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}, \forall n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k, l \in [\ell]. \quad (46)$$

This is accomplished by letting the transmitter send pure \mathbf{w}_n^l through the M antennas at some time slot in the future and having Rx- k switch its antenna to mode- $m_{k,n}^l$. Thus, the scheme should ensure that Rx- k will obtain the interference in the future so it can cancel it from all received symbols. For now, suppose Rx- k already has the interference terms, so it can cancel the interference and obtain,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_k(1) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_k((M-1)\ell) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k,f_n(1),[p_k(1)]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k,f_n((M-1)\ell),[p_k((M-1)\ell)]} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

This, however, still does not guarantee the decodability of the desired messages. The transmitter and the receivers will ‘repeat’ the process specified above another $\nu_g - 1$ times, with the difference being that, \mathbf{T}_n will be scaled by some λ to precode the message W_n . Specifically, for each $v \in [2 : \nu_g]$, the transmitter uses $(M-1)\ell$ time slots to send,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}((v-1)(M-1)\ell+1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}(v(M-1)\ell) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \lambda_{v,n} \mathbf{T}_n \mathbf{w}_n = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \lambda_{v,n} \mathbf{\Pi} \otimes \mathbf{I}_M \mathbf{w}_n. \quad (48)$$

Again, following the switching pattern \mathbf{p}_k , Rx- k obtains,

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_k((v-1)(M-1)\ell+1) \\ \vdots \\ y_k(v(M-1)\ell) \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \lambda_{v,n} \begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k,f_n(1),[p_k(1)]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k,f_n((M-1)\ell),[p_k((M-1)\ell)]} \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{desired}} + \underbrace{\sum_{n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k} \lambda_{v,n} \begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k,f_n(1),[p_k(1)]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k,f_n((M-1)\ell),[p_k((M-1)\ell)]} \end{bmatrix}}_{\text{interference}}. \quad (49)$$

The interference can again be eliminated by subtracting the same combinations in (46). Note that no ‘new’ interference is encountered, highlighting the interference alignment aspect of the coding scheme.

After eliminating the interference, for any $v \in [\nu_g]$, Rx- k obtains,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_k((v-1)(M-1)\ell+1) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_k(v(M-1)\ell) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \lambda_{v,n} \begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k,f_n(1),[p_k(1)]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k,f_n((M-1)\ell),[p_k((M-1)\ell)]} \end{bmatrix} \quad (50)$$

Recall that for $r = 1$, we have $\lambda_{1,1} = \dots = \lambda_{1,N_g} = 1$, because the first row of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is an all one vector. Stacking the t^{th} rows, where $t \in [(M-1)\ell]$, of (50) for all $v \in [\nu_g]$ together, Rx- k obtains,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_k(t) \\ \tilde{y}_k((M-1)\ell + t) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_k((\nu_g - 1)(M-1)\ell + t) \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \lambda_{1,n} w_n^{k, f_n(t), [p_k(t)]} \\ \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \lambda_{2,n} w_n^{k, f_n(t), [p_k(t)]} \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \lambda_{\nu_g, n} w_n^{k, f_n(t), [p_k(t)]} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{1, n_1} & \lambda_{1, n_2} & \cdots & \lambda_{1, n_{\nu_g}} \\ \lambda_{2, n_1} & \lambda_{2, n_2} & \cdots & \lambda_{2, n_{\nu_g}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_{\nu_g, n_1} & \lambda_{\nu_g, n_2} & \cdots & \lambda_{\nu_g, n_{\nu_g}} \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{\Lambda}_{:, \mathcal{V}_k}} \begin{bmatrix} w_{n_1}^{k, f_{n_1}(t), [p_k(t)]} \\ w_{n_2}^{k, f_{n_2}(t), [p_k(t)]} \\ \vdots \\ w_{n_{\nu_g}}^{k, f_{n_{\nu_g}}(t), [p_k(t)]} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where we let the ν_g elements of \mathcal{V}_k , i.e., the indices of the ν_g messages desired by Rx- k , be denoted by,

$$\mathcal{V}_k = \{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{\nu_g}\}. \quad (52)$$

Note that $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{:, \mathcal{V}_k}$ is invertible due the MDS property of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ and the fact that $|\mathcal{V}_k| = \nu_g$. Thus, $\forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k, t \in [(M-1)\ell]$, Rx- k is able to recover $w_n^{k, f_n(t), [p_k(t)]}$ by inverting $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{:, \mathcal{V}_k}$. According to (45), Rx- k is thus able to recover,

$$\begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k, l, [1]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k, l, [M-1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_k^{[1]} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{h}_k^{[M-1]} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_n^l, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k, l \in [\ell]. \quad (53)$$

To fully recover the l^{th} block of a desired message W_n , one more combination,

$$w_n^{k, l, [M]} = \mathbf{h}_k^{[M]} \mathbf{w}_n^l, \quad (54)$$

needs to be downloaded by Rx- k . Also, recall that, the interference symbols in (46) have not been downloaded yet. We will deal with them together next.

Let the transmitter now use another $N_g \ell$ time slots to broadcast each block (M symbols) of the N_g messages. Specifically, for any $t \in [N_g \ell]$,

$$\mathbf{x}(\nu_g(M-1)\ell + t) = \mathbf{w}_{\lfloor \frac{t-1}{\ell} \rfloor + 1}^{(t)\ell}. \quad (55)$$

Rx- k switches its antenna to mode- M if the transmitter is broadcasting a block of a desired message at the current time slot, or switches to mode- $m_{k,n}^l$ if the transmitter is broadcasting the l^{th} block of an undesired message W_n . Thus,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(\nu_g(M-1)\ell + 1) \\ \mathbf{x}(\nu_g(M-1)\ell + 2) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}(\nu_g(M-1)\ell + N_g \ell) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{(n-1)\ell \times \ell} \\ \mathbf{I}_\ell \\ \mathbf{0}_{(N_g-n)\ell \times \ell} \end{bmatrix}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{U}_n} \otimes \mathbf{I}_M \mathbf{w}_n = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \mathbf{U}_n \mathbf{w}_n, \quad (56)$$

and for any $t \in [N_g\ell]$, Rx- k sets the mode to $m_k(\nu_g(M-1)\ell + t)$ at time slot $\nu_g(M-1)\ell + t$. Specifically,

$$m_k(\nu_g(M-1)\ell + t) = \begin{cases} m_{k, \lfloor \frac{t-1}{\ell} \rfloor + 1}^{(t)_\ell} & \lfloor \frac{t-1}{\ell} \rfloor + 1 \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k \\ M & \lfloor \frac{t-1}{\ell} \rfloor + 1 \in \mathcal{V}_k \end{cases}, \forall t \in [N_g\ell]. \quad (57)$$

This guarantees that the mode- M combination of all blocks of all desired messages and the interference in (46) can be recovered. Thus, after $T_p = \nu_g(M-1)\ell + N_g\ell$ time slots, for all $n \in \mathcal{V}_k, l \in \ell$, Rx- k obtains,

$$\begin{bmatrix} w_n^{k,l,[1]} \\ \vdots \\ w_n^{k,l,[M]} \end{bmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_k^{[1]} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{h}_k^{[M]} \end{bmatrix}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{H}_k} \mathbf{w}_n^l. \quad (58)$$

Since \mathbf{H}_k is invertible *almost surely*, $\{\mathbf{w}_n^l\}_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k, l \in [\ell]}$ can be recovered almost surely, i.e., for all $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$, \mathbf{w}_n can be recovered by Rx- k .

Overall, in $T_p = \nu_g(M-1)\ell + N_g\ell$ time slots, the transmitter sends,

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}(\nu_g(M-1)\ell + N_g\ell) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T}_n \\ \lambda_{2,n} \mathbf{T}_n \\ \vdots \\ \lambda_{\nu_g,n} \mathbf{T}_n \\ \mathbf{U}_n \end{bmatrix}}_{= \mathbb{V}_n} \mathbf{w}_n, \quad (59)$$

and the Rx- k 's switching pattern over the first $\nu_g(M-1)\ell$ time slots is

$$m_k(1), m_k(2), \dots, m_k(\nu_g(M-1)\ell) = \underbrace{[\mathbf{p}_k \cdots \mathbf{p}_k]}_{\ell}, \quad (60)$$

while the switching pattern over the last $N_g\ell$ time slots is specified by (57).

From a dimension counting perspective, note that since over $T_p = \nu_g(M-1)\ell + N_g\ell$ channel uses, $L = M\ell$ symbols of each messages are delivered, the DoF achieved for each message is

$$d_n = \frac{M\ell}{T_p} = \frac{M\ell}{\nu_g(M-1)\ell + N_g\ell} = \frac{M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}, \forall n \in [N_g] \quad (61)$$

so the sum-DoF value achieved is $d_\Sigma = \frac{N_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}$.

2.5.2 Key Properties of BIA Precoding Scheme

Let us represent our BIA precoding scheme for the BCGM setting in a slightly more general form and specify its properties to complete the proof that the sum-DoF $d_\Sigma = \frac{N_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}$ is achievable. The generalized representation will be useful to apply the scheme later in a different context in Section 3.2.

Specifically, according to (35), (56) and (59), the signal sent from the M antennas of the transmitter over T_p channel uses, can be represented as

$$\mathbf{X} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(1) \\ \mathbf{x}(2) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}(T_p) \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{n,1}^1 \mathbf{I}_M & \alpha_{n,1}^2 \mathbf{I}_M & \cdots & \alpha_{n,1}^\ell \mathbf{I}_M \\ \alpha_{n,2}^1 \mathbf{I}_M & \alpha_{n,2}^2 \mathbf{I}_M & \cdots & \alpha_{n,2}^\ell \mathbf{I}_M \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_{n,T_p}^1 \mathbf{I}_M & \alpha_{n,T_p}^2 \mathbf{I}_M & \cdots & \alpha_{n,T_p}^\ell \mathbf{I}_M \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbb{V}_n} \mathbf{w}_n \quad (62)$$

where \mathbb{V}_n is the precoding matrix for message W_n , and the α 's can be 0, 1 or some λ as an entry of the $\nu_g \times N_g$ MDS matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$.

Let $\mathbf{z}_k = [z_k(1) \ z_k(2) \ \cdots \ z_k(T_p)]^\top$ be the AWGN over the T_p channel uses at Rx- k . The signal received at Rx- k , $k \in [K]$ can then be represented as

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \text{Block-Diag}(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]}, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]}) \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (63)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \text{Block-Diag}(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]}, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]}) \mathbb{V}_n \mathbf{w}_n + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (64)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{n,1}^1 \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]} & \alpha_{n,1}^2 \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]} & \cdots & \alpha_{n,1}^\ell \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]} \\ \alpha_{n,2}^1 \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]} & \alpha_{n,2}^2 \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]} & \cdots & \alpha_{n,2}^\ell \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_{n,T_p}^1 \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]} & \alpha_{n,T_p}^2 \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]} & \cdots & \alpha_{n,T_p}^\ell \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_n + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (65)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{n,1}^1 \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(1)} & \alpha_{n,1}^2 \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(1)} & \cdots & \alpha_{n,1}^\ell \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(1)} \\ \alpha_{n,2}^1 \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(2)} & \alpha_{n,2}^2 \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(2)} & \cdots & \alpha_{n,2}^\ell \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_{n,T_p}^1 \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(T_p)} & \alpha_{n,T_p}^2 \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(T_p)} & \cdots & \alpha_{n,T_p}^\ell \mathbf{e}_M^{m_k(T_p)} \end{bmatrix}}_{\triangleq \mathbb{E}_{k,n} \in \mathbb{C}^{T_p \times M\ell}} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_k & & & \\ & \mathbf{H}_k & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{H}_k \end{bmatrix}}_{\# \text{ of } \mathbf{H}_k = \ell, \triangleq \mathbb{H}_k} \mathbf{w}_n + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (66)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \mathbb{E}_{k,n} \underbrace{\mathbb{H}_k \mathbf{w}_n}_{\text{desired}} + \sum_{n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k} \mathbb{E}_{k,n} \underbrace{\mathbb{H}_k \mathbf{w}_n}_{\text{interference}} + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (67)$$

where in step (66) \mathbf{H}_k is as defined in (58), and we use the fact that $\mathbf{e}_M^m \mathbf{H}_k = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]}$ for any $m \in [M]$.

Note that in our scheme, all the $M\ell \times M\ell$ symbols of the desired message are recovered at Rx- k , while every block of M symbols of the undesired message (interference) is aligned into 1 dimension at Rx- k . This implies the following properties.

$$\begin{cases} \text{rk}(\mathbb{E}_{k,n}) = M\ell, \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k \\ \text{rk}(\mathbb{E}_{k,n}) = \ell, \forall n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k \\ \text{rk}(\cup_{n \in [N_g]} \mathbb{E}_{k,n}) = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \text{rk}(\mathbb{E}_{k,n}) = T_p \end{cases} \quad (68)$$

Note that according to (68) there exists $\mathbb{D}_{k,n} \in \mathbb{C}^{T_p \times M\ell}$, $\forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k$ s.t.

$$\mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbb{E}_{k,n} = \mathbf{I}_{M\ell}, \quad \mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbb{E}_{k,\bar{n}} = \mathbf{0}_{M\ell \times M\ell}, \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k, \bar{n} \in [N_g], \bar{n} \neq n. \quad (69)$$

For a specific desired message W_n where $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$, after applying $\mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top$ to \mathbf{y}_k , Rx- k obtains,

$$\mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbf{y}_k = \mathbb{H}_{k,n} \mathbf{w}_n + \mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbf{z}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_k \mathbf{w}_n^1 \\ \mathbf{H}_k \mathbf{w}_n^2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{H}_k \mathbf{w}_n^{\ell_n} \end{bmatrix} + \mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbf{z}_k \quad (70)$$

where $\mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbf{z}_k$ is AWGN whose variance is determined by $\mathbb{D}_{k,n}$, which is further determined by $\mathbb{E}_{k,n}$'s. That is to say, after T_p channel uses, for any block of M symbols of W_n , i.e., $\mathbf{w}_n^l, l \in [\ell_n]$, Rx- k sees a point to point $M \times M$ MIMO channel $\mathbf{H}_k \mathbf{w}_n^l$ plus some AWGN, whose DoF is known to be the rank of \mathbf{H}_k which is equal to M almost surely. Thus, for any message W_n , the DoF value achieved is $d_n^{\text{BCGM}} = M\ell_n/T_p$ and the sum-DoF achieved is $d_\Sigma^{\text{BCGM}} = N_g d_n^{\text{BCGM}} = N_g M / ((M-1)\nu_g + N_g)$.

3 Application to Wireless MapReduce

We will now show how the BIA scheme for the BCGM setting can be applied to the wireless MapReduce setting. To avoid the complexities of MapReduce that are non-essential for our purpose, we abstract the wireless MapReduce problem into a wireless network which is similar to the r -fold cooperation network of [8, Section II.B]. Note that this wireless network corresponds to a symmetric MapReduce setting where every file is assigned to the same number (r) of computation nodes (Tx-Rx pairs). We will focus on the symmetric setting.

3.1 (K, r, M) MapReduce: Formulation

In a (K, r, M) MapReduce network, there are K Tx's each of which has only one conventional antenna. There are also K Rx's each equipped with a reconfigurable antenna that is able to switch among M independent modes. Over the t^{th} channel use, the scalar signal received at Rx- k is

$$y_k(t) = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(t)]}(t) \mathbf{x}(t) + z_k(t), \quad \forall k \in [K]. \quad (71)$$

Here $\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(t)]}(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{1 \times K}$ is the $1 \times K$ channel vector corresponding to receive-antenna mode $m_k(t) \in [M]$ chosen by Rx- k at time t , $\mathbf{x}(t) = [x_1(t) \cdots x_K(t)]^\top$ is the $K \times 1$ vector of symbols sent from the K Tx's (Tx- k corresponds to $x_k(t)$), and $z_k(t)$ is the zero-mean unit variance circularly symmetric complex AWGN at Rx- k at time t . The channel fading model, and the power constraint are the same as those in the BCGM setting. Also as before, let T_c be the channel coherence time. There is no CSIT while all the Rx's have perfect CSIR.

Let us next specify the messages. There are $N_r = \binom{K}{r}$ independent super-messages indexed as $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathcal{T}}, \forall \mathcal{T} \subset \binom{[K]}{r}$. Each super-message is a set of $K - r$ independent messages, $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathcal{T}} \triangleq \{\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{T}, \bar{i}}, \bar{i} \in [K] \setminus \mathcal{T}\}$. Thus, the total number of independent messages in the MapReduce problem is $N_m = N_r(K - r)$. Define,

$$\text{SI}_k^{\text{MR}} \triangleq \{\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathcal{T}} \mid \forall \mathcal{T} \in \binom{[K]}{r}, k \in \mathcal{T}\} \quad (72)$$

as the set of messages available as side-information to Rx- k . Tx- k has knowledge of only the messages in SI_k^{MR} , thus $x_k(t)$ can only depend on these messages. The set of messages desired by




Figure 6: ($K = 4, r = 2, M$) MapReduce and its equivalent ($K = 4, G = 3, M$) USI setting.

Rx- k is specified as,

$$DE_k^{\text{MR}} = \{\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{T},k} \mid \forall \mathcal{T} \in \binom{[K]}{r}, k \in [K] \setminus \mathcal{T}\}. \quad (73)$$

In plain words, each super-message is known to r Tx-Rx pairs, and its constituent $K - r$ messages are desired by the remaining $K - r$ receivers, respectively.

One example of a ($K = 4, r = 2, M$) MapReduce problem is shown in Fig. 6a. The super-message $\widetilde{W}_{\{1,2\}}$ which is relabeled as $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}$ for ease of reference, is known to Tx-1, 2 and Rx-1, 2, and is comprised of $K - r = 2$ messages $\widetilde{W}_{\{1,2\},3} = \widetilde{A}_3, \widetilde{W}_{\{1,2\},4} = \widetilde{A}_4$, such that Rx-3 desires \widetilde{A}_3 while Rx-4 desires \widetilde{A}_4 .

For any message $W_{\mathcal{T},\bar{t}}, \mathcal{T} \subset \binom{[K]}{r}, \bar{t} \in [K] \setminus \mathcal{T}$, let $|W_{\mathcal{T},\bar{t}}(P)|$ denote its alphabet size (P is the power constraint). For codewords spanning T channel uses, the rate associated with $W_{\mathcal{T},\bar{t}}$ is $R_{\mathcal{T},\bar{t}}^{\text{MR}}(P) \triangleq \frac{\log |W_{\mathcal{T},\bar{t}}(P)|}{T}$. The rate is achievable if there exists a sequence of coding schemes with the specified rate, such that all the messages can be decoded at their intended Rx's with negligible probability of error. Due to the fact that a message in this MapReduce network corresponds to an intermediate value (IVA) in the original MapReduce setting [7, 8], and all the IVAs are assumed to have the same number of bits of information, we require that in the MapReduce network, all the messages are transmitted at the same rate, i.e.,

$$R_{\mathcal{T},\bar{t}}^{\text{MR}}(P) = R^{\text{MR}}(P), \forall \mathcal{T} \subset \binom{[K]}{r}, \bar{t} \in [K] \setminus \mathcal{T}. \quad (74)$$

A DoF per message value d^{MR} is said to be achievable if there exists an achievable rate $R^{\text{MR}}(P)$ such that

$$d^{\text{MR}} = \lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R^{\text{MR}}(P)}{P}, \quad (75)$$

and the DoF per message of this network $d^{\text{MR},*}$ is the largest achievable DoF per message value. Since the messages are transmitted at the same rate, the sum-DoF of this network is simply

$$d_{\Sigma}^{\text{MR},*} = (K - r) \binom{K}{r} d^{\text{MR},*}. \quad (76)$$

Remark 2. Compared with the r -fold cooperation network in [8, Section II.B] whose channel model is specified in [8, Eq. (5)] where there is no direct link (link from Tx- k to Rx- k), our network with direct links is equivalent since all the messages known by Tx- k are also known to Rx- k as side information and thus any signal transmitted from Tx- k can be eliminated by Rx- k .

Remark 3. The K Tx-Rx pairs in our definition of MapReduce correspond to the K computation nodes defined in [7, 8]. A super-message, and a message within a super-message intended for Rx- k in our definition corresponds to a file, and an intermediate values (IVA) computed from a file that is desired by computation node k in [7, 8]. In both settings, r is the computation load. The MapReduce problem studied in this paper corresponds to a symmetric MapReduce problem in [7, 8] where there are $\binom{K}{r}$ files (super-messages) each of which is available to r computation nodes (Tx-Rx pairs). Note that we have eliminated the IVAs that can be trivially computed at their destinations. Thus from every file, only $(K - r)$ IVAs, instead of K IVAs are computed and transmitted, since the r computation nodes who have the corresponding file can compute IVAs themselves. Reflected in our setting, every super-message contains only $K - r$ messages.

3.2 (K, G, M) Unicast with Side Information (USI)

To properly leverage the side information at each Rx to improve the communication efficiency, we relabel each message in a (K, r, M) MapReduce network and regroup them into new super-messages. We call the setting after the relabeling a (K, G, M) unicast with side information (USI) setting with $G = r + 1$. Let us first specify what we mean by a $(K, G = r + 1, M)$ USI setting, and then show the exact way we relabel the messages.

In a $(K, G = r + 1, M)$ USI setting, there are $N_g \triangleq \binom{K}{G}$ groups and N_g independent super-messages, namely $\mathbf{W}_n, \forall n \in [N_g]$. For any $n \in [N_g]$, the G Rx's in group \mathcal{S}_n (as defined in (3)) correspond to the super-message \mathbf{W}_n . Similar to the (K, G, M) BCGM setting, for any $k \in [K]$, let \mathcal{V}_k be the indices of all the super-messages corresponding to Rx- k — same as defined in (4). Each super-message consists of G independent messages, i.e., $\mathbf{W}_n \triangleq \{W_{n,g}, g \in [G]\}$. The g^{th} Rx in the group \mathcal{S}_n , i.e., Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$, desires message $W_{n,g}$. At the same time, the messages $\mathbf{W}_n \setminus \{W_{n,g}\}$, i.e., all the messages within the super-message \mathbf{W}_n other than $W_{n,g}$ that desired by Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$, are known to Tx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$ and also available to Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$ as *side-information* prior to the transmission. In total, there are $N_u = GN_g$ messages and each Rx desires a total of $\nu_g = GN_g/K$ messages. For any $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$, let the index of the message within the super-message \mathbf{W}_n that is required by Rx- k be $g_n^k \in [G]$, i.e.,

$$g_n^k \triangleq g \in [G] \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}_n(g) = k, \forall k \in [K], n \in \mathcal{V}_k. \quad (77)$$

The set of messages desired by Rx- k is denoted by DE_k^{USI} , and the set of messages available to Rx- k as side-information is denoted by SI_k^{USI} ,

$$\text{DE}_k^{\text{USI}} = \{W_{n,g} \mid \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k, g \in [G] \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}_n(g) = k\} = \{W_{n,g_n^k} \mid \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k\}, \quad (78)$$

$$\text{SI}_k^{\text{USI}} = \{W_{n,\bar{g}} \mid \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k, \bar{g} \in [G] \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g}) \neq k\} = \{W_{n,\bar{g}} \mid \forall n \in \mathcal{V}_k, \bar{g} \in [G], \bar{g} \neq g_n^k\}. \quad (79)$$

Note that Tx- k only has the messages in SI_k^{USI} , thus $x_k(t)$ only depends on SI_k^{USI} .

An example of $(K = 4, G = 3, M)$ USI setting is shown in Fig. 6b, where we have $N_g = 4$ groups $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}, \mathcal{S}_2 = \{1, 2, 4\}, \mathcal{S}_3 = \{1, 3, 4\}, \mathcal{S}_4 = \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $N_g = 4$ super-messages $\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \mathbf{W}_3, \mathbf{W}_4$, re-labeled as **A, B, C, D** respectively for convenience, correspond to each group. Each super-message is comprised of $G = 3$ messages, each Rx desires $\nu_g = 3$ messages. Take the

super-message \mathbf{W}_2 which is relabeled as \mathbf{B} for example. It is comprised of 3 messages $W_{2,1} = B_1, W_{2,2} = B_2, W_{2,3} = B_3$ and corresponds to the group $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{1, 2, 4\}$. The first Rx within the group, i.e., Rx-1 desires $W_{2,1} = B_1$ and knows $W_{2,2} = B_2, W_{2,3} = B_3$. Similarly, the second Rx in \mathcal{S}_2 , i.e., Rx-2 desires B_2 and knows B_1, B_3 , Rx-4 which is the 3rd Rx in group \mathcal{S}_2 , desires B_3 and knows B_1, B_2 . Note that Tx-1 only knows the messages in the set $\text{SI}_1^{\text{USI}} = \{A_2, A_3, B_2, B_3, C_2, C_3\}$. Thus, the transmitted symbols $x_1(t)$ can only depend on messages SI_1^{USI} .

Let us now specify how to relabel the messages in (K, r, M) MapReduce to form a $(K, G = r + 1, M)$ USI. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *A (K, r, M) MapReduce setting with super-messages $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{\mathcal{T}}, \forall \mathcal{T} \subset \binom{[K]}{r}$ is equivalent to a $(K, G = r + 1, M)$ USI setting with super-messages $\mathbf{W}_n, \forall n \in [N_g]$ following the relabeling,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_n &= \left(W_{n,1}, W_{n,2}, \dots, W_{n,G} \right) \\ &\triangleq \left(\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(1)\}, \mathcal{S}_n(1)}, \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(2)\}, \mathcal{S}_n(2)}, \dots, \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(G)\}, \mathcal{S}_n(G)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Proof. Consider any specific n, g where $n \in [N_g]$ and $g \in [G]$. The set $\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(g)\}$ has cardinality $r = G - 1$. The message $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(g)\}, \mathcal{S}_n(g)}$ is desired by Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$. Meanwhile, for all $\bar{g} \in [G], \bar{g} \neq g$, $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g})\}, \mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g})}$ is available to Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$ as side information, because in the MapReduce setting, $\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g})\}, \mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g})}$ that is desired by Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g})$, is available as side information to every Rx whose index is in $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g})\}$. Note that $\mathcal{S}_n(g) \in \mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(\bar{g})\}$. Thus, according to the mapping, for any $g \in [G]$, $W_{n,g} = \widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(g)\}, \mathcal{S}_n(g)}$ is desired by Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$, while $\mathbf{W}_n \setminus \{W_{n,g}\} = (80) \setminus \{\widetilde{W}_{\mathcal{S}_n \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_n(g)\}, \mathcal{S}_n(g)}\}$ are known to Rx- $\mathcal{S}_n(g)$, thus establishing the equivalence between the two settings. Also, note that the mapping is one to one, as there are $(K - r) \binom{K}{r} = \frac{K!}{r!(K-r-1)!}$ messages in (K, r, M) MapReduce, which is equal to the number of messages, $G \binom{K}{G} = \frac{K!}{(G-1)!(K-G)!}$, in a (K, G, M) USI setting, with $G = r + 1$. \blacksquare

Remark 4. *In our precoding scheme for USI, in each Rx's received signal, all the G messages belonging to the same super-message will be aligned with each other (inter-message alignment). Specifically, the example in Fig. 6b corresponds to the example in Fig. 6a with relabeled messages. A_1, A_2, A_3 circled with red will be aligned in each Rx's received signal, reflected back to the example in Fig. 6a, messages $\widetilde{D}_1, \widetilde{B}_2, \widetilde{A}_3$ will be aligned. Note that compared with the scheme in [12] when there is no CSIT and just conventional Rx antennas, our alignment scheme is strictly better even if each Rx's antenna is conventional ($M = 1$). Specifically, the scheme in [12] only inter-aligns r messages following the scheme intended for wired networks in [10]. However, with the mapping to USI, our scheme inter-aligns $G = r + 1$ messages by using the superposition nature of wireless networks. Specifically, in Fig. 6b, A_1, A_2, A_3 will not be able to be aligned in a wired network as no Tx has all of them. However, in the wireless network, we can let Tx-1, 2, 3 transmit A_1, A_2, A_3 separately and they will automatically be aligned at each receiver.*

Remark 5. *Since USI is just a MapReduce with relabeled messages, the rates, DoF per message, sum-DoF of a USI setting are defined, and DoF results of USI translate to MapReduce. Thus, we only need to study USI.*

3.3 DoF of the USI Setting

It is now increasingly apparent that a (K, G, M) USI setting is similar to a (K, G, M) BCGM setting. Specifically, we may view every message W_n in a BCGM setting as the aligned version of

the super-message \mathbf{W}_n in USI. Intuitively, in USI, if $\sum_{g \in [G]} W_{n,g}$ is received by the G Rx's in the corresponding group, they will all be able to decode their desired messages by subtracting their side information out. We will show that the BIA precoding scheme for a (K, G, M) BCGM setting yields a precoding scheme for a (K, G, M) USI setting when $M \leq G - 1$. Intuitively, in USI, every message will be precoded and broadcast from the first M Tx's who have that message, and messages belong to the same super-message will be aligned due to the fact that they will be precoded with the same precoding matrix. Specifically, we have the following theorem and corollary.

Theorem 2. *For the (K, G, M) USI, the sum-DoF*

$$d_{\Sigma}^{\text{USI},*} = \frac{GN_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g} \quad M \leq G-1, \quad (81)$$

$$\frac{GN_g(G-1)}{(G-2)\nu_g + N_g} \leq d_{\Sigma}^{\text{USI},*} \leq \frac{GN_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g} \quad M \geq G. \quad (82)$$

Let us now prove the achievability by applying the BIA precoding scheme for (K, G, M) BCGM to (K, G, M) USI. The converse will be proved in Appendix B.2.

3.4 Proof of Achievability for Theorem 2

3.4.1 Achievability for the Case: $M \leq G - 1$

Let \mathbb{T}_p, ℓ , the precoding matrices $\mathbb{V}_n, n \in [N_g]$, the matrices $\mathbb{E}_{k,n}, \mathbb{D}_{k,n}, k \in [K], n \in [N_g]$ and the switching pattern $\mathbf{m}_k, k \in [K]$ be the same as those in the achievable scheme for the BCGM setting. For any $n \in [N_g], g \in [G]$, message $W_{n,g}$ is encoded into $L = M\ell$ independent streams $\mathbf{w}_{n,g} = [W_{n,g}^1 \ \cdots \ W_{n,g}^L]^\top$. Let $\mathcal{M}_{n,g} \subset [K], |\mathcal{M}_{n,g}| = M$ denote the first M Tx's who have the message $W_{n,g}$. Let us introduce the following definition.

Definition 1. $\forall n \in [N_g], g \in [G]$, let $\mathbf{X}_{n,g} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times L}$ be defined to be the overall signal transmitted by the K Tx's over \mathbb{T}_p channel uses when the Tx's in $\mathcal{M}_{n,g}$ simulate the M transmit antennas in BCGM setting and transmit $\mathbb{V}_n \mathbf{w}_{n,g}$, with \mathbb{V}_n as specified in (62), while the remaining $K - M$ Tx's transmit nothing.

Let the signal transmitted by the K Tx's over \mathbb{T}_p be

$$\mathbf{X} = \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \sum_{g \in [G]} \mathbf{X}_{n,g} \in \mathbb{C}^{K \times L}, \quad (83)$$

then following the switching pattern \mathbf{m}_k , Rx- k , $k \in [K]$ receives

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \text{Block-Diag}(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]}, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]})\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (84)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \sum_{g \in [G]} \text{Block-Diag}(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]}, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]}, \dots, \mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]})\mathbf{X}_{n,g} + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (85)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \sum_{g \in [G]} \text{Block-Diag} \left(\left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(1)]} \right)_{\mathcal{M}_{n,g}}, \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(2)]} \right)_{\mathcal{M}_{n,g}}, \dots, \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m_k(T_p)]} \right)_{\mathcal{M}_{n,g}} \right) \mathbb{V}_n \mathbf{w}_{n,g} + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (86)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in [N_g]} \sum_{g \in [G]} \mathbb{E}_{k,n} \mathbb{H}_{k,n,g} \mathbf{w}_{n,g} + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (87)$$

$$= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} \mathbb{E}_{k,n} \underbrace{\sum_{g \in [G]} \mathbb{H}_{k,n,g} \mathbf{w}_{n,g}}_{\text{desired + side information}} + \sum_{n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k} \mathbb{E}_{k,n} \underbrace{\sum_{g \in [G]} \mathbb{H}_{k,n,g} \mathbf{w}_{n,g}}_{\text{interference}} + \mathbf{z}_k \quad (88)$$

where $\mathbf{z}_k \in \mathbb{C}^{T_p \times 1}$ is the AWGN at Rx- k , (86) results from the fact that in $\mathbf{X}_{n,g}$, only Tx's in $\mathcal{M}_{n,g}$ transmit $\mathbb{V}_n \mathbf{w}_{n,g}$ while all other Tx's transmit nothing according to Definition 1, (87) follows from the same reasoning as used from (64) to (66), and we have defined,

$$\mathbf{H}_{k,n,g} = \begin{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[1]} \right)_{\mathcal{M}_{n,g}} \\ \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[2]} \right)_{\mathcal{M}_{n,g}} \\ \vdots \\ \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[M]} \right)_{\mathcal{M}_{n,g}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times M}, \mathbb{H}_{k,n,g} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{k,n,g} & & & \\ & \mathbf{H}_{k,n,g} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \mathbf{H}_{k,n,g} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{M\ell \times M\ell}. \quad (89)$$

For any $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$, Rx- k can apply the $\mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top$ to \mathbf{y}_k and get

$$\mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbf{y}_k = \sum_{g \in [G]} \mathbb{H}_{k,n,g} \mathbf{w}_{n,g} + \mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbf{z}_k = \underbrace{\mathbb{H}_{k,n,g_n^k} \mathbf{w}_{n,g_n^k}}_{\text{desired}} + \underbrace{\sum_{g \in [G], g \neq g_n^k} \mathbb{H}_{k,n,g} \mathbf{w}_{n,g}}_{\text{side information}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{D}_{k,n}^\top \mathbf{z}_k}_{\text{AWGN}} \quad (90)$$

Note that for the super-message \mathbf{W}_n , $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$, Rx- k knows $W_{n,g}, g \neq g_n^k$ as side information. It can thus subtract the known symbols out from (90). Again, for any block of M symbols of W_{n,g_n^k} , Rx- k sees a point to point AWGN $M \times M$ MIMO channel, and the DoF per message achieved is $d^{\text{USI}} = M\ell/T_p$. The sum-DoF achieved is thus $d_{\Sigma}^{\text{USI}} = GN_g d = GN_g M / ((M-1)\nu_g + N_g)$.

3.4.2 Example 3: Converting the BIA Scheme from BCGM to USI

Let us show how to convert the BIA precoding scheme for the ($K = 4, G = 3, M = 2$) BCGM setting shown in Fig. 1b to the corresponding USI setting shown in Fig. 6b. Each message is encoded into 2 streams of coded symbols as follows,

$$A_i \rightarrow [A_i^1 \ A_i^2] \quad B_i \rightarrow [B_i^1 \ B_i^2] \quad C_i \rightarrow [C_i^1 \ C_i^2] \quad D_i \rightarrow [D_i^1 \ D_i^2]. \quad (91)$$

	$t = 1$	$t = 2$	$t = 3$	$t = 4$	$t = 5$	$t = 6$	$t = 7$	
x_1	$\lambda_1 W^1$	$\lambda_2 W^1$	$\lambda_3 W^1$	$w_{1,A}$	$w_{1,B}$	$w_{1,C}$	$w_{1,D}$	
x_2	$\lambda_1 W^2$	$\lambda_2 W^2$	$\lambda_3 W^2$	$w_{2,A}$	$w_{2,B}$	$w_{2,C}$	$w_{2,D}$	
x_3	$\lambda_1 W^3$	$\lambda_2 W^3$	$\lambda_3 W^3$	$w_{3,A}$	$w_{3,B}$	$w_{3,C}$	$w_{3,D}$	
x_4	$\lambda_1 W^4$	$\lambda_2 W^4$	$\lambda_3 W^4$	$w_{4,A}$	$w_{4,B}$	$w_{4,C}$	$w_{4,D}$	
y_1	$\lambda_1 [a^{1,[1]} \dots d^{1,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_2 [a^{1,[1]} \dots d^{1,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_3 [a^{1,[1]} \dots d^{1,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{1,[2]}$	$b^{1,[2]}$	$c^{1,[2]}$	$d^{1,[1]}$	$\rightarrow (a^{1,[m]}, b^{1,[m]}, c^{1,[m]})_{m \in [2]}$
y_2	$\lambda_1 [a^{2,[1]} \dots d^{2,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_2 [a^{2,[1]} \dots d^{2,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_3 [a^{2,[1]} \dots d^{2,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{2,[2]}$	$b^{2,[2]}$	$c^{2,[1]}$	$d^{2,[2]}$	$\rightarrow (a^{2,[m]}, b^{2,[m]}, d^{2,[m]})_{m \in [2]}$
y_3	$\lambda_1 [a^{3,[1]} \dots d^{3,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_2 [a^{3,[1]} \dots d^{3,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_3 [a^{3,[1]} \dots d^{3,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{3,[2]}$	$b^{3,[1]}$	$c^{3,[2]}$	$d^{3,[2]}$	$\rightarrow (a^{3,[m]}, c^{3,[m]}, d^{3,[m]})_{m \in [2]}$
y_4	$\lambda_1 [a^{4,[1]} \dots d^{4,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_2 [a^{4,[1]} \dots d^{4,[1]}]^\top$	$\lambda_3 [a^{4,[1]} \dots d^{4,[1]}]^\top$	$a^{4,[1]}$	$b^{4,[2]}$	$c^{4,[2]}$	$d^{4,[2]}$	$\rightarrow (b^{4,[m]}, c^{4,[m]}, d^{4,[m]})_{m \in [2]}$

Figure 7: Precoding scheme for a $(4, 3, 2)$ USI setting.

Transmitters Tx-1, 2, 3, 4 then prepare W^1, W^2, W^3, W^4 , respectively, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
W^1 &\triangleq [A_2^1 + A_3^1 \quad B_2^1 + B_3^1 \quad C_2^1 + C_3^1 \quad 0]^\top \triangleq [w_{1,A} \quad w_{1,B} \quad w_{1,C} \quad w_{1,D}]^\top \\
W^2 &\triangleq [A_1^1 + A_3^2 \quad B_1^1 + B_3^2 \quad 0 \quad D_2^1 + D_3^1]^\top \triangleq [w_{2,A} \quad w_{2,B} \quad w_{2,C} \quad w_{2,D}]^\top \\
W^3 &\triangleq [A_1^2 + A_2^2 \quad 0 \quad C_1^1 + C_3^2 \quad D_1^1 + D_3^2]^\top \triangleq [w_{3,A} \quad w_{3,B} \quad w_{3,C} \quad w_{3,D}]^\top \\
W^4 &\triangleq [0 \quad B_1^2 + B_2^2 \quad C_1^2 + C_2^2 \quad D_1^2 + D_2^2]^\top \triangleq [w_{4,A} \quad w_{4,B} \quad w_{4,C} \quad w_{4,D}]^\top
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

The precise forms of the symbols, e.g., $w_{1,A}, w_{2,A}, w_{3,A}$ are determined as follows. The (first) two Txs who have A_2 , i.e., Tx-1 and Tx-3, will have A_2^1, A_2^2 in their $w_{1,A}, w_{3,A}$ respectively which are marked red in (92). Similarly, A_3^1, A_3^2 which are marked blue are included in $w_{1,A}, w_{2,A}$ respectively, as Tx-1 and Tx-2 are the first two that know A_3 . Following the same rule, A_1^1 and A_1^2 are involved in $w_{2,A}, w_{3,A}$ respectively.

Now, again, let $\lambda_1 = [1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1]$, $\lambda_2 = [1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4]$, $\lambda_3 = [1 \ 4 \ 9 \ 16]$. The precoding structure of the achievable scheme is shown over 7 channel-uses in Fig. 7 where the noise is ignored for ease of understanding. The blue blocks mean that the corresponding receivers operate in mode-1, while the red blocks mean that the corresponding receivers operate in mode-2. Note that the switching pattern here is the same as the one shown in Fig. 3.

Let us then analyze the received signal at Rx- k . Note that if at a time slot $t, t \in [3]$, Tx-1, 2, 3, 4 send $\lambda_t W^1, \lambda_t W^2, \lambda_t W^3, \lambda_t W^4$, respectively, then Rx- k , operating in antenna mode m , receives (ignore AWGN),

$$y_k(t) = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} [\lambda_t W^1 \quad \lambda_t W^2 \quad \lambda_t W^3 \quad \lambda_t W^4]^\top \tag{93}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} [W^1 \quad W^2 \quad W^3 \quad W^4]^\top \lambda_t^\top \\
&= \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \begin{bmatrix} w_{1,A} & w_{1,B} & w_{1,C} & w_{1,D} \\ w_{2,A} & w_{2,B} & w_{2,C} & w_{2,D} \\ w_{3,A} & w_{3,B} & w_{3,C} & w_{3,D} \\ w_{4,A} & w_{4,B} & w_{4,C} & w_{4,D} \end{bmatrix} \lambda_t^\top
\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

$$\triangleq [a^{k,[m]} \quad b^{k,[m]} \quad c^{k,[m]} \quad d^{k,[m]}] \lambda_t^\top \tag{95}$$

where we define

$$a^{k,[m]} \triangleq \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} [w_{1,A} \ w_{2,A} \ w_{3,A} \ w_{4,A}]^\top \quad (96)$$

$$\stackrel{(92)}{=} \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \right)_{\{2,3\}} \begin{bmatrix} A_1^1 \\ A_1^2 \end{bmatrix} + \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \right)_{\{1,3\}} \begin{bmatrix} A_2^1 \\ A_2^2 \end{bmatrix} + \left(\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} \right)_{\{1,2\}} \begin{bmatrix} A_3^1 \\ A_3^2 \end{bmatrix}, \forall m \in [2], \quad (97)$$

i.e., a linear combination of $w_{1,A}, \dots, w_{4,A}$ determined by the channel operated in mode m at Rx- k . $b^{k,[m]}, c^{k,[m]}, d^{k,[m]}$ are similarly defined.

Also note that, if at time slot t , Tx-1, 2, 3, 4 send $w_{1,A}, w_{2,A}, w_{3,A}, w_{4,A}$, respectively, then Rx- k , operating in antenna mode m , receives (ignore AWGN),

$$y_k(t) = \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]} [w_{1,A} \ w_{2,A} \ w_{3,A} \ w_{4,A}]^\top = a^{k,[m]}. \quad (98)$$

$b^{k,[m]}, c^{k,[m]}, d^{k,[m]}$ are received by Rx- k similarly.

For the decodability of the desired message, let us take Rx-1 for example. Since the structure of the precoding scheme in Fig. 7 is the same as the precoding scheme in Fig. 3, we know that Rx-1 is able to decode $(a^{1,[m]}, b^{1,[m]}, c^{1,[m]})_{m \in [2]}$. Take message A_1 for example. Rx-1 can subtract the side information A_2, A_3 from $a^{k,[1]}, a^{k,[2]}$ and, according to (97), obtains,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{a}^{1,[1]} \\ \tilde{a}^{1,[2]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \left(\mathbf{h}_1^{[1]} \right)_{\{2,3\}} \\ \left(\mathbf{h}_1^{[2]} \right)_{\{2,3\}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_1^1 \\ A_1^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (99)$$

The channel matrix above is invertible almost surely because the channel vectors associated with the two modes are generic. Thus A_1^1, A_1^2 can be decoded. All desired messages are decoded similarly. The DoF achieved for each message is $2/7$.

3.4.3 Achievability for the case $M \geq G$

For $M \geq G$, we always have the choice to let the Rx's switch among $M' = G$ modes and apply the scheme mentioned above.

3.5 DoF of MapReduce

Combining Theorem 2 and Lemma 2 (the equivalence of (K, r, M) MapReduce and $(K, G = r + 1, M)$ USI), we have the following corollary that states our DoF result for MapReduce.

Corollary 1. *For the (K, r, M) MapReduce problem, the sum-DoF*

$$\begin{aligned} d_\Sigma^{\text{MR},*} &= \frac{(r+1) \binom{K}{r+1} M}{(M-1) \binom{K-1}{r} + \binom{K}{r+1}} = \frac{K(r+1)M}{(M-1)(r+1) + K} & M \leq r \\ \frac{K(r+1)r}{(r-1)(r+1) + K} &\leq d_\Sigma^{\text{MR},*} \leq \frac{K(r+1)M}{(M-1)(r+1) + K} & M \geq r+1. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Corollary 1 is acquired by directly setting $G = r + 1$ in (82).

Remark 6. *Even if there is no reconfigurable antenna, compared with the scheme in [12] or equivalently the scheme in [10] that requires no CSIT nor reconfigurable antenna and achieves the sum-DoF r , our scheme achieves a strictly higher sum-DoF $r + 1$. This advantage arises from the carefully designed inter-message alignment scheme by relabeling MapReduce to USI.*

4 Conclusion

We found the sum-DoF of a MISO BC with groupcast messages (BCGM) without CSIT, where each receiver is equipped with a reconfigurable antenna. The coding scheme was then applied to the wireless MapReduce network, with the unicast with side information (USI) setting as an intermediate step for identifying the desired inter-message alignments. Considering that BIA schemes harness the power of interference alignment with no CSIT overhead, exploiting the benefits of side-information to further strengthen such schemes is a promising path towards discovering robust interference management schemes for wireless networks when used for distributed computation tasks. New achievable schemes emerge from this study, that require both inter-message and intra-message alignments. The progress made here points the way for the next steps, exploring DoF when the channel coherence time and side-information are further restricted.

A Appendix: Proof of Lemma 1

Here we prove that the \mathbf{p}_k generated by the Algorithm 1 satisfies (44). Let us explain the way we generate \mathbf{p}_k . Essentially, the first n messages determine the first $(M-1)^n$ entries of \mathbf{p}_k .

First of all, (44) is true for $n = 1, h = 0$. Note that $(M-1)^{1-1} = 1$ and thus $j \in [1 : 1]$ and

$$1 = t_1^{0,0,1}, 2 = t_1^{0,1,1}, \dots, M-1 = t_1^{0,M-2,1}. \quad (101)$$

Combining with the initialization of Algorithm 1, (44) is true.

Let us now prove (44) is true for arbitrary $n \in [N_g], h = 0, j \in [(M-1)^{n-1}]$. Suppose the first $(M-1)^{n-1}$ entries of \mathbf{p}_k have already been determined by the first $n-1$ messages. Then the n^{th} message enters the outer ‘while loop’ in the algorithm. Suppose W_n is not Rx- k ’s desired message, i.e., $n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k$. The first $(M-1)^n$ entries of \mathbf{p}_k become,

t	$1 = t_n^{0,0,1}$	$2 = t_n^{0,0,2}$	\dots	$(M-1)^{n-1} = t_n^{0,0,(M-1)^{n-1}}$	determined
$p_k(t)$	$p_k(1)$	$p_k(2)$	\dots	$p_k((M-1)^{n-1})$	
t	$(M-1)^{n-1} + 1 = t_n^{0,1,1}$	$(M-1)^{n-1} + 2 = t_n^{0,1,2}$	\dots	$2(M-1)^{n-1} = t_n^{0,1,(M-1)^{n-1}}$	repeat
$p_k(t)$	$p_k(1)$	$p_k(2)$	\dots	$p_k((M-1)^{n-1})$	
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
t	$(M-2)(M-1)^{n-1} + 1 = t_n^{0,M-2,1}$	$(M-2)(M-1)^{n-1} + 2 = t_n^{0,M-2,2}$	\dots	$(M-1)^n = t_n^{0,M-2,(M-1)^{n-1}}$	repeat
$p_k(t)$	$p_k(1)$	$p_k(2)$	\dots	$p_k((M-1)^{n-1})$	

(102)

Note that in (102), the first table that corresponds to the first $(M-1)^{n-1}$ entries of \mathbf{p}_k , is determined by the previous $n-1$ messages. The next $M-2$ tables are just repetitions of the first table which are determined by the n^{th} message. Column-wise, $p_k(t)$ remains unchanged.

On the other hand, suppose W_n is Rx- k ’s desired message, i.e., $n \in \mathcal{V}_k$. The first $(M-1)^n$ entries of \mathbf{p}_k now take the form,

t	$1 = t_n^{0,0,1}$	$2 = t_n^{0,0,2}$	\dots	$(M-1)^{n-1} = t_n^{0,0,(M-1)^{n-1}}$	determined
$p_k(t)$	$p_k(1)$	$p_k(2)$	\dots	$p_k((M-1)^{n-1})$	
t	$(M-1)^{n-1} + 1 = t_n^{0,1,1}$	$(M-1)^{n-1} + 2 = t_n^{0,1,2}$	\dots	$2(M-1)^{n-1} = t_n^{0,1,(M-1)^{n-1}}$	shift
$p_k(t)$	$\langle p_k(1) + 1 \rangle_{M-1}$	$\langle p_k(2) + 1 \rangle_{M-1}$	\dots	$\langle p_k((M-1)^{n-1}) + 1 \rangle_{M-1}$	
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
t	$(M-2)(M-1)^{n-1} + 1 = t_n^{0,M-2,1}$	$(M-2)(M-1)^{n-1} + 2 = t_n^{0,M-2,2}$	\dots	$(M-1)^n = t_n^{0,M-2,(M-1)^{n-1}}$	shift
$p_k(t)$	$\langle p_k(1) + (M-2) \rangle_{M-1}$	$\langle p_k(2) + (M-2) \rangle_{M-1}$	\dots	$\langle p_k((M-1)^{n-1}) + (M-2) \rangle_{M-1}$	

(103)

Again, in (103), the first table that corresponds to the first $(M-1)^{n-1}$ entries of \mathbf{p}_k is determined by the previous $n-1$ messages. The next $M-2$ tables are just the first table *shifted* by some value, which is determined by the n^{th} message. Column-wise, $p_k(t_n^{0,i,j}) = \langle p_k(t_n^{0,0,j}) + i \rangle_{M-1}$.

Let us then prove (44) is true for arbitrary $n \in [N_g], h \in [0 : (M-1)^{N_g-n} - 1], j \in [(M-1)^{n-1}]$. It can be easily verify that, for arbitrary $h \in [0 : (M-1)^{N_g-n} - 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & p_k(h(M-1)^n + 1), p_k(h(M-1)^n + 2), \dots, p_k((h+1)(M-1)^n) \\ &= \langle p_k(1) + z \rangle_{M-1}, \langle p_k(2) + z \rangle_{M-1}, \dots, \langle p_k((M-1)^n) + z \rangle_{M-1} \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where $z \in [0 : M-1]$ can be viewed as a random number. This is because according to the algorithm, $p_k(h(M-1)^n + 1), \dots, p_k((h+1)(M-1)^n)$ is generated by repeating or shifting $p_k(1), \dots, p_k((M-1)^n)$ as a whole each time by messages whose indices are greater than n . Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} & p_k(h(M-1)^n + 1), p_k(h(M-1)^n + 2), \dots, p_k((h+1)(M-1)^n) \\ &= p_k(t_n^{h,0,1}), \dots, p_k(t_n^{h,M-2,(M-1)^{n-1}}). \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Thus, for arbitrary $n \in [N_g], h \in [0 : (M-1)^{N_g-n} - 1], j \in [(M-1)^{n-1}]$, and for all $i \in [0 : M-2]$ the difference between $p_k(t_n^{h,i,j})$ and $p_k(t_n^{h,0,j})$ is the same as the difference between $p_k(t_n^{0,i,j})$ and $p_k(t_n^{0,0,j})$. (44) is thus proved. (45) is a direct consequence of (44). Basically, given any $n \in [N_g]$, for any $h \in [0 : (M-1)^{N_g-n} - 1], j \in [(M-1)^{n-1}]$ and $l = t_n^{h,j} \in [\ell]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \{w_n^{k,f_n(t_n^{h,0,j}), [p_k(t_n^{h,0,j})]}, w_n^{k,f_n(t_n^{h,1,j}), [p_k(t_n^{h,1,j})]}, \dots, w_n^{k,f_n(t_n^{h,M-2,j}), [p_k(t_n^{h,M-2,j})]}\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}, w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}, \dots, w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}\} & n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k \\ \{w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}, w_n^{k,l,[\langle m_{k,n}^l + 1 \rangle_{M-1}]}, \dots, w_n^{k,l,[\langle m_{k,n}^l + (M-2) \rangle_{M-1}]}\} & n \in \mathcal{V}_k \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{w_n^{k,l,[m_{k,n}^l]}\} & n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k \\ \{w_n^{k,l,[1]}, w_n^{k,l,[2]}, \dots, w_n^{k,l,[M-1]}\} & n \in \mathcal{V}_k \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

B Appendix: Converse Proofs for Theorem 1 and Theorem 2

Suppose a scheme takes T channel uses and the switching pattern of Rx- k , $k \in [K]$, is $\mathbf{m}_k = (m_k(1), m_k(2), \dots, m_k(T))$. We allow T to approach infinity so that $T \geq T_c$, i.e., channel coherence time. Let $Q = \lceil \frac{T}{T_c} \rceil$, i.e., a scheme takes Q coherence blocks. Let

$$\mathbf{h}_k^{[m]}(1 + qN_c), q \in [0 : Q-1], m \in [M] \quad (107)$$

be a random variable that denotes the channel vector at Rx- k in the $(q+1)^{\text{th}}$ coherence block when the antenna is operating in mode- m . Let

$$\mathcal{H}_k \triangleq \{\mathbf{L}_k^{[m]}(1 + qN_c)\}_{q \in [0:Q-1], m \in [M]}. \quad (108)$$

Note that Rx- k knows \mathcal{H}_k since we assume perfect CSIR.

For ease of proof, let us first define $y_k^{[m]}(t), k \in [K], m \in [M]$ as the signal received by Rx- k at time t , with the antenna operating in mode m . Specifically,

$$y_k^{[m]}(t) \triangleq \mathbf{h}_k^{[m]}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + z_k(t). \quad (109)$$

Also, for compact notation, for $\mathbf{m} = (m(1), m(2), \dots, m(T))$, let $\mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\mathbf{m}]}$ denote the collection of the received signals within the T time slots at Rx- k , when the switching pattern is \mathbf{m} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\mathbf{m}]} \triangleq \left(y_k^{[m(1)]}(1), y_k^{[m(2)]}(2), \dots, y_k^{[m(T)]}(T) \right). \quad (110)$$

Note that, if Rx- k follows the designed switching pattern \mathbf{m}_k , the received signal over the T channel uses, at Rx- k , is $\mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}$. Further, let

$$\mathbf{Y}_{k_M} \triangleq \left(\mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\langle \mathbf{m}_k + \mathbf{1} \rangle_M]}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\langle \mathbf{m}_k + (M-1)\mathbf{1} \rangle_M]} \right) \quad (111)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left(y_k^{[m_k(1)]}(1), y_k^{[\langle m_k(1)+1 \rangle_M]}(1), \dots, y_k^{[\langle m_k(1)+(M-1) \rangle_M]}(1), \right. \\ &\quad y_k^{[m_k(2)]}(2), y_k^{[\langle m_k(2)+1 \rangle_M]}(2), \dots, y_k^{[\langle m_k(2)+(M-1) \rangle_M]}(2), \\ &\quad \left. \dots, y_k^{[m_k(T)]}(T), y_k^{[\langle m_k(T)+1 \rangle_M]}(T), \dots, y_k^{[\langle m_k(T)+(M-1) \rangle_M]}(T) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left(y_k^{[1]}(1), y_k^{[2]}(1), \dots, y_k^{[M]}(1), \right. \\ &\quad y_k^{[1]}(2), y_k^{[2]}(2), \dots, y_k^{[M]}(2), \\ &\quad \left. \dots, y_k^{[1]}(T), y_k^{[2]}(T), \dots, y_k^{[M]}(T) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

so that \mathbf{Y}_{k_M} denotes the collection of the signal received at Rx- k with all the M possible modes, in the T time slots. Note that, according to the definition,

$$\mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\mathbf{m}]} \subset \mathbf{Y}_{k_M}, \forall k \in [K], \mathbf{m} \in [M]^T. \quad (114)$$

We also have the following lemma which is important for the converse proof. The lemma essentially says that, in any feasible BCGM or USI scheme, M "copies" of Rx- k (each with switching pattern that is obtained by shifting the designed switching pattern \mathbf{m}_k as whole by a distinct value), are able to decode the messages desired by an arbitrary receiver, if provided with the corresponding receiver's side information (which is empty in the BCGM setting). Also, any one of the M "copies" of Rx- k , is able to decode the messages desired by Rx- k .

Lemma 3.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Other Rxs: } &\forall k, \bar{k} \in [K], k \neq \bar{k}, \\ &H(\text{DE}_k^* \mid \text{SI}_k^*, \mathbf{Y}_{\bar{k}_M}, \mathcal{H}_{\bar{k}}) = o(T), \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rx-}k: &\forall \eta \in [M], \\ &H(\text{DE}_k^* \mid \text{SI}_k^*, \mathbf{y}_{k,T}^{[\langle \mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1} \rangle_M]}, \mathcal{H}_k) = o(T). \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

where $*$ can be substituted with "BCGM" when referring to BCGM, and "USI" when referring to USI. Note that there is no side information in the BCGM setting, i.e., $\text{SI}_k^{\text{BCGM}} = \emptyset$.

Proof. Let us first consider BCGM. Note that according to the definition of the problem (all desired messages should be recovered with negligible probability of error), after applying Fano's inequality [39], we have

$$H(\text{DE}_k^{\text{BCGM}} | \mathbf{y}_{k,\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_k) = o(\mathbb{T}). \quad (117)$$

Recall that $\mathbf{y}_{k,\mathbb{T}}^{\mathbf{m}_k}$ denotes the signals received by Rx- k over \mathbb{T} channel uses, following the designed switching pattern \mathbf{m}_k .

For a different Rx- $\bar{k} \neq k$, we note that, if it follows Rx- k 's switching pattern \mathbf{m}_k instead of its own switching pattern $\mathbf{m}_{\bar{k}}$, it receives $\mathbf{y}_{\bar{k},\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}$. Due to the fact that $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{k}}$ is statistically equivalent to \mathcal{H}_k and the transmitters have no CSIT so $\mathbf{x}(1), \dots, \mathbf{x}(\mathbb{T})$ are independent of \mathcal{H}_k for any $k \in [K]$. Thus, we must have $\mathbf{y}_{\bar{k},\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_{\bar{k}}$ are statistically equivalent to $\mathbf{y}_{k,\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_k$, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{y}_{\bar{k},\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_{\bar{k}}) \sim (\mathbf{y}_{k,\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_k), \forall k, \bar{k} \in [K], k \neq \bar{k}. \quad (118)$$

Combined with (117), we must have

$$H(\text{DE}_k^{\text{BCGM}} | \mathbf{y}_{\bar{k},\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_{\bar{k}}) = o(\mathbb{T}). \quad (119)$$

Note that according to (114), $\mathbf{y}_{\bar{k},\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]} \subset \mathbf{Y}_{\bar{k}_M}$, thus

$$H(\text{DE}_k^{\text{BCGM}} | \mathbf{Y}_{\bar{k}_M}, \mathcal{H}_{\bar{k}}) \leq H(\text{DE}_k^{\text{BCGM}} | \mathbf{y}_{\bar{k},\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_{\bar{k}}) = o(\mathbb{T}), \quad (120)$$

since conditioning reduces entropy. Thus, for the BCGM, (115) is proved.

Intuitively, the M "copies" (with different offsets) of, say, Rx-1 can jointly obtain a signal statistically equivalent to the signal seen by Rx-2 regardless of how Rx-2 switches its antenna modes. Thus, M "copies" of Rx-1 are able to decode the messages desired by the Rx-2 with negligible probability of error. Similarly, they are able to decode the messages desired by Rx-3, 4, \dots , K with negligible probability of error.

For (116), since the channels for the different modes are i.i.d. and the transmitter has no CSIT, thus

$$(\mathbf{y}_{k,\mathbb{T}}^{[\mathbf{m}_k]}, \mathcal{H}_k) \sim (\mathbf{y}_{k,\mathbb{T}}^{[\langle \mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1} \rangle_M]}, \mathcal{H}_k), \forall k \in [K], \eta \in [M], \quad (121)$$

combined with (117), (116) for the BCGM setting is proved. (116) essentially says that the encoding scheme must enable each "copy" of receiver, say Rx-1, to decode the desired messages.

The proof for the USI is similar. The only difference is that the M "copies" of Rx- \bar{k} need other Rx- k 's side information to decode corresponding desired messages. \blacksquare

B.1 Converse of Theorem 1

To simplify the notation, we eliminate all the subscripts or superscripts that denote we are considering BCGM setting in the proof. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned}
M \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_1} \mathsf{T}R_n &= MH(\text{DE}_1) = MH(\text{DE}_1 \mid \mathcal{H}_1) \\
&\stackrel{(116)}{=} \sum_{\eta \in [M]} I(\text{DE}_1; \mathbf{y}_{1,\mathsf{T}}^{[(\mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1})_M]} \mid \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\mathsf{T}) \\
&= \sum_{\eta \in [M]} \left(h(\mathbf{y}_{1,\mathsf{T}}^{[(\mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1})_M]} \mid \mathcal{H}_1) - h(\mathbf{y}_{1,\mathsf{T}}^{[(\mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1})_M]} \mid \text{DE}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) \right) + o(\mathsf{T}) \\
&\leq M\mathsf{T} \log(P) - h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\log P)
\end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

where (122) follows from the fact that Gaussian distribution maximizes entropy under power constraint P and conditioning reduces entropy. Meanwhile, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_1} \mathsf{T}R_n &= H(\text{DE}_{[2:K]} \setminus \text{DE}_1) \\
&= H(\text{DE}_{[2:K]} \mid \text{DE}_1) = H(\text{DE}_{[2:K]} \mid \text{DE}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) \\
&\stackrel{(115)}{=} I(\text{DE}_{[2:K]}; \mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\mathsf{T})
\end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) - h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_{[K]}, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\mathsf{T}) \\
&= h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) - \underbrace{h(z_1(1), \dots, z_1(\mathsf{T}))}_{o(\log P)} + o(\mathsf{T})
\end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

where (124) follows from the fact that given all the messages and channel vectors, the received signal is a function of the noise which is independent of the channel vector and messages. Adding (122) and (124), dividing by T , and considering the symmetry of the receivers, for any $k \in [K]$, we have,

$$M \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} R_n + \sum_{n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k} R_n \leq M \log(P) + o(\log P). \tag{125}$$

Thus,

$$M \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}_k} d_n + \sum_{n \in [N_g] \setminus \mathcal{V}_k} d_n \leq M. \tag{126}$$

Averaging over all the K receivers, we have

$$\sum_{n \in [N_g]} d_n \leq \frac{MK}{GM + K - G} = \frac{N_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}. \tag{127}$$

Thus, $d_\Sigma \leq \frac{N_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}$.

B.2 Converse of Theorem 2

The converse idea is similar, but a bit more involved in the USI setting. Recall that in USI, all messages are transmitted at the same rate R , since we have this restriction in MapReduce which is equivalent to USI.

$$\begin{aligned}
M \underbrace{\binom{K-1}{G-1}}_{\nu_g} \text{T}R &= MH(\text{DE}_1) = MH(\text{DE}_1 \mid \text{SI}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) \\
&\stackrel{(116)}{=} \sum_{\eta \in [M]} I(\text{DE}_1; \mathbf{y}_{1,\text{T}}^{[\langle \mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1} \rangle_M]} \mid \text{SI}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\text{T}) \\
&= \sum_{\eta \in [M]} \left(h(\mathbf{y}_{1,\text{T}}^{[\langle \mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1} \rangle_M]} \mid \text{SI}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) - h(\mathbf{y}_{1,\text{T}}^{[\langle \mathbf{m}_k + \eta \mathbf{1} \rangle_M]} \mid \text{DE}_1, \text{SI}_1, \mathcal{H}_1) \right) + o(\text{T}) \\
&\leq M\text{T} \log(P) - h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_1, \text{SI}_{[2]}, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\text{T}), \tag{128}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the fact that Gaussian distribution maximizes entropy under power constraint P , and conditioning reduces entropy. Meanwhile, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{K-2}{G-1} \text{T}R &= H(\text{DE}_2 \setminus \text{SI}_1) \\
&= H(\text{DE}_2 \mid \text{SI}_1) = H(\text{DE}_2 \mid \text{DE}_1, \text{SI}_{[2]}, \mathcal{H}_1) \\
&\stackrel{(116)}{=} I(\text{DE}_2; \mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_1, \text{SI}_{[2]}, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\text{T}) \\
&\leq h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_1, \text{SI}_{[2]}, \mathcal{H}_1) - h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_{[2]}, \text{SI}_{[3]}, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\text{T}). \tag{129}
\end{aligned}$$

The first step is to bound the entropy of the messages that are desired by Rx-2 and are not available to Rx-1 as side information. Specifically, there are $\binom{K-2}{G-1}$ super-messages that correspond to Rx-2 while not to Rx-1, each of which contains a message that is desired by Rx-2. Meanwhile, there are $\binom{K-2}{G-2}$ super-messages correspond to both Rx-1 and Rx-2. Though these super-messages also contain messages desired by Rx-2, these messages are all known to Rx-1 by problem formulation. The last step follows from the fact that conditioning reduces entropy.

Following a similar process, we have the bound,

$$\binom{K-k}{G-1} \text{T}R \leq h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_{[k-1]}, \text{SI}_{[k]}, \mathcal{H}_1) - h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_{[k]}, \text{SI}_{[k+1]}, \mathcal{H}_1) + o(\text{T}). \tag{130}$$

Here, we bound the entropy of the messages that are desired by Rx- k and are not available to the first $k-1$ receivers as side information.

For all $k \in [2 : K - G + 1]$, adding (130) to (128) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(M \binom{K-1}{G-1} + \binom{K-2}{G-1} + \cdots + \binom{G-1}{G-1} \right) \Uparrow R \\
&= (M-1)\nu_g \Uparrow R + \underbrace{\left(\binom{K-1}{G-1} + \binom{K-2}{G-1} + \cdots + \binom{G-1}{G-1} \right)}_{=\binom{K}{G}=N_g} \Uparrow R \\
&\leq M\Uparrow \log P - h(\mathbf{Y}_{1_M} \mid \text{DE}_{[k-G+1]}, \text{SI}_{[k-G+2]}) + o(\log P) \\
&= M\Uparrow \log P - \underbrace{h(z_1(1), \dots, z_1(\Uparrow))}_{o(\log P)} + o(\log P), \tag{131}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds as any $K - G + 1$ receivers' side information and their desired messages constitute all the N_g super-messages, and the power of the noise is bounded (negligible for DoF). Thus,

$$((M-1)\nu_g + N_g) R \leq M \log P + o(\log P) \Rightarrow d \leq \frac{M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}, \tag{132}$$

and $d_\Sigma \leq \frac{GN_g M}{(M-1)\nu_g + N_g}$.

References

- [1] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "MapReduce: simplified data processing on large clusters," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 107–113, 2008.
- [2] A. Sengupta, R. Tandon, and O. Simeone, "Fog-aided wireless networks for content delivery: Fundamental latency tradeoffs," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 6650–6678, 2017.
- [3] S. Ha, J. Zhang, O. Simeone, and J. Kang, "Coded federated computing in wireless networks with straggling devices and imperfect CSI," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2649–2653, IEEE, 2019.
- [4] Q. Yu, M. A. Maddah-Ali, and A. S. Avestimehr, "Straggler mitigation in distributed matrix multiplication: Fundamental limits and optimal coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1920–1933, 2020.
- [5] Q. Yu and A. S. Avestimehr, "Coded computing for resilient, secure, and privacy-preserving distributed matrix multiplication," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 59–72, 2020.
- [6] Z. Jia and S. A. Jafar, "Cross subspace alignment codes for coded distributed batch computation," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2821–2846, 2021.
- [7] F. Li, J. Chen, and Z. Wang, "Wireless MapReduce distributed computing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 10, pp. 6101–6114, 2019.

- [8] Y. Bi, M. Wigger, and Y. Wu, "A new interference-alignment scheme for wireless MapReduce," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06621*, 2023.
- [9] Y. Bi, P. Ciblat, M. Wigger, and Y. Wu, "DoF of a cooperative X-channel with an application to distributed computing," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 566–571, IEEE, 2022.
- [10] S. Li, M. A. Maddah-Ali, Q. Yu, and A. S. Avestimehr, "A fundamental tradeoff between computation and communication in distributed computing," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 109–128, 2017.
- [11] S. Li, Q. Yu, M. A. Maddah-Ali, and A. S. Avestimehr, "A scalable framework for wireless distributed computing," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 2643–2654, 2017.
- [12] S. Ha, J. Zhang, O. Simeone, and J. Kang, "Wireless Map-Reduce distributed computing with full-duplex radios and imperfect CSI," in *2019 IEEE 20th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, pp. 1–5, IEEE, 2019.
- [13] K. Yang, Y. Shi, and Z. Ding, "Data shuffling in wireless distributed computing via low-rank optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 12, pp. 3087–3099, 2019.
- [14] F. Xu, S. Shao, and M. Tao, "New results on the computation-communication tradeoff for heterogeneous coded distributed computing," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 2254–2270, 2021.
- [15] F. Han, V. K. Lau, and Y. Gong, "Over-the-Air computation of large-scale nomographic functions in MapReduce over the edge cloud network," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 14, pp. 11843–11857, 2021.
- [16] F. Wang and V. K. Lau, "Dynamic rat selection and transceiver optimization for mobile-edge computing over multi-rat heterogeneous networks," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 20, pp. 20532–20546, 2022.
- [17] V. Cadambe and S. Jafar, "Interference alignment and degrees of freedom of the K user interference channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, pp. 3425–3441, Aug. 2008.
- [18] A. G. Davoodi and S. A. Jafar, "Aligned image sets under channel uncertainty: Settling conjectures on the collapse of degrees of freedom under finite precision CSIT," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 5603–5618, 2016.
- [19] S. A. Jafar, "Blind interference alignment," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 216–227, 2012.
- [20] T. Gou, C. Wang, and S. A. Jafar, "Aiming perfectly in the dark-blind interference alignment through staggered antenna switching," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 2734–2744, 2011.
- [21] S. Jafar, "Interference alignment: A new look at signal dimensions in a communication network," in *Foundations and Trends in Communication and Information Theory*, pp. 1–136, 2011.

- [22] V. Cadambe and S. Jafar, "Interference alignment and the degrees of freedom of wireless X networks," *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, pp. 3893–3908, Sep 2009.
- [23] C. Wang, T. Gou, and S. A. Jafar, "Interference alignment through staggered antenna switching for MIMO BC with no CSIT," in *Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, Nov. 2010.
- [24] X. Chen, Z. Zhang, L. Zheng, L. Wu, J. Dang, P.-S. Lu, and C. Sun, "Blind interference alignment in two-cell Z interference MIMO channel," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 10526–10532, 2017.
- [25] M. Morales-Céspedes, J. Plata-Chaves, D. Toumpakaris, S. A. Jafar, A. Garcia, *et al.*, "Blind interference alignment for cellular networks," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 1, pp. 41–56, 2014.
- [26] H. Yang, N. Naderializadeh, A. S. Avestimehr, and J. Lee, "Topological interference management with reconfigurable antennas," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4926–4939, 2017.
- [27] M. Morales-Céspedes, O. A. Dobre, and A. García-Armada, "Semi-blind interference aligned noma for downlink MU-MISO systems," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1852–1865, 2019.
- [28] Y. Lu, W. Zhang, and K. Letaief, "Blind interference alignment with diversity in K -user interference channels," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 2850–2859, 2014.
- [29] Y. Lu and W. Zhang, "Blind interference alignment in the K -user MISO interference channel," in *2013 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, pp. 3464–3469, IEEE, 2013.
- [30] H. Yang, W. Shin, and J. Lee, "Linear degrees of freedom for K -user MISO interference channels with blind interference alignment," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 1921–1934, 2017.
- [31] H. Yang, W. Shin, and J. Lee, "Degrees of freedom for K -user SISO interference channels with blind interference alignment," in *2015 49th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, pp. 1097–1101, IEEE, 2015.
- [32] M. Johnny and M. R. Aref, "Blind interference alignment for the K -User SISO interference channel using reconfigurable antennas," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1046–1049, 2018.
- [33] M. Johnny and M. R. Aref, "BIA for the K -user interference channel using reconfigurable antenna at receivers," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 2184–2197, 2019.
- [34] V. U. Menon and P. Selvaprabhu, "Blind interference alignment: A comprehensive survey," *International Journal Of Communication Systems*, vol. 35, no. 8, 2022.
- [35] Y. Liu, X. Liu, X. Mu, T. Hou, J. Xu, M. Di Renzo, and N. Al-Dhahir, "Reconfigurable intelligent surfaces: Principles and opportunities," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1546–1577, 2021.

- [36] M. M. Cespedes, M. S. Fernandez, and A. G. Armada, "Experimental evaluation of blind interference alignment," in *2015 IEEE 81st Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Spring)*, pp. 1–5, IEEE, 2015.
- [37] S. Begashaw, J. Chacko, N. Gulati, D. H. Nguyen, N. Kandasamy, and K. R. Dandekar, "Experimental evaluation of a reconfigurable antenna system for blind interference alignment," in *2016 IEEE 17th Annual Wireless and Microwave Technology Conference (WAMICON)*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2016.
- [38] Y. Bi, Y. Wu, and C. Hua, "DoF analysis for (M, N) -channels through a number-filling puzzle," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02189*, 2024.
- [39] T. M. Cover, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.