

On approximating Gaussian relay networks by deterministic networks

M. Anand and P. R. Kumar

Dept. of ECE and CSL, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

Email: {amurali2,prkumar}@illinois.edu

Abstract— We examine the extent to which Gaussian relay networks can be approximated by deterministic networks, and present two results, one negative and one positive.

The gap between the capacities of a Gaussian relay network and a corresponding linear deterministic network can be unbounded. The key reasons are that the linear deterministic model fails to capture the phase of received signals, and there is a loss in signal strength in the reduction to a linear deterministic network.

On the positive side, Gaussian relay networks are indeed well approximated by certain deterministic superposition networks, where the inputs and outputs to the channels are discrete, and channel gains are signed integers.

As a corollary, MIMO channels cannot be well approximated by the linear deterministic model but can be by the deterministic superposition model.

I. INTRODUCTION

There have been many efforts to determine the capacities of Gaussian networks with multiple sources and destinations. A recent proposal is to approximate a given Gaussian network by a linear deterministic model which is noise-free, linear, and easy to analyze. This model was introduced in [1], [2] where the capacity of linear deterministic networks with a single source-destination pair is determined. This approach was successful for certain Gaussian networks like the interference channel [5], and the MAC and broadcast networks [2], where the gap between the capacities of the Gaussian network and the linear deterministic network is bounded by a constant independent of channel gains. Most subsequent research on the linear deterministic model has been focussed on deriving coding schemes for Gaussian networks that are inspired by those for the deterministic network [4], [6].

A. Our results

We consider Gaussian relay networks with a single source-destination pair and multiple relay nodes. The relays have no data to transmit but help the source in sending its data to the destination. We analyze the

extent to which a deterministic model can approximate such networks, by comparing their capacities. We show that the gap in the capacities can be unbounded. This is since the deterministic model cannot capture the phase of a channel gain. Even restricted to Gaussian networks with positive channel gains, the linear deterministic model is not a good approximation.

As a positive result towards approximating Gaussian networks, we show that an earlier deterministic *superposition* model with discrete inputs and outputs [5] serves as a good approximation for Gaussian relay networks.

A corollary is that MIMO channels cannot be approximated by linear deterministic model, but can be by deterministic superposition models.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Model

We consider a wireless network represented as a directed graph $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ represents nodes, and the directed edges in \mathcal{E} correspond to wireless links. Denote by h_{ij} the complex number representing the fixed channel gain for link (i, j) . Let the complex number x_i denote the transmission of node i . Every node has an average power constraint, taken to be 1. Node j receives $y_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}(j)} h_{ij}x_i + z_j$, where $\mathcal{N}(j)$ is the set of its neighbors and z_j is complex white Gaussian noise, $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$, independent of the transmitted signals.

B. Constructing the linear deterministic network

Perhaps the best way to understand the linear deterministic model [1] is to first develop it in a point-to-point setting. Consider a simple AWGN channel: $y = hx + n$. Its capacity is $C = \log(1 + |h|^2)$. Let $C_D := \lfloor \log |h|^2 \rfloor$ denote its approximate capacity in the high SNR regime. To approximate this, we construct a deterministic network in which the source transmits a vector of infinite bits, $x = 0.x(1)x(2)x(3)\dots$. However, the channel attenuates the signal and only the C_D most significant bits are received at the destination.

In a general Gaussian network, each link with channel gain h is replaced by a deterministic shift matrix so that only the $\lfloor \log |h|^2 \rfloor$ most significant bits of the input arrive at the destination. All inputs are chosen

This material is based upon work partially supported by USARO under Contract Nos. W911NF-08-1-0238 and W-911- NF-0710287, and NSF under Contract Nos. ECCS-0701604, CNS-07-21992, CNS-0626584, and CNS-05-19535.

to be binary vectors of length $\max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \lceil \log |h_{ij}|^2 \rceil$. At a receiver, the vectors from multiple inputs are added bit by bit over the binary field. This models the partially destructive nature of interference in wireless. The channel is simply a linear transformation over the binary field. Modeling the broadcast feature of wireless networks, a node transmits the same vector on all outgoing links, albeit with different attenuations in the sense that the number of significant bits arriving at a receiver depends on the channel gain.




Fig. 1. Linear deterministic model of Gaussian network. (Note $\lceil \log 2.2^2 \rceil = \lceil \log 2.5^2 \rceil = 2$, $\lceil \log 1.8^2 \rceil = \lceil \log 1.5^2 \rceil = 1$)

The capacity of single source-destination pair linear deterministic relay networks is known [2]. Recently, the capacity of Gaussian networks with a single source-destination pair was approximately computed [3]. Therefore, one can compare them.

C. The cut-set bound

The cut-set bound [7] of a single source-destination pair network, with source 0 and destination M , is

$$C \leq \max_{p(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{M-1})} \min_{\Omega \in \Lambda} I(X_\Omega; Y_{\Omega^c} | X_{\Omega^c}), \quad (1)$$

where C is the capacity, Λ is the set of all partitions of \mathcal{V} with $0 \in \Omega$ and $M \in \Omega^c$, and $\{p(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_M | x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{M-1})\}$ is the transition probability matrix.

1) *Cut-set bounds for linear deterministic networks:* Since inputs deterministically determine outputs in a linear deterministic network, $I(X_\Omega; Y_{\Omega^c} | X_{\Omega^c}) = H(Y_{\Omega^c} | X_{\Omega^c})$. This is maximized when all input variables are i.i.d. over the underlying field, and equals the rank of the transfer matrix $\mathcal{G}_{\Omega, \Omega^c}$ associated with the cut Ω [2], where the rank is determined over the appropriate finite field:

$$C \leq \min_{\Omega} \text{rank } \mathcal{G}_{\Omega, \Omega^c}. \quad (2)$$

For Fig. 1(b), the rank of $\mathcal{G}_{\Omega, \Omega^c}$ over \mathbb{F}_2 , with $\Omega = \{0, 1\}$ is 2 with

$$\mathcal{G}_{\Omega, \Omega^c} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The cut-set bound is exactly the capacity of the linear deterministic network, and is achieved by random linear coding [2].

2) *Cut-set bounds for Gaussian Networks:* In Gaussian networks,

$$p(y_1, \dots, y_M | x_0, \dots, x_{M-1}) = \prod_{i=1}^M p(z_i).$$

Choosing $\{X_j\}$'s to be i.i.d. $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$ weakens the bound in (1) by at most $(M + 1)$ bits for any choice of channel gains and yields

$$\bar{C} := \min_{\Omega \in \Lambda} \log |I + \mathcal{H}_\Omega \mathcal{H}_\Omega^\dagger|, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{H}_Ω is the transfer matrix of the MIMO channel corresponding to cut Ω , and $|\cdot|$ is the determinant [3].

In [3], a coding scheme is developed that achieves a rate no less than $\bar{C} - \kappa$ for all channel gains, with κ only depending on the number M of nodes. Nodes quantize and forward their data, and the destination eventually decodes the transmitted symbol after hearing from all the nodes. This scheme is said to be inspired by a coding scheme that was developed in [2] for a more general class of deterministic networks.

III. UNBOUNDED CAPACITY DIFFERENCE OF LINEAR DETERMINISTIC MODEL

We will show that the capacity of the linear deterministic network can be much lower than that of the original Gaussian network, with their difference unbounded as channel gains are varied.

From the previous section, if the capacity of the linear deterministic network differed from that of the Gaussian network by a bounded amount, then the difference between their individual cut-set bounds would also be so. We establish unboundedness of the difference by comparing the mutual information across cuts in a Gaussian network with the ranks of the corresponding cuts in the linear deterministic network.

For the rest, we choose the inputs X_i for the Gaussian network to be i.i.d. $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$, noting that this can achieve, within a constant bound, the maximum mutual information across any cut. For the linear deterministic network, we choose inputs that are independent and uniformly distributed over their range, since that maximizes the mutual information across a cut.

A. Counterexample to constant bit approximation

Consider the network in Fig. 2(a). The channels marked as ∞ have very high capacity. The mutual information across $\Omega = \{0, 1, 2\}$ is

$$I(X_\Omega; Y_{\Omega^c} | X_{\Omega^c}) = \log |I + \mathcal{H} \mathcal{H}^\dagger| \quad (4)$$

$$= 2 \log(1 + 2|h|^2) \quad (5)$$

$$= 4 \log |h| + O(1), \text{ as } |h| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (6)$$

with $\mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} h & -h \\ h & h \end{bmatrix}$. This is the minimum among all cuts and is therefore the capacity.

In the corresponding linear deterministic network, the transfer matrix of $\Omega = \{0, 1, 2\}$ in Fig. 2(b) is $\mathcal{G} = \begin{bmatrix} I & I \\ I & I \end{bmatrix}$, where each identity matrix has




Fig. 2. Counterexample.

dimension $\lfloor \log |h|^2 \rfloor$. The capacity of the network is $\lfloor 2 \log |h| \rfloor$ and is limited by the rank of \mathcal{G} .

The gap between the capacities of the Gaussian network in Fig. 2(a) and its deterministic counterpart is $2 \log |h| + O(1)$, and therefore is not bounded independently of channel gains.

The deterministic model considers only the modulus of the channel gain and fails to capture its phase. Constructing the deterministic model over a larger prime field does not help either.

B. Gaussian networks with positive channel gains

Unfortunately, phase is not the only problem. We construct a Gaussian network with *positive* channel coefficients that cannot be approximated by a linear deterministic network.




Fig. 3. Two networks with positive channel coefficients, both of which have the same linear deterministic network as their counterpart.

Consider the Gaussian networks in Fig. 3, where $h = 2^k$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. The linear deterministic network corresponding to both Gaussian networks is the same. However, the difference in the capacities of the Gaussian networks is unbounded.

The capacity of the network in Fig. 3(a) is

$$\begin{aligned} C &= I(X_\Omega; Y_\Omega^c | X_\Omega^c) + O(1) \\ &= 4 \log h + 1 \quad (\text{as } h \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned}$$

with $\Omega = \{0, 1, 2\}$, while the capacity of the network in Fig. 3(b) is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C} &= I(X_\Omega; Y_\Omega^c | X_\Omega^c) + O(1) \\ &= 2 \log h + 1 \quad (\text{as } h \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

So, the difference in the capacities of the linear deterministic network and at least one of its counterparts in Fig. 3 must be unbounded in h .

One may wonder if taking the channel gains into account and quantizing the gains with respect to a larger field than \mathbb{F}_2 will provide a bounded error approximation. However, this reasoning is flawed since then the gap in the capacities would be a function of the chosen prime and thus, in turn, a function of channel gains.

IV. APPROXIMATING GAUSSIAN NETWORKS BY DETERMINISTIC SUPERPOSITION NETWORKS

The question arises if there is some other deterministic network that is a good approximation. We now show that an alternate deterministic model, first mentioned in [5], is indeed a good approximation of a Gaussian relay network. This model, which we call a *deterministic superposition* model, captures the phases of channel gains, and ensures that the signal strength does not drop due to quantization of channel gains.

A. The deterministic superposition model

We define the inputs, outputs, and channels in a deterministic superposition network. Let $n := \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \max\{\lfloor \log |h_{ijR}| \rfloor, \lfloor \log |h_{ijI}| \rfloor\}$, where $h_{ij} = h_{ijR} + ih_{ijI}$. The inputs are complex valued and both real and imaginary parts can take 2^n equally spaced discrete values from $\{0, 2^{-n}, \dots, 1 - 2^{-n}\}$. It helps to think of either the real or imaginary part ($x = 0.x(1)x(2)\dots x(n)$) of an input in terms of its binary representation, where each $x(i) \in \mathbb{F}_2$.

The real and imaginary parts of channel gains are quantized to integers by neglecting their fractional parts. The channel between two nodes multiplies the complex input by the corresponding channel gain, and then truncates it by neglecting the fractional components of both real and imaginary parts of the product. The outputs of all incoming channels at a receiver node are complex numbers with integer real and imaginary parts. All the outputs are added up at a receiver by standard summation over $\mathbb{Z} + i\mathbb{Z}$.

This model retains the essential superposition property of the channel. The truncation of channel coefficients does not substantially change the channel matrix in the high SNR limit. Also, the effect of noise is captured in essentially the same way as in the linear deterministic model by truncating least significant bits.

This deterministic superposition model was first used in [5] in a sequence of networks that reduced the Gaussian interference channel to a linear deterministic network. We use some of the techniques from [5] in the proof below. In [2], it was shown that the cut-set bound is achievable for such deterministic networks, provided attention is restricted to product distributions for the input signals. The main result presented below entails showing that the loss in restricting attention to product distributions for inputs is bounded for deterministic superposition relay networks. The connection with Gaussian relay networks or with MIMO channels (see the following Sec. V) was not made in [5]. There is also no cooperation among the input or output nodes in [5], which is a key ingredient of the proof below.

Theorem 4.1: The difference in capacities of the Gaussian relay network with a single source-destination pair, and the corresponding deterministic

superposition network, is bounded, with bound depending only on the number of nodes.

Proof: We prove the result by assuming that the network permits only real valued signals. Extending the result to Gaussian networks with complex valued signals is straightforward, but involves more bookkeeping as noted at the end.

We show that achievable rates in the Gaussian network are within a bounded gap of achievable rates in the deterministic superposition network, and vice versa.

First, we start with the Gaussian network and reduce it to a deterministic superposition network in stages, bounding the loss in mutual information at each stage. For specificity, consider a cut with two input nodes and two output nodes. Let the output signals be

$$y_i = h_{i1}x_1 + h_{i2}x_2 + z_i, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (7)$$

Choose x_1, x_2 as i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (since this choice is approximately optimal in the sense that it maximizes the mutual information of the cut up to a constant, see Sec. II-C.2). The mutual information across this cut is

$$I(X_1, X_2; Y_1, Y_2) = \frac{1}{2} \log |I + \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}^t|, \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{H} is the channel transfer matrix. Our goal is to derive, from x_1 and x_2 , inputs to the corresponding deterministic discrete superposition channel such that mutual information of the deterministic channel differs by no more than a constant from (8).

We begin by scaling all channel gains by half:

$$\begin{aligned} y'_i &:= (h_{i1}/2)x_1 + (h_{i2}/2)x_2 + z_i \\ &= h'_{i1}x_1 + h'_{i2}x_2 + z_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with $h'_{ij} := h_{ij}/2$. The mutual information decreases by at most 1 bit in comparison to (8), since $(I + \mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}^t) \preceq 4(I + \frac{\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}^t}{2})$ as positive definite matrices. So, $I(X_1, X_2; Y_1, Y_2) \leq I(X_1, X_2; Y'_1, Y'_2) + 1$.

Next, the x_i 's, satisfying an average power constraint, are converted into \hat{x}_i 's satisfying a peak power constraint of 1, by discarding their integer part \hat{x}_i and retaining only their fractional part \bar{x}_i . Hence $\hat{x}_i := (\text{sign } x_i) \lfloor |x_i| \rfloor$, $\bar{x}_i := x_i - \hat{x}_i$. Define

$$\bar{y}_i := h'_{i1}\bar{x}_1 + h'_{i2}\bar{x}_2 + z_i, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (11)$$

Denote the discarded portion of the received signal by

$$\hat{y}_i = h'_{i1}\hat{x}_1 + h'_{i2}\hat{x}_2, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (12)$$

Comparing with the channel in (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(X_1, X_2; Y'_1, Y'_2) & \\ &= h(Y'_1, Y'_2) - h(Y'_1, Y'_2 | X_1, X_2) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\leq h(\bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2) - h(Z_1, Z_2) \quad (14)$$

$$\leq h(\bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2) - h(Z_1, Z_2) + H(\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2) \quad (15)$$

$$= I(\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2; \bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2) + H(\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2) \quad (16)$$

$$\leq I(\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2; \bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2) + H(\hat{X}_1) + H(\hat{X}_2), \quad (17)$$

where (17) holds because \hat{Y}_i 's are a function of \hat{X}_i 's from (12). Since X_i is $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, we can show that

$$H(\hat{X}_i) = - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} p_{\hat{X}_i}(k) \log p_{\hat{X}_i}(k) < 4. \quad (18)$$

From (17) and above, channel (11) loses at most 8 bits compared to channel (10).

Since \hat{x}_i are not necessarily positive, we obtain positive inputs by adding $(h'_{i1} + h'_{i2})$ to \bar{y}_i :

$$\tilde{y}_i := \bar{y}_i + h'_{i1} + h'_{i2} \quad (19)$$

$$= h_{i1}(\bar{x}_1 + 1)/2 + h_{i2}(\bar{x}_2 + 1)/2 + z_i \quad (20)$$

$$=: h_{i1}\tilde{x}_1 + h_{i2}\tilde{x}_2 + z_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (21)$$

where now \tilde{x}_i lies in $[0, 1)$. $I(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2; \tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2)$ remains equal to $I(\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2; \bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2)$.

The features of the model that we next address are

- 1) channel gains are integers,
- 2) inputs are restricted to $n := \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \lfloor \log h_{ij} \rfloor$ bits,
- 3) there is no AWGN, and
- 4) outputs involve truncation to integers.

Let the binary expansion of \tilde{x}_i be $0.\tilde{x}_i(1)\tilde{x}_i(2)\dots$. We get the output of the deterministic superposition channel by retaining the relevant portion of signal (21):

$$y_i^{\text{det}} =: \left\lfloor \hat{h}_{i1}x_1^{\text{det}} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \hat{h}_{i2}x_2^{\text{det}} \right\rfloor, \quad (22)$$

where $x_i^{\text{det}} := \sum_{k=1}^n \tilde{x}_i(k)2^{-k}$, and we have truncated channel gains, i.e., $\hat{h}_{ij} := (\text{sign } h_{ij}) \lfloor |h_{ij}| \rfloor$. To get (22) from (21), we subtracted

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^2 \left(h_{ij}(\tilde{x}_j - x_j^{\text{det}}) + (h_{ij} - \hat{h}_{ij})x_j^{\text{det}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{frac}(\hat{h}_{ij}x_j^{\text{det}}) \right) + z_i \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$=: \sum_{j=1}^2 w_{ji} + z_i. \quad (24)$$

To bound the loss in mutual information, note that

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2; \tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2) & \\ &= h(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2) - h(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2 | \tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$= h(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2) - h(Z_1) - h(Z_2) \quad (26)$$

$$\leq h(Y_1^{\text{det}}, Y_2^{\text{det}}, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) - h(Z_1) - h(Z_2) \quad (27)$$

$$\leq H(Y_1^{\text{det}}, Y_2^{\text{det}}) + h(\epsilon_1) + h(\epsilon_2) \quad (28)$$

$$- h(Z_1) - h(Z_2).$$

From the definition of ϵ_i in (23), and since y_i^{det} are completely determined by $x_1^{\text{det}}, x_2^{\text{det}}$, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} I(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{X}_2; \tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2) &= I(X_1^{\text{det}}, X_2^{\text{det}}; Y_1^{\text{det}}, Y_2^{\text{det}}) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^2 (h(\epsilon_i) - h(\epsilon_i | W_{1i}, W_{2i})) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= I(X_1^{\text{det}}, X_2^{\text{det}}; Y_1^{\text{det}}, Y_2^{\text{det}}) \\ &+ I(W_{11}, W_{21}; \epsilon_1) + I(W_{12}, W_{22}; \epsilon_2). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

By bounding the magnitudes of terms in (23), we get $|w_{ji}| \leq 4$. So, $I(W_{11}, W_{2i}; \epsilon_1)$ is the mutual information of a MISO channel with input power constraint $(16 + 16) = 32$ and $I(W_{11}, W_{21}; \epsilon_1) \leq \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + 32) < 3$ bits. So we lose at most 6 bits in the last step.

We have proved that difference between the maximum mutual information across a cut in a Gaussian network and an achievable mutual information for the same cut in the deterministic superposition network is bounded. Repeating this for every cut yields a bound that depends solely on number of nodes.

Conversely, start with a joint distribution for the inputs x_i^{det} in the deterministic superposition network. Since x_i^{det} 's satisfy average power constraints, we can apply them directly to the Gaussian channel to get

$$y_i = h_{i1}x_1^{\text{det}} + h_{i2}x_2^{\text{det}} + z_i, i = 1, 2. \quad (31)$$

We can rewrite y_i as

$$y_i = y_i^{\text{det}} + \sum_{j=1}^2 \left((h_{ij} - \hat{h}_{ij}) x_j^{\text{det}} \right) \quad (32)$$

$$+ \text{frac}(\hat{h}_{ij} x_j^{\text{det}}) + z_i$$

$$=: y_i^{\text{det}} + \sum_{j=1}^2 v_{ji} + z_i, i = 1, 2. \quad (33)$$

By definition, y_i^{det} takes on only integer values. Hence, y_i^{det} can be recovered from y_i , the integer parts of v_{ji} 's and noise z_i , and the carry c_i obtained from adding the fractional parts of v_{ji} 's and z_i . So,

$$\begin{aligned} & I(X_1^{\text{det}}, X_2^{\text{det}}; Y_1^{\text{det}}, Y_2^{\text{det}}) \\ & \leq I(X_1^{\text{det}}, X_2^{\text{det}}; Y_1, Y_2, \{\hat{V}_{ji}\}, \{\hat{Z}_i\}, \{C_i\}) \quad (34) \\ & \leq I(X_1^{\text{det}}, X_2^{\text{det}}; Y_1, Y_2) + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 H(\hat{V}_{ji}) \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^2 H(\hat{Z}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^2 H(C_i). \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

Here \hat{v}_{ji}, \hat{z}_i are integer parts of the respective variables. Since $|v_{ji}| \leq 2$, $\hat{v}_{ji} \in \{-2, -1, \dots, 2\}$, and $H(\hat{V}_{ji}) \leq 3$. The carry $c_i \in \{-2, -1, \dots, 2\}$, hence $H(C_i) \leq 3$. As earlier, $H(\hat{Z}_i) \leq 4$. Therefore, the mutual information of the Gaussian channel is at most 28 bits lesser than that of the deterministic superposition channel.

The above arguments can be extended to show that for every choice of a joint distribution for inputs in the deterministic superposition channel, there is a product distribution for inputs with a bounded reduction in the mutual information. To complete the proof, we note that the cut-set bound in (1) restricted to product distributions is achievable in the deterministic superposition network [2].

For the general case of complex Gaussian networks, we allow signals in (7) to be complex valued and

rewrite

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{iR} \\ y_{iI} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{i1R} & -h_{i1I} \\ h_{i1I} & h_{i1R} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{1R} \\ x_{1I} \end{bmatrix} \quad (36)$$

$$+ \begin{bmatrix} h_{i2R} & -h_{i2I} \\ h_{i2I} & h_{i2R} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{2R} \\ x_{2I} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} z_{iR} \\ z_{iI} \end{bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

Now, choose inputs to be i.i.d. $\mathcal{CN}(0, 1)$. Increasing variances of both inputs and Gaussian noise from 1 to 2 does not change the mutual information, but has the benefit that now X_{iR}, X_{iI}, Z_R, Z_I are $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The rest of the analysis can be repeated. ■

V. MIMO CHANNELS AND DETERMINISTIC MODELS

Above, we essentially consider the point-to-point MIMO channel at every cut, allowing transmitter-side and receiver-side cooperation, and compare MIMO channels corresponding to the same cut in the Gaussian network and the deterministic network.

Our proof that the linear deterministic network is a poor approximation for Gaussian relay networks can therefore be easily extended to show that MIMO channels cannot, in general, be approximated by the linear deterministic model. In the same vein, we can extend the positive result that the deterministic superposition model remains a good approximation for MIMO channels.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since the capacity of the linear deterministic model is not a bounded error approximation of that of the Gaussian relay network, the challenge is to quantitatively show to what extent, how, and why, good coding strategies for the former yield good strategies for the latter.

For deterministic superposition networks, the challenge is to extend the bounded error approximation result to networks with multiple sources and destinations.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. S. Avestimehr, S. N. Diggavi, and D. N. C. Tse, "A Deterministic Approach to Wireless Relay Networks," *Proc. 45th Annu. Allerton Conf.*, Monticello, IL, Sept. 2007.
- [2] ———, "Wireless Network Information Flow," *Proc. 45th Annu. Allerton Conf.*, Monticello, IL, Sept. 2007.
- [3] ———, "Approximate Capacity of Gaussian Relay Networks," *Proc. of IEEE ISIT 2008*, Toronto, Canada, July 2008.
- [4] A. S. Avestimehr, A. Sezgin, and D. N. C. Tse, "Approximate capacity of the two-way relay channel: A deterministic approach," *Proc. 46th Annu. Allerton Conf.*, Monticello, IL, Sep. 2008.
- [5] G. Bresler and D. N. C. Tse, "The two-user Gaussian interference channel: a deterministic view," arXiv:0807.3222v1
- [6] V. R. Cadambe, S. A. Jafar, and S. Shamai, "Interference Alignment on the Deterministic Channel and Application to Fully Connected AWGN Interference Networks," accepted for publication in the *IEEE Trans. on Info. Theory*. arXiv: 0711.2547.
- [7] A. El Gamal, "On Information Flow in Relay Networks," *IEEE National Telecomm. Conf.*, Vol. 2, pp. D4.1.1 - D4.1.4, Nov. 1981.
- [8] R. Etkin, D. N. C. Tse, and H. Wang, "Gaussian Interference Channel Capacity to Within One Bit," arXiv: 0702045v2.