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We are getting close to the frame theory!
Recall from the last time we did in class:

- $\gamma(X)=\stackrel{\text { matrix }}{H X}+\overbrace{N}^{\text {ii.d., Gussian with variance } \sigma^{2}}$

We had arrived at an upper bound $\prod_{j=1}^{k}(\underbrace{1+(\Delta)_{j, j}^{2}}_{\text {eigenvalues of } C_{X}: S_{j}^{2}} \underbrace{\left(W^{t} D^{2} W\right)_{j, j}}_{\text {eigenvalues of } H^{t} H: \lambda_{j}})$
(Note: This estimate is achieved if $C_{X}$ and $H^{t} H$ are simultaneously diagonalizable.)
To compute the capacity, we want to maximize $\ln \prod_{j=1}^{k}(1+\ldots \ldots \ldots)$.
EulerLagrange equations give: $\lambda_{i}\left(1+S_{j} \lambda_{j}\right)^{-1}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}M, & S_{j}>0 \\ \lambda_{j}, & \text { else }\end{array}\right.$,
so $S_{j}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{1}{\lambda_{j}}, & S_{j}>0 \\ 0, & \text { else }\end{array}\right.$ and $\mu$ is choosen such that $\sum_{j=1}^{k} S_{j}=S$.
Now we compute the mutual information

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(X ; Y) & \left.=\frac{1}{2} \ln \left((2 \pi e)^{n} \prod_{j=1}\left(\lambda_{j}\left(\mu^{-1}-\lambda_{j}^{-1}\right)^{+}+1\right)\right)-\frac{1}{2} \ln \left((2 \pi e)^{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k} \max \left\{1, \lambda_{j} \mu^{-1}\right\}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\ln \left(\lambda_{j} \mu^{-1}\right)\right)^{+}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mu$ gives $\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{1}{\lambda_{j}}\right)^{+}=S$.

Now we get to today's inequality:
Given $A=A^{t}$, opt. on $\mathbb{H}$ and $P=P^{*} P,\left(P=P^{2}, P=P^{*}\right)$, $\operatorname{rank} P=k$, We claim $\operatorname{tr}[P A] \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_{j}$, whose $\left\{\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}, \lambda_{3}, \ldots \ldots, \lambda_{k-1, \lambda}, \lambda_{k}\right\}$ are the $k$ largest eigenvalues of $A$.

Proof: Let $A=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j} E_{j}$, without loss of generality $\operatorname{rank} E_{j}=1, E_{j}^{*} E_{j}=E_{j}$. If $P$ is a rank-free projection, then $P=X X^{*},|X|=1$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\max _{P=x x^{*}} \operatorname{tr}[P A] & =\max _{P=x x^{*}} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{\left\langle P A e_{l}, e_{l}\right\rangle}_{\left\langle A e_{l}, x\right\rangle} \\
& =\max _{\|x\|=1}^{\left\langle x, e_{l}\right\rangle}\langle A x, x\rangle \\
& =\max _{\|x\|=1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j} \underbrace{\left\langle E_{j} x, x\right\rangle}_{\left\|E_{j} x\right\|^{2}=P_{j}, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}} P_{j}=1 \\
& \leq \max _{j} \lambda_{j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

(Note: $\boldsymbol{\star}$ is achieved if we choose $e_{1}=x, e_{l} \perp x, l \geq 2$ )
If $\operatorname{rankP}=k$, we have $\operatorname{tr}[A P]=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j} \underbrace{\operatorname{tr}\left[E_{j} p\right]}_{\leq 1}$
and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{tr}\left[E_{j} P\right]=\operatorname{tr}[P]=k$, so we need to:
maximize $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{j} P_{j}$, subject to $0 \leq P_{j} \leq 1, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P_{j}=k$.
In this case, we choose $P_{j}=1$ when j belongs to the $k$ largest eigenvalues, and else set $P_{j}=0$, then $\operatorname{tr}[P A]=\sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_{j}$.

## 7 Linear codes for parallel additive white noise channels

Assume we have input $X=\left(X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots \ldots, X_{k}\right)$ with $X_{j}$ i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussians and $C_{X}=\frac{S}{k} I$ and suppose $\gamma: \mathbb{R}^{n} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k}$ is additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) $\gamma(\hat{X})=\hat{X}+N$. We have input constraint $\operatorname{tr}\left[C_{\hat{X}}\right] \leq S$ and noise coveriance $C_{N}$.

QUESTION: What is the best linear encoding $\hat{X}=H X^{2}$ ?

By power constraint and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr}\left[C_{\hat{X}}\right] & =\operatorname{tr}[H \underbrace{C_{x}}_{\frac{S}{k} I} H^{t}] \\
& =\frac{S}{k} \operatorname{tr}\left[H H^{t}\right] \leq S
\end{aligned}
$$

We have $\operatorname{tr}\left[H H^{t}\right] \leq k$.
According to the usual procedure, we then want to:
maximize $\operatorname{det}\left(C_{N}+\frac{S}{k} H H^{t}\right)$, subject to $\operatorname{tr}\left[H H^{t}\right] \leq k$.
Choosing a basis which diagonalizes $C_{N}$ then gives:
$\operatorname{det}\left(C_{N}+\frac{S}{k} H H^{t}\right)=\operatorname{det}\left(D^{2}+\frac{S}{k} \hat{H} \hat{H}^{t}\right)$ with $\widetilde{H}=D H$.
We assume eigenvalues of $C_{N}$ that are strictly positive, otherwise the capacity would be infinite. In this case, we can factor them out of the determinant:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det}\left(C_{N}+\frac{S}{k} H H^{t}\right) & =\operatorname{det}\left(D^{2}\right) \operatorname{det}\left(I_{n}+\frac{S}{k} D^{-1} \widetilde{H} \widetilde{H}^{t} D^{-1}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{det}\left(D^{2}\right) \operatorname{det}\left(I_{k}+\frac{S}{k} \widetilde{H}^{t} D^{-2} \widetilde{H}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{det}\left(D^{2}\right) \operatorname{det}\left(I_{k}+\frac{S}{k} \widetilde{V}^{t} \widetilde{W}^{t} D^{-2} \widetilde{W} \widetilde{V}\right) \\
& \leq \operatorname{det}\left(D^{2}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(1+\frac{S}{k} \widetilde{V}_{j, j}^{2}\left(\widetilde{W^{t}} D^{-2} \widetilde{W}\right)_{j, j}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\widetilde{V}$ is diagonal positive, $\widetilde{W}$ is isometry, equality holds in hadamard's inequality if and only if $\widetilde{W}^{t} D^{-2} \widetilde{W}$ is diagonal.

In this case, the maximum value is achieved by picking the $k$ largest eigenvalues of $D^{-2}$.
To achieve equality, we choose $H H^{t}$ so that it is simultaneously diagonalizable with $C_{N}$ and the range of $H$ is the span of eigenvectors of $C_{N}$ corresponding to the $k$ largest eigenvalues of $C_{N}^{-1}$, meaning the $k$ smallest eigenvalues of $C_{N}$.

Then, $\widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{H}$ is diagonal with entries such that the Euler-Lagrange equations are satisfied:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{S}{k} \lambda_{j}\left(1+\frac{S}{k}\left(\widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{H}\right)_{j, j} \lambda_{j}\right)^{-1}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\mu,\left(\widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{H}\right)_{j, j}>0 \\
\frac{S}{k} \lambda_{j}, \text { else }
\end{array}\right. \\
& \text { so } \widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{H}=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{k}{S \lambda_{j}},\left(\widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{H}\right)_{j, j}>0 \\
0, \text { else }
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

We then get:

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(X ; Y) & =\frac{1}{2} \ln ((2 \pi e)^{n} \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(\lambda_{j}\left(\mu^{-1}-\frac{k}{S} \lambda_{j}^{-1}\right)^{+}+1\right) \underbrace{\operatorname{det}\left(D^{2}\right)}_{\operatorname{det}\left(C_{N}\right)}-\frac{1}{2} \ln \left((2 \pi e)^{n} \operatorname{det}\left(C_{N}\right)\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \ln (\prod_{j=1}^{k}(\underbrace{\lambda_{j}\left(\mu^{-1}-\frac{k}{S} \lambda_{j}^{-1}\right)^{+}}_{\frac{\lambda_{j}}{\mu}-\frac{k}{S}}+1)) \\
& =\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \ln \left(\left(\frac{\lambda_{j}}{\mu}-\frac{k}{S}\right)^{+}+1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mu$ is choosen such that $\operatorname{tr}\left[\widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{H}\right]=\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\frac{1}{\mu}-\frac{k}{S \lambda_{j}}\right)^{+}=k$.

