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#### Abstract

We generalize a convexity result due to Wyner and Ziv to channels with binary inputs and arbitrary outputs. This results in a convex reformulation of some non-convex optimization problems that arise naturally in multi-user information theory.


## 1 Introduction

The optimality of certain achievable rate regions for communication settings in multiuser information theory, such as Marton's region for the two-receiver broadcast channel, can be verified by establishing that product distributions are the global maximizers of a corresponding non-convex functional on product spaces, [1]. A functional satisfying the above property is said to satisfy global tensorization. As stated in [2] a curious connection has been repeatedly observed between functionals that satisfy global tensorization and those that satisfy a so-called local tensorization property. One way to reconcile this apparent relationship is to determine if all the local maximizers of non-convex functionals that satisfy global tensorization are also product distributions.

On a related note, information inequalities concerning non-convex functionals have also been established [3] by determining all the local maximizers. Additionally, certain non-convex functionals, such as the one arising in the capacity region computation of the vector Gaussian channel [4] is shown to have a unique local maximum. Inspired by these observations, we seek to understand the geometric structure of certain information functionals and determine its set of local extremizers. The family considered in this paper can be considered as an elementary but non-trivial sub-class of functionals. The results in this paper extend the celebrated convexity result, sometimes referred to as Mrs. Gerber's lemma, of Wyner and Ziv to broader family of channels. Alternate extensions of Mrs. Gerber's lemma have been studied in literature, for instance in [5], [6], and [7].

Given a conditional distribution $W_{Y \mid X}$, a reference distribution $P_{X}$, and a non-negative parameter $\lambda$ we will be investigating non-convex optimization problems of form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{\Phi_{X}}\left\{\lambda D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)-D\left((W \Phi)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)\right\}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and see if these problems can be reparameterized into convex optimization problems. In the above expression $D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)$ denotes the relative entropy, and the logarithms are assumed to be with respect to base $e$. If such a reparameterization exists, then any local minimizer would also be a global minimizer (similar to the observation in the MIMO Gaussian broadcast channel). The main idea is to choose a parameterization of $\Phi_{X}$ so that $D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)$ is linear in the parameter and determine whether the output relative entropy, $D\left((W \Phi)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$, is concave. This approach is motivated by geodesically convex reformulations of the Brascamp-Lieb constants in [8].

### 1.1 Motivation

Consider the following optimization scenarios originating in multiuser information theory.
(i) In the Ahlswede-Korner source coding problem [9], to compute the minimal weighted sum-rate, one is faced with the following optimization problem: Given a conditional distribution $W_{Y \mid X}$ and an input distribution $\Phi_{X}$, one seeks to compute the value of the following optimization problem (parameterized by $\lambda, \lambda \geq 0$ ):

$$
\min _{U: U \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y} H(Y \mid U)+\lambda I(U ; X)
$$

(ii) In the degraded broadcast channel, to compute the maximum weighted sum-rate $R_{Z}+\lambda R_{Y}$, one seeks to compute the value of the following optimization problem (parameterized by $\lambda, \lambda \leq 1$ ):

$$
\max _{U, X: U \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z} I(U ; Z)+\lambda I(X ; Y \mid U) .
$$

Both of these problems result in the computation of the lower convex envelope with respect to $\Phi_{X}$ for the functionals $H(Y)-\lambda H(X)$ and $H(Z)-\lambda H(Y)$, respectively. Observe that in the latter case, the channel
$W_{Z \mid Y}$ is fixed, and in the former case the conditional distribution $W_{Y \mid X}$ is fixed. Note that, when $\lambda=0$ both functionals are concave in $\Phi_{X}$ and when $\lambda=1$ both functionals are convex in $\Phi_{X}$. For $\lambda \in(0,1)$ (the interesting regime), the function is not necessarily convex nor concave. Therefore the computation of the lower convex envelope does not reduce to a convex optimization problem and apriori the functionals may have multiple local minimizers. Hence it is natural to ask if there is a subset of the above family of problems for which under a suitable reparameterization, the problem reduces to a convex optimization problem.

Characterization of the lower convex envelope can be done via Fenchel duality by computing its supporting hyperplanes. To this end we seek to compute the minimum of

$$
\begin{aligned}
G\left(P_{X}\right) & :=\min _{\Phi_{X}}\left\{\lambda D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)-D\left((W \Phi)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)\right\} \\
& =\min _{\Phi_{X}}\left\{H_{\Phi}(Y)-\lambda H_{\Phi}(X)-\sum_{x} a_{x} \Phi_{X}(x)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $(W \Phi)_{Y}$ denotes the distribution on $Y$ induced by the input distribution $\Phi_{X}$ and the channel $W_{Y \mid X}$, $H_{\Phi}(X)$ denotes the Shannon entropy of $X$ when $X \sim \Phi_{X}$, and $a_{x}=\sum_{y} W(y \mid x) \log \frac{(W P)_{y}}{P(x)^{\lambda}}$. Thus $G\left(P_{X}\right)$ denotes the Fenchel dual for the convex envelope of $H(Y)-H(X)$, with $a_{x}=\sum_{y} W(y \mid x) \log \frac{(W P)_{y}}{P(x)^{\lambda}}$ being the dual variables. This is one way in which optimization problems of the type described in (1) arise.

Another motivation for such optimization problems lie in determining the optimal constants for Strong-Data-Processing inequalities and in turn to determining limiting hypercontractivity parameters [10]. It has been shown in [11] that given $p_{X}, W_{Y \mid X}$, the inequality

$$
I(U ; Y)-\eta I(U ; X) \leq 0
$$

holds for all $U: U \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$ is Markov, if and only if, the inequality

$$
\min _{\Phi_{X}}\left\{\eta D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)-D\left((W \Phi)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)\right\} \geq 0
$$

Note that the range of $\eta$ depends on $P_{X}$. One can also define a similar $\eta$ that holds for all input distributions (and thus depends only on the channel) to be

$$
\eta_{W}:=\min \left\{\eta: I(U ; Y)-\eta I(U ; X) \leq 0, \forall p_{U X}: U \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \text { is Markov }\right\}
$$

or equivalently (see Exercise 15.12 in [12])

$$
\eta_{W}:=\min \left\{\eta: \lambda D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)-D\left((W \Phi)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right) \geq 0, \forall q_{X}, p_{X}\right\}
$$

It has recently been shown [13] that for any $W_{Y \mid X}$ it suffices to consider $P_{X}$ having support on two alphabets and $\Phi_{X} \ll P_{X}$ to compute $\eta_{W}$.
Remark 1. In light of this result, the case of $\mathcal{X}$ being binary takes particular significance while considering the family of optimization problems of the form

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\min _{\Phi_{X}}\left\{\lambda D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)-D\left((W \Phi)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)\right\} \\
\min _{P_{X}, \Phi_{X}}\left\{\lambda D\left(\Phi_{X} \| P_{X}\right)-D\left((W \Phi)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)\right\} \tag{3}
\end{array}
$$

### 1.2 A convexity result due to Wyner and Ziv

While trying to compute the superposition coding region of a degraded binary-symmetric broadcast channel (see item (ii) in the Motivation), Wyner and Ziv showed that for any $\alpha \in\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$, the function $H_{2}\left(\alpha * H_{2}^{-1}(u)\right)$ is convex in $u$, where $H_{2}:\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \mapsto[0, \log 2]$ is binary entropy function given by $H_{2}(x)=-x \log x-(1-x) \log (1-x)$ and $H_{2}^{-1}:[0, \log 2] \mapsto\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ is its inverse. Here $a * b=a(1-b)+b(1-a)$ denotes a two-point convolution.

We can interpret this result alternately as the following: Let $W_{Y \mid X}$ be the binary symmetric channel with crossover probability $\alpha$. Let $p_{X}$ be the uniform distribution and parameterize $\Phi_{X, t}(0)=H_{2}^{-1}(t)$. Now observe that under this parameterization, $D\left(\Phi_{X, t} \| P_{X}\right)=\log 2-t$ is linear in $t$, and $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)=\log 2-$ $H_{2}\left(\alpha * H_{2}^{-1}(t)\right)$ is concave in $t$. Therefore the function

$$
\lambda D\left(\Phi_{X, t} \| P_{X}\right)-D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)
$$

is convex in $t$, reducing the computation of (1) to a convex optimization problem. Note that $\Phi_{X, t}$ determines a path along the binary simplex such that $D\left(\Phi_{X, t} \| P_{X}\right)$ is linear in $t$ and $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$ is concave in $t$.

Thus the question we seek to address is: given any channel $W_{Y \mid X}$, a reference distribution $P_{X}$, and an initial distribution $\Phi_{X}$, is it possible to parameterize the path from $\Phi_{X}$ to $P_{X}$ according to $\Phi_{X, t}$, where $\Phi_{X, 0}=\Phi_{X}$ and $\Phi_{X, 1}=P_{X}$, with the property that $D\left(\Phi_{X, t} \| P_{X}\right)$ is linear in $t$ and $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$ is concave in $t$. We will answer this question for channels with binary inputs and arbitray output cardinalities. As stated in Remark 1, the case of binary inputs (and outputs of arbitrary cardinality) is particularly useful when computing $\eta_{W}$ for channels with arbitrary input alphabets.

We first present our results for channels with binary outputs as we have slightly stronger results (see Proposition 1) in this setting. Our main results are presented in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2; these results generalize the convexity of $H_{2}\left(\alpha * H_{2}^{-1}(u)\right)$.

## 2 Channels with binary inputs and binary outputs

Let us denote a binary-input binary-output channel as

$$
W_{Y \mid X}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
a & b  \tag{4}\\
\bar{a} & \bar{b}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Here the matrix entry $W_{i j}=P(Y=i \mid X=j), \bar{a}=1-a, \bar{b}=1-b$. Let us denote $\Phi_{X, t}=(\phi(t), 1-\phi(t))$ and $P_{X}=(p, 1-p)$ to characterize the parameterized path and the reference distribution. Further we denote, for $a, b \in[0,1]$,

$$
D_{2}(a \| b):=a \log \frac{a}{b}+(1-a) \log \frac{1-a}{1-b}
$$

to be the relative entropy between the two-point distributions characterized by ( $a, 1-a$ ) and ( $b, 1-b$ ) respectively. We also use $\bar{\phi}$ to represent $1-\phi$ for brevity. We also assume that the reference measure satisfies $p>0$; otherwise $D_{2}(\phi \| 0)=\infty$ for all $\phi \neq 0$.

Note that $D_{2}(\phi(t) \| p)$ is monotonically increasing (resp. decreasing) when $\phi(t) \geq p$ (resp. $\left.\phi(t) \leq p\right)$. Hence if we enforce the linear dependence of input divergence on $t$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} D_{2}(\phi \| p)=\phi^{\prime \prime} \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p}+\frac{\phi^{\prime 2}}{\phi \bar{\phi}}=0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Imposing the boundary conditions $\phi(0)=1$ (resp. $\phi(0)=1$ ) and $\phi(1)=p$, then $\phi(t)$ can be uniquely determined (due to the monotonicity of $D_{2}(\phi(t) \| p)$ ). Concretely, for $\phi(t) \geq p, \phi(t)$ is the unique solution of

$$
D_{2}(\phi(t) \| p)=(1-t) \log _{2} \frac{1}{p}
$$

and for $\phi(t) \leq p, \phi(t)$ is the unique solution of

$$
D_{2}(\phi(t) \| p)=(1-t) \log _{2} \frac{1}{1-p}
$$

Remark 2. Note that this reparameterization $\phi(t)$ generalizes the parameterization $H_{2}^{-1}(t)$ employed by Wyner and Ziv for the binary symmetric channel.

Let $(W P)_{Y}=(a p+b \bar{p}, \bar{a} p+\bar{b} \bar{p})$ and $(W \Phi)_{Y}=(a \phi+b \bar{\phi}, \bar{a} \phi+\bar{b} \bar{\phi})$. We define $q \triangleq a p+b \bar{p}$, and $\psi \triangleq a \phi+b \bar{\phi}$. Now we can calculate the second order derivative $\frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} D_{2}(\psi \| q)$ as following:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} D_{2}(\psi \| q)=\psi^{\prime \prime} \log \frac{\psi \bar{q}}{\bar{\psi} q}+\frac{\psi^{\prime 2}}{\psi \bar{\psi}} \stackrel{(a)}{=}-(a-b) \frac{\phi^{\prime 2} \log \frac{\psi \bar{q}}{\psi \bar{q}}}{\log \frac{\phi \bar{q}}{\phi p}}+(a-b)^{2} \frac{\phi^{\prime 2}}{\psi \bar{\psi}} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equality (a) follows from equation (5). Suppose $\phi^{\prime} \neq 0$, then concavity of $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$ is equivalent to $\frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} D_{2}(\psi \| q) \leq 0$. This, in turn, is equivalent to

$$
f(\phi ; p):=(a-b)^{2} \phi \bar{\phi} \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p}-(a-b) \psi \bar{\psi} \log \frac{\psi \bar{q}}{\bar{\psi} q}\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\geq 0,  \tag{7}\\
\leq 0, \\
\leq 0 \leq p
\end{array}\right.
$$

since $\log \frac{\phi}{p} \leq 0($ resp. $\geq 0)$ when $\phi \leq p$ (resp. $\phi \geq p$ ).
Specifically, the condition (7) now can be expressed as $f(\phi ; p) \geq 0$ for $\phi \in[0, p]$ and $f(\phi ; p) \leq 0$ for $\phi \in[p, 1]$. We remark that this condition now does not depend on $t$. One may calculate the derivatives of $f(\phi ; p)$ w.r.t. $\phi$
as the following.

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{d \phi} f(\phi ; p) & =(a-b)^{2}(1-2 \phi) \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p}-(a-b)^{2}(1-2 \psi) \log \frac{\psi \bar{q}}{\bar{\psi} q} \\
\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p) & =(a-b)^{2}\left[-2 \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p}+\frac{(1-2 \phi)}{\phi \bar{\phi}}\right]-(a-b)^{3}\left[-2 \log \frac{\psi \bar{q}}{\bar{\psi} q}+\frac{(1-2 \psi)}{\psi \bar{\psi}}\right]  \tag{8}\\
\frac{d^{3}}{d \phi^{3}} f(\phi ; p) & =-\frac{(a-b)^{2}}{\phi^{2} \bar{\phi}^{2}}+\frac{(a-b)^{4}}{\psi^{2} \bar{\psi}^{2}}
\end{align*}
$$

We will show that $\frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} f(\phi)$ is decreasing w.r.t. $\phi$ in the following lemma.
Lemma 1. The second-order derivative $\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p)$ is monotonically decreasing in $\phi \in[0,1]$.
Proof. Note that $\frac{d^{3}}{d \phi^{3}} f(\phi ; p) \leq 0$ is equivalent to $\psi^{2} \bar{\psi}^{2} \geq(a-b)^{2} \phi^{2} \bar{\phi}^{2}$ or

$$
(\psi \bar{\psi}+(a-b) \phi \bar{\phi})(\psi \bar{\psi}-(a-b) \phi \bar{\phi}) \geq 0
$$

When $0 \leq b \leq a \leq 1$, we have $\psi \bar{\psi}+(a-b) \phi \bar{\phi} \geq 0$. Hence we only need to argue $\psi \bar{\psi}-(a-b) \phi \bar{\phi} \geq 0$. Note we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\psi \bar{\psi}-(a-b) \phi \bar{\phi} & =(b+(a-b) \phi)(\bar{b}+(b-a) \phi)-(a-b) \phi(1-\phi) \\
& =(a-b)(\bar{a}+b) \phi^{2}-2 b(a-b) \phi+b \bar{b} \\
& =(a-b)(\bar{a}+b)\left(\phi-\frac{b}{\bar{a}+b}\right)^{2}+\frac{\bar{a} b}{\bar{a}+b} \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, when $0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1$, we have $(\psi \bar{\psi}-(a-b) \phi \bar{\phi}) \geq 0$. Hence we need to check

$$
\psi \bar{\psi}+(a-b) \phi \bar{\phi}=(b-a)(a+\bar{b})\left(\phi-\frac{\bar{b}}{a+\bar{b}}\right)^{2}+\frac{a \bar{b}}{a+\bar{b}} \geq 0
$$

This proves the required inequality.
Theorem 1. Consider a binary channel represented as Equation (4), with $a \neq b$ and $a, b \in(0,1)$. Assume that the input distribution is reparametrized according to Equation (5), then the output relative entropy $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$ is concave w.r.t. $t$ under such a reparametrization, if and only if $p$ is equal to

$$
p^{*}:=\frac{\sqrt{b \bar{b}}}{\sqrt{b \bar{b}}+\sqrt{a \bar{a}}}
$$

Proof. We will first show that $p=p^{*}$ is necessary. Calculate the Taylor expansion of $f(\phi ; p)$ at $\phi=p$, and observe that $f(p ; p)=\left.\frac{d}{d \phi} f(\phi ; p)\right|_{\phi=p}=0$, we have $f(p+\epsilon ; p)=\left.\frac{\epsilon^{2}}{2} \frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p)\right|_{\phi=p}+O\left(\epsilon^{3}\right)$. Hence to satisfy the condition in (7). i.e. for

$$
f(\phi ; p)\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\geq 0, \quad \phi \leq p \\
\leq 0, \quad \phi \geq p
\end{array}\right.
$$

we must have $\left.\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p)\right|_{\phi=p}=0$. By Equation (8), this is equivalent to

$$
(a-b) \frac{1-2 q}{q \bar{q}}-\frac{1-2 p}{p \bar{p}}=0
$$

The above equation is quadratic in $p$ and the only feasible solution is $p^{*}$. Hence $p=p^{*}$ is necessary.
To show that it is sufficient, assume $p=p^{*}$. From Lemma 1, we have that $\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right)$ is decreasing w.r.t. $\phi$. Since $\left.\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right)\right|_{\phi=p^{*}}=0$, then $\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right) \leq 0$ for $\phi \geq p^{*}$. This implies that $\frac{d}{d \phi} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right)$ is decreasing for $\phi \geq p^{*}$. As $\left.\frac{d}{d \phi} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right)\right|_{\phi=p^{*}}=0$, we have $\frac{d}{d \phi} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right) \leq 0$ for $\phi \geq p^{*}$. Consequently $f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right)$ is decreasing for $\phi \geq p^{*}$. Finally, as $f\left(p^{*} ; p^{*}\right)=0$, we obtain $f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right) \leq 0$ when $\phi \geq p^{*}$. The analysis of $\phi \leq p^{*}$ is similar. This completes the proof.

Remark 3. This theorem implies that for the binary symmetric channel, the only $P_{X}$ for which we have the concavity of $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$ with respect to $t$ is the uniform distribution.

When $p \neq p^{*}$, the next proposition establishes a one-sided concavity result for the output relative entropy.
Proposition 1. In the same setting as Theorem 1, if $p>p^{*}, D_{2}(\psi \| q)$ is concave for $1 \geq \phi \geq p$. Similarly, if $p<p^{*}, D_{2}(\psi \| q)$ is concave for $0 \leq \phi \leq p$.

Proof. We will prove the claim when $p>p^{*}$. The case where $p<p^{*}$ is analogous. We will show that $\left.\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p)\right|_{\phi=p}$ is decreasing w.r.t. $p$ first. By Equation (8), we have

$$
g(p):=\left.\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p)\right|_{\phi=p}=(a-b)^{2} \frac{1-2 p}{p \bar{p}}-(a-b)^{3} \frac{1-2 q}{q \bar{q}} .
$$

Since $q=a p+b \bar{p}$, we deduce that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d}{d p} g(p)=(a-b)^{2}\left(-\frac{1}{p^{2}}-\frac{1}{\bar{p}^{2}}\right)-(a-b)^{4}\left(-\frac{1}{q^{2}}-\frac{1}{\bar{q}^{2}}\right) \\
& \quad=-(a-b)^{2} \frac{\left(2(a-b) b p+b^{2}\right)}{p^{2} q^{2}}-(a-b)^{2} \frac{\left(2(a-b) \bar{a} \bar{p}+\bar{a}^{2}\right)}{\bar{p}^{2} \bar{q}^{2}}  \tag{9}\\
& \quad=-(b-a)^{2} \frac{\left(2(b-a) \bar{b} p+\bar{b}^{2}\right)}{p^{2} \bar{q}^{2}}-(b-a)^{2} \frac{\left(2(b-a) a \bar{p}+a^{2}\right)}{\bar{p}^{2} q^{2}} \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore, irrespective of the sign of $a-b$ (see (9) or (10)), we have $\frac{d}{d p} g(p) \leq 0$. Since $g\left(p^{*}\right)=\left.\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right)\right|_{\phi=p^{*}}=$ 0 and $g(p)$ is decreasing w.r.t $p, g(p) \leq 0$ when $p \geq p^{*}$. Moreover, by Lemma 1 , we have $\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p)$ is decreasing w.r.t $\phi$ and hence $\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p) \leq 0$ for all $\phi \geq p$. Since $f(p ; p)=0$ and $\left.\frac{d}{d \phi} f(\phi ; p)\right|_{\phi=p}=0$, we have $f(\phi ; p) \leq 0$ for all $\phi \geq p$. This implies $D_{2}(\psi \| q)$ is concave with $t$ when $\phi \geq p$.

## 3 Concavity over a 2-to-n Channel

We now generalize our result from binary outputs to 2 -to- $n$ channels for arbitrary finite output dimension $n$. To do so, we follow the same approach to find the $p$ such that when we make the input divergence linear in $t$, the output divergence becomes concave in $t$. The key difference is that one is unable to explicitly identify the $p^{*}$. We denote the channel as

$$
W(y \mid x)=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
a_{1} & b_{1}  \tag{11}\\
a_{2} & b_{2} \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
a_{n} & b_{n}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Here the matrix entry $W_{i j}=P(Y=i \mid X=j)$. The differential equation that makes the input divergence $D_{2}(\phi \| p)$ linear is same as the binary channel case, as is shown in Equation (5). However, the expression for the output divergence $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$ is different. Define $q_{i}=a_{i} p+b_{i} \bar{p}$ and $\psi_{i}=a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}$. Denote $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)=D(\boldsymbol{\psi} \| \boldsymbol{q})$. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
D(\boldsymbol{\psi} \| \boldsymbol{q}) & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_{i} \log \frac{\psi_{i}}{q_{i}} \\
\frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}} D(\boldsymbol{\psi} \| \boldsymbol{q}) & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi_{i}^{\prime \prime} \log \frac{\psi_{i}}{q_{i}}+\frac{\psi_{i}^{\prime 2}}{\psi_{i}} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right) \phi^{\prime \prime} \log \frac{\psi_{i}}{q_{i}}+\frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2} \phi^{\prime 2}}{\psi_{i}}\right)  \tag{12}\\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(-\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right) \frac{\phi^{\prime 2}}{\phi \bar{\phi}} \log \frac{\psi_{i}}{q_{i}}\left(\log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p}\right)^{-1}+\frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2} \phi^{\prime 2}}{\psi_{i}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Here we used Equation (5) in the final step. Requiring, the output relative entropy to be concave, i.e. the second-order derivative to be negative, is then equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(\phi ; p): & =\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(-\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right) \log \frac{\psi_{i}}{q_{i}}+\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2} \frac{\phi \bar{\phi}}{\psi_{i}} \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p}\right) \\
& \left\{\begin{array}{l}
\geq 0, \quad 0 \leq \phi \leq p \\
\leq 0, \quad p \leq \phi \leq 1
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking derivatives of $f(\phi ; p)$ w.r.t. $\phi$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d \phi} f(\phi ; p) & =\log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2}\left(-a_{i} \phi^{2}+b_{i} \bar{\phi}^{2}\right)}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}} \\
& =\log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)\left(-a_{i}^{2} \phi^{2}+a_{i} b_{i}\left(\phi^{2}+\bar{\phi}^{2}\right)-b_{i}^{2} \bar{\phi}^{2}\right)}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}} \\
& =\log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)\left(-a_{i}^{2} \phi^{2}+a_{i} b_{i}(1-2 \phi \bar{\phi})-b_{i}^{2} \bar{\phi}^{2}\right)}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}} \\
& =\log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)\left(-\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}+a_{i} b_{i}\right)}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}} \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{a_{i} b_{i}\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The second derivative can be expressed in terms of the first derivative according to

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(\phi ; p) & =\frac{1}{\phi \bar{\phi}} \sum \frac{a_{i} b_{i}\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}}-2 \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2} a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{3}} \\
& =\frac{1}{\phi \bar{\phi}}\left(\frac{d}{d \phi} f(\phi ; p)\right)\left(\log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p}\right)^{-1}-2 \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2} a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{3}} \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

Finally the third derivative can be expressed as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^{3}}{d \phi^{3}} f(\phi ; p)= & \left(\frac{1}{\bar{\phi}^{2}}-\frac{1}{\phi^{2}}\right) \sum \frac{a_{i} b_{i}\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{2}}+6 \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}}{\bar{\phi} p} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{3} a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{4}} \\
& -\frac{4}{\phi \bar{\phi}} \sum \frac{a_{i} b_{i}\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2}}{\left(a_{i} \phi+b_{i} \bar{\phi}\right)^{3}}
\end{aligned}
$$

We can now generalize Theorem 1 to 2-to- $n$ channels.
Theorem 2. For a 2 -to-n channel represented as Equation (11), if $\boldsymbol{a} \neq \boldsymbol{b}$, and we reparameterize the input distribution according to Equation (5), then the output relative entropy $D\left(\left(W \Phi_{X, t}\right)_{Y} \|(W P)_{Y}\right)$ is concave w.r.t. $t$ under such reparameterization, if and only if $p=p^{*}$ where $p^{*}$ is the unique solution to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right) a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(p a_{i}+\bar{p} b_{i}\right)^{2}}=0 \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $g(p):=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right) a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(a_{i} p+b_{i} \bar{p}\right)^{2}}=0$. Observe that $g(p)$ is decreasing since

$$
\frac{d}{d p} g(p)=-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{2\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2} a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(a_{i} p+b_{i} \bar{p}\right)^{3}} \leq 0
$$

Since $g(0)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2}}{b_{i}} \geq 0, g(1)=-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2}}{a_{i}} \leq 0$, we conclude that $g(p)$ has a unique zero over [ 0,1$]$ so long as $\boldsymbol{a} \neq \boldsymbol{b}$.

Since $f(p ; p)=\frac{d}{d \phi} f(p ; p)=0$ for any $p$, by considering the Taylor expansion at $\phi=p$ we see that the condition

$$
f(\phi ; p) \begin{cases}\geq 0, & \phi \leq p \\ \leq 0, & \phi \geq p\end{cases}
$$

forces $\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f(p ; p)=0$. Therefore from Equation (13), require $g(p)=0$ or that $p=p^{*}$ is necessary.
We now argue that the above condition is also sufficient. By Equation(13), we have $f\left(p^{*} ; p^{*}\right)=\frac{d}{d \phi} f\left(p^{*} ; p^{*}\right)=$ $\frac{d^{2}}{d \phi^{2}} f\left(p^{*} ; p^{*}\right)=0$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d^{3}}{d \phi^{3}} f\left(p^{*} ; p^{*}\right)=-\frac{4}{p^{*} \bar{p}^{*}} \sum \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right)^{2} a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(a_{i} p^{*}+b_{i} \bar{p}^{*}\right)^{3}} \leq 0 \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Lemma 2 completes the proof.
Lemma 2. Consider a real function $f(\phi):(0,1) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and assume $f \in \mathbf{C}^{4}$, i.e. four times differentiable, and satisfies the following properties:

1. $f(p)=f^{\prime}(p)=f^{\prime \prime}(p)=0$, and $f^{\prime \prime \prime}(p)<0$ for some $p \in(0,1)$;
2. $f^{\prime \prime}(\phi)=a(\phi) \cdot f^{\prime}(\phi)+b(\phi)$, where $a(\phi)>0$ and $b(\phi) \leq 0$ for $\phi \in(p, 1)$; while $a(\phi)<0$ and $b(\phi) \geq 0$ for $\phi \in(0, p)$.

Then we have $f(\phi) \leq 0$ for $\phi \in(p, 1)$. Similarly, $f(\phi) \geq 0$ for $\phi \in(0, p)$.
Proof. From the Taylor expansion at $p$, we have $f^{\prime}(\phi)=\frac{f^{\prime \prime \prime}(p)}{2}(\phi-p)^{2}+O\left((\phi-p)^{3}\right)$. Since $f^{\prime \prime \prime}(p)$ is strictly less than zero, then there must exist some positive constant $q \in(p, 1)$, such that for $p<\phi \leq q$, we have $f^{\prime}(\phi)<0$. Suppose there is some $s \in(q, 1)$, such that $f^{\prime}(s)>0$. We then deduce that the minimum of $f^{\prime}(\phi)$ over $\phi \in[p, s]$ must be attained by some interior minimizer $\phi_{0} \in(p, s)$, and $f^{\prime}\left(\phi_{0}\right)<0$. Also we have $f^{\prime \prime}\left(\phi_{0}\right)=0$ by local optimality conditions for interior minimizers. Since $a(\phi)>0$ and $b(\phi) \leq 0$ for $\phi \in(p, 1)$, we obtain

$$
0=f^{\prime \prime}\left(\phi_{0}\right)=a\left(\phi_{0}\right) \cdot f^{\prime}\left(\phi_{0}\right)+b\left(\phi_{0}\right) \leq a\left(\phi_{0}\right) \cdot f^{\prime}\left(\phi_{0}\right)<0
$$

Contradiction! Hence such an $s$ cannot exist. This guarantees $f^{\prime}(\phi) \leq 0$ for $\phi \in(p, 1)$ and therefore $f(\phi) \leq 0$ for $\phi \in(p, 1)$. The other side can be proved by similar arguments.

We then give an alternate proof of the sufficiency part in Theorem 2 as the following, without needing the above Lemma.
Alternate proof of sufficiency. We note that $\frac{d}{d \phi} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right)=g(\phi) \log \frac{\phi \bar{p}^{*}}{\phi p^{*}}$. Here $g(\phi):=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(a_{i}-b_{i}\right) a_{i} b_{i}}{\left(a_{i} p+b_{i} \bar{p}\right)^{2}}$ as is defined in the previous proof. Then we know that $g(\phi)$ is decreasing over $\phi \in[0,1]$, and hence $g(\phi) \leq 0$ for $\phi \geq p^{*}$. Also note that $\log \frac{\phi \bar{p}^{*}}{\phi p^{*}} \geq 0$ for $\phi \geq p^{*}$. Then we have $\frac{d}{d \phi} f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right) \leq 0$ for $\phi \geq p^{*}$, which further guarantees $f\left(\phi ; p^{*}\right) \leq 0$ for $\phi \geq p^{*}$. The other side $\left(\phi \leq p^{*}\right)$ can be analyzed analogously.

## Conclusion and Further Work

We generalized the convexity result of Wyner and Ziv [14] for the binary symmetric channel to channels with binary inputs. This allows us to reformulate certain non-convex optimization problems as convex optimization problems. More importantly, it shows that for such optimization problems any local extremizer is also a global extremizer.

It is worth trying to generalize these results to non-binary alphabets. The main issue is in the fact that there are multiple paths that connect two distributions on a probability simplex. For differential entropies and AWGN channels, such a result (along the heat flow) has recently been obtained in [15]. We also hope that some of the techniques that we used to prove the concavity in the case where output alphabet is non-binary can be useful in generalizing such results.
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