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#### Abstract

We consider a Gaussian multiple-access channel with random user activity where the total number of users $\ell_{n}$ and the average number of active users $k_{n}$ may be unbounded. For this channel, we characterize the maximum number of bits that can be transmitted reliably per unit-energy in terms of $\ell_{n}$ and $k_{n}$. We show that if $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}$ is sublinear in $n$, then each user can achieve the single-user capacity per unit-energy. Conversely, if $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}$ is superlinear in $n$, then the capacity per unit-energy is zero. We further demonstrate that orthogonal-access schemes, which are optimal when all users are active with probability one, can be strictly suboptimal.


## I. Introduction

Chen et al. [1] introduced the many-access channel (MnAC) as a multiple-access channel (MAC) where the number of users grows with the blocklength and each user is active with a given probability. This model is motivated by systems consisting of a single receiver and many transmitters, the number of which is comparable or even larger than the blocklength, a situation that may occur, e.g., in a machine-to-machine communication system with many thousands of devices in a given cell that are active only sporadically. In [1], Chen et al. considered a Gaussian MnAC with $\ell_{n}$ users, each of which is active with probability $\alpha_{n}$, and determined the number of messages $M_{n}$ each user can transmit reliably with a codebook of average power not exceeding $P$. Since then, MnACs have been studied in various papers under different settings. For example, Polyanskiy [2] considered a Gaussian MnAC where the number of active users grows linearly in the blocklength and each user's payload is fixed. Zadik et al. [3] presented improved bounds on the tradeoff between user density and energy-per-bit of this channel. Low-complexity schemes for the MnAC were studied in [4], [5]. Generalizations to quasistatic fading MnACs can be found in [6]-[9]. Shahi et al. [10] studied the capacity region of strongly asynchronous MnACs.

Recently, we studied the capacity per unit-energy of the Gaussian MnAC as a function of the order of growth of users when all users are active with probability one [11]. We showed that if the order of growth is above $n / \log n$, then the capacity

[^0]per unit-energy is zero, and if the order of growth is below $n / \log n$, then each user can achieve the singe-user capacity per unit-energy. Thus, there is a sharp transition between orders of growth where interference-free communication is feasible and orders of growth where reliable communication at a positive rate is infeasible. We further showed that the capacity per unit-energy can be achieved by an orthogonalaccess scheme where the codewords of different users are orthogonal to each other.
In this paper, we extend the analysis of [11] to a randomaccess setting. In particular, we consider a setting where the total number of users $\ell_{n}$ may grow as an arbitrary function of the blocklength and the probability $\alpha_{n}$ that a user is active may be a function of the blocklength, too. Let $k_{n}=\alpha_{n} \ell_{n}$ denote the average number of active users. We demonstrate that if $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}$ is sublinear in $n$, then each user can achieve the single-user capacity per unit-energy. Conversely, if $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}$ is superlinear in $n$, then the capacity per unit-energy is zero. Hence, there is again a sharp transition between orders of growth where interference-free communication is feasible and orders of growth where reliable communication at a positive rate is infeasible, but the transition threshold depends on the behaviors of both $\ell_{n}$ and $k_{n}$. We further show that orthogonalaccess schemes, which are optimal when $\alpha_{n}=1$, are strictly suboptimal when $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow 0$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the system model. Section III presents our main results. Section IV briefly discusses the capacity per unitenergy when the error probability is replaced by the so-called per-user probability of error considered, e.g., in [2]-[9].

## II. Problem Formulation and Preliminaries

## A. Model and Definitions

Consider a network with $\ell$ users that, if they are active, wish to transmit their messages $W_{i}, i=1, \ldots, \ell$ to one common receiver. The messages are assumed to be independent and uniformly distributed on $\left\{1, \ldots, M_{n}^{(i)}\right\}$. To transmit their messages, the users send a codeword of $n$ symbols over the channel, where $n$ is referred to as the blocklength. We consider a many-access scenario where the number of users $\ell$ grows with $n$, hence, we denote it as $\ell_{n}$. We further assume that a user is active with probability $\alpha_{n}$, where $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow \alpha \in[0,1]$ as
$n$ tends to infinity. Since an inactive user is equivalent to a user transmitting the all-zero codeword, we can express the distribution of the $i$-th user's message as

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left\{W_{i}=w\right\}= \begin{cases}1-\alpha_{n}, & w=0  \tag{1}\\ \frac{\alpha_{n}}{M_{n}^{(i)}}, & w \in\left\{1, \ldots, M_{n}^{(i)}\right\}\end{cases}
$$

and assume that the codebook is such that message 0 is mapped to the all-zero codeword. We denote the average number of active users at blocklength $n$ by $k_{n}$, i.e., $k_{n}=\alpha_{n} \ell_{n}$.

We consider a Gaussian channel model where the received vector $\mathbf{Y}$ is given by

$$
\mathbf{Y}=\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_{n}} \mathbf{X}_{i}\left(W_{i}\right)+\mathbf{Z}
$$

Here $\mathbf{X}_{i}\left(W_{i}\right)$ is the $n$-length transmitted codeword from user $i$ for message $W_{i}$ and $\mathbf{Z}$ is a vector of $n$ i.i.d. Gaussian components $Z_{j} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, N_{0} / 2\right)$ independent of $\mathbf{X}_{i}$.

Definition 1: For $0 \leq \epsilon<1$, an $\left(n,\left\{M_{n}^{(\cdot)}\right\},\left\{E_{n}^{(\cdot)}\right\}, \epsilon\right)$ code for the Gaussian many-access channel consists of:

1) Encoding functions $f_{i}:\left\{0,1, \ldots, M_{n}^{(i)}\right\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$, $i=1, \ldots, \ell_{n}$ which map user $i$ 's message to the codeword $\mathbf{X}_{i}\left(W_{i}\right)$, satisfying the energy constraint

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{i j}^{2}\left(w_{i}\right) \leq E_{n}^{(i)} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x_{i j}$ is the $j$-th symbol of the transmitted codeword. If $W_{i}=0$, then $x_{i j}=0$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$.
2) Decoding function $g: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow\left\{0,1, \ldots, M_{n}^{(1)}\right\} \times \ldots \times$ $\left\{0,1, \ldots, M_{n}^{\left(\ell_{n}\right)}\right\}$ which maps the received vector $\mathbf{Y}$ to the messages of all users and whose probability of error $P_{e}^{(n)}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{e}^{(n)} \triangleq \operatorname{Pr}\left\{g(\mathbf{Y}) \neq\left(W_{1}, \ldots, W_{\ell_{n}}\right)\right\} \leq \epsilon \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

An $\left(n,\left\{M_{n}^{(\cdot)}\right\},\left\{E_{n}^{(\cdot)}\right\}, \epsilon\right)$ code is said to be symmetric if $M_{n}^{(i)}=M_{n}$ and $E_{n}^{(i)}=E_{n}$ for all $i=1, \ldots, \ell_{n}$. For compactness, we denote such a code by $\left(n, M_{n}, E_{n}, \epsilon\right)$. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to symmetric codes.

Definition 2: For a symmetric code, the rate per unit-energy $\dot{R}$ is said to be $\epsilon$-achievable if for every $\delta>0$ there exists an $n_{0}$ such that if $n \geq n_{0}$, then an $\left(n, M_{n}, E_{n}, \epsilon\right)$ code can be found whose rate per unit-energy satisfies $\frac{\log M_{n}}{E_{n}}>\dot{R}-\delta$. Furthermore, $\dot{R}$ is said to be achievable if it is $\epsilon$-achievable for all $0<\epsilon<1$. The capacity per unit-energy $\dot{C}$ is the supremum of all achievable rates per unit-energy.

## B. Order Notations

Let $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ and $\left\{b_{n}\right\}$ be two sequences of nonnegative real numbers. We write $a_{n}=O\left(b_{n}\right)$ if there exists an $n_{0}$ and a positive real number $S$ such that for all $n \geq n_{0}, a_{n} \leq S b_{n}$. We write $a_{n}=o\left(b_{n}\right)$ if $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{n}}{b_{n}}=0$, and $a_{n}=\Omega\left(b_{n}\right)$ if $\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{n}}{b_{n}}>0$. Similarly, $a_{n}=\Theta\left(b_{n}\right)$ indicates that there exist $0<l_{1}<l_{2}$ and $n_{0}$ such that $l_{1} b_{n} \leq a_{n} \leq l_{2} b_{n}$ for all $n \geq n_{0}$. We write $a_{n}=\omega\left(b_{n}\right)$ if $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{n}}{b_{n}}=\infty$.

## III. CAPACITY PER UNIT-ENERGY

In this section, we discuss our results on the behavior of capacity per unit-energy for Gaussian random MnACs. Our main result is Theorem 1, which characterizes the capacity per unit-energy in terms of $\ell_{n}$ and $k_{n}$. In Theorem 2, we characterize the behavior of the largest rate per unit-energy that can be achieved by an orthogonal-access scheme. These results are presented in Subsection III-A. The proofs of Theorems 1 and 2 are given in Subsections III-B and III-C, respectively.

Before presenting our results, we first note that the case where $k_{n}$ vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is uninteresting. Indeed, this case only happens if $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow 0$. Then, the probability that all the users are inactive, given by $\left(\left(1-\alpha_{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{n}}}\right)^{k_{n}}$, tends to one since $\left(1-\alpha_{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{n}}} \rightarrow 1 / e$ and $k_{n} \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, a code with $M_{n}=2$ and $E_{n}=0$ for all $n$ and a decoding function that always declares that all users are inactive achieve an error probability $P_{e}^{(n)}$ that vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that $\dot{C}=\infty$. In the following, we avoid this trivial case and assume that $\ell_{n}$ and $\alpha_{n}$ are such that $k_{n}$ is bounded away from zero.

## A. Our Main Results

Theorem 1: Assume that $k_{n}=\Omega(1)$. Then the capacity per unit-energy of the Gaussian random MnAC has the following behavior:

1) If $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}=o(n)$, then $\dot{C}=(\log e) / N_{0}$.
2) If $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}=\omega(n)$, then $\dot{C}=0$.

Proof: See Subsection III-B.
Theorem 1 demonstrates that there is a sharp transition between orders of growth where interference-free communication is feasible and orders of growth where no positive rate per unit-energy is feasible. The same behavior was observed for the non-random-access case, where the transition threshold seperating these two regimes is at $n / \log n$ [11]. When $\alpha_{n}$ converges to a positive value, the order of growth of $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}$ coincides with that of both $k_{n} \log k_{n}$ and $\ell_{n} \log \ell_{n}$. In this case, the transition threshold in the random-access case is also at $n / \log n$. However, when $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow 0$, the orders of growth of $k_{n}$ and $\ell_{n}$ are different and the transition threshold for $\ell_{n}$ is in general larger than $n / \log n$, so random user-activity enables interference-free communication at an order of growth above the limit $n / \log n$ of the non-random-access case. Similarly, when $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow 0$, the transition threshold for $k_{n}$ is in general smaller than $n / \log n$, so treating a random MnAC with $\ell_{n}$ users as a non-random MnAC with $k_{n}$ users may be overlyoptimistic.

In [11], it was shown that, when $k_{n}=o(n / \log n)$ and $\alpha_{n}=1$, an orthogonal-access scheme is sufficient to achieve the capacity per unit-energy. It turns out that this is not the case anymore when $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 2: Assume that $k_{n}=\Omega(1)$. The largest rate per unit-energy $\dot{C}_{\perp}$ achievable with an orthogonal-access scheme satisfies the following:

1) If $\ell_{n}=o(n / \log n)$, then $\dot{C}_{\perp}=(\log e) / N_{0}$.
2) If $\ell_{n}=\omega(n / \log n)$, then $\dot{C}_{\perp}=0$.

Proof: See Subsection III-C.

Observe that there is again a sharp transition between the orders of growth of $\ell_{n}$ where interference-free communication is feasible and orders of growth where no positive rate per unit-energy is feasible. In contrast to the optimal transmission scheme, the transition threshold for orthogonal-access schemes happens at $n / \log n$, irrespective of the behavior of $\alpha_{n}$. Thus, by using an orthogonal-access scheme, we treat the random MnAC as if it were a non-random MnAC. Theorem 2 also implies that there are orders of growth of $\ell_{n}$ and $k_{n}$ where non-orthogonal-access schemes are necessary to achieve the capacity per unit-energy.

## B. Proof of Theorem 1

To prove Part 1), we use an achievability scheme with a decoding process consisting of two steps. First, the receiver determines which users are active. If the number of estimated active users is less than or equal to $\xi k_{n}$ for some positive integer $\xi$, then the receiver decodes the messages of all active users. If the number of estimated active users is greater than $\xi k_{n}$, then it declares an error. The total error probability of this scheme is upper-bounded by

$$
P(\mathcal{D})+\sum_{k_{n}^{\prime}=1}^{\xi k_{n}} \operatorname{Pr}\left\{K_{n}^{\prime}=k_{n}^{\prime}\right\} P\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(k_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)+\operatorname{Pr}\left\{K_{n}^{\prime}>\xi k_{n}\right\}
$$

where $K_{n}^{\prime}$ is the number of active users, $P(\mathcal{D})$ is the probability of a detection error, and $P\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(k_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ is the probability of a decoding error when the receiver has correctly detected that there are $k_{n}^{\prime}$ users active. In the following, we show that these probabilities vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any fixed, positive integer $\xi$. Furthermore, by Markov's inequality, we have that $\operatorname{Pr}\left\{K_{n}^{\prime}>\xi k_{n}\right\} \leq 1 / \xi$. It thus follows that the total probability of error vanishes as we let first $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\xi \rightarrow \infty$.

To enable user detection at the receiver, out of $n$ channel uses, each user uses the first $n^{\prime \prime}$ channel uses to send its signature and $n^{\prime}=n-n^{\prime \prime}$ channel uses for sending the message. Furthermore, the signature uses energy $E_{n}^{\prime \prime}$ out of $E_{n}$, while the energy used for sending message is given by $E_{n}^{\prime}=E_{n}-E_{n}^{\prime \prime}$.

Let $\mathbf{s}_{i}$ denote the signature of user $i$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\left(w_{i}\right)$ denote the codeword of length $n^{\prime}$ for sending the message $w_{i}$, where $w_{i}=1, \ldots, M_{n}$. Then the codeword $\mathbf{x}_{i}\left(w_{i}\right)$ is given by

$$
\mathbf{x}_{i}\left(w_{i}\right)=\left(\mathbf{s}_{i}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\left(w_{i}\right)\right)
$$

Explicitly, for a given arbitrary $0<b<1$, we let

$$
\begin{equation*}
n^{\prime \prime}=b n \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{n}^{\prime \prime}=b E_{n}, \quad E_{n}=c_{n} \ln \ell_{n} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $c_{n}=\ln \left(\frac{n}{k_{n} \ln \ell_{n}}\right)$.
Based on the first $n^{\prime \prime}$ received symbols, the receiver detects which users are active. We need the following lemma to show that the detection error probability vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 1: If $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}=o(n)$, then there exist signatures $\mathbf{s}_{i}, i=1, \ldots, \ell_{n}$ with $n^{\prime \prime}$ channel uses and energy $E_{n}^{\prime \prime}$ such that $P(\mathcal{D})$ vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: The proof follows along similar lines as that of [1, Theorem 2]. For details, see the extended version of this paper [12].

We next use the following lemma to show that $P\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(k_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 2: Let $A_{n} \triangleq \frac{1}{k_{n}^{\prime}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_{n}^{\prime}} \mathbf{1}\left(\hat{W}_{i} \neq W_{i}\right)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{n} \triangleq\left\{1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \ldots, 1\right\}$, where $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function. Then for any arbitrary $0<\rho \leq 1$, we have

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left\{A_{n}=a\right\} \leq\binom{ k_{n}^{\prime}}{a k_{n}^{\prime}} M_{n}^{a k_{n}^{\prime} \rho} e^{-n E_{0}(a, \rho)}, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}_{n}
$$

where

$$
E_{0}(a, \rho) \triangleq \frac{\rho}{2} \ln \left(1+\frac{a 2 k_{n}^{\prime} E_{n}^{\prime}}{n^{\prime}(\rho+1) N_{0}}\right)
$$

Proof: See [13, Theorem 2].
The probability of error $P\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(k_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(k_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)=\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{n}} \operatorname{Pr}\left\{A_{n}=a\right\} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using Lemma 2, we upper-bound $\operatorname{Pr}\left\{A_{n}=a\right\}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left\{A_{n}=a\right\} & \leq\binom{ k_{n}^{\prime}}{a k_{n}^{\prime}} M_{n}^{a k_{n}^{\prime} \rho} \exp \left[-n^{\prime} E_{0}(a, \rho)\right] \\
& \leq \exp \left[k_{n}^{\prime} H_{2}(a)+a \rho k_{n}^{\prime} \log M_{n}-n^{\prime} E_{0}(a, \rho)\right] \\
& =\exp \left[-E_{n}^{\prime} f_{n}(a, \rho)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
f_{n}(a, \rho) \triangleq \frac{n^{\prime} E_{0}(a, \rho)}{E_{n}^{\prime}}-\frac{a \rho k_{n}^{\prime} \log M_{n}}{E_{n}^{\prime}}-\frac{k_{n}^{\prime} H_{2}(a)}{E_{n}^{\prime}}
$$

We next show that, for sufficiently large $n$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Pr}\left\{A_{n}=a\right\} \leq \exp \left[-E_{n}^{\prime} f_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right)\right], \quad a \in \mathcal{A}_{n} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

To this end, we first note that for any fixed value of $\rho$ and our choices of $E_{n}^{\prime}$ and $\dot{R}$,

$$
\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d f_{n}(a, \rho)}{d a}>0, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}_{n}
$$

This follows from [14, Eq. (11)] and the fact that $\frac{k_{n}^{\prime} E_{n}^{\prime}}{n^{\prime}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which in turn follows from our choice of $E_{n}^{\prime}$ and since $k_{n}^{\prime}=o(n / \log n)$. Hence, there exists an $n_{0}>0$ such that

$$
\min _{a \in \mathcal{A}_{n}} f_{n}(a, \rho) \geq f_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right), \quad n \geq n_{0}
$$

Next we show that, for our choice of $E_{n}^{\prime}$ and $\dot{R}=\frac{(1-b) \log e}{(1+\rho) N_{0}}-\delta$ (for some arbitrary $\left.0<\delta<\frac{(1-b) \log e}{(1+\rho) N_{0}}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right)>0 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
i_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right) & \triangleq \frac{n^{\prime} E_{0}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right)}{E_{n}^{\prime}} \\
j(\rho) & \triangleq \frac{\rho \dot{R}}{(1-b) \log e} \\
h_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}\right) & \triangleq \frac{k_{n}^{\prime} H_{2}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}\right)}{E_{n}^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $\frac{h_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}\right)}{j(\rho)}$ vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for our choice of $E_{n}^{\prime}$. Consequently,

$$
\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right)=j(\rho)\left\{\liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{i_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right)}{j(\rho)}-1\right\}
$$

The term $j(\rho)=\rho \dot{R} /(1-b) \log e$ is bounded away from zero for our choice of $\dot{R}$ and $\delta<\frac{(1-b) \log e}{(1+\rho) N_{0}}$. Furthermore, since $E_{n}^{\prime} / n^{\prime} \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{i_{n}\left(1 / k_{n}^{\prime}, \rho\right)}{j(\rho)}=\frac{(1-b) \log e}{(1+\rho) N_{0} \dot{R}}
$$

which is strictly larger than 1 for our choice of $\dot{R}$. So, (8) follows. We conclude that there exist two positive constants $n_{0}$ and $\gamma$ such that, for $n \geq n_{0}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Pr}\left\{A_{n}=a\right\} \leq e^{-E_{n}^{\prime} \gamma}, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}_{n} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\left|\mathcal{A}_{n}\right|=k_{n}^{\prime}$, it follows from (6) and (9) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(k_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq k_{n}^{\prime} e^{-E_{n}^{\prime} \gamma} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Noting that $E_{n}^{\prime}=(1-b) c_{n} \ln \ell_{n}$ and $k_{n}^{\prime}=O\left(\ell_{n}\right)$, it follows that $P\left(\mathcal{E}_{m}\left(k_{n}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for our choice of $\dot{R}=\frac{(1-b) \log e}{(1+\rho) N_{0}}-\delta$. Since $\rho, \delta$, and $b$ are arbitrary, any rate $\dot{R}<\frac{\log e}{N_{0}}$ is thus achievable. This proves Part 1) of Theorem 1.

Next we prove Part 2). Let $\hat{W}_{i}$ denote the receiver's estimate of $W_{i}$, and denote by $\mathbf{W}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{W}}$ the vectors $\left(W_{1}, \ldots, W_{\ell_{n}}\right)$ and $\left(\hat{W}_{1}, \ldots, \hat{W}_{\ell_{n}}\right)$, respectively. The messages $W_{1}, \ldots, W_{\ell_{n}}$ are independent, so it follows from (1) that

$$
H(\mathbf{W})=\ell_{n} H\left(\mathbf{W}_{1}\right)=\ell_{n}\left(H_{2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)+\alpha_{n} \log M_{n}\right)
$$

where $H_{2}(\cdot)$ denotes the binary entropy function. Since $H(\mathbf{W})=H(\mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{Y})+I(\mathbf{W} ; \mathbf{Y})$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ell_{n}\left(H_{2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)+\alpha_{n} \log M_{n}\right)=H(\mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{Y})+I(\mathbf{W} ; \mathbf{Y}) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

To bound $H(\mathbf{W})$, we use the upper bounds [1, Lemma 2]

$$
\begin{align*}
H(\mathbf{W} \mid \mathbf{Y}) \leq \log 4+4 P_{e}^{(n)} & \left(k_{n} \log M_{n}+k_{n}\right. \\
& \left.+\ell_{n} H_{2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)+\log M_{n}\right) \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

and [1, Lemma 1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
I(\mathbf{W} ; \mathbf{Y}) \leq \frac{n}{2} \log \left(1+\frac{2 k_{n} E_{n}}{n N_{0}}\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (12) and (13) in (11), rearranging terms, and dividing by $k_{n} E_{n}$, yields

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(1-4 P_{e}^{(n)}\left(1+1 / k_{n}\right)\right) \dot{R} \leq \frac{\log 4}{k_{n} E_{n}}+\frac{H_{2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)}{\alpha_{n} E_{n}}\left(4 P_{e}^{(n)}-1\right) \\
& +4 P_{e}^{(n)}\left(1 / E_{n}+1 / k_{n}\right)+\frac{n}{2 k_{n} E_{n}} \log \left(1+\frac{2 k_{n} E_{n}}{n N_{0}}\right) . \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

We next show that if $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}=\omega(n)$, then the right-hand side (RHS) of (14) tends to a non-positive value. To this end, we need the following lemma.
Lemma 3: If $\dot{R}>0$, then $P_{e}^{(n)}$ vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$ only if $E_{n}=\Omega\left(\log \ell_{n}\right)$.

Proof: The proof of this lemma follows along similar lines as that of [11, Lemma 2]. For details, see [12].

Part 2) of Theorem 1 follows now by contradiction. Indeed, let us assume that $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}=\omega(n), P_{e}^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$, and $\dot{R}>0$. Then, Lemma 3 together with the assumption that $k_{n}=\Omega(1)$ implies that $k_{n} E_{n}=\omega(n)$. It follows that the last term on the RHS of (14) tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The assumption $k_{n} \log \ell_{n}=\omega(n)$ in turn implies that $\ell_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So, by Lemma 3, $E_{n} \rightarrow \infty$. Together with the assumption that $k_{n}=\Omega(1)$, this implies that the first and third term on the RHS of (14) vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, $\frac{H_{2}\left(\alpha_{n}\right)}{\alpha_{n} E_{n}}$ is a sequence of non-negative numbers and $\left(4 P_{e}^{(n)}-1\right) \rightarrow-1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so the second term converges to a non-positive value. Thus, we obtain that $\dot{R}$ tends to a non-positive value as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This contradicts the assumption $\dot{R}>0$, so Part 2) of Theorem 1 follows.

## C. Proof of Theorem 2

To prove Part 1), we present a scheme that is similar to the one given in [11] for the non-random-access case. Specifically, each user is assigned $n / \ell_{n}$ channel uses out of which the first one is used for sending a pilot signal and the rest are used for sending the message. Out of the available energy $E_{n}, t E_{n}$ for some arbitrary $0<t<1$ is used for the pilot signal and $(1-t) E_{n}$ is used for sending the message. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w)$ denote the codeword of length $\frac{n}{\ell_{n}}-1$ for sending message $w$. Then user $i$ sends in his assigned slot the codeword

$$
\mathbf{x}\left(w_{i}\right)=\left(\sqrt{t E_{n}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}\left(w_{i}\right)\right)
$$

The receiver first detects from the pilot signal whether user $i$ is active or not. If the user is estimated as active, then it decodes the user's message. Let $P_{i}=\operatorname{Pr}\left\{\hat{W}_{i} \neq W_{i}\right\}$ denote the probability that user $i$ 's message is decoded erroneously. Since all users follow the same coding scheme, the probability of correct decoding is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{c}^{(n)}=\left(1-P_{1}\right)^{\ell_{n}} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

By employing the transmission scheme that was used to prove [11, Theorem 2], we get an upper bound on the probability of error $P_{1}$ as follows.

Lemma 4: For $n \geq n_{0}$ and sufficiently large $n_{0}$, the probability of error in decoding user 1's message can be upperbounded as:

$$
P_{1} \leq \frac{2}{n^{2}}
$$

Proof: See [12].

From Lemma 4 and (15),

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{c}^{(n)} & \geq\left(1-\frac{2}{n^{2}}\right)^{\ell_{n}} \\
& \geq\left(1-\frac{2}{n^{2}}\right)^{\frac{n}{\log n}}
\end{aligned}
$$

which tends to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, Part 1) of Theorem 2 follows.

To prove Part 2), we first note that we consider symmetric codes, i.e., the pair $\left(M_{n}, E_{n}\right)$ is the same for all users. However, each user may be assigned different numbers of channel uses. Let $n_{i}$ denote the number of channel uses assigned to user $i$. For an orthogonal-access scheme, if $\ell_{n}=\omega(n / \log n)$, then there exists at least one user, say $i=1$, such that $n_{i}=o(\log n)$. Using that $H\left(W_{1} \mid W_{1} \neq 0\right)=\log M_{n}$, it follows from Fano's inequality that

$$
\log M_{n} \leq 1+P_{1} \log M_{n}+\frac{n_{1}}{2} \log \left(1+\frac{2 E_{n}}{n_{1} N_{0}}\right)
$$

This implies that the rate per unit-energy $\dot{R}=\left(\log M_{n}\right) / E_{n}$ for user 1 is upper-bounded by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{R} \leq \frac{\frac{1}{E_{n}}+\frac{n_{1}}{2 E_{n}} \log \left(1+\frac{2 E_{n}}{n_{1} N_{0}}\right)}{1-P_{1}} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\ell_{n}=\omega(n / \log n)$, it follows from Lemma 3 that $P_{e}^{(n)}$ goes to zero only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{n}=\Omega(\log n) \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

In contrast, (16) implies that $\dot{R}>0$ only if $E_{n}=O\left(n_{1}\right)$. Since $n_{1}=o(\log n)$, this further implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{n}=o(\log n) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

No sequence $\left\{E_{n}\right\}$ can satisfy both (18) and (17) simultaneously. We thus obtain that if $\ell_{n}=\omega(n / \log n)$, then the capacity per unit-energy is zero. This is Part 2 ) of Theorem 2.

## IV. Per-User Probability of Error

Many works in the literature on many-access channels, including [2]-[9], consider a per-user probability of error

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{e, A}^{(n)} \triangleq \frac{1}{\ell_{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell_{n}} \operatorname{Pr}\left\{\hat{W}_{i} \neq W_{i}\right\} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

rather than the joint error probability (3). In the following, we briefly discuss the behavior of the capacity per unit-energy when the error probability is $P_{e, A}^{(n)}$, which in this paper we shall refer to as average probability of error (APE). To this end, we define an $\left(n,\left\{M_{n}^{(\cdot)}\right\},\left\{E_{n}^{(\cdot)}\right\}, \epsilon\right)$ code under APE with the same encoding and decoding functions defined in Section II, but with the probability of error (3) replaced with (19). We denote the capacity per unit-energy under APE by $\dot{C}^{A}$.

Under APE, if $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\operatorname{Pr}\left\{W_{i}=0\right\} \rightarrow 1$ for all $i=1, \ldots, \ell_{n}$. Consequently, a code with $M_{n}=2$ and $E_{n}=0$ for all $n$ and a decoding function that always declares that all users are inactive achieves an APE that vanishes as
$n \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that $\dot{C}^{A}=\infty$ for vanishing $\alpha_{n}$. In the following, we avoid this trivial case and assume that $\alpha_{n}$ is bounded away from zero.

For a Gaussian MnAC with APE and $\alpha_{n}=1$ (non-randomaccess case), we showed in [14] that if the number of users grows sublinear in $n$, then each user can achieve the singleuser capacity per unit-energy, and if the order of growth is linear or superlinear, then the capacity per unit-energy is zero. Perhaps not surprisingly, the same result holds in the randomaccess case since, when $\alpha_{n}$ is bounded away from zero, $k_{n}$ is of the same order as $\ell_{n}$.

Theorem 3: If $k_{n}=\Theta\left(\ell_{n}\right)$ and $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow \alpha \in(0,1]$, then $\dot{C}^{A}$ has the following behavior:

1) If $\ell_{n}=o(n)$, then $\dot{C}^{A}=\frac{\log e}{N_{0}}$. Moreover, the capacity per unit-energy can be achieved by an orthogonal-access scheme where each user uses a codebook with orthogonal codewords.
2) If $\ell_{n}=\Omega(n)$, then $\dot{C}^{A}=0$.

Proof: To prove Part 1), we first argue that $P_{e, A}^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ only if $E_{n} \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{e, A}^{(n)} & \geq \min _{i} \operatorname{Pr}\left\{\hat{W}_{i} \neq W_{i}\right\} \\
& \geq \alpha_{n} \operatorname{Pr}\left(\hat{W}_{i} \neq W_{i} \mid W_{i} \neq 0\right) \text { for some } i .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\alpha_{n} \rightarrow \alpha>0$, this implies that $P_{e, A}^{(n)}$ vanishes only if $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\hat{W}_{i} \neq W_{i} \mid W_{i} \neq 0\right)$ vanishes. We next note that $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\hat{W}_{i} \neq W_{i} \mid W_{i} \neq 0\right)$ is lower-bounded by the error probability of the Gaussian single-user channel. By following the arguments in the proof of [14, Theorem 2, Part 1)], we obtain that $P_{e, A}^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ only if $E_{n} \rightarrow \infty$, which also implies that $\dot{C}^{A} \leq \frac{\log e}{N_{0}}$.

We next show that any rate per unit-energy $\dot{R}<\frac{\log e}{N_{0}}$ is achievable by an orthogonal-access scheme where each user uses an orthogonal codebook of blocklength $n / \ell_{n}$. Out of these $n / \ell_{n}$ channel uses, the first one is used for sending a pilot signal to convey whether the user is active or not, and the remaining channel uses are used to send the message. Specifically, to transmit message $w_{i}$, user $i$ sends in his assigned slot the codeword $\mathbf{x}\left(w_{i}\right)=\left(x_{1}\left(w_{1}\right), \ldots, x_{n / \ell_{n}}\left(w_{i}\right)\right)$, which is given by

$$
x_{k}\left(w_{i}\right)= \begin{cases}\sqrt{t E_{n}}, & \text { if } k=1 \\ \sqrt{(1-t) E_{n}}, & \text { if } k=w_{i}+1 \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

From the pilot signal, the receiver first detects whether the user is active or not. As shown in the proof of Lemma 4, the detection error vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using the upper bound on the decoding-error probability for an orthogonal code with $M$ codewords and rate per unit-energy $\dot{R}$ given in [15, Lemma 3], we can then show that $P_{i}, i=1, \ldots, \ell_{n}$ vanishes as $n$ tends to infinity. This implies that also $P_{e, A}^{(n)}$ vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$. More details can be found in [12].

The proof of Part 2) follows from Fano's inequality and is similar to that of [14, Theorem 2, Part 2)]. Details can be found in [12].
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