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Abstract—It is known that fiber nonlinearities induce crosstalk in a wavelength division multiplexed (WDM) system, which limits the capacity of such systems as the transmitted signal power is increased. A network user in a WDM system is an entity that operates around a given optical wavelength. Traditionally, the channel capacity of a WDM system has been analyzed under different assumptions for the transmitted signals of the other users, while treating the interference arising from these users as noise. In this paper, we instead take a multi-user information theoretic view and treat the optical WDM system impaired by cross-phase modulation and dispersion as an interference channel. We characterize, for the first time, an outer bound on the capacity region of simultaneously achievable rate pairs, assuming a general \( K \)-user perturbative channel model using genie-aided techniques. Furthermore, an achievable rate region is obtained by time-sharing between certain single-user strategies. It is shown that such time-sharing can achieve better rate tuples compared to treating nonlinear interference as noise. For the single-polarization single-span system under consideration and a power 4.4 dB above the optimum launch power, treating nonlinear interference as noise results in a rate of 0.22 bit/sym, while time-sharing gives a rate of 1.82 bit/sym.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a point-to-point wavelength division multiplexing (WDM) system, independent data from different users across different wavelengths are multiplexed into a single optical fiber using several optical transmitters, with corresponding demultiplexing at the receiver side. The nonlinear Kerr effect in an optical fiber causes the signal in one wavelength to interfere with the signals in other wavelengths. The combination of nonlinear effects with chromatic dispersion (group velocity dispersion) and noise, result in a stochastic nonlinear channel with memory. Such a channel is described by the (noisy) nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLSE) (or the Manakov equation in case of dual polarization systems), which considers intra-channel effects like self-phase modulation (SPM), and inter-channel effects such as cross-phase modulation (XPM) and four-wave mixing (FWM). SPM can be compensated for using digital backpropagation (DBP) [2], while FWM is known to be negligible compared to XPM for most practical systems. Full XPM compensation, on the other hand, would entail joint detection of multiple channels that is prohibitively complex. As a result, XPM represents the dominant transmission bottleneck in WDM systems. This paper focuses on XPM-dominated systems.

Information theory applied to optical communications studies transmission limits of such systems and has received increased interest in the last 10 years. Early works on the capacity limits of optical fibers were based on approximations involving low fiber nonlinearity [3]–[5]. A capacity lower bound based on mismatched decoding [6] was obtained in [7] for a channel model incorporating XPM as well as FWM. More recently, the seminal work of [8] stressed the importance of information theory in the studies of transmission limits over optical fiber channels. For WDM systems, the coupling between the different users resulting from XPM makes it a multiuser channel, whose fundamental limits fall within the domain of multiuser information theory. Unlike single-user information theory where channel capacity is the key quantity under study, the central object of interest in multiuser information theory is the capacity region, i.e., the region of all simultaneously achievable rates of all the different users.

Despite the inherent multiuser nature of optical WDM channels, their information-theoretic analysis so far has been restricted to a single-user view focusing on the individual users. As such, optical WDM channels have never been truly analyzed from a multi-user perspective in the information-theoretic sense. For instance, [9] examined the impact of different behavioral assumptions for the interfering users on the capacity of a specific user in the system. As a result of such assumptions, the characterisation of achievable information rates in [9] is performed from a single-user perspective. Later, [10] analyzed the capacity of a single user in the WDM system under the assumption that the interfering users transmit independent information at the same transmit power with the same modulation format. Under this behavioral model, it was shown that WDM capacity grows unbounded with power as opposed to Gaussian achievable information rates that exhibit a finite maximum.

The aforementioned works [9], [10] attempt to reduce the analysis of a multi-user problem to more familiar single-user problems by making various behavioral assumptions on
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the interfering users. However, such an approach is neither optimal from a single-user nor an overall WDM system perspective. In this paper, we deviate from the norm of a single-user information theoretic analysis of optical WDM channels, and investigate them from a multi-user information theoretic viewpoint. This better captures the rate contention amongst different WDM users and allows us to investigate the ultimate limits in terms of sum capacity in a WDM system. In addition to achievable information rates for the different WDM users, capacity upper bounds are also of interest since they present impossibility results for the system under consideration. The analogue of capacity upper bounds in a multi-user framework is the notion of a capacity region outer bound (see Sec. II-C for a precise definition), which is largely neglected in the literature on optical multi-user channels.

In the multi-user information theory literature, multiple one-to-one communications over a shared medium with crosstalk between the users is known as an interference channel [13]. Interference channels have attracted very little attention in the fiber optical communication literature. To the best of our knowledge, only two papers exist on the interference channel. The earliest of such work from 2006 was [15], where the benefits of multi-user detection in WDM systems were analyzed by modeling it as a multiple access channel, which is nothing but an interference channel with full receiver cooperation. More than ten years later, [16] studied a simplified interference channel model based on logarithmic perturbation ignoring group velocity dispersion across WDM bands and introduced the technique of interference focusing.

With the aforementioned exceptions [15], [16], a study of the set of simultaneously achievable rates that captures the contention amongst the different users accessing the optical channel transmission resources based on a realistic channel model is not available in the literature. Moreover, capacity region outer bounds are as of today also completely missing in the framework of optical multi-user channels.

In this paper, we take a step in the direction of analyzing optical multi-user channels and consider a realistic first-order perturbative multi-user model that considers both chromatic dispersion and Kerr nonlinearity. We do not make restrictive assumptions such as full receiver cooperation as in [15] or negligible group velocity dispersion as in [16]. The main contributions of this paper are twofold: (i) We propose a novel outer bound on the capacity region of an optical multi-user channel where both the transmitters and the receivers are independently operated, and (ii) we obtain an achievable rate region by time-sharing between certain single-user strategies, and show that the latter can achieve better rate tuples compared to treating interference arising from other WDM users as noise (abbreviated TIN henceforth).

Notation convention: Random variables or random vectors are represented by upper-case letters, whereas their realizations are represented by the corresponding lower case characters. A length-$n$ block of random symbols is denoted by $X_k^n \triangleq (X_k[1], X_k[2], \ldots, X_k[n])$, where the subscript $k$ is a user index and the number within square brackets is a discrete time index. All logarithms in this paper are assumed to be with respect to base 2, unless stated otherwise. Given a complex random variable $X$, we will denote its real part by $X^R$ and its imaginary part by $X^I$, i.e., $X = X^R + jX^I$ with $j = \sqrt{-1}$. Sets are denoted using calligraphic letters.

Paper Organization: The channel model along with a review of some (network) information-theoretic preliminaries are first described in Sec. II. Capacity region outer bounds are derived in Sec. II-A. Achievable rates for the individual users are computed in Sec. II-B. Sec. II-C contains the numerical results and discussions. Finally, Sec. IV concludes the paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. System Model

We study the $K$-user WDM system shown in Fig. 1, where the interference channel
\( p(Y^n_1, Y^n_2, \ldots, Y^n_n | X^n_1, X^n_2, \ldots, X^n_n) \) encompasses the electro-optical (E-O) conversion, WDM multiplexing, the physical channel, WDM demultiplexing, optical-electrical (O-E) conversion, single-channel DBP, matched filtering and symbol-rate sampling. Given that this is the first study on the capacity region for regular perturbative models, we assume single-polarization transmission and ignore signal-noise interactions by studying a single span of standard single mode fiber (SSMF).

For such a single-mode fiber with Kerr nonlinearity and chromatic dispersion, the complex envelope of the optical field, \( A(t, z) \), at time \( t \) and distance \( z \) from the transmitter is governed by the nonlinear Schrödinger equation \[17\]

\[
\frac{\partial A(t, z)}{\partial z} = \frac{i}{2} \beta_2 \frac{\partial^2 A(t, z)}{\partial t^2} - \gamma |A(t, z)|^2 A(t, z) + W(t),
\]

(1)

where \( \tau = t - \beta_1 z \) is the shifted time reference of the moving pulse, with \( \beta_1 \) being the inverse of the group velocity. In \[1\], \( \beta_2 \) stands for the group velocity dispersion parameter, while \( \gamma \) is the fiber nonlinearity parameter, with the second-last term on the right-hand side representing Kerr nonlinearity. The term \( W(t) \) represents additive noise from the erbium doped fiber amplifier (EDFA) which ideally compensates for the fiber attenuation.

**B. Channel Model**

The output at the receiver of user-\( k \), \( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \), can be approximated using a first-order regular perturbative discrete-time model \[15\] eqs. (59),(60), \[19\] eqs. (5),(7)]

\[
Y_k[i] \approx X_k[i] + N_k[i]
\]

\[
+ j \gamma \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} X_k[i-t] \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} S_k^{t,l,m} \sum_{w \in W_k} X_w[i-l] X_w[i-m]^*,
\]

(2)

where \( X_k[i] \) represents the input of user-\( k \) at time instant \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \),

\[
W_k \triangleq \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \setminus \{k\}
\]

(3)

is the set of interferers for user \( k \), \( X_k[i] \) for \( w \in W_k \) are the inputs of the interfering users at instant \( i \), and \( X_w[i-l] \) represents the corresponding input at a time lag of \( l \) and \( \gamma \) is the fiber nonlinearity parameter from \[1\]. The complex channel coefficients \( S_k^{t,l,m} \) are given in \[19\] eq. (7)), can be computed numerically, and depend on the properties of the optical link and the transmission parameters. In \[2\], \( N_k[i] \) models amplified spontaneous emission (ASE) noise from the EDFAs. The ASE noise is circularly symmetric complex Gaussian with mean zero and variance \( \sigma^2_k \) per complex dimension.

We assume length-\( n \) codewords \( \{x_k[1], x_k[2], \ldots, x_k[n]\} \) with maximum power constraints:

\[
\max_{i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}} |x_k[i]|^2 \leq P_k, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}.
\]

(4)

\[2\]We use the convention that \( X_w[i-l] = 0 \) for \( i-l < 1 \) and \( i-l > n \). In other words, \( X_w[i-l] \neq 0 \) only when the time index satisfies \( 1 \leq i-l \leq n \).

In other words, \( P_k \) represents a peak power constraint on the symbols transmitted by user-\( k \), which is imposed on all the possible codewords in its codebook. We note that the channel model specified by \[2\] is more realistic compared to the FWM-only model studied in \[9\], which assumes that both the dispersion and the nonlinearity are weak, and the generalized phase-matching condition is fulfilled \[20\].

It is known from \[21\] Figs. 4 and 5] and \[19\] eq. (8)) that for few-span systems of relatively short lengths using lumped amplification, the largest contribution to the nonlinear interference (NLI) comes from the \( S_k^{0,m,m} \) terms in \[2\], i.e., when only two time shifted sequences interact with each other. This corresponds to \( t = 0 \) and \( l = m \) in \[2\], and is referred to as two-pulse collisions in \[21\]. In other words, the magnitudes \( |S_k^{0,m,m}| \) dominate over the terms corresponding to other values of the indices \( t, l, m \). Furthermore, since physical channels do not have infinite memory, we truncate the sums on \( t, l, m \) in \[2\] to the set

\[
\mathcal{M} \triangleq \{-M,-M+1,\ldots,M-1,M\}.
\]

(5)

This results in the following approximate model:

\[
Y_k[i] \approx X_k[i] + N_k[i]
\]

\[
+ j \gamma X_k[i] \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{w \in W_k} |X_w[i-m]|^2
\]

\[
= X_k[i] \left(1 + j \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_k^m \sum_{w \in W_k} |X_w[i-m]|^2\right) + N_k[i],
\]

(6)

where we have defined

\[
c_k^m \triangleq \gamma S_k^{0,m,m}
\]

(7)

for compactness. The coefficients \( c_k^m \) (computed along the direction \( t = 0 \) and \( l = m \) in \[2\] using \[19\] eq. (8)) are known to be nonnegative reals, i.e.,

\[
c_k^m > 0.
\]

(8)

Notice that in \[6\], only \( M \) symbols before and after the current time instance contribute to the nonlinear interference, as opposed to the infinite summations involved in \[2\]. This results in a finite-memory channel similar in structure to the heuristic model introduced and studied from a single-user point of view in \[22\]. We shall work with the model in \[6\] in the sequel.

**Example 1** (3 WDM channels). Consider the case of \( K = 3 \) users, the user of interest being \( k = 2 \), and a single-sided channel memory of \( M = 2 \) symbols. In this case, the received symbols for user-2 are given by

\[
Y_2[i] = X_2[i] + N_2[i]
\]

\[
+ j X_2[i] \sum_{m=-2}^{2} c_2^m (|X_1[i-m]|^2 + |X_3[i-m]|^2).
\]

(9)

This is pictorially represented in Fig. 2.
C. Information-theoretic Preliminaries

In this section, we review some relevant information-theoretic notions for the $K$-user model in Fig. 1 modeled by (6). An $(n, 2^n R_1, 2^n R_2, \ldots, 2^n R_K)$ code for this channel consists of $K$ message sets $\{1, 2, \ldots, 2^n R_k\}$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$, $K$ encoders where $E_k$ maps a message $M_k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 2^n R_k\}$ into a codeword $X^n_k(M_k)$, along with the decoders. The messages $M_k$ are assumed to be equally likely on their respective alphabets $\{1, 2, \ldots, 2^n R_k\}$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}$, where $R_k$ is the transmission rate of user $k$.

At the receiver, $K$ decoders $D_k$ assign an estimate $\hat{M}_k$ (or an error message) to each received sequence $Y^n_k$. The probability of error is defined as

$$P_e \triangleq \Pr\{\hat{M}_1(Y^n_1), \ldots, \hat{M}_K(Y^n_K) \neq (M_1, \ldots, M_K)\}. \quad (10)$$

While the error probability definition in (10) depends on the decisions of all the decoders, we emphasize here that the $K$ decoders do not cooperate, as shown at the receiver side of Fig. 1.

Using the above definitions, we now formally define certain important quantities. These quantities will be explained later using an example.

Definition 1 (Achievability). A rate tuple $(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_K)$ is said to be achievable if there exists a sequence of $(n, 2^n R_1, 2^n R_2, \ldots, 2^n R_K)$ codes such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} P_e = 0$.

Definition 2 (Capacity Region). The capacity region $C_K$ is defined as the closure of the set of all achievable rate tuples $(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_K)$.

The capacity region in Definition 2 is a collection of all rate tuples that are achievable as per Definition 1. Note that Definition 2 is an operational definition of the capacity region as commonly used in multi-user information theory [14]. An optimization over the joint probability distributions of the inputs is implicit in such definitions. This is in contrast to the single-user channel capacity definition often found in the literature (i.e., $\max\limits_{p(x)} I(X; Y)$), where the optimization over the input distribution is made explicit.

Definition 3 (Single-user Capacity). The single-user capacity is defined as:

$$C_k \triangleq \max_{(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_K) \in C_K} R_k. \quad (11)$$

The single-user capacity for user $k$ in Definition 3 can then be interpreted as the largest achievable rate $R_k$, obtained while the rates of all other users are also achievable according to Definition 1.

Definition 4 (Capacity Inner/Outer Bounds). A region $C_{in}$ is said to be an inner bound to $C_K$ if every rate tuple $(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_K) \in C_{in}$ is achievable. A region $C_{out}$ is said to be an outer bound to $C_K$ if every achievable rate tuple satisfies $(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_K) \in C_{out}$.

The inner bound in Definition 4 is also often called an achievable region. This inner bound is a subset of the capacity region whose interior is entirely achievable. The definition of the outer bound in Definition 4 is such that $C_{out}$ contains all the achievable rate tuples, i.e., it contains the capacity region. However, unless it is a perfectly tight bound, $C_{out}$ will also contain rate tuples that are not achievable.

The inner and outer bounds in Definition 4 are generalizations of the familiar notions of single-user capacity and lower/upper bounds. It follows from the above definitions that $C_{in} \subseteq C_K \subseteq C_{out}$. For the special case of $K = 1$, the operation of containment $\subseteq$ is replaced by an inequality $\leq$ and the sets $C$ become scalars.

We next review the notion of time-sharing which is commonly used to obtain inner bounds in multi-user information theory.

Definition 5 (Time Sharing). Given any two achievable rate tuples $(R_1', R_2', \ldots, R_K')$ and $(R_1'', R_2'', \ldots, R_K'')$, time sharing between them results in the rate tuple

$$(R_1\lambda, R_2\lambda, \ldots, R_K\lambda) = (\lambda R_1', \lambda R_2', \ldots, \lambda R_K', \lambda R_1'', \lambda R_2'', \ldots, \lambda R_K''), \quad (12)$$

where $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda = (1 - \lambda)$.

The rate tuple given by (12) is achievable as well. A proof of this statement is given for instance in [14] Proposition 4.1.
Example 2 (Information-theoretic quantities). The information theoretic concepts just described are illustrated in Fig. 3. The shaded region in red represents the capacity region $C_K$. $C_1$ and $C_2$ represent the single-user capacities of the two users. Notice that when user $1$ achieves its single-user capacity $C_1$, it is possible to obtain a nonzero rate for user $2$. In other words, the rate of user $2$ can be increased up to the corner point of the pentagon (marked as $P_1$) without reducing the rate of user $1$. The shaded region in purple marked $C_m$ as well as the shaded region in blue marked $C'_m$ are inner bounds, while the region marked $C_{out}$ is an outer bound to $C_K$. In this example, $C_m \subseteq C'_m \subseteq C_K \subseteq C_{out}$, and the outer bound is not tight, resulting in nonachievable rates (like $B$) being included in $C_{out}$. The region $C_{out}$ defines an inadmissible region, in that it is impossible to achieve any rate pairs outside $C_{out}$. The dotted line illustrates time sharing, where every point on the line segment joining two achievable rate pairs is achievable as well via time sharing.

The main results in this paper are organized into three subsections. One of our key contributions, a novel outer bound on the capacity region, is discussed in Sec. III-A. Next, Sec. III-B describes an inner bound on the capacity region obtained via time-sharing between certain single-user strategies. Finally, Sec. III-C contains the numerical results and discussions on these capacity bounds.

A. Capacity Region Outer Bounds

Here we obtain an outer bound on the capacity region $C_K$ (Theorem 1 ahead) using genie-aided techniques [23]. The following lemma will prove useful towards this end.

Lemma 1. For all interferers $w \in \mathcal{W}_k$ with peak power constraints $P_w$ in (4) and $1 \leq i - m \leq n$, we have

$$\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_{i}^{m} |x_{i} - m|^{2} \leq P_w \left( \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_{i}^{m} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{W}_k$, $\mathcal{M}$, and $c_{i}^{m}$ are given by (3), (5), and (7), resp. Equality is obtained in (15) with a choice of $|x_{i} - m|^{2} = P_w$. \hfill \Box

Proof. See Appendix A

Note that (16) involves constant-amplitude signaling for the interferers $w \in \mathcal{W}_k$. Our outer bound is stated next.

Theorem 1. An outer bound $C_{out}$ on the capacity region $C_K$ of the interference channel in (6) is specified by the set of $(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_K)$ tuples such that

$$R_k \leq U_k, \ \forall k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\},$$

where

$$U_k \triangleq \log \left( 1 + \frac{P_k}{2\sigma_k^2} \left( 1 + \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}_k} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_{i}^{m} \right)^2 \right) \right),$$

and $P_k$ are peak power constraints in (4). $\mathcal{W}_k$ and $\mathcal{M}$ are defined in (3) and (5) respectively, while $c_{i}^{m}$ is given in (7).

Proof. See Appendix B

$^{3}$The lower bound is derived by treating the NLI as Gaussian noise (like the ASE noise term $N_k[i]$) and using the entropy power inequality, similar to Appendix C.
The proof of Theorem 1 involves the identification of constant-amplitude signaling for the interferers \( w \in \mathcal{W}_k \) (see (16)) to be the best strategy with regards to maximizing the rate of user-\( k \). Lemma 1 forms the basis for our achievability scheme discussed next.

### B. Capacity Region Inner Bounds

We first develop a (single-user) capacity lower bound for each individual user \( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \). We then time-share between such single-user achievability strategies to obtain a capacity region inner bound \( C_{\text{in}} \). Towards this end, consider the channel output for user-\( k \), \( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \) in (6). Suppose the interferer symbols are chosen as in (16) from Lemma 1. This results in the following memoryless single-user channel:

\[
Y_k[i] = X_k[i] \left( 1 + j \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_k^m P_w \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}_k} + N_k[i] \right). \tag{19}
\]

Notice that (19) is a complex AWGN channel with a peak power constraint on the input, which has been extensively studied in the information theory literature [26]–[30]. It is known that the capacity achieving input distribution for this channel is discrete in amplitude with uniform phase. No closed form expressions exist for the capacity of the channel, but the number of mass points for the amplitude of the capacity achieving input distribution as a function of the signal-to-noise ratio have been characterized [27].

For our purposes of computing an achievable rate for user-\( k \) in (19) (under constant-amplitude signaling for the interferers), we resort to the lower bounding technique used in [27] eq. (38), based on the entropy power inequality. We have the following theorem that gives a lower bound on the single-user capacity for user-\( k \), \( k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\} \).

**Theorem 2.** The single-user capacity of user-\( k \) under peak input power constraints is lower bounded as:

\[
C_k \geq L_k, \quad \forall k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, K\}, \tag{20}
\]

where

\[
L_k \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \log \left( 1 + \frac{P_k}{2\sigma_k^2} \left( 1 + \left( \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}_k} P_w \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_k^m \right)^2 \right) \right). \tag{21}
\]

**Proof.** See Appendix C

Theorem 2 defines an achievable rate for user-\( k \) in the model specified by (6). The rate in (21) is achieved when all the interferers do constant-amplitude signaling, i.e., the interference symbols satisfy \( |x_w[j]|^2 = P_w, \forall w \in \mathcal{W}_k, 1 \leq j \leq n \), while user-\( k \) uses symbols distributed according to [27] eq. (30) with the phase of \( X_k \) being uniform on \([-\pi, \pi]\) and independent of the amplitude \( |X_k| = R \) that has probability density function:

\[
p_R(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{2r}{\sqrt{\pi} \sigma_k}, & 0 \leq r \leq \sqrt{\frac{P_k}{\sigma_k^2}} \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases} \tag{22}
\]

This approach of obtaining lower bounds for the channel of interest by choosing the interferer behaviour was also used in [9].
single-span system of length $L = 250$ km and the signalling rate under consideration.

The upper bound on rates admissible for user $1$ ($U_1$) in Theorem 1 and the corresponding lower bound in Theorem 2 are plotted in Fig. 4 against the peak input power for the symmetric case of $P_1 = P_2 = P_3$, Theorem 2 implies that any rate below $L_k$ in (21) is achievable, which gives the blue shaded area. The upper bound in (17) from Theorem 1 gives an inadmissible region, which is not achievable. For comparison, we also plot the TIN bound in (14) obtained by treating the interference term in (13) as Gaussian noise (whose variance is computed numerically), by choosing the inputs $X_k$ to be i.i.d. (with equal powers $P_k = P$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$) according to the probability distribution $p_X(x)$, where the phase of $X$ is uniform on the interval $[-\pi, \pi]$ and independent of its amplitude $|X| = R$ that has probability density function given in (22). The choice of this distribution is motivated by commonly used achievability schemes for complex Gaussian channels with peak power constraints on the input [27]. The resulting TIN region is depicted by the shaded purple area in Fig. 4. The achievability of the area marked “?” remains unknown.

In Figs. 5(a)–(c), we plot the trade-off between the rates of the three users for fixed (and equal) powers of $-5$ dBm, $0$ dBm and $5$ dBm, respectively (see the red stars in Fig. 5). The cubical region implied by the genie-aided outer bound in Theorem 1 is shown by solid black lines in Figs. 5(a)–(c). For comparison, we have depicted the respective achievable rate regions obtained by treating the interference terms in (6) as Gaussian noise as the cubical regions in purple. Note that these interference as noise regions eventually vanish in the highly nonlinear regime.

The strategy of constant-amplitude signaling for the interferers (users $w \in W_k$) along with Theorem 2 for user-$k$, $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, defines $3$ achievable rate triples on the $3$-dimensional plane. Time-sharing between these achievable rate triples yields another inner bound for the channel in (6). These polyhedral regions are depicted in blue in Figs. 5(a)–(c). It is observed that this simple strategy of time-sharing between single-user codes outperforms treating interference as noise. In fact, the relative gains of time-sharing (in terms of better achievable rate tuples) compared to treating interference as noise becomes more pronounced with increasing powers. We note that these conclusions are valid as long as the channel model under consideration is valid. It is well accepted that the perturbative model under consideration is accurate for powers a few dB beyond the optimum launch power (which is $0$ dBm in Fig. 4).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We took a multi-user information theoretic view of a $K$-user wavelength division multiplexing system impaired by cross-phase modulation and dispersion, and derived a novel capacity region outer bound using genie-aided techniques. An achievable rate region was also obtained for the same, and it was shown that time-sharing between certain single-user schemes can strictly outperform treating interference as noise. Though we assumed that SPM is ideally compensated in our model, we believe that the results in this paper can be generalized to take into account both SPM as well as XPM.

This paper is a very first step towards a multi-user characterization of fiber optic systems with realistic channel models, breaking away from the traditional single-user perspective. Future works include obtaining tighter achievable regions/inner bounds as well as outer bounds, and the design and implementation of schemes that can achieve the presented capacity bounds in practice.

We assume here that all the interfering users $w \in W_k$ send a fixed sequence $P_w$ as in Lemma 1 and hence their rates are zero. But this need not necessarily be the case. The interfering users could achieve a nonzero rate by using phase-shift keying alphabets for instance.
The rate of user−

\[ \text{This completes the proof.} \]
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**APPENDIX A**

**PROOF OF LEMMA 1**

We first note that for any given \( l \) such that \( M \leq l \leq n-M \), the symbols \( X_w[l] \) are well defined. We then have

\[
\sum_{m \in M} c_k^m |x_w[l-m]|^2 \leq \max_{j \in J_l} \left| x_w[j] \right|^2 \left( \sum_{m \in M} c_k^m \right),
\]

(23)

where the set \( J_l \triangleq \{ l-M, l-M+1, \ldots, l+M \} \) is a set of indices for the sliding window depicted in Fig. 6. In other words, we upper bound each of the \( |x_w[l-m]|^2 \) terms in the weighted sum \( \sum_{m \in M} c_k^m |x_w[l-m]|^2 \) by its maximum value over the interval \( J_l \). Furthermore,

\[
\max_{j \in J_l} \left| x_w[j] \right|^2 \leq \max_{j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}} \left| x_w[j] \right|^2 \leq P_w,
\]

(24)

where the last step follows from the peak power constraint on user \( w \). Applying the inequality (24) in (23), we obtain

\[
\sum_{m \in M} c_k^m |x_w[l-m]|^2 \leq P_w \left( \sum_{m \in M} c_k^m \right),
\]

(25)

as desired.

Clearly, equality holds in (25) with the choice of \( |x_w[l-m]|^2 = P_w, \ \forall w \in W_k, \ m \in M, 1 \leq i-m \leq n \).

This completes the proof.

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF OF THEOREM 1**

We now establish the outer bound using information theoretic inequalities. The rate of user−

\[ nR_k = H(M_k) \]

(a) \[ H(M_k|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) \]

\[ = H(M_k|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}, Y_k^n) \]

\[ + H(M_k|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}, Y_k^n) \]

(b) \[ \leq I(M_k; Y_k^n|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) + H(M_k|Y_k^n) \]

(c) \[ \leq I(M_k; Y_k^n|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) + 1 + P_c nR_k \]

(d) \[ = I(M_k; Y_k^n|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) + nc_n \]

(e) \[ \leq I(X_k^n; Y_k^n|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) + nc_n \]

\[ = h(Y_k^n|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) - h(Y_k^n|X_k^n, \{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) + nc_n \]

\[ = h(Y_k^n|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) - h(N_k^n) + nc_n \]

(f) \[ \leq \sum_{i=1}^n h(Y_k[i]|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) - \sum_{i=1}^n h(N_k[i]) + nc_n \]

\[ \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{\{x^n_w|w \in W_k\}} \left[ h(Y_k[i]|\{X_w^n = x^n_w|w \in W_k\}) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^n h(N_k[i]) + nc_n \]

\[ \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{\{x^n_w|w \in W_k\}} \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \det \left( \text{cov} \left( \{Y_k[i]|\{X_w^n = x^n_w|w \in W_k\}\} \right) \right) \right) - n \log (\sigma_k^2) + nc_n, \]

(27)

where (a) follows since \( M_k \) is independent of \( \{X_w^n|w \in W_k\} \) with the set \( W_k \) being defined in (3), (b) follows since conditioning does not increase the entropy, (c) follows from Fano’s inequality with \( P_c \) being defined as in (10), (d) follows by defining \( \epsilon_n = (1/n + P_c R_k) \) with \( \epsilon_n \rightarrow 0 \) (e) follows from the data processing inequality since \( M_k \rightarrow X_k^n \rightarrow Y_k^n \) form a Markov chain conditioned on \( \{X_w^n|w \in W_k\} \), (f) follows since conditioning does not increase the entropy and the fact that the additive noise is i.i.d., (g) follows since \( h(Y_k[i]|\{X_w^n|w \in W_k\}) \) represents an average over \( \{x^n_w|w \in W_k\} \) and the average is upper bounded by the maximum, while (h) follows from the fact that Gaussian random vectors maximize the differential entropy under a covariance constraint. We note that the max over \( x^n_w \) sequences in steps (g) and (h) are subject to the peak power constraint \( \max_{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}} |x_w[i]|^2 \leq P_w, \ \forall w \in W_k \).

It now remains to bound the \( \log(\det(\cdot)) \) terms in expression (27). On expressing equation (6) in terms of its respective real and imaginary components, we have:

\[
Y_k^R[i] = X_k^R[i] - \sum_{w \in W_k} \sum_{m \in M} c_k^m |X_w[i-m]|^2 X_k[i] + N_k^R[i],
\]

(28)

\[
Y_k^I[i] = X_k^I[i] + \sum_{w \in W_k} \sum_{m \in M} c_k^m |X_w[i-m]|^2 X_k^R[i] + N_k^I[i].
\]

(29)

Let \( \mathbb{E}[\{X_k^R[i]\}] = p_k^R[i] \) and \( \mathbb{E}[\{X_k^I[i]\}] = p_k^I[i] \) be the instantaneous powers associated with the real and imaginary parts of \( X_k[i] \). Since the sum of these powers constitute the instantaneous power of \( X_k[i] \), we write

\[
p_k^R[i] + p_k^I[i] = P_{k,i}, \]

(30)

where \( P_{k,i} = \mathbb{E}[\|X_k[i]\|^2] \). Hence we can write the following chain of inequalities for the determinant of the covariance
and where (a) follows from the independence of the inputs \(X^n_k\) and \(X^n_w, w \in W_k\), (b) follows since \(\det(A) \leq \left(\frac{\text{trace}(A)}{n}\right)^n\) for any \(n \times n\) square matrix \(A\), while (c) follows from (30). From expressions (27) and (31), we obtain the following expression for the rate of user-\(k\):

\[
\begin{align*}
n(R_k - \epsilon_n) & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{x^n_w \in W_k} \{x^n_w \mid w \in W_k\} \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{x^n_w \in W_k} \{x^n_w \mid w \in W_k\}
\end{align*}
\]
Substituting (39) in (38), we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
&= h(Y_k) - h(N_k) \\
&\geq \ln \left( e^{h(X_k (1 + \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} P_w \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_m^n))} + e^{h(N_k)} \right) \\
&\quad - \ln(2\pi e \sigma_k^2) \\
&= \ln \left( e^{h(X_k) + \ln \left( 1 + \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} P_w \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_m^n \right)^2 \right) + 2\pi e \sigma_k^2} \right) \\
&\quad - \ln(2\pi e \sigma_k^2), \quad (38)
\end{align*}
\]

where (a) follows from the entropy power inequality. Now we choose the input distribution of \( X_k \) as in \([27]\), eq. (30)] to maximize the differential entropy \( h(X_k) \), with the phase of \( X_k \) being uniform on \([-\pi, \pi]\) and independent of the amplitude \( |X_k| = R \) that has the probability density function given in \([22]\). This leads to \([27]\), eq. (37)]

\[
h(X_k) = \ln(\pi P_k).
\]  

(39)

Substituting (39) in (38), we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
I(X_k; Y_k) &\geq \ln \left( e^{h(X_k) + \ln \left( 1 + \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} P_w \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_m^n \right)^2 \right) + 2\pi e \sigma_k^2} \right) \\
&\quad - \ln(2\pi e \sigma_k^2) \\
&= \ln \left( 1 + \frac{P_k}{2\sigma_k^2 e} \left( 1 + \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} P_w \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_m^n \right)^2 \right) \right) \text{nats} \\
&= \log \left( 1 + \frac{P_k}{2\sigma_k^2 e} \left( 1 + \left( \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}} P_w \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} c_m^n \right)^2 \right) \right) \text{bits.} \\
&\quad (40)
\end{align*}
\]

This completes the proof.
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