

Problem Set 3

Issued: Monday 19th October, 2020

Due: Friday 30th October, 2020

Notations: We use $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{x}}, \underline{\mathbf{y}}, \underline{\mathbf{w}}$ to denote random variables and random vectors. We use $\text{Bern}(p)$ to denote the Bernoulli distribution with the parameter p , and use $\text{Binom}(n, p)$ to denote the binomial distribution with parameters n and p .

- 3.1. (a) $P_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}}(x, y)$ is a joint distribution of discrete random variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . Assume $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ is a value of \mathbf{x} , prove that

$$I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{\mathbf{x}}(x) D(P_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}=x} \| P_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}=x_0}) - D(P_{\mathbf{y}} \| P_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}=x_0})$$

- (b) Let $\{P_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}=x}, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ be a set of distributions. Prove that

$$\sup_{P_{\mathbf{x}}} I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \leq \sup_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}} D(P_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}=x} \| P_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}=x'}).$$

This is the information-theoretic version of "radius \leq diameter".

- 3.2. (a) Prove

$$2H(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}) \leq H(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) + H(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}) + H(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{x}).$$

- (b) Use the above inequality to prove *Shearer's lemma*: Place n points in \mathbb{R}^3 arbitrarily. Let n_1, n_2, n_3 denote the number of distinct points projected onto the xy, xz and yz -plane, respectively. Then:

$$n_1 n_2 n_3 \geq n^2.$$

- 3.3. Recall that $d(p||q) = D(\text{Bern}(p) \| \text{Bern}(q))$ denotes the binary divergence function:

$$d(p||q) = p \log \frac{p}{q} + (1-p) \log \frac{1-p}{1-q} \quad (1)$$

- (a) **Prove for all** $p, q \in [0, 1]$

$$d(p||q) \geq 2(p-q)^2 \log e \quad (2)$$

- (b) Apply data processing inequality (Chain Rule for K-L divergence) to prove the *Pinsker-Csiszar inequality*:

$$\text{TV}(P, Q) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\log e} D(P||Q)} \quad (3)$$

where $\text{TV}(P, Q)$ is the *total variation* distance between probability distribution P and Q :

$$\text{TV}(P, Q) \triangleq \sup_{E \in \mathcal{F}} (P(E) - Q(E)), \quad (4)$$

with the supremum taken over all events E .

3.4. Let y be a continuous random variable distributed over the closed interval $[0, 1]$. Under the null hypothesis H_0 , y is uniform:

$$p_{y|H}(y|H_0) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq y \leq 1 \\ 0, & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

Under the alternative hypothesis H_1 , the conditional pdf of y is as follows:

$$p_{y|H}(y|H_1) = \begin{cases} 2y, & 0 \leq y \leq 1 \\ 0, & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

The *a-priori* probability that y is uniformly distributed is p .

- (a) Find the decision rule that minimizes the expected error.
- (b) Find the closed form expression for the operating characteristic of the LRT, i.e., $P_D \triangleq \mathbb{P}(\hat{H} = H_1 | H = H_1)$ as a function of $P_F \triangleq \mathbb{P}(\hat{H} = H_1 | H = H_0)$ for the likelihood ratio test.
- (c) Suppose we require that P_D is at least $(1 + \epsilon)P_F$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is a fixed constant.
 - i. Find $P_D^{\max}(\epsilon)$, the maximal value of P_D that is achievable under this constraint.
 - ii. Find the range of values of ϵ that lead to non-trivial performance, i.e. $P_D^{\max}(\epsilon) > 0$.
 - iii. When using the decision rule from part a, what values of p guarantee that $P_D \geq (1 + \epsilon)P_F$?

3.5. A 3-dimensional random vector \underline{y} is observed, and we know that one of the three hypotheses is true:

$$H_1: \underline{y} = \underline{m}_1 + \underline{w}$$

$$H_2: \underline{y} = \underline{m}_2 + \underline{w}$$

$$H_3: \underline{y} = \underline{m}_3 + \underline{w},$$

where

$$\underline{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underline{m}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underline{m}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \underline{m}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and \underline{w} is a zero-mean Gaussian vector with covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$.

(a) Let

$$\underline{\pi}(\underline{y}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{P}(H = H_1 | \underline{y} = \underline{y}) \\ \mathbb{P}(H = H_2 | \underline{y} = \underline{y}) \\ \mathbb{P}(H = H_3 | \underline{y} = \underline{y}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1(\underline{y}) \\ \pi_2(\underline{y}) \\ \pi_3(\underline{y}) \end{bmatrix},$$

and suppose that the Bayes costs are

$$C_{11} = C_{22} = C_{33} = 0, \quad C_{12} = C_{21} = 1, \quad C_{13} = C_{31} = C_{23} = C_{32} = 2.$$

- i. Specify the optimum decision rule in terms of $\pi_1(\underline{y})$, $\pi_2(\underline{y})$ and $\pi_3(\underline{y})$.
- ii. Recalling that $\pi_1 + \pi_2 + \pi_3 = 1$, express this rule completely in terms of π_1 and π_2 , and sketch the decision regions in the (π_1, π_2) plane.

- (b) Suppose that the three hypotheses are equally likely a priori and that the Bayes costs are

$$C_{ij} = 1 - \delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & i \neq j \\ 0, & i = j \end{cases}.$$

Show that the optimum decision rule can be specified in terms of the pair of sufficient statistics

$$\ell_2(\underline{y}) = y_2 - y_1,$$

$$\ell_3(\underline{y}) = y_3 - y_1.$$

Hint: To begin, see if you can specify the optimum decision rules in terms of

$$L_i(\underline{y}) = \frac{p_{\underline{y}|\mathbf{H}}(\underline{y}|H_i)}{p_{\underline{y}|\mathbf{H}}(\underline{y}|H_1)}, \quad \text{for } i = 2, 3.$$

3.6. A binary random variable \mathbf{x} with prior $p_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$ takes values in $\{-1, 1\}$. It is observed via n separate sensors; y_i denotes the observation at sensor i . The y_1, \dots, y_n are conditionally independent given \mathbf{x} , i.e.,

$$p_{y_1, \dots, y_n|\mathbf{x}}(y_1, \dots, y_n|x) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_{y_i|\mathbf{x}}(y_i|x).$$

A *local* decision $\hat{x}_i(y_i) \in \{-1, 1\}$ about the value of x is made at each sensor.

- (a) In this part of the problem, each sensor sends its local decision to a fusion center. The fusion center combines the local decisions from all sensors to produce a global decision $\hat{x}(\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_n)$. Consider the special case in which:

- $P_{\mathbf{x}}(1) = P_{\mathbf{x}}(-1) = 1/2$;
- $y_i = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}_i$, where $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$ are independent and each uniformly distributed over the interval $[-2, 2]$;
- the local decision rule is a simple thresholding of the observation, i.e.,

$$y_i \underset{\hat{x}_i(y_i)=-1}{\overset{\hat{x}_i(y_i)=1}{\geq}} 0.$$

Determine the minimum probability of error decision $\hat{x}(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$, at the fusion center.

In the remainder of the problem, there is no fusion center. The prior $P_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$, observation model $p_{y_i|\mathbf{x}}(\cdot|x)$, $i = 1, 2$, and local decision rules \hat{x}_i , are no longer restricted as in part (a). However, we limit our attention to the two-sensor case ($n = 2$).

Consider local decisions $\hat{x}_i(y_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, that minimize the expected cost, where the cost is defined for the two local rules jointly. Specifically, $C(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, x)$ is the cost of deciding \hat{x}_1 at sensor 1 and deciding \hat{x}_2 at sensor 2 when the true value of \mathbf{x} is x . The cost C strictly increases with the number of errors made by the two sensors but is not necessarily symmetric.

- (b) First, assume $\hat{x}_2(\cdot)$ is given. Show that the choice $\hat{x}_1^*(\cdot)$ for $\hat{x}_1(\cdot)$ that minimizes the expected (joint) cost is a likelihood ratio test of the form

$$\frac{p_{y_1|x}(y_1|1)}{p_{y_1|x}(y_1|-1)} \underset{\hat{x}_1(y_1)=-1}{\overset{\hat{x}_1(y_1)=1}{\geq}} \gamma_1.$$

where γ_1 is a threshold that depends on the rule $\hat{x}_2(\cdot)$. Determine the threshold γ_1 .

- (c) Assuming, instead, that $\hat{x}_1(\cdot)$ is given, determine the choice $\hat{x}_2^*(\cdot)$ for $\hat{x}_2(\cdot)$ that minimizes the expected joint cost.
- (d) Consider a joint cost function $C(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, x)$ such that the cost is: 0 if both sensors making correct decisions; 1 if exactly one sensor makes a mistake; and L if both sensors make an error. Determine the value of L such that the optimal local decision rules at the two sensors are decoupled, i.e., the optimal threshold γ_1 does not depend on $\hat{x}_2^*(\cdot)$, and *vice versa*.