

COMP2610/COMP6261 Tutorial 2 Solutions*

Semester 2, 2018

1. (a) Let n_i denote the number of times that we observe outcome $X = i$. The likelihood is

$$L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^N p(X = x_i | \theta)$$

$$= \prod_{i: x_i=1} \theta^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \cdot \prod_{i: x_i=2} \theta^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \cdot \prod_{i: x_i=3} (1-\theta)$$

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

- (b) The log-likelihood is

Add WeChat edu_assist_pro

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = (n_1 + n_2) \cdot \log \frac{\theta}{2} + n_3 \cdot \log(1 - \theta).$$

The derivative is

$$\mathcal{L}'(\theta) = \frac{n_1 + n_2}{\theta} - \frac{n_3}{1 - \theta}.$$

We have that $n_1 = 3, n_2 = 3, n_3 = 4$. So, we need

$$\frac{6}{\theta} = \frac{4}{1 - \theta}$$

for which the solution may be checked to be $\theta = 0.6$. Observe then that we estimate

$$p(X = 1) = 0.3$$

$$p(X = 2) = 0.3$$

$$p(X = 3) = 0.4,$$

matching the frequencies of observations of each outcome.

*Based in part on solutions by Avraham Ruderman or the 2012 version of the course.

2. (a) We can show that X and Y are not statistically independent by showing that $p(x, y) \neq p(x)p(y)$ for at least one value of x and y . For example: $p(X = 1) = 1/8 + 1/8 = 1/4$ and $p(Y = 2) = 1/8 + 1/16 + 1/16 = 1/4$. From the given table we see that: $p(X = 1, Y = 2) = 1/8$ which is different from $p(X = 1)p(Y = 2) = 1/16$.

(b) First, we find the marginal probabilities using the sum rule:

$$\mathbf{p}(X) = (P(X = 1), P(X = 2), P(X = 3), P(X = 4)) = (1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4)$$

$$\mathbf{p}(Y) = (P(Y = 1), P(Y = 2), P(Y = 3), P(Y = 4)) = (1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4).$$

We see that both $p(X)$ and $p(Y)$ are uniform distributions with 4 possible states. Hence: $H(X) = H(Y) = \log_2 4 = 2$ bits.

To compute the conditional entropy $H(X|Y)$ we need the conditional distributions $p(X|Y)$ which can be computed by using the definition of conditional probability $p(X = x|Y = y) = p(X = x, Y = y)/p(Y = y)$. In other words, we divide the rows of the given table by the corresponding marginal.

$$\mathbf{p}(X|Y = 1) = (0, 0, 1/2, 1/2)$$

$$\mathbf{p}(X|Y = 2) = (1/2, 1/4, 1/4, 0)$$

$$\mathbf{p}(X|Y = 3) = (1/2, 1/2, 0, 0)$$

$$\mathbf{p}(X|Y = 4) = (0, 1/4, 1/4, 1/2).$$

Hence the

<https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

Add WeChat edu_assist_pro

$$H(X|Y) = \sum_{Y=y} p(Y = y) H(X|Y = y)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (1/4)H(0, 0, 1/2, 1/2) + (1/4)H(1/2, 1/4, 1/4, 0) \\ &\quad + (1/4)H(1/2, 1/2, 0, 0) + (1/4)H(0, 1/4, 1/4, 1/2) \\ &= 1/4 \times 1 + 1/4 \times 3/2 + 1/4 \times 1 + 1/4 \times 3/2 \\ &= 5/4 \text{ bits.} \end{aligned}$$

Here we note that conditioning has indeed decreased entropy. We can compute the joint entropy by using the chain rule:

$$H(X, Y) = H(X|Y) + H(Y) = 5/4 + 2 = 13/4 \text{ bits.}$$

Additionally, we know that by the chain rule $H(X, Y) = H(Y|X) + H(X)$, hence:

$$H(Y|X) = H(X, Y) - H(X) = 13/4 - 2 = 5/4 \text{ bits.}$$

We see that for this particular example $H(X|Y) = H(Y|X)$, which is not generally the case.

Finally, the mutual information $I(X; Y)$ is given by:

$$I(X; Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = 2 - 5/4 = 3/4 \text{ bits.}$$

3. (a) $h(c = \text{red}, v = \mathbf{K}) = \log_2 \frac{1}{P(c=\text{red}, v=\mathbf{K})} = \log_2 \frac{1}{1/26} = 4.7004 \text{ bits.}$
- (b) $h(v = \mathbf{K} | f = 1) = \log_2 \frac{1}{P(v=\mathbf{K} | f=1)} = \log_2 \frac{1}{1/3} = 1.585 \text{ bits.}$
- (c) We have
- i. $H(S) = \sum_s p(s) \log_2 \frac{1}{p(s)} = 4 \times \frac{1}{4} \times \log_2 \frac{1}{1/4} = 2 \text{ bits.}$
- ii. $H(V, S) = \sum_{v,s} p(v, s) \log_2 \frac{1}{p(v,s)} = 52 \times \frac{1}{52} \log_2 \frac{1}{1/52} = 5.7 \text{ bits.}$
- (d) Since V and S are independent we have $I(V; S) = 0 \text{ bits.}$
- (e) Since C is a function of S and by the data processing inequality $I(V; C) \leq I(V; S) = 0$. However, mutual information must be nonnegative so we must have $I(V; C) = 0 \text{ bits.}$
4. This is a direct application of Jensen's inequality to the convex function $g(x) = x^2$.
5. (a) We see that $I(X; Y) = 0$ as $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$.
- (b) To compute $I(X; Y|Z)$ we apply the definition of conditional mutual information:

Assignment Project Exam Help

Now, X is fully determined by Y and Z . In other words, given Y and Z there is only one state

$H(X|Y, Z) = 0$ <https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

$$I(X; Y|Z)$$

To determine this value we look at the distribution which is computed by considering the following possibilities:

X	Y	Z
0	0	0
0	1	1
1	0	1
1	1	2

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} p(X|Z = 0) &= (1, 0) \\ p(X|Z = 1) &= (1/2, 1/2) \\ p(X|Z = 2) &= (0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

From this, we obtain: $H(X|Z = 0) = 0$, $H(X|Z = 2) = 0$, $H(X|Z = 1) = 1 \text{ bit.}$

Therefore:

$$I(X; Y|Z) = p(Z = 1)H(X|Z = 1) = (1/2)(1) = 0.5 \text{ bits.}$$

- (c) This does not contradict the data-processing inequality (or more specifically the “conditioning on a downstream variable” corollary): the random variables in this example do not form a Markov chain. In fact, Z depends on both X and Y .
6. Gibb’s inequality tells us that for any two probability vectors $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_{|\mathcal{X}|})$ and $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_{|\mathcal{X}|})$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} p_i \log \frac{p_i}{q_i} \geq 0$$

with equality if and only if $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$. If we take \mathbf{q} to be the vector representing the uniform distribution $q_1 = \dots = q_{|\mathcal{X}|} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|}$, then we get

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} p_i \log \frac{p_i}{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|}} = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} p_i \log p_i + \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} p_i \log |\mathcal{X}| = -H(\mathbf{p}) + \log |\mathcal{X}|$$

with equality if and only if \mathbf{p} is the uniform distribution. Moving $H(\mathbf{p})$ to the other side gives the inequality.

Assignment Project Exam Help

<https://eduassistpro.github.io/>

Add WeChat edu_assist_pro