

Lecture Notes 16: Joint Typicality Lemma

Instructor: Shashank Vatedka

Scribe: Ritesh Kumar

Disclaimer: These notes have not been subjected to the usual scrutiny reserved for formal publications. Please email the course instructor in case of any errors.

16.1 Joint typicality lemma

Consider a distribution P_{XYZ} such that $Z^n \sim \text{i.i.d } P_{Z|XY}$, if X^n and Y^n are typical, then Z will also be typical. If Z is not drawn from the distribution $P_{Z|XY}$ but it's drawn from another distribution i.e $Z \sim P_{Z|X}$ that is Z is independent to Y .

Lemma 16.1. Suppose we have sequences x^n and y^n , then for any (x^n, y^n) , and $Z^n \sim P_{Z|X}^n(\cdot|x^n)$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\Pr \left[(x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_{XYZ}) \right] \leq 2^{-nI(Y;Z|X)(1+\delta(\epsilon))} \quad (16.1)$$

for some $\delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

It gives an upper bound on the probability of 3 sequences being jointly typical. For the upper bound x^n and y^n may jointly typical or not. In some cases, we also use a lower bound on the probability that they are jointly typical. Hence similar to the upper bound, we have a lower bound on that as follows

Lemma 16.2. For any $\epsilon > \epsilon'$,

$$\Pr \left[(x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_{\epsilon'}^{(n)}(P_{XYZ}) \right] > 2^{-nI(Y;Z|X)(1+\delta(\epsilon))} \quad (16.2)$$

for some $\delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

For the lower bound, we have to assume that, x^n and y^n are jointly typical. If they are not jointly typical then, we may not have this lower bound.

Proof.

$$\Pr \left[(x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}) \right] = \sum_{z^n: ((x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))} \prod_{i=1}^n P_{Z|X}(z_i|x_i) \quad (16.3)$$

For every $z^n \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XZ|x^n})$, we have

$$\Pr_{Z|X}(z^n|x^n) \leq 2^{-nH(Z|X)(1-\epsilon)} \quad (16.4)$$

In R.H.S. of equation (16.3), we are summing all the possible sequences in the different typical set (which is not conditional typical set). There we are considering z^n for which we are summing over the is $T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ})$ set. Hence the equation (16.3) can be bounded as :

$$Pr[(x^n, y^n, z^n \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))] = \sum_{z^n: ((x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))} \prod_{i=1}^n P_{Z|X}(z_i|x_i) \leq |T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}|x^n, y^n)| 2^{-nH(Z|X)(1-\epsilon)} \quad (16.5)$$

The size of the typical set is bounded as :

$$|T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}|x^n, y^n)| \leq 2^{nH(Z|XY)(1+\epsilon)} \quad (16.6)$$

Now using equation (16.4) and equation (16.6) in (16.5),

$$\begin{aligned} Pr[(x^n, y^n, z^n \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))] &\leq 2^{nH(Z|XY)(1+\epsilon)} \times 2^{-nH(Z|X)(1-\epsilon)} \\ &\leq 2^{-n[H(Z|X) - H(Z|XY)](1-\epsilon)} \\ &= 2^{-n[I(Z;Y|X)(1-\epsilon)]} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$Pr[(x^n, y^n, z^n \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))] \leq 2^{-n[I(Z;Y|X)(1-\epsilon)]} \quad (16.7)$$

□

Now coming the proof of lemma 1.2

Proof. For the lower bound, we have to assume that, x^n and y^n are jointly typical i.e. $((x^n, y^n) \in T_\epsilon^n)$ and $Z^n \sim P_{Z|X}^n(\cdot|x^n)$

$$Pr[(x^n, y^n, z^n \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))] = \sum_{z^n: ((x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))} P_{Z|X}(z^n|x^n) \quad (16.8)$$

$$\sum_{z^n: ((x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))} P_{Z|X}(z^n|x^n) \geq \sum_{z^n: ((x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))} 2^{-nH(Z|X)(1+\epsilon)} \quad (16.9)$$

$$= 2^{-nH(Z|X)(1+\epsilon)} \sum_{z^n: ((x^n, y^n, z^n) \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))} 1 \quad (16.10)$$

For this condition the size of the typical set is bounded as :

$$|T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}|x^n, y^n)| \leq 2^{nH(Z|XY)(1+\epsilon)} \quad (16.11)$$

Now using equation (16.11) in equation (16.10) we have,

$$\begin{aligned} Pr[(x^n, y^n, z^n \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))] &\geq 2^{-nH(Z|XY)(1+\epsilon)} \times 2^{nH(Z|X)(1+\epsilon)} \\ &= 2^{-n[H(Z|X) - H(Z|XY)](1+\epsilon)} \\ &= 2^{-n[I(Z;Y|X)(1+\epsilon)]} \\ &= 2^{-n[I(Z;Y|X) + \delta(\epsilon)]} \end{aligned}$$

finally,

$$Pr[(x^n, y^n, z^n \in T_\epsilon^n(P_{XYZ}))] \geq 2^{-n[I(Z;Y|X) + \delta(\epsilon)]} \quad (16.12)$$

This concludes the proof of lemmas 1.1 and 1.2

□