

February 27, 2021

2.15 MLE minimizes KL Divergence to the Empirical Distribution

I learned a lot about probability and statistics from this question!

We are concerned with the value of $KL(p_{emp}||q(\theta))$.

First of all, what is the empirical distribution? The empirical distribution function is the distribution function associated with the empirical measure of a sample. For example, if we had a dataset sample from a Gaussian distribution, we could estimate the mean and the variance. Those estimates are parameters of the empirical Gaussian distribution. FYI, the empirical distribution function converges with probability 1 to the underlying distribution under the Gilvenko-Cantelli theorem as the dataset size grows.

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} KL(p_{emp}||q) &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{emp}} [\log p_{emp} - \log q(x; \theta)] \\ &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{emp}} [\log q(x; \theta)] \end{aligned}$$

Let X be your dataset of size n . I.e, $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Then the MLE is

$$\hat{\theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta} q(X; \theta) \tag{1}$$

Where q is the likelihood of your data. In particular, q may encode dependencies in your data. If the data is *iid*, then q can be decomposed into products of the likelihoods of individual data points, and then the *MLE* is exactly the right hand side of our *KL* expression, as the empirical distribution converges to the real distribution in the limit of the sample size.

Combined with the fact that the *KL* divergence is always non-negative, we've made an argument that the *MLE* converges in *KL* distance to the true distribution in the limit of sample size.