

Information Theory and Coding - Prof. Emere Telatar

Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, Sebastien Speierer, Thomas Batschelet

October 17, 2017

1 Data compression

Definition 1.1 (Information). *Abstractly, **information** can be thought of as the resolution of uncertainty.*

Given an alphabet \mathcal{U} (e.g. $\mathcal{U} = \{a, \dots, z, A, \dots, Z, \dots\}$), we want to assign binary sequences to elements of \mathcal{U} , i.e.

$$\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^* = \{\emptyset, 0, 1, 00, 01, \dots\}$$

For \mathcal{X} a set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X}^n &\equiv \{(x_0 \dots x_n), x_i \in \mathcal{X}\} \\ \mathcal{X}^* &\equiv \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}^n\end{aligned}$$

Definition 1.2. A code \mathcal{C} is called **singular** if

$$\exists (u, v) \in \mathcal{U}^2, u \neq v \quad \text{s.t.} \quad C(u) = C(v)$$

Non singular code is defined as opposite

Definition 1.3. A code \mathcal{C} is called **uniquely decodable** if

$$\forall u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathcal{U}^* \quad \text{s.t.} \quad u_1, \dots, u_n \neq v_1, \dots, v_n$$

we have

$$\mathcal{C}(u_1) \dots \mathcal{C}(u_n) \neq \mathcal{C}(v_1) \dots \mathcal{C}(v_n)$$

i.e., \mathcal{C} is non-singular

Definition 1.4. Suppose $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ and $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ we can define

$$\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^* \quad \text{as} \quad (\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D})(u, v) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(u)\mathcal{D}(v)$$

Definition 1.5. Given $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$, define

$$\mathcal{C}^* : \mathcal{U}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^* \quad \text{as} \quad \mathcal{C}^*(u_1, u_n) = \mathcal{C}(u_1) \dots \mathcal{C}(u_n)$$

Definition 1.6. A code $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ is **prefix-free** if for no $u \neq v$ $\mathcal{C}(u)$ is a prefix of $\mathcal{C}(v)$.

Theorem 1.1. If \mathcal{C} is prefix-free then \mathcal{C} is uniquely decodable.

Definition 1.7. $l(\mathcal{C}(u))$ is the length of the code word $\mathcal{C}(u)$ and $l(\mathcal{C})$ is the expected length of the code:

$$l(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_u l(\mathcal{C}(u))p(u)$$

Definition 1.8 (Kraft sum). Given $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$

$$\text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_u 2^{l(\mathcal{C}(u))}$$

Lemma 1.2. if $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ and $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ then

$$\text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}) = \text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}) \times \text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{D})$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}) &= \sum_{u,v} 2^{-(l(\mathcal{C})+l(\mathcal{D}))} \\ &= \sum_u 2^{-l(\mathcal{C})} \sum_v 2^{-l(\mathcal{D})} \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 1.2.1. $\text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}^n) = (\text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}))^n$

Proposition 1.1. if \mathcal{C} is non-singular, then

$$\text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}) \leq 1 + \max_n l(\mathcal{C}(u))$$

In coding theory, the **Kraft-McMillan inequality** gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a uniquely decodable code for a given set of codeword lengths.

Theorem 1.3. if \mathcal{C} is uniquely decodable, then $\text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}) \leq 1$

Proof. \mathcal{C} is uniquely decodable $\equiv \mathcal{C}^*$ is non singular

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}^n) &\leq 1 + \max_{u_1, \dots, u_n} l(\mathcal{C}^n) \\ \Rightarrow \text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C})^n &\leq 1 + nL, \quad L = \max l(\mathcal{C}(n)) \end{aligned}$$

A growing exp cannot be bounded by a linear function

$$\Rightarrow \text{kraftsum}(\mathcal{C}) \leq 1$$

□

Theorem 1.4. Suppose $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is such that $\sum_u i^{\mathcal{C}(u)} \leq 1$, then, there exist a prefix-free code $\mathcal{C}' : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ s.t. $\forall l(\mathcal{C}(u)) = l(\mathcal{C}'(u))$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ and $\mathcal{C}(u_1) \leq \mathcal{C}(u_2) \leq \dots \leq \mathcal{C}(u_k) = \mathcal{C}_{max}$. Consider the complete binary tree up to depth \mathcal{C}_{max} initially all nodes are available to be used as codewords. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, place $\mathcal{C}(u_i)$ at an available node at level $\mathcal{C}(u_i)$ remove all descendant of $\mathcal{C}(u_i)$ from the available list.

Corollary 1.4.1. Suppose $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ is u.d., then there exist an $\mathcal{C}' : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ which is prefix-free and $l(\mathcal{C}'(n)) = l(\mathcal{C}(n))$

□

Example 1. $\mathcal{U} = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 01, 011, 111\}$ and $\mathcal{C}' : \{0, 10, 110, 111\}$
In this case, decoding \mathcal{C} may require delay, while decoding \mathcal{C}' is instanteneous.

2 Alphabet with statistics

Suppose we have an alphabet \mathcal{U} , and suppose we have a random variable U taking values in \mathcal{U} . We denote by $p(u) = \Pr(U = u)$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$ with $p(u) \geq 0$ and $\sum_u p(u) = 1$.

Suppose we have a code $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$. We then have $\mathcal{C}(u)$ a random binary string and $l(\mathcal{C}(u))$ a random integer.

Example 2. $\mathcal{U} = \{a, b, c, d\}$
 $p : \{0.5, 0.25, 0.125, 0.125\}$
 $\mathcal{C} : \{0, 01, 110, 111\}$

then we have

$$l(\mathcal{C}(u)) = \begin{cases} 1, & p = 0.5 \\ 2, & p = 0.25 \\ 3, & p = 0.125 + 0.125 + 0.25 \end{cases}$$

We can measure how efficient \mathcal{C} represents \mathcal{U} by considering

$$E[l(\mathcal{C}(u))] = \sum_u p(u) \mathcal{C}(u) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{C}(u) = l(\mathcal{C}(u))$$

Theorem 2.1. if \mathcal{C} is u.d., then

$$E[l(\mathcal{C}(u))] \geq \sum_u p(u) \log\left(\frac{1}{p(u)}\right)$$

Proof. let $\mathcal{C}(u) = l(\mathcal{C}(u))$, we know $\sum_u 2^{-\mathcal{C}(u)} \leq 1$ because \mathcal{C} is u.d.

$$\begin{aligned} E[l(\mathcal{C}(u))] &= \sum_u p(u) \mathcal{C}(u) = \sum_u p(u) \log_2\left(\frac{1}{q(u)}\right) \\ &\equiv \sum_u p(u) \log\left(\frac{q(u)}{p(u)}\right) \leq 0 \\ &\equiv \sum_u p(u) \ln\left(\frac{q(u)}{p(u)}\right) \leq 0 \\ &\leq \sum_u p(u) \left[\frac{q(u)}{p(u)} - 1\right] = \underbrace{\sum_u q(u)}_{\leq 1} - \underbrace{\sum_u p(u)}_{=1} \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 2.2. For any \mathcal{U} , there exists a prefix-free code \mathcal{C} s.t.

$$E[l(\mathcal{C}(u))] < 1 + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u) \log\left(\frac{1}{p(u)}\right)$$

Proof. Given \mathcal{U} , let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(u) &= \lceil \log\left(\frac{1}{p(u)}\right) \rceil < 1 + \log\left(\frac{1}{p(u)}\right) \\ \Rightarrow \sum_u 2^{-\mathcal{C}(u)} &\leq \sum_u p(u) = 1 \\ \Rightarrow \sum_u p(u) \mathcal{C}(u) &< \sum_u p(u) \log\left(\frac{1}{p(u)}\right) + \underbrace{1}_{\sum p(u)} \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 2.1 (Entropy). *Entropy quantifies the amount of uncertainty involved in the value of a random variable or the outcome of a random process.*

Theorem 2.3. *The entropy of a random variable $U \in \mathcal{U}$ is*

$$H(U) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u) \log\left(\frac{1}{p(u)}\right)$$

with $p(u) = \Pr(U = u)$

Note that $H(U)$ is a function of the distribution $\mathcal{C}_u(\cdot)$ of the random variable U , it isn't a function of U .

$$H(U) = E[f(U)] \quad \text{where} \quad f(U) = \log\left(\frac{1}{p(u)}\right)$$

How to design optimal codes (in the sense of minimizing $E[l(\mathcal{C}(u))]$)?
Formally, given a random variable U , find $\mathcal{C}(u) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ s.t.

$$\sum_{u \in U} 2^{\mathcal{C}(u)} \leq 1 \quad \text{that minimizes} \quad \sum_{u \in U} p(u) \mathcal{C}(u)$$

Properties of optimal prefix-free codes

- if $p(u) < p(v)$ then $\mathcal{C}(u) \geq \mathcal{C}(v)$
- The two longest codewords have the same length
- There is an optimal code such that the two least probable letters are assigned codewords that differ in the last bit.

Observe that if $\{\mathcal{C}(u_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}(u_{k-1}), \mathcal{C}(u_k)\}$ is a prefix-free collection of the property that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(u_{k-1}) &= \alpha 0 \\ \mathcal{C}(u_k) &= \alpha 1 \end{aligned} \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha \in \{0, 1\}^*$$

then $\{\mathcal{C}(u_1), \dots, \mathcal{C}(u_{k-2}), \alpha\}$ is also a prefix-free collection.

Also

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u) l(\mathcal{C}(u)) &= p(u_1) l(\mathcal{C}(u_1)) + \dots + p(u_{k-2}) l(\mathcal{C}(u_{k-2})) + [p(u_{k-1}) + p(u_k)] (l(\alpha) + 1) \\ &= (p(u_{k-1}) + p(u_k)) + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} p(v) l(\mathcal{C}'(v)) \end{aligned}$$

So we have shown that with

$$E[l(\mathcal{C}(U))] = p(u_{k-1}) + p(u_k) + E[l(\mathcal{C}'(v))]$$

if \mathcal{C} is optimal for U , then \mathcal{C}' is optimal for V

3 Entropy and mutual information

Definition 3.1 (Joint entropy). Suppose U, V are random variables with $p(u, v) = P(U = u, V = v)$, the joint entropy is

$$H(UV) = \sum_{u,v} p(u, v) \log \frac{1}{p(u, v)}$$

Theorem 3.1.

$$H(UV) \leq H(U) + H(V)$$

with equality iff U and V are independants.

Proof. We want to show that

$$\sum_{u,v} p(u, v) \log \frac{1}{p(u, v)} \leq \sum_u p(u) \log \frac{1}{p(u)} + \sum_v p(v) \log \frac{1}{p(v)} \iff \sum_{u,v} p(u, v) \log \frac{p(u)p(v)}{p(u, v)} \leq 0$$

We use $\ln z \leq z - 1 \forall z$ (with equality iff $z = 1$):

$$\sum_{u,v} p(u, v) \log \frac{p(u)p(v)}{p(u, v)} \leq \sum_{u,v} p(u, v) \left[\frac{p(u)p(v)}{p(u, v)} - 1 \right] = \sum_{u,v} p(u)p(v) - \sum_{u,v} p(u, v) = 1 - 1 = 0$$

□

Same definitions of entropy holds for n symbols.

Definition 3.2 (Joint Entropy). Suppose U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n are RVs and we are given $p(u_1 \dots u_n)$, the joint entropy is

$$H(U_1, \dots, U_n) = \sum_{u_1 \dots u_n} p(u_1 \dots u_n) \log \frac{1}{p(u_1 \dots u_n)}$$

Theorem 3.2.

$$H(U_1, \dots, U_n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n H(U_i)$$

with equality iff U s are independants

Corollary 3.2.1. if U_1, \dots, U_n are i.i.d. then $H(U_1 \dots U_n) = nH(U_1)$

Definition 3.3 (Conditional entropy).

$$H(U|V) = \sum_{u,v} p(u, v) \log \frac{1}{p(u|v)}$$

Theorem 3.3.

$$H(UV) = H(U) + H(V|U) = H(V) + H(U|V)$$

Theorem 3.4.

$$H(U) + H(V) \geq H(U, V) = H(V) + H(U|V)$$

Definition 3.4 (Mutual information). Mutual information measures the amount of information that can be obtained about one random variable by observing another.

$$\begin{aligned} I(U; V) &= I(V; U) = H(U) - H(U|V) \\ &= H(V) - H(V|U) \\ &= H(U) + H(V) - H(UV) \end{aligned}$$

We can apply the chain rule on the entropy as follow

$$H(U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n) = H(U_1) + H(U_2|U_1) + \dots + H(U_n|U_1, U_2 \dots U_{n-1})$$

Definition 3.5 (Conditional mutual information).

$$\begin{aligned} I(U; V|W) &= H(U|W) - H(U|VW) \\ &= H(V|W) - H(V|UW) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{u,v,w} \left[\log \frac{p(uv|w)}{p(u|w)p(v|w)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.5.

$$I(V; U_1 \dots U_n) = I(V; U_1) + I(V; U_2|U_1) + \dots + I(V; U_n|U_1 \dots U_{n-1})$$

Notation 1.

$$U^n \triangleq (U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n)$$

Theorem 3.6.

$$I(U; V|W) \geq 0$$

equality iff conditioned on w , u and v are independant, that is iff $U - V - W$ is a Markov chain.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} I(U; V|W) &= \frac{1}{\ln 2} \sum_{u,v,w} p(u, v, w) \ln \frac{p(u|w)p(v|w)}{p(uv|w)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \sum_{u,v,w} p(u, v, w) \left[\frac{p(u|w)p(v|w)}{p(uv|w)} - 1 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\ln 2} \sum_{u,v,w} (p(w)p(u|w)p(v|w) - p(uvw)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ln 2} (1 - 1) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Data processing

Theorem 4.1. $U - V - W$ is a MC $\iff I(U; W|V) = 0$

Corollary 4.1.1. $I(U; V) \geq I(U; W)$ and by symmetry of MC $I(W; V) \geq I(U; W)$

Proof.

$$I(U; VW) = I(U; V) + I(U; W|V) = I(U; V)$$

and

$$I(U; VW) = I(U; W) + I(U; V|W) \geq I(U; W)$$

□

Theorem 4.2. Given U a RV taking values in \mathcal{U} then $0 \leq H(U) \leq \log |\mathcal{U}|$. $H(U) = 0$ iff U is constant, $H(U) = \log |\mathcal{U}|$ iff U is $p(u) = 1/|\mathcal{U}|$ for all u .

Proof. For the lower bound,

$$H(U) = \sum_u \underbrace{p(u)}_{\geq 0} \underbrace{\log \frac{1}{p(u)}}_{\geq 0} \geq 0$$

For the upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} H(U) - \log |\mathcal{U}| &= \sum_u p(u) \log \frac{1}{p(u)} - \sum_u p(u) \log |\mathcal{U}| \\ &= \frac{1}{\ln 2} \sum_u p(u) \ln \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|p(u)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \sum_u p(u) \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|p(u)} - 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ln 2} \left[\sum_u \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} - \sum_u p(u) \right] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4.3. $I(U; V) = 0 \iff U \perp V$

Definition 4.1 (Entropy rate of a stochastic process). $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(U^n)$ if the limit exists.

Theorem 4.4. For stationary stochastic process U^n , the sequences

$$a_n = \frac{1}{n} H(U^n) \text{ and } b_n = H(U_n | U^{n-1})$$

are positive and non increasing. Then $a = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ and $b = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$ exists and $a = b$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} b_{n+1} &= H(U_{n+1} | U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n) \\ &\leq H(U_{n+1} | U_2, \dots, U_n) \\ &= H(U_n | U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{n-1}) \\ &= b_n, \text{ because } U_1 \dots U_n \sim U_2 \dots U_{n+1} \text{ (Stationarity).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it is non-increasing.

For the $\{a_n\}$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= \frac{1}{n} H(U^n) = \frac{1}{n} \left[H(U_1) + H(U_2|U_1) + H(U_3|U^2) + \cdots + H(U_n|U^{n-1}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left[b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_n \right] \end{aligned}$$

and by the "Lemma", whenever $b_n \rightarrow b$, $a_n \rightarrow b$ □

Lemma 4.5 (Cesaro). *Suppose $b_n \rightarrow b$,*

then,

$$a_n = \frac{1}{n} \left[b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_n \right] \text{ also converges and to } b.$$

Proof. Since $b_n \rightarrow b$, $\left(\equiv \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists n(\epsilon) \text{ s.t. } \forall n > n(\epsilon) |b_n - b| < \epsilon \right)$

$\exists B$ s.t. $|b_n| < B$ for all n .

Take $n > n_1(\epsilon) \triangleq \dots$ then

$$\begin{aligned} |a_n - b| &\leq \frac{|b_1 - b| + |b_2 - b| + |b_3 - b| + \cdots + |b_n - b|}{n} \\ \text{so } |a_n - b| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_0(\epsilon)} \underbrace{|b_i - b|}_{2B} + \sum_{i=n_0(\epsilon)+1}^n \underbrace{|b_i - b|}_{\leq \epsilon} \right] \leq \frac{n_0(\epsilon)2B}{n} + \epsilon < 2\epsilon \\ &\text{for } n > n_1(\epsilon) \triangleq \max, \{n_0(\epsilon) \frac{1}{\epsilon} n_0(\epsilon) 2B\} \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4.6. *Given a stationary process with entropy rate r :*

$$r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\mathcal{U}^n)$$

then

1. *for every source coding scheme*

$$\mathcal{C}_n : \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$$

the expected number of bits / letter is given by

$$\frac{1}{n} E[l(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{U}^n))] \geq r$$

2. *for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a source coding scheme $\mathcal{C}_n : \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ s.t.*

$$\frac{1}{n} E[l(\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{U}^n))] < r + \epsilon$$

Proof. 1. we already know

$$\frac{1}{n} E[l(\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{U}^n))] \geq \frac{1}{n} H(\mathcal{U}_1 \dots \mathcal{U}_n)$$

and the right term is decreasing

2. we also know that for each $n, \exists \mathcal{C}_n$ that is prefix-free s.t.

$$E[l(\mathcal{C}_n(U^n))] < \underbrace{\frac{1}{n}H(\mathcal{U}^n)}_r + \underbrace{\frac{1}{n}}_0$$

we can find n large enough s.t. the RHS $< r + \epsilon$

□

5 Typicality and typical set

Suppose we have a sequence U_1, U_2, \dots of i.i.d. random variables taking values in an alphabet \mathcal{U} . Suppose we observe u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n . We will call it to be *typical*-(ϵ, p) if

$$p(u)(1 - \epsilon) \leq \frac{\# \text{ of times } u \text{ appears in } u_1, \dots, u_n}{n} \leq p(u)(1 + \epsilon)$$

Theorem 5.1. u^n is (ϵ, p) -typical then

$$2^{-nH(u)(1+\epsilon)} \leq Pr(U^n = u^n) \leq 2^{-nH(u)(1-\epsilon)}$$

Proof.

$$Pr(U^n = u^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n Pr(U_i = u_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(u_i) = \prod_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^{\#_u}$$

with $\#_u$ the number of times u appears in u_1, \dots, u_n where

$$n(1 - \epsilon)p(u) \leq \#_u \leq n(1 + \epsilon)p(u)$$

consequently

$$p(u)^{np(u)(1-\epsilon)} \geq p(u)^{\#_u} \geq p(u)^{np(u)(1+\epsilon)}$$

then

$$\left(\prod_n p(u)^{p(u)}\right)^{(1-\epsilon)n} \geq Pr(U^n = u^n) \geq \left(\prod_n p(u)^{p(u)}\right)^{(1+\epsilon)n}$$

but

$$p(u)^{p(u)} = 2^{-p(u) \log(\frac{1}{p(u)})} \Rightarrow \prod p(u)^{p(u)} = 2^{-H(u)}$$

□

Definition 5.1 (Typical set).

$$T(n, \epsilon, p) = \{u^n \in U^n : u^n \text{ is } (\epsilon, p)\text{-typical}\}$$

Theorem 5.2. 1. if $u^n \in T(n, \epsilon, p)$ then

$$p(u^n) = Pr(U^n = u^n) = 2^{-nH(u)(1 \pm \epsilon)}$$

when U_i i.i.d.

2.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Pr(U^n \in T(n, \epsilon, p)) = 1$$

3.

$$|T(n, \epsilon, p)| \leq 2^{n(H(u)(1+\epsilon))}$$

4.

$$|T(n, \epsilon, p)| \geq (1 - \epsilon)2^{nH(u)(1-\epsilon)}$$

Proof. **TODO:**

□

Definition 5.2 (Kullback-Leiber divergence (information gain)). *If we compress data in a manner that assumes $q(u)$ is the distribution underlying some data, when, in reality, $p(u)$ is the correct distribution, the Kullback-Leiber divergence is the number of average additional bits per datum necessary for compression.*

Lemma 5.3. *if $U_1 \dots U_n$ are i.i.d. with distribution q and $u_1 \dots u_n$ is (ϵ, p) -typical, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \{U^n = u^n\} &= \left[\prod_u q(u)^{p(u)} \right]^{n(1+\epsilon)} \\ &= 2^{-n(1+\epsilon) \sum_u p(u) \log \frac{1}{q(u)}} \end{aligned}$$

U_1, U_2, \dots iid $\sim p$

$\Pr \{U^n \in T(n, \epsilon, p)\} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$(1 - \epsilon)2^{nH(U)(1-\epsilon)} \leq |T(n, \epsilon, p)| \leq 2^{nH(U)(1+\epsilon)}$$

TODO: Something wrong in the formula above

Suppose $U_1 \dots U_n$ are iid following q and $u^n \in T(n, \epsilon, p)$

Observe:

$$\left[\prod_u q(u)^{p(u)} \right]^{n(1+\epsilon)} \leq \Pr \{U^n = u^n\} \leq \left[\prod_u q(u)^{p(u)} \right]^{n(1-\epsilon)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_u q(u)^{p(u)} &= 2^{-\sum p(u) \log \frac{1}{q(u)}} \\ \sum_u p(u) \log \frac{1}{q(u)} &= \underbrace{\sum_u p(u) \log \frac{1}{p(u)}}_{H(p)} + \underbrace{\sum_u p(u) \log \frac{p(u)}{q(u)}}_{D(p||q)} \end{aligned}$$

Corollary of the observation: **TODO: corollary tag**

Theorem 5.4. *if $U_1 \dots U_n$ are i.i.d. following distribution q , then*

$$2^{-n[(1+\epsilon)D(p||q)+2\epsilon H(p)]} \leq \Pr \{U^n \in T(n, \epsilon, p)\} \leq 2^{-n[(1-\epsilon)D(p||q)-2\epsilon H(p)]}$$

Proof.

$$\Pr \{U^n \in T(n, \epsilon, p)\} = \sum_{u^n \in T(n, \epsilon, p)} \Pr \{U^n = u^n\}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-n[H(p)+D(p||q)](1+\epsilon)} &\leq \Pr \{U^n = u^n\} \leq 2^{-n[H(p)+D(p||q)](1-\epsilon)} \\ 2^{nH(p)(1-\epsilon)} &\leq |T(n, \epsilon, p)| \leq 2^{nH(p)(1+\epsilon)} \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 5.5.

$$D(p||q) = \sum_u p(u) \log \left(\frac{p(u)}{q(u)} \right) \geq 0 \text{ with equality iff } p = q$$

Example 3. $U \in \{0, 1\}$, $p = \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}$, $q = \frac{1}{2} - \delta, \frac{1}{2} + \delta$

$$D(p||q) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{1-2\delta} + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{1+2\delta} = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{1}{1-4\delta^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \log(1-4\delta^2) \approx \frac{1}{2} 4\delta^2 + o(\delta^4)$$

TODO: too long So if we want $2^{-nD(p||q)}$ small $n = \Omega(1/\delta^2)$

Example 4. Suppose we are told that U is p distributed and $p(u)$ are powers of 2 and we design a prefix-free code \mathcal{C} to minimize $\sum_u p(u) l(\mathcal{C}(u))$.

We have been misinformed and $U \sim q$

$$\begin{aligned} E[l(\mathcal{C}(u))] &= \sum_u q(u) \log \frac{1}{p(u)} \\ &= \underbrace{H(q)}_{\text{length for optimal code}} + \underbrace{D(q||p)}_{\text{penalty for misbelief}} \end{aligned}$$

5.1 Universal data compression

Suppose we know that the distribution p of U is either $p_1, p_2 \dots p_k$, can we design a code $\mathcal{C} : U \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$

$$E[l(\mathcal{C}(U))] \leq H(U) + \text{small for every } p$$

$$E \left[\frac{1}{n} l(\mathcal{C}(U)) \right] \leq o(n) + E \left[h_2 \left(\frac{K}{n} \right) \right]$$

with $K = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i$

We have $\frac{E[K]}{n} = \theta_1$ and $E \left[h_2 \left(\frac{K}{n} \right) \right] \leq h_2 E \left[\frac{K}{n} \right] = h_2(\theta)$

TODO: maybe missing things here

Suggestion for \mathcal{C}

Given $u_1 \dots u_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$, first count the number of 1, call it k .

$$\mathcal{C}(u_1 \dots u_n) = \underbrace{\text{describe } k}_{\lceil \log(n+1) \rceil} \underbrace{\text{describe } u_1 \dots u_n}_{\lceil \log \binom{n}{k} \rceil}$$

We now want to evaluate

$$\frac{1}{n} E[l(\mathcal{C}(U))]$$

when $U_1 \dots U_n$ are i.i.d with $p_1 = \theta$ and $p_0 = 1 - p_1$

Observe for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= 1^n = (\alpha + (1 - \alpha))^n \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \alpha^i (1 - \alpha)^{n-i} \\ &\geq \binom{n}{k} \alpha^k (1 - \alpha)^{n-k} \end{aligned}$$

Then for all α

$$\binom{n}{k} \leq \alpha^{-k} (1 - \alpha)^{-(n-k)} = 2^{-n(\frac{k}{n} \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + (1 - \frac{k}{n}) \log \frac{1}{1-\alpha})}$$

We pick $\alpha = \frac{k}{n}$, and we get

$$\binom{n}{k} < 2^{nh_2(\frac{k}{n})}$$

TODO: missing 1.5 pages to scribe

TODO: THOMAS SCRIBE ICI

Suppose we have an infinite string $u_1u_2\dots, u_i \in U$, and

$$u_1u_2\dots = v_1v_2\dots \text{ with } v_i \in U^*, v_i \neq v_j \text{ when } i \neq j$$

for any k we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{length}(v_1\dots v_m)}{m} \geq k \Rightarrow \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{length}(v_1\dots v_m)}{m} = \infty$$

Definition 5.3. Given an infinite string $u_1u_2\dots$ and a machine M , let

$$\rho_M(u_1u_2\dots) = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{length of the output } M \text{ after reading } u_1u_2\dots}{n}$$

also given $s > 0$, define

- The compressibility of U^* by s -state machines

$$\rho_s(u_1u_2\dots) = \min_M \rho_M(u_1u_2\dots)$$

with M an s' -state machine with $s' \leq s$

- Compressibility of U^* by finite state machines

$$\rho_{FSM}(u_1u_2\dots) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \rho_s(u_1u_2\dots)$$

Definition 5.4. Suppose $u_1u_2\dots$ an infinite sequence, define $m(n)$ as the largest m for which $u_1\dots u_n = v_1\dots v_m$ with distinct $v_1\dots v_m$

Example 5.

$$u = \underbrace{aaaaaaaaa}_{v_1} \underbrace{a}_{v_2} \underbrace{aa}_{v_3} \underbrace{aaa}_{v_4} \underbrace{aaaa}_{v_5} \Rightarrow m(10) = 5$$

So far we know that

$$\frac{\text{length of the output of any } s\text{-state IL machine when it reads } u_1u_2\dots}{n} \geq \frac{m(n) \log(\frac{m(n)}{8s^2})}{n}$$

with

$$\frac{m(n) \log(\frac{m(n)}{8s^2})}{n} = \frac{m(n) \log(m(n))}{n} - \frac{m(n) \log(8s^2)}{\text{length}(v_1\dots v_m)}$$

hence if M is a s -state machine

$$\rho_M(u_1u_2\dots) \geq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m(n) \log(m(n))}{n} \quad \text{then} \quad \rho_{FSM}(u_1u_2\dots) \geq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m(n) \log m(n)}{n}$$

6 Lemple-Ziv data compression method

Given some alphabet U to both encoder and decoder, they also agree an order on U :

1. Start with a dictionary $D = U$
2. To each word $w \in D$, assign a $\lceil \log |D| \rceil$ -bit binary description in the dictionary order
3. Parse the first word in $u_1 u_2 \dots$ in the dictionary, output its binary description
4. replace w in D by $\{wu, \forall u \in U\}$.
5. Go to 2.

Example 6. Define an alphabet $U = \{a, b, c\}$ with $a \leq b \leq c$ and an input message

$$u = bbacac$$

- Create the dictionary $D = \{a, b, c\}$ and its corresponding binary description $D_{bin} = \{00, 01, 10\}$
- The first word in the message is 'a', output its binary description

$$output = 01$$

- Update the dictionary:

$$D = \{a, ba, bb, bc, c\} \quad D_{bin} = \{000, 001, 010, 011, 100\}$$

- Parse the next word 'ba' and output its binary description

$$output = 01001$$

- Update the dictionary

$$D = \{a, baa, bab, bac, bb, bc, c\} \quad D_{bin} = \{000, 001, \dots\}$$

- Continue until the end of the input data...

The decoder can proceed in a similar way to iteratively update the dictionary while decoding the message.

6.1 Analysis of LZ

Observe that LZ parses the string $u_1 u_2 \dots$ into $v_1 v_2 \dots$ with $v_i \in U^*$ or $v_i \in D_i$ where D_i is the dictionary at step i .

When going from iteration $i \rightarrow i + 1$, v_i is removed from D , consequently v_1, v_2, v_3 are distinct.

The length of the output of LZ after reading $v_1 \dots v_m$ is given by

$$\text{LZ output's length} = \lceil \log |U| \rceil + \lceil \log(2|U| - 1) \rceil + \lceil \log(3|U| - 2) \rceil + \dots + \lceil \log(m|U| - m + 1) \rceil$$

we observe that

$$\text{LZ output's length} < m(\log(m|U|) + 1) = m \log(2m|U|)$$

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} \# \text{ bits / letter} &< \frac{m \log(2m|U|)}{\text{length}(v_1 \dots v_m)} \\ &= \frac{m \log(m)}{\text{length}(v_1 \dots v_m)} + \frac{m \log(2|U|)}{\text{length}(v_1 \dots v_m)} \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\rho_{LZ}(u_1 u_2 \dots) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\# \text{ bits}}{\text{letter}} \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m \log(m)}{\text{length}(v_1 \dots v_m)} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m(n) \log(m(n))}{n} \leq \rho_{FSM}(u_1 u_2 \dots)$$

So we have proved the following theorem:

Theorem 6.1. *for every $u_1u_2\dots$*

$$\rho_{LZ}(u_1u_2\dots) \leq \rho_{FSM}(u_1u_2\dots)$$

Corollary 6.1.1. *if $u_1u_2\dots$ is stationary*

$$\rho_{LZ}(u_1u_2\dots) = \text{entropy rate of } u_1u_2\dots$$

Appendices

A Markov chains

$U_1 - U_2 - \dots - U_n$ forms a Markov chain if the joint probability distribution of the RVs is

$$p(a, b, c, d) = p(a)p(b|a)p(c|b)p(d|c)$$

which is equivalent to (U_1, \dots, U_{k-1}) are independant of (U_{k+1}, \dots, U_n) when conditioned on U_k for any k .

Theorem A.1. *The reverse of a MC is a MC*

B Stochastic processes

A stochastic process is a collection $U_1, U_2 \dots U_n$ of RVs each taking values in \mathcal{U} . It is described by its joint probability

$$p(u^n) = P(U_1 \dots U_n = u_1 \dots u_n) = P(U^n = u^n)$$

Definition B.1 (Stationary stochastic process). *A process U_1, U_2, \dots is called stationary if for every n and k and $u_1 \dots u_n$, we have*

$$p(u^n) = p(U_1 \dots U_n = u_1 \dots u_n) = p(U_{1+k} \dots U_{n+k} = u_1 \dots u_n)$$

In other words, the process is time shift invariant.