

Information Theory

Problem Set 04 - Symbol Codes

Luís Felipe Ramos Ferreira

lframos_ferreira@outlook.com

1. (a) A (binary) symbol code for an ensemble, denoted by C , is a function that maps the outcomes of the ensemble to a set of binary strings. In particular, this set of strings is a subset of $\{0, 1\}^+$, which denotes the set of all binary strings of non zero length. The extended code for the ensemble, denoted by C^+ , is a function from \mathcal{A}_X^+ to $\{0, 1\}^+$. More precisely, it represents the concatenation of the codewords of an ordered set of outcomes from the ensemble.
- (b) A symbol code is uniquely decodeable when no element is mapped to the same codeword. It is easy to see that is true based on the pigeon-hole principle. More formally, a code $C(x)$ is uniquely decodeable if, under the extended code C^+ , we have:

$$\forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}_X^+, x \neq y \Rightarrow c^+(x) \neq c^+(y)$$

A symbol code is prefix-free if no codeword is a prefix of any other codeword, as stated by McKay [1].

- (c) The Kraft inequality says that, for any uniquely decodeable code $C(x)$ over the alphabet $\{0, 1\}$, the length l_i of the codewords must satisfy:

$$\sum_{i=1}^I 2^{-l_i} \leq 1$$

, where $I = |\mathcal{A}_X|$. Kraft and McMillan proved the intrinsic relation between the Kraft inequality and prefix codes. In general, a set of codeword lengths satisfies the Kraft inequality if and only if there exists a prefix code with the given lengths. So they are two complete tied concepts.

- (d) The source coding theorem for symbol codes states that for an ensemble X , there is a prefix code C whose expected length $L(C, X)$ satisfies the following inequality:

$$H(X) \leq L(C, X) \leq H(X) + 1$$

, where $H(X)$ denotes the entropy of the ensemble X . So, at a high level, the optimal prefix code for the ensemble has an expected length

very close to the entropy of the ensemble. Such a prefix code is the best way to compress the outcomes of the ensemble X in a binary encoding, i. e. the entropy of the ensemble is the limit for the amount of bits per symbol of a prefix free encoding. Also, one can always use a prefix free encoding and achieve a result with at most $H(X) + 1$ bits per symbol.

2. No, it is not uniquely decodeable, since there are codewords that are prefixer of others. The string 111111, for example, could represent three uses of the code 111 or two uses of the code 111.
3. Yes, it is, since it is prefix free.
4. Handmade exercise.
 - (a) First part

(/ /)

$X^2 = \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$

$$H(X^2) = \sum_{i \in X^2} p_i \log_2 \frac{1}{p_i} = (0,9)^2 \log_2 \frac{1}{(0,9)^2} + 0,9 \cdot 0,1 \log_2 \frac{1}{0,9 \cdot 0,1} \cdot 2 + (0,1)^2 \log_2 \frac{1}{(0,1)^2}$$

$$H(X^2) \approx 0,938$$

■ Huffman

				Codes
00 - 0,81	0,81	0,81	0	00 - 0
01 - 0,09	0,09	0,19	1	01 - 10
10 - 0,09	0,1			10 - 110
11 - 0,01				11 - 111

$$L(C, X^2) = \sum p_i \cdot l_i = 0,81 \cdot 1 + 0,09 \cdot 2 + 0,09 \cdot 3 + 0,01 \cdot 3 = 1,29$$

For X^2 , the Entropy is 0,938 and the expected length of the Huffman code is 1,29.

$X^3 = \{000, 001, 010, 011, 100, 101, 110, 111\}$

$$H(X^3) = \sum_{i \in X^3} p_i \log_2 \frac{1}{p_i} \approx 1,4069$$

Codes

000 - 1	100 - 110
001 - 100	101 - 11101
010 - 101	110 - 11110
011 - 11100	111 - 11111

■ Huffman

000 - 0,729			
001 - 0,081	0	0,162	0
010 - 0,081			0,271
011 - 0,009	0		
100 - 0,081	0,018	0	0,109
101 - 0,009		0,028	
110 - 0,009	0,01		
111 - 0,001			

$$L(C, X^3) = \sum p_i \cdot l_i \approx 1,598$$

(b) Second part

$$X^2 = \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$$

$$H(X^2) = \sum_{i \in X^2} p_i \log \frac{1}{p_i} = \underbrace{(0.6)^2 \log \frac{1}{(0.6)^2}}_{0.6^2} + 2 \underbrace{(0.6 \cdot 0.4 \log \frac{1}{0.6 \cdot 0.4})}_{0.6 \cdot 0.4} + \underbrace{(0.4)^2 \log \frac{1}{(0.4)^2}}_{(0.4)^2}$$

$$H(X^2) \approx 1.941$$

■ Huffman

	0	1	Codes
00 - 0.36			00 - 00
01 - 0.24	1	0.60 - 0	01 - 01
10 - 0.24	0	0.40 - 1	10 - 10
11 - 0.16			11 - 11

$$L(X^2) = \sum l_i p_i = 0.36 \cdot 2 + 0.24 \cdot 2 + 0.24 \cdot 2 + 0.16 \cdot 2 = 2$$

5. We know that Huffman codes are optimal for symbol codes. We will show that the following probability distribution S give *two* different optimal codes that assing different lengths to the symbols.

$$S = \{1/6, 1/6, 1/3, 1/3\}$$

■ Huffman 1

	0	1/3	0	2/3	1	Codes
a: 1/6						a: 000
b: 1/6	1					b: 001
c: 1/3			1			c: 01
d: 1/3				1		d: 1

■ Huffman 2

	0	1/3	0	2/3	1	Codes
a: 1/6						a: 00
b: 1/6	1		1/3			b: 01
c: 1/3		0	2/3		1	c: 10
d: 1/3				1		d: 11

This happens because in the second step there is more than one option to choose to create de Huffman encoding.

6. To play the **twenty questions** optimally, it is necessary to find a set of binary questions that guarantees you to eliminate half or as close as

possible to half of the current options for the answer. This ensures the number of questions to be asked to be always of the order of $\log N$, where N is the number of elements in the universe. To find such set of questions, several approaches can be made, given the properties of the elements of the universe. One of them is to find some kind of order in the set of elements of the universe. With such an ordering, one can apply a binary search algorithm to find the desired object.

But why is this the optimal strategy? Because it ENSURES the correct guess will be made in an order of N of the number of possible objects in the universe. Suppose you ask a specific question like: "is the object A?". You could be lucky and get it right on the first try, but the probability of this happening is very low. Particularly, the larger N is, the lower the probability you would win on the first 20 rounds of questions. With the previous mentioned approach, luck doesn't matter, you will ALWAYS get to the answer in an order of $\log N$ questions, and that's why it is the optimal solution to the game.

References

- [1] David J. C. MacKay. *Information Theory, Inference and Learning Algorithms*. 7th edition, 2005.