

# Entropy

## Empirical Distribution:

$$\hat{p}_x = \frac{\#\{i : X_i = x\}}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{X_i = x\}$$

## Stirling's Approximation:

$$k! \approx k^k e^{-k} \sqrt{2\pi k}$$

## Shannon Entropy: For $p$ a distribution,

$$H(p) = - \sum_x p(x) \log p(x)$$

with

- $H(X, Y) = H(X) + H(Y)$  if  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent

## Maximum Entropy Principle:

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i T_i(x) \right)$$

for normalizing constant  $Z$  and parameters  $\lambda_{i=1:k}$  is the distribution that maximizes  $H(p)$  subject to

$$\begin{cases} \sum p_x \mathcal{E}_1(x) = \theta_1 \\ \sum p_x \mathcal{E}_2(x) = \theta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \sum p_x \mathcal{E}_k(x) = \theta_k \\ \sum p_x = 1 \end{cases}$$

**Large Deviation Principle:** Let  $p$  be a distribution on  $\{1, \dots, s\}$  and  $\mathcal{E} : \{1, \dots, s\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If  $X_1, \dots, X_n \stackrel{\text{extiid}}{\sim} p$  satisfy

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}(X_i) = \theta$$

then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}} \mathcal{E}(X) = \sum_{x=1}^s \hat{p}_x \mathcal{E}(x) = \theta$$

**KL Divergence:** For  $p, q$  two distributions,

$$D(q \parallel p) = \sum_{x=1}^s q_x \log \frac{q_x}{p_x}$$

satisfies

1.  $D(q \parallel p) \geq 0$
2.  $D(q \parallel p) = 0 \iff q = p$

**Convexity:**  $f$  is convex if  $\forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$f(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)f(y)$$

equivalently, if  $f''(x) \geq 0$

**Jensen's Inequality:** For  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  convex,  $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \geq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$

**Sanov's Theorem:** Let  $B$  be an open subset of the set of function on  $\{1, \dots, s\}$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(\hat{p} \in B) = - \inf_{q \in B} D(q \parallel p)$$

where  $\hat{q}$  is the empirical distribution of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ .

Further, if  $p^* = \arg \min_{q \in B} D(q \parallel p)$  is unique, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\|\hat{p} - p^*\| > \varepsilon \mid \hat{p} \in B) = 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

for any metric  $\|\cdot\|$  on the space of distributions.

**Exponential Family:** Distributions of the form

$$p(x; \lambda) = \frac{1}{Z(\lambda)} \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i T_i(x) \right)$$

comprise an exponential family with sufficient statistics  $T_i(x)$  and natural parameters  $\lambda_i$  satisfying

1.  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_k} \log Z_\lambda = \mathbb{E}_\lambda[T_k(x)]$
2.  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda_k \partial \lambda_j} \log Z_\lambda = \text{Cov}_\lambda(T_k(x), T_j(x))$
3.  $\log Z_\lambda$  is convex in  $\lambda$  and strictly convex unless the conditions  $\{E_{p^*}[T_k(x)] = \theta_k\}_{k=1}^c$  are redundant
4.  $\log Z_\lambda - \sum_{k=1}^c \lambda_k \theta_k$  is strictly convex and is minimized when  $\mathbb{E}_\lambda[T_k(x)] = \theta_k$

## Source Coding

**Prefix code:** A code  $C : \{1, \dots, t\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$  is a prefix code if  $C(x)$  is not a prefix of  $C(y)$  for any  $x \neq y$ .

**Kraft-McMillan:**

1. For all prefix codes  $C$ ,

$$\sum_{x=1}^t 2^{-|C(x)|} \leq 1$$

2. For any code lengths  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t$  satisfying

$$\sum_{x=1}^t 2^{-\ell_x} \leq 1$$

there exists a prefix code  $C$  such that  $|C(x)| = \ell_x$  for all  $x = 1 : t$ .

**Theorem:** Let  $X \sim p$ . For the optimal  $C^* = \arg \min_C \text{prefix } \mathbb{E}_p |C(x)|$ ,

$$H(p) \leq \mathbb{E}_p |C^*(X)| \leq H(p) + 1$$

**Block Coding:** Further, for  $n$  fixed,

$$H(p) \leq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_p |C_n^*(X_{1:n})| \leq H(p) + \frac{1}{n}$$

so by coding large enough blocks, we can get arbitrarily close to  $H(p)$  bits/symbol.

## Statistical Learning

**Unbiased Estimator:** Suppose  $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is an estimator of  $\theta$ . We say  $\hat{\theta}$  is unbiased if  $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}] = \theta$

**Consistency:**  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is consistent if  $\hat{\theta}_n \rightarrow \theta$  in some sense.

- $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta$  if  $\mathbb{P}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\theta}_n = \theta) = 1$
- $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \theta$  if  $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta| > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$
- $\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{L^2} \theta$  if  $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta\|^2] \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

**Mean Square Error (MSE):**  $\text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_n - \theta]^2 = \text{Var}(\hat{\theta}) + (\mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_n] - \theta)^2$

**Kensity Density Estimation:** For a function  $k$  satisfying  $k \geq 0, \int k = 1, \text{Var}[k] = 1$ , we approximate a discrete density  $f$  by the continuous density

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_{n,w}(x, X_1, \dots, X_n) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n k_w(x - X_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{k(x/w)}{w} \end{aligned}$$

since for  $\text{MSE} = \text{bias}^2 + \text{variance}$ , we have

- bias  $\searrow$  and variance  $\nearrow$  as  $w \rightarrow 0$
- bias  $\nearrow$  and variance  $\searrow$  as  $w \rightarrow \infty$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_{n,w}(x)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(t) k_w(x - t) dt = (f \star k_w)(x)$$

**Integrated Square Error (ISE):**

$$\text{ISE} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{f}_n(x, X_1, \dots, X_n) - f(x)|^2 dx$$

**Mean Integrated Square Error (MISE):**

$$\text{MISE} = \mathbb{E}[\text{ISE}] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} |\hat{f}_n(x, X_1, \dots, X_n)|^2 dx$$

**Theorem:** For  $f$  smooth and  $k$  a kernel density, as  $w \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\text{MISE}_{n,w} = \alpha w^4 + \frac{\beta}{nw} + \text{error}$$

for  $\alpha, \beta$  constants.

**Silverman's Rule of Thumb:** The optimal bandwidth  $w^* \propto n^{-1/5}$ .

**Cross-validation Estimator:** With

$$\hat{f}_{n-1,w}^{(i)}(X_i) = \hat{f}_{n-1,w}(x, X_1 \dots X_{i-1}, X_{i+1} \dots X_n)$$

define

$$I = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{f}_{n-1,w}^{(i)}(X_i)$$

**Theorem (Stone 1984):** with  $w$  chosen by

$$\arg \min_w \left[ \int \hat{f}_{n,w}(x)^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{f}_{n-1,w}^{(i)}(X_i) \right]$$

we have

$$\text{ISE}(\hat{f}_{\hat{w}_n}, f) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \inf_w \text{ISE}(\hat{f}_{w,n}, f)$$

though the convergence is very slow in high-dimensional spaces.

**Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE):**

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta} &= \arg \max_{\theta} p_{\theta}(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_n = x_n) \\ &= \arg \min_{\theta} D(\hat{p} \parallel p_{\theta}) \end{aligned}$$

**Bayes' Classification Rule:**

$$h^*(x) = \arg \max_c \mathbb{P}(Y = C \mid X = x)$$

$$= \arg \max_c \frac{\pi_c f_c(x)}{\mathbb{P}(X = x)}$$

for  $\pi_i = \mathbb{P}(Y = i)$ ,  $f_i(x) = \mathbb{P}(X = x \mid Y = i)$  the class-conditional densities.

**Neyman-Pearson Classification:** Fix  $t \in (0, \infty)$ . Then

$$h_t(x) = \begin{cases} 2 & \frac{\pi_1 f_1(x)}{\pi_2 f_2(x)} > t \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Remark:** In the case  $t = \pi_1/\pi_2$ , NP is equivalent to Bayes' classification rule (the optimal classifier).

**Theorem:** For  $h$  any classifier, with  $\mathbb{P}(h(X) = 2 \mid Y = 1) \leq \mathbb{P}(h_{NP}(X) = 2 \mid Y = 1)$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(h(X) = 2 \mid Y = 2) \leq \mathbb{P}(h_{NP}(X) = 2 \mid Y = 2)$ .

That is, NP is the classifier which maximizes the detection rate relative to the false alarm rate.

**Naive Bayes':** Assume that  $f_c(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \prod_{i=1}^d f_c(x_i)$ .

**Softmax:** Let  $r_c(x) = \mathbb{P}(Y = c \mid X = x)$ . Then we have linear decision boundaries

$$\log \frac{r_k(x)}{r_1(x)} = \alpha_k + \beta_k x$$

and

$$r_k(x) = \frac{e^{\alpha_k + \beta_k x}}{1 + \sum_{k=2}^s e^{\alpha_k + \beta_k x}}$$

where we find  $\alpha_k, \beta_k$  by MLE.

**k-Nearest Neighbors:** Let  $D_k(x)$  be the closed ball at  $x$  with radius  $R_k(x)$ , the smallest radius that contains  $k$  points. Then

$$\hat{r}_c(x) = \frac{\#\{i : X_i \in D_k(x), Y_i = c\}}{k}$$

In this case,

$$\hat{r}_c(x) \rightarrow r_c(x)$$

i.e., the estimator is consistent.

**Support Vector Machine:** For any collection of data  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ , we can find a transformation  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d'}$  with  $d' \gg d$ , such that the  $d'$ -dimensional hyperplane  $\alpha + \beta x_i$  separates the data.

Our goal then is to find the **maximum margin classifier**

$$h(x) = \text{sign}(\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta}x)$$

where

$$(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) = \arg \max_{\alpha, \beta} \min_{i=1:n} \text{dist}(X_i, \{\alpha + \beta x = 0\})$$

for all  $i : (\alpha + \beta x_i) Y_i \geq 0$ .

**Graphical Models**

**Clique:** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph. Then  $C \subseteq V$  is a *clique* if  $\forall i \neq j \in C, (i, j) \in E$ .

**Gibbs Random Field (GRF):**  $\{X_v\}_{v \in V}$  is a GRF with respect to  $G$  if

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{c \text{ cliques in } G} \phi_c(x_c)$$

for some  $\phi_c : \Omega_c \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  clique functions and  $Z$  a partition function.

**Strictly Positive GRF:** If  $\phi_c > 0$  for all  $c$ , then the GRF is *strictly positive*. Equivalently,  $\forall x_1, \dots, x_M, p(x_1, \dots, x_M) > 0$ .

**Markov Chain:** A Markov chain satisfies

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = p(x_1) \prod_{i=2}^n p(x_i \mid x_{i-1})$$

**Proposition (Independence):** Two random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  on a GRF are independent if there exists no paths between them

**Remark:** Independence does not imply there is no path between  $X$  and  $Y$  (even on a minimal graph!)

**Conditioning Theorem:** Let  $A \subseteq V(G)$  be a set of nodes. Then  $(X_v)_{v \in A}$ , conditioned on  $X_{V \setminus A}$ , is a GRF with respect to the subgraph

$$G|_A = (A, \{(i, j) : i, j \in A, i \stackrel{G}{\sim} j\})$$

**Marginalizing Theorem:** Let  $A \subseteq V(G)$  be a set of nodes. Then  $\{X_v\}_{v \in A}$ , marginalized over  $\{X_{V \setminus A}\}$ , is a GRF with respect to the graph  $G' = (A, E')$  where

$$u \stackrel{G'}{\sim} v \iff \begin{cases} u \stackrel{G}{\sim} v \\ \text{exists path from } u \text{ to } v \text{ in } A^c \end{cases}$$

**Markov Random Field (MRF):**  $(X_v)_{v \in G}$  is a Markov Random Field if

$$\mathbb{P}(X_i = x_i \mid X_{i^c} = x_{i^c}) = \mathbb{P}(X_i = x_i \mid x_{N(i)} = x_{N(i)})$$

where  $N(i) = \{j : (i, j) \in E\}$  is the neighborhood of  $i$  in  $G$ .

**Theorem (Hammersley-Clifford):** Assume  $(X_v)$  is strictly positive. Then  $X$  is a GRF iff it is a MRF.

**Dynamic Programming:** To sample from a GRF, we need to know the partition function  $Z$ . We can calculate this by

$$Z = \sum_{x_v} \prod_{c \text{ cliques}} \phi_c(x_c)$$

or by the much faster

1. Sample  $X_1$
2. Sample  $X_2 \mid X_1$
3. Sample  $X_n \mid X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}$ .

according to the visitation schedule that minimizes  $\sum_x |\Omega|^{k_x}$  where  $k_x = \# \text{new neighbors} + 1$  and  $|\Omega|$  is the size of the state space.

**Gibbs Sampling:** Gibbs Sampling provides a cost effective alternative to dynamic programming:

1. Randomly initialize  $X_1^{(0)}, \dots, X_n^{(0)}$
2. Sample a vertex  $i \sim \pi$  where  $\pi$  is any distribution over  $V$
3. Let  $X_i^{(t)} \sim p(x_i^{(t-1)} \mid x_{i^c}^{(t-1)})$  and  $X_{i^c}^{(t)} = X_{i^c}^{(t-1)}$
4. Iterate

**Proposition:** Let  $X^{(0)}, \dots, X^{(N)}$  be a Gibbs sampler and  $q_t$  a distribution on  $X^{(t)}$ . Then

$$D(q_t \parallel p) \leq D(q_{t-1} \parallel p) \quad \forall t$$

**EM Algorithm:** For a general exponential family

$$f(x, y, \lambda) = \frac{1}{Z_\lambda} p(x, y) e^{\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i T_i(x, y)}$$

with observed data  $Y = (y_i)$ , we have log-likelihood

$$\ell(y, \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left( \frac{1}{Z_\lambda} \sum_x p(x, y_i) e^{\sum_j \lambda_j T_j(x, y_j)} \right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_\lambda[T_k(x, y)] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_\lambda[T_k(x, y_i)]$$

hence, we can find  $\hat{\lambda}$  by

1. *E-step:*

$$\hat{T}_k^{(t)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\lambda^{(t)}}[T_k(x, y_i \mid y_i)]$$

2. *M-step:* Find  $\lambda(t+1)$  by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\lambda(t+1)}[T_k(x, y)] = \hat{T}_k^{(t)}$$

**MM Algorithm:** The EM algorithm is a subset of a large class of *MM Algorithms* seeking to maximize  $\ell(\theta)$  given  $A(\theta, \tilde{\theta})$  satisfying

1.  $A(\theta, \tilde{\theta}) \leq \ell(\theta)$
2.  $A(\theta, \theta) = \ell(\theta)$

In this case, we define

$$\theta^{(t+1)} = \arg \max_{\theta} A(\theta, \theta^{(t)})$$

in which case  $\ell(\theta^{(t)}) \leq \ell(\theta^{(t+1)})$