

1. **Entropy (full) Chain Rule.**

Let $(X_1, \dots, X_k) \sim P_{X_1, \dots, X_k}$. Show that:

(a) If (X_1, \dots, X_k) is discrete, then its Shannon entropy decomposes as

$$H(X_1, \dots, X_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k H(X_i \mid X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})$$

where $H(X_1 \mid X_0) = H(X_1)$.

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned} H(X_1, \dots, X_k) &:= \mathbb{E}_P \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_1, \dots, X_k}(X_1, \dots, X_k)} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_1} P_{X_2|X_1} P_{X_3|X_2, X_1} \dots P_{X_i|X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}} \dots P_{X_k|X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}}} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_1}} \right) + \log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_2|X_1}} \right) + \dots + \log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_k|X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}}} \right) \right] \\ &= H(X_1 \mid X_0) + H(X_2 \mid X_1, X_2) + \dots + H(X_k \mid X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k H(X_i \mid X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}) \end{aligned}$$

■

(b) If (X_1, \dots, X_k) is jointly continuous, then its differential entropy decomposes as

$$h(X_1, \dots, X_k) = h(X_k) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} h(X_{k-i} \mid X_k, \dots, X_{k-i+1}).$$

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned}
 h(X_1, \dots, X_k) &:= \mathbb{E}_P \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_1, \dots, X_k}(X_1, \dots, X_k)} \right) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_P \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_k} P_{X_{k-1}|X_k} P_{X_{k-2}|X_k, X_{k-1}} \dots P_{X_{k-i}|X_k, \dots, X_{k-i+1}} \dots P_{X_1|X_k, \dots, X_2}} \right) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}_P \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_k}} \right) + \log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_{k-1}|X_k}} \right) + \dots + \log \left(\frac{1}{P_{X_1|X_k, \dots, X_2}} \right) \right] \\
 &= h(X_k) + h(X_{k-1} | X_k) + \dots + H(X_1 | X_k, \dots, X_2) \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^k H(X_i | X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})
 \end{aligned}$$

■

2. Properties of Mutual Information.

Let $(X, Y, Z) \sim P_{X,Y,Z} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z})$. Establish the following relations:

(a) KL Divergence Chain Rule: For any $Q_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, we have

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P_{X,Y} \| Q_{X,Y}) = D_{\text{KL}}(P_X \| Q_X) + D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Y|X} \| Q_{Y|X} | P_X)$$

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_{\text{KL}}(P_{X,Y} \| Q_{X,Y}) &= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{XY}} \left[\frac{dP_{XY}}{dQ_{XY}} \log \frac{dP_{XY}}{dQ_{XY}} \right] \\
 &= \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \frac{dP_{XY}}{dQ_{XY}} \log \frac{dP_{XY}}{dQ_{XY}} dQ_{XY} \\
 &= dP_{XY} \log \frac{dP_{XY}}{dQ_{XY}} \\
 &= dP_{Y|X} dP_X \log \frac{dP_{Y|X} dP_X}{dQ_{Y|X} dQ_X} \\
 &= dP_{Y|X} dP_X \log \left(\frac{P_X}{Q_X} \right) - dP_{Y|X} dP_X \log \left(\frac{dP_{Y|X}}{dQ_{Y|X}} \right) \\
 &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_X \| Q_X) + D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Y|X} \| Q_{Y|X} | P_X)
 \end{aligned}$$

■

- (b) Relation to Conditional KL Divergence: $I(X; Y) = D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Y|X} \| Q_{Y|X} | P_X)$, where $P_{X,Y} = P_X P_{Y|X}$ and P_Y is the Y -marginal.

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned} I(X; Y) &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XY} \| P_X \times P_Y) \\ &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_X P_{Y|X} \| P_X \times P_Y) \\ &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_X \| P_X) + D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Y|X} \| P_Y | P_X) \\ &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Y|X} \| P_Y | P_X) \end{aligned}$$

■

- (c) Symmetry: $I(X; Y) = I(Y; X)$.

Solution. We apply the data processing inequality in both directions. Let $f(x, y) = (y, x)$ be our transition kernel. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XY} \| P_X \times P_Y) &\leq D_{\text{KL}}(P_{YX} \| P_Y \times P_X) \\ D_{\text{KL}}(P_{YX} \| P_Y \times P_X) &\leq D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XY} \| P_X \times P_Y) \\ \rightarrow D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XY} \| P_X \times P_Y) &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_{YX} \| P_Y \times P_X) \end{aligned}$$

■

- (d) More Data \implies More Information: $I(X; Y) \leq I(X; Y, Z)$.

Solution. First we expand $I(X; Y, Z)$.

$$\begin{aligned} I(X; Y, Z) &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XYZ} \| P_X \times P_{YZ}) \\ &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_{YZ|X} \| P_{YZ} | P_X) \\ &= \int P_X P_{Y|X} P_{Z|XY} \log \left(\frac{P_{Y|X} P_{Z|XY}}{P_Y P_{Z|Y}} \right) \\ &= \int P_X P_{Y|X} P_{Z|XY} \left[\log \left(\frac{P_{Y|X}}{P_Y} \right) + \log \left(\frac{P_{Z|XY}}{P_{Z|Y}} \right) \right] \\ &= \int P_X P_{Y|X} P_{Z|XY} \log \frac{P_{Y|X}}{P_Y} + \int P_X P_{Y|X} P_{Z|XY} \log \frac{P_{Z|XY}}{P_{Z|Y}} \\ &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Y|X} \| P_Y | P_X) + D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Z|XY} \| P_{Z|Y} | P_{XY}) \\ &\geq D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Y|X} \| P_Y | P_X) \\ &= I(X; Y) \end{aligned}$$

Note: Letting $f(x, y, z) = (x, y)$ and using data processing inequality also suffices for the proof and avoids the mess that is above. ■

- (e) Mutual Information and Functions: $I(X; Y) \geq I(X; f(Y))$ for any deterministic function f . Furthermore, if f is continuous and one-to-one, then

$$I(X; f(X)) = \begin{cases} H(X), & \text{if } X \text{ is discrete} \\ \infty, & \text{if } X \text{ is continuous} \end{cases}.$$

Solution.

$$I(X; Y) = D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XY} \| P_X \times P_Y)$$

Using DPI for the kl divergence, with the transition kernel that maps Y to $f(Y)$, we have $D_{\text{KL}}(P_{XY} \| P_X \times P_Y) \geq D_{\text{KL}}(P_{Xf(Y)} \| P_X \times P_{f(Y)}) = I(X; f(Y))$ which gives us the desired result of $I(X; Y) \geq I(X; f(Y))$

Furthermore, if f is continuous and one-to-one then for a discrete X we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(X; f(X)) &= D_{\text{KL}}(P_{X|f(X)} \| P_X | P_{f(X)}) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_X(x) \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \delta_X(x') \frac{\log(\delta_X(x'))}{p_X(x')} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_X(x) \log \frac{1}{p_X(x)} = H(X). \end{aligned}$$

If X is instead continuous we show that $P_{Xf(X)} \not\ll P_X \times P_{f(X)}$. Let $\nabla = \{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

$$P_{Xf(X)}(\nabla) = \int_{\nabla} dP_{Xf(X)} = \int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} dP_X(x) \int_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} d\delta_X(x') = 1 > 0$$

However

$$P_X \times P_{f(X)}(\nabla) = \int_{\nabla} dP_X \times P_{f(X)}(s, x') = 0$$

which will cause the kl divergence to blow up to infinity. ■

3. Entropy of a Sum.

Let $(X, Y) \sim P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$, where $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_s\}$, and define $Z = X + Y$.

- (a) Show that $\max\{H(X), H(Y)\} \leq H(Z) \leq H(X) + H(Y)$ when X is independent of Y .

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned} H(Z) &= H(X + Y) \leq H(X + Y, Y) && \text{follows from the chain rule} \\ &= H(X) + H(X + Y \mid Y) \\ &= H(X) + H(Y \mid X) && \text{see part b} \\ &\leq H(X) + H(Y) \end{aligned}$$

If X and Y are independent, we have

$$H(Z) \geq H(Z|X) \quad (1)$$

$$= H(Y|X) \quad \text{see part b} \quad (2)$$

$$= H(Y) \quad \text{since } Y \text{ and } X \text{ are independent} \quad (3)$$

Similarly, we have $H(Z) \geq H(X)$, which gives us $\max(H(Y), H(X)) \leq H(Z)$ ■

- (b) Show that $H(Z | X) = H(Y | X)$. Argue that if (X, Y) are independent, then $H(Y) \leq H(Z)$ and $H(X) \leq H(Z)$. Thus the summation of *independent* random variables increases uncertainty.

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned} H(Z | X) &:= \mathbb{E}_{XZ} \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{P_{Z|X}} \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Z = x + y, X = x) \log \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(Z = x + y | X = x)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}(Y = y, X = x) \log \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(Y = y | X = x)} \\ &= H(Y|X) \end{aligned}$$

■

- (c) Give an example of dependent random variables for which $H(X) > H(Z)$ and $H(Y) > H(Z)$.

Solution. Consider $X = \text{Ber}(\frac{1}{2})$, and $Y = -X$. That will give us $Z = 0$ (the constant RV). We get

$$1 = H(X) = H(Y) > H(Z) = 0$$

■

4. Information Inequalities.

Let $(X, Y, Z) \sim P_{X,Y,Z} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z})$. Prove the following inequalities and find (necessary and sufficient) conditions for equality.

- (a) $H(X, Y | Z) \geq H(X | Z)$.

Solution.

$$\begin{aligned}
 H(X, Y | Z) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{1}{P_{XY|Z}} \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{1}{P_{X|Z} P_{Y|XZ}} \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{1}{P_{X|Z}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{1}{P_{Y|XZ}} \right] \\
 &= H(X | Z) + H(Y | X, Z) \geq H(X | Z).
 \end{aligned}$$

From the above we see that equality holds when Y is completely determined once given X, Z . ■

(b) $I(X, Y; Z) \geq I(X; Z)$.

Solution. This directly follows from 2d – more data leads to more information. The equality condition is if $H(X|Y, Z) = H(X|Z)$. In other words, given Z , Y does not provide more information about X . ■

(c) $H(X, Y, Z) - H(X, Y) \leq H(X, Z) - H(X)$.

Solution. Use the decompositions

$$\begin{aligned}
 H(X, Y, Z) &= H(X, Y) + H(Z | X, Y) \rightarrow H(X, Y, Z) - H(X, Y) = H(Z | X, Y) \\
 H(X, Z) &= H(X) + H(Z | X) \rightarrow H(X, Z) - H(X) = H(Z | X)
 \end{aligned}$$

We are left to prove $H(Z | X, Y) \leq H(Z | X)$. This follows from the property that conditioning decreases entropy.

The condition for equality thus becomes Z being conditionally independent of Y given X . ■

(d) $I(X; Z | Y) \geq I(Z; Y | X) - I(Z; Y) + I(X; Z)$.

Solution. We will start by expanding both sides.

$$LHS = H(Z|Y) - H(Z|X, Y)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 RHS &= H(Z|X) - H(Z|X, Y) - H(Z) + H(Z|Y) + H(Z) - H(Z|X) \\
 &= H(Z|Y) - H(Z|X, Y)
 \end{aligned}$$

So we have $LHS = RHS$, and the inequality holds as a strict equality *always* ■

5. Shannon Entropy on Infinite Alphabets.

Let $X \sim P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$.

(a) Prove that $H(P) \leq \log(\frac{\pi^2}{6}) + 2\mathbb{E}_P[\log(X)]$.

Solution. We use the fact that $q(n) = \frac{6}{\pi^2 n^2}$ is a valid PMF on \mathbb{N} . This is in part due to the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6} = \zeta(2)$. That result could also be obtained from Euler's infinite product for $\sin(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} H(P) &= \mathbb{E}_P \left[\log \frac{1}{p(\mathbb{N})} \right] \\ &= \sum_x P(X=x) \log \frac{1}{P(X=x)} = - \sum_x P(X=x) \log P(X=x) \end{aligned}$$

Consider $D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) = \sum p(x) \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} = \sum p(x)(\log p(x) - \log q(x))$. Note we know that divergences are non-negative, so $0 \leq D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q)$, which gives us

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum p(x) \log p(x) &\leq - \sum p(x) \log q(x) \\ &= - \sum p(x) \log \frac{6}{\pi^2 x^2} \\ &= \log\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6}\right) + 2 \sum p(x) \log x \\ &= \log\left(\frac{\pi^2}{6}\right) + 2\mathbb{E}_P[\log X] \end{aligned}$$

■

(b) Provide an example of a distribution of P such that $H(P) = \infty$.

Solution. Given the above, a distribution that has infinite shannon entropy must have $\mathbb{E}_P[\log X] = \infty$. Let $p(n) = \frac{c}{n \log^2 n}$ (for $n \geq 2$ and 0 otherwise) where c is some normalization constant. We know that the sum $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \log^2 n}$ converges from ¹ so it is a valid pmf.

Note that $\mathbb{E}_P[\log X] = \sum p(x) \log x = \frac{\log x}{x \log^2 x} = \frac{1}{x \log x}$ which diverges. Now we need to confirm that the shannon entropy also diverges.

$$\begin{aligned} H(P) &= \sum -p(x) \log p(x) \\ &= \sum p(x) \log(x \log^2(x)) \\ &= \sum p(x) \log x + \sum p(x) \log^2 x \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[\log X] + \sum p(x) \log^2 x \quad \text{note that the first term diverges} \\ &= \infty \end{aligned}$$

■

¹<https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/574503/infinite-series-sum-n-2-infty-frac{1}{n \log n}>

6. Convexity/Concavity of Mutual Information.

For $(X, Y) \sim P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ the mutual information $I(X; Y)$ is a functional of $P_{X,Y}$. With the decomposition $P_{X,Y} = P_X P_{Y|X}$, the mutual information can be equivalently represented as a functional of the pair $(P_X, P_{Y|X})$. In this question we focus on the latter representation, and henceforth use the notation $I(P_X, P_{Y|X})$ in place of $I(X; Y)$. Prove the following:

- (a) For fixed P_X , $I(P_X, P_{Y|X})$ is convex in $P_{Y|X}$.

Solution. Note that $I(P_X; P_{Y|X}) = D_{\text{KL}}(P_Y \| P_{Y|X} | P_X)$. Since P_X is fixed, we use the convexity of the KL Divergence to get that $D_{\text{KL}}(P_Y \| P_{Y|X} | P_X)$ is convex in P_Y and $P_{Y|X}$ which gives us the desire result that $I(P_X; P_{Y|X})$ is convex in $P_{Y|X}$ ■

- (b) For fixed $P_{Y|X}$, $I(P_X, P_{Y|X})$ is concave in P_X .

Solution.

- i. We have $X = P_X^{(1)} \mathbb{P}(\Theta = 1) + P_X^{(2)} \mathbb{P}(\Theta = 2) = \alpha P_X^{(1)} + (1 - \alpha) P_X^{(2)}$
- ii. Note that $\mathbb{P}_{Y|X}(\cdot | X) = \mathbb{P}_{Y|X}(\cdot | X, \Theta)$ since given a value $X = x$, the value of Θ only affects the distribution of X , but since X is given, then $\mathbb{P}(X = x | X = x, \Theta) = \mathbb{P}(X = x | X = x)$ as having the value of Θ would not alter the probability of X since x is given, which imply the Markov property
- iii. Using the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(X; Y) &= H(Y) - H(Y|X) \\ &\geq H(Y|\Theta) - H(Y|X) && \text{conditioning decrease entropy} \\ &= H(Y|\Theta) - H(Y|X, \Theta) && \text{follows from above} \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} LHS &= I(\alpha P_X^{(1)} + (1 - \alpha) P_X^{(2)}; P_{Y|X}) \\ &\geq I(X; Y|\Theta) \\ &= p(\Theta = 1) I(P_X^{(1)}; P_{Y|X}) + p(\Theta = 2) I(P_X^{(2)}; P_{Y|X}) \\ &= \alpha I(P_X^{(1)}; P_{Y|X}) + (1 - \alpha) I(P_X^{(2)}; P_{Y|X}) \end{aligned}$$

which is the convexity result that we want. ■

7. Mutual Information of Sums.

Let Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, \dots be an i.i.d sequence of $\text{Ber}(\frac{1}{2})$ random variables. Define

$$X_i := \sum_{j=1}^i Z_j, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Find $I(X_1; X_2, \dots, X_n)$.

Solution. We start by first noting that these variables form a markov chain $\mathbb{P}(X_i|X_{i-1}) = \mathbb{P}(X_i|X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1)$. Using this, we show that $\mathbb{P}(X_1|X_2) = \mathbb{P}(X_1|X_2, \dots, X_n)$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_1|X_2, \dots, X_n) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_n, \dots, X_2|X_1)\mathbb{P}(X_1)}{\mathbb{P}(X_n, \dots, X_2)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_n, \dots, X_3|X_2, X_1)\mathbb{P}(X_2|X_1)\mathbb{P}(X_1)}{\mathbb{P}(X_n, \dots, X_3|X_2)\mathbb{P}(X_2)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_n, \dots, X_3|X_2)\mathbb{P}(X_2|X_1)\mathbb{P}(X_1)}{\mathbb{P}(X_n, \dots, X_3|X_2)\mathbb{P}(X_2)} \quad \text{using the markov property} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_2|X_1)}{\mathbb{P}(X_2)}\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $I(X_1; X_2, \dots, X_n) = I(X_1; X_2)$, and we use

$$I(X_1; X_2) = H(X_1) - H(X_1|X_2)$$

We know that $H(X_1) = 1$ since it's $Ber(\frac{1}{2})$. For $H(X_1|X_2)$, we have

$$P(X_1 = 0|X_2 = 0) = P(X_1 = 1|X_2 = 2) = 1$$

and

$$P(X_1 = 1|X_2 = 0) = P(X_1 = 0|X_2 = 2) = 0,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}H(X_1|X_2) &= P(X_1 = 1|X_2 = 1) \log \frac{1}{P(X_1 = 1|X_2 = 1)} + P(X_1 = 0|X_2 = 1) \log \frac{1}{P(X_1 = 0|X_2 = 1)} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\end{aligned}$$

Finally, giving us $I(X_1; X_2, \dots, X_n) = I(X_1; X_2) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$

■

8. KL Divergence and L^2 Norm.

Let $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}([0, 1])$ with PDFs p and q respectively. Assume that

$$0 < c_1 \leq p(x), q(x) < c_2 < \infty \quad \forall x \in [0, 1].$$

Show that the KL divergence is equivalent to the L_2 distance between the two PDFs. That is, $\exists k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that

$$k_1 \int (p(x) - q(x))^2 dx \leq D_{\text{KL}}(P||Q) \leq k_2 \int (p(x) - q(x))^2 dx$$

Solution. For the lower bound, we utilize the Pinsker's inequality that we proved on the previous homework

$$\frac{1}{2}\|P - Q\|^2 \leq D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q)$$

Now we need to show $\exists k_1$ s.t. $k_1 \int (p(x) - q(x))^2 dx \leq \frac{1}{2}(\int |p(x) - q(x)| dx)^2$. First, note that $|p(x) - q(x)| \leq c_2 - c_1$, so we get

$$\begin{aligned} (p(x) - q(x))^2 &= |p(x) - q(x)| |p(x) - q(x)| \\ &\leq |p(x) - q(x)| (c_2 - c_1) \end{aligned}$$

and since $\frac{(p(x)-q(x))^2}{c_2-c_1} \leq |p(x) - q(x)|$, we get

$$\frac{\int (p(x) - q(x))^2 dx}{c_2 - c_1} \leq \int |p(x) - q(x)| dx$$

Now we need to consider squaring the integral on the right hand side.

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int |p(x) - q(x)| dx \right)^2 &= \left(\int |p(x) - q(x)| dx \right) \left(\int |p(x) - q(x)| dx \right) \\ &\leq \left(\int |p(x) - q(x)| dx \right) \int_0^1 (c_2 - c_1) dx \\ &= \left(\int |p(x) - q(x)| dx \right) (c_2 - c_1) \end{aligned}$$

So finally, we have

$$\frac{\int (p(x) - q(x))^2 dx}{2(c_2 - c_1)^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|P - Q\|^2 \leq D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q)$$

so $k_1 = \frac{1}{2(c_2 - c_1)^2}$ gives us the lower bound that we want.

For the upper bound we utilize the Taylor expansion of the logarithm.³ We note that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) &= \int p(x) \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} dx \\ &= \int p(x) \log p(x) - p(x) \log q(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

²This is TV distance

³<https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/2614201/on-the-equivalence-between-the-kullback-leiber-divergence-and-the-l2-distance?answertab=oldest#tab-top>

and then express $\log q(x)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\log q(x) &= \log(q(x) - p(x) + p(x)) \\ &= \log \left(p(x) \left(\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] + 1 \right) \right) \\ &= \log p(x) + \log \left(\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] + 1 \right).\end{aligned}$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) &= \int p(x) \log p(x) - p(x) \left(\log p(x) + \log \left(\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] + 1 \right) \right) dx \\ &= \int -p(x) \log \left(\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] + 1 \right) dx\end{aligned}$$

We now Taylor series expand the logarithm around 1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\log \left(\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] + 1 \right) &= \left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right]^2 \int_1^{\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}} \frac{1}{t^2} dt \\ &= \left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right]^2 \left(\frac{\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right]}{\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right]} \right) \\ &= \left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{q(x) - p(x)}{p(x)} \right)^2 \left(\frac{q(x) - p(x)}{q(x)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Plugging the above expansion into the KL-divergence yields

$$\begin{aligned}D_{\text{KL}}(P\|Q) &= \int -p(x) \left(\left[\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{q(x) - p(x)}{p(x)} \right)^2 \left(\frac{q(x) - p(x)}{q(x)} \right) \right) dx \\ &= \int p(x) - q(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int (q(x) - p(x))^2 \left[\frac{1}{p(x)} - \frac{1}{q(x)} \right] dx \\ &= 0 + \frac{1}{2} \int (q(x) - p(x))^2 \left[\frac{1}{p(x)} - \frac{1}{q(x)} \right] dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int (q(x) - p(x))^2 \left[\frac{1}{c_1} - \frac{1}{c_2} \right] dx \\ &= \frac{c_2 - c_1}{2c_1c_2} \int (q(x) - p(x))^2 dx\end{aligned}$$

giving us the desired $k_2 = \frac{c_2 - c_1}{2c_1c_2}$ as our upper bound constant. ■