

# Div. from Info. Theory

c) Motivation from odds:

If we want to decide whether given data is from list.  $\mu$  or  $\nu$ :

i) If  $\exists A, B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}}$  s.t.  $\mu(A) > 0$ ,  $\nu(B) > 0$  and  $\mu(B) = \nu(A) = 0$ . Assume sample  $X = (X_1 \dots X_n)$  is from  $\mu$  of size  $n$ . So with probn =  $1 - (1 - \mu(A))^n$  we can observe at least one sample is from  $A$ .  $\Rightarrow$  Make decision that  $X$  is from list.  $\mu$ .

Key:  $1 - (1 - \mu(A))^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$ . So the conclusion can be reached exponentially fast.

ii) If  $\mu \sim \nu$ , i.e.  $\mu \ll \nu$  &  $\nu \ll \mu$ . Then: the decision become uncertain no matter how many samples we know.

Thm. (Khan - Mikosyan)

For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_1^+(\mathcal{X})$ ,  $\nu \ll \mu$ . Then  $\exists Z(x) \in$

$L^1(\mu)$ . s.t.  $z(x) \geq 0$   $\mu$ -a.s.  $\nu(x) = z(x)\mu(x)$

Pf: Consider  $L^2(\frac{1}{2}(\mu+\nu))$ . We see:

$$\|L_\mu(g)\| \leq 2 \|g\|_{L^2(\frac{1}{2}(\mu+\nu))}. \quad \text{So } L_\mu(\cdot) \text{ is}$$

$$\text{BLD on } L^2(\frac{1}{2}(\mu+\nu)) \subset L^2(\mu) \cap L^2(\nu).$$

By Riesz Thm.  $\exists f \in L^2(\frac{1}{2}(\mu+\nu))$ , s.t.

$$\int g d\mu = \int g f d\frac{1}{2}(\mu+\nu). \quad \forall g \in L^2(\frac{1}{2}(\mu+\nu))$$

$$\Rightarrow \int g(2-f) d\mu = \int g f d\nu.$$

Let  $A = \{f \leq 0\}$ . We see that:

$$0 \leq \mu(A) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int I_A (2-f) d\mu = \int I_A f d\nu$$

$$\leq 0 \Rightarrow \mu(A) = 0 \Rightarrow \nu(A) = 0.$$

$$\text{So: } \nu(B) = \int I_B \cdot f(x)/f(x) d\nu$$

$$= \int I_B \frac{2-f}{f} d\mu. \Rightarrow z = \frac{2-f}{f}$$

Let  $A = \{z < 0\}$ . Then:

$$0 \leq \nu(A) = \int I_A \overset{(\mu)}{z} \overset{(\mu)}{d\mu} \leq 0. \Rightarrow \mu(A) = 0.$$

Remark:  $z(x) = \nu/\mu(x)$  is bdd of  $\nu$  w.r.t.  $\mu$ .

$\mu$  is observed data pt.  $x$ .

(2) Kullback-Leibler Div.:

Def: For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^k)$ ,  $\nu \ll \mu$ . KL div. is

$$d_{KL}(\mu \parallel \nu) = \int \left( \log \frac{d\mu}{d\nu}(x) \right) \cdot d\mu(x)$$

Prop: i) If  $\nu \not\ll \mu$ . We set  $d_{KL}(\mu \parallel \nu) = \infty$

ii) If  $\mu \sim \nu$ . We have  $d_{KL}(\mu \parallel \nu)$

$$= \int -\log \left( \frac{d\nu(x)}{d\mu(x)} \right) d\mu(x).$$

Lemma (Jensen inequality)

$f: I \subseteq \mathbb{R}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}'$ . Convex. For  $X$ ,  $f(X) \in L'$ .

$$\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}(f(X)) \geq f(\mathbb{E}(X))$$

Notice if  $f$  is strictly convex. and  $X$

isn't deterministic.  $\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}(f(X)) > f(\mathbb{E}(X))$

Thm. For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^k)$ . Then:  $d_{KL}(\mu \parallel \nu) \geq 0$  and

$$d_{KL}(\mu \parallel \nu) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu = \nu.$$

Prop:  $d_{KL}$  is a divergence but not a metric on  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^k)$ .

Claim: There's no metric  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  on

$\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^k)$ , st.  $d \sim d_{KL}$ .

Pf: It's because  $d_{KL}$  isn't sym:

$$h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \nu) \ll h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \nu) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (\mu_m \downarrow 1)$$

$$\text{But } h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \nu) \ll h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \nu) \equiv \star$$

$$\text{Since } h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \nu) / h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \nu) = \frac{1}{\mu_m} \text{ and}$$

$$\mu \llbracket \nu \not\ll \mu \llbracket \nu.$$

$$\text{Pf: } h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \nu) = \int \left( \log \frac{\mu}{\nu} \right) \frac{\mu}{\nu} d\nu$$

$f(t) = t \log t$  is strictly convex on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ .

$$\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\nu[f(x)] \geq f(\mathbb{E}_\nu[x]) = 0.$$

With "=" holds if  $X = \frac{\mu}{\nu} \equiv \text{const.}$

$$(\text{But } \mu(\mathbb{R}^+) = \text{const.} \cdot \nu(\mathbb{R}^+) = 1 \Rightarrow c=1)$$

Def: For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}^+(\mathbb{R}^+)$ ,  $\mu \sim \nu$ . Jensen-Shannon

$$\text{div. is } h_{JS}(\mu \llbracket \nu) = \frac{1}{2} (h_{KL}(\mu \llbracket \frac{\mu+\nu}{2}) + h_{KL}(\nu \llbracket \frac{\mu+\nu}{2}))$$

Remark:  $h_{JS}$  is also a div. which is of importance in GANs.

# Comparison of Topo.

Next, we want to prove:

$$K_{KL} \Rightarrow K_{TV} \Rightarrow K_{PO} \xRightarrow[\text{set}]{\text{cpt}} K_{W,cs} \Rightarrow \text{weak topo}$$

$K_{TS} \Leftrightarrow$  equiv. in cpt set.

Remark: These relations can help us transit some property (e.g. separability) from one topo. to another topo.

Prop. (Hibbs' Variational principle)

$$X: (\mathbb{R}^k, B_{\mathbb{R}^k}, \mu) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, B_{\mathbb{R}}) \text{ with CHF } \gamma_{x,n}(\alpha)$$

Then:  $\forall \alpha > 0$ . Set  $E_{\alpha}(X) = -\infty$  if  $E_{\alpha}(X_-) = -\infty$ .

$$\gamma_{x,n}(\alpha) = \sup_{v \in M_1(\mathbb{R}^k)} (\alpha E_{\alpha}(X) - K_{KL}(v \| \mu))$$

Remark: Note that we don't restrict on  $L'$ -r.v. on condition.

Pf: Set  $X_n = X \wedge n$ . And define:

$$K_{\mu_{q,n}}(X) = e^{\alpha X_n} K_{\mu}(X) / E_{\mu}(e^{\alpha X_n})$$

(It's well-def since  $X_n$  is upper-bd)

For  $k_L(v||\mu) < \infty$ . (since  $k_L(v||v) = 0$   
and RHS takes sup over  $\geq 0$ )

$$\psi_{X_n, \mu}(\alpha) - k_L(v||\mu_{q,n}) =$$

$$\psi_{X_n, \mu}(\alpha) + \int \log(k_{\mu_{q,n}}/k_v) d\nu =$$

$$\psi_{X_n, \mu}(\alpha) + \int [\log(k_{\mu_{q,n}}/k_\mu) + \log(k_\mu/k_v)] d\nu$$

$$= \psi_{X_n, \mu}(\alpha) + E_v(\alpha X_n) - \psi_{X_n, \mu}(\alpha) - k_L(v||\mu).$$

$$= E_v(\alpha X_n) - k_L(v||\mu).$$

Take  $\sup_{v \in \mathcal{M}_{q,n}^+}$  on both sides:

LHS =  $\psi_{X_n, \mu}(\alpha)$  by:  $v = \mu_{q,n}$  is optimal.

Next, we take  $\sup_n$  on both sides:

By  $m \subset T$ ,  $\psi_{X_n, \mu}(\alpha) \uparrow \psi_{X, \mu}(\alpha)$  with

$$E_v(\alpha X_n) \uparrow E_v(\alpha X).$$

(It's consistent with  $E_v(X_-) = -\infty$

since  $(X_n)_- = X_- \Rightarrow E_v(X_n) = -\infty$ )

$$\underline{\text{Lem.}} \quad \sup_x \sup_y f(x, y) \stackrel{a)}{=} \sup_y \sup_x f(x, y) \stackrel{b)}{=} \sup_{x, y} f(x, y)$$

Pf: Note  $\sup_y f(x, y) \geq f(x, y) \Rightarrow a) \Rightarrow b)$

And by sym.  $\Rightarrow a) : \leq$  holds as well.

For b). Note:  $\exists (x_k, y_k)$ . s.t.

$f(x_k, y_k) \rightarrow \sup_{x,y} f(x,y)$ . So we have:

$$\sup_x \sup_y f(x,y) \geq \sup_y f(x_k, y_k) \geq f(x_k, y_k)$$

Also  $f(x,y) \leq \sup_{x,y} f(x,y) \Rightarrow "$  holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \Psi_{X,\mu}(\tau) &= \sup_v \sup_u (\mathbb{E}_v(\tau X_u) - \lambda_{KL}(v||\mu)) \\ &= \sup_v \sup_u \mathbb{E}_v(\tau X_u) - \lambda_{KL}(v||\mu) \\ &= \sup_{v \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_v(\tau X) - \lambda_{KL}(v||\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Thm. (Bobkov - Hötzel)

$\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .  $\delta$  is metric on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . s.t.  $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$\mapsto \delta(x,y)$  is Borel-measurable.  $\forall g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . For

i) For  $X \sim \mu$ ,  $g \in \text{Lip}(\delta)$ .  $Y_g = g(X) - \mathbb{E}_\mu(g(X))$

is subgaussian with var. proxy  $\sigma^2 > 0$

that doesn't depend on  $g$ .

ii)  $K_{W,(\delta)}(v||\mu) \leq (2\sigma^2 K_{KL}(v||\mu))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .  $\forall v \in \mathcal{M}_+^1$ .

Then: We have i)  $(\Leftrightarrow)$  ii).

Pf: i)  $(\Leftrightarrow) \Psi_{Y_g,\mu}(\tau) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \tau^2$ ,  $\forall g \in \text{Lip}(\delta)$ .  $\forall \tau \geq 0$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sup_{g \in \text{Lip}(\delta)} \sup_{\alpha} \sup_{V \in M} (E_V(\alpha, Y_g) - K_{KL}(V \| \mu) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \alpha^2)$$

$\leq 0$  from variational principle.

$$\text{LHS} \stackrel{Y_g = \dots}{=} \sup_V \sup_{\alpha} \sup_g \left\{ \alpha \left( \int g dV - \int g d\mu \right) - \frac{\sigma^2 \alpha^2}{2} - K_{KL}(V \| \mu) \right\}.$$

$$\stackrel{g \in \text{Lip}(\delta)}{=} \sup_V \sup_{\alpha} (\alpha K_{V, \delta, \delta}(V \| \mu) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \alpha^2 - K_{KL}(V \| \mu))$$

$$\stackrel{\alpha=0}{=} \sup_V \left\{ (2\delta)^{-1} K_{V, \delta, \delta}(V \| \mu) - K_{KL}(V \| \mu) \right\}$$

So:  $\text{LHS} \leq 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{ii) holds.}$

Ex 7. Consider  $\mathcal{S} = [0, 1]$ .  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  has diameter

with radius  $r_B$ , i.e.  $\exists z \in B$  s.t.  $\sup_{x \in B} |z - x|$

$\leq r_B + \varepsilon$ . Next, restrict  $\nu, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(B)$ :

First note TMM above works when we

replace  $\text{Lip}(\delta)$  by  $\text{Lip}_z(\delta)$  and  $Y_g = Y_{g^*}$

if  $g - g^* = \text{const}$ . So let  $g = g_z$ . Then:

$|g(x)| \leq r_B + \varepsilon$ , v.a.s.  $\forall \nu \in \mathcal{M}_+^1(B)$ .  $g \in \text{Lip}_{g_z}(\delta)$ .

$\Rightarrow$  By Hoeffding inequality:  $\sigma^2 = (r_B + \varepsilon)^2$ .

$$\text{So: } K_{V, \delta, \delta}(V \| \mu) \leq (r_B + \varepsilon) (2 K_{KL}(V \| \mu))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} r_B (2 K_{KL}(V \| \mu))^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$



Note the Bobkov & Hütter Theorem above can be applied in any metric  $\delta$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

Def: metric of the discrete type  $\delta_d(x, y)$  is:

$$\delta_d(x, y) = \mathbb{I}_{x \neq y}. \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Ex:  $\mathbb{I}$ 's real metric. (check triangle inequality)

Lem. i)  $\mu^{+, \delta_d}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mu^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

ii)  $\text{Lip}(\delta_d) = \{f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f - \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f \leq 1\}$ .

iii)  $\kappa_{TV}(\mu, \nu) = 2 \kappa_W(\delta_d)(\mu, \nu)$  on  $\mu^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Pf: i) Since  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Rightarrow y \mapsto \delta_d(y, x)$  is measurable for  $\forall x$ .

And note:  $\int \delta_d(x, y) d\nu = 1 - \nu(\{x\}) \leq 1$ .

ii) " $\leq$ ":  $\sup f - \inf f = \sup_{x, y} |f(x) - f(y)| \leq \delta_d(x, y) \leq 1$ .

" $\geq$ ":  $\sup_{x, y} |f(x) - f(y)| \leq$

$$(\sup f - \inf f) \delta_d(x, y) \leq \delta_d(x, y).$$

iii) Set  $g^*(x) = f(x) - \frac{1}{2}(\sup f + \inf f)$  for

$$f \in \text{Lip}(\delta_d) \stackrel{ii)}{\Rightarrow} \|g^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad g^* \in \text{Lip}(\delta_d)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Note } \kappa_{TV}(\mu, \nu) &= 2 \sup_{g \in L^1, \|g\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}} \left| \int g d\mu - \int g d\nu \right| \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{g \in \text{Lip}(\delta_X)} \left| \int g d\mu - \int g d\nu \right| \\
&= 2 \kappa_{W_1(\delta_X)}(\mu, \nu) \\
&= 2 \sup_{g \in \text{Lip}(\delta_X)} \left| \int g^* d\mu - \int g^* d\nu \right| \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{g^* \in L^1, \|g^*\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}} \left| \int g^* d\mu - \int g^* d\nu \right| = \kappa_{TV}(\mu, \nu).
\end{aligned}$$

Thm. ( Pinsker's inequality )

$$\kappa_{TV}(\mu, \nu) \leq \left( 2 \kappa_{KL}(\mu, \nu) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ on } \mathcal{M}_1^+(\mathcal{X}).$$

Cor.  $\kappa_{KL}$ -topo is stronger than  $TV$ -topo  
and  $R_{KL}$ -topo.

Pf: By Lem ii) above.  $\forall g \in \text{Lip}(\delta_X)$ .  $\Rightarrow$  <sup>Dooffman</sup>  
 $Y_g$  is subgaussian with var. proxy  $1/4$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{J.1: } \kappa_{TV}(\mu, \nu) &\stackrel{\text{Lem ii)}}{=} 2 \kappa_{W_1(\delta_X)}(\mu, \nu) \\
&\stackrel{\text{Thm}}{\leq} 2 \left( 2 \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \kappa_{KL}(\mu, \nu) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$