

# Notes for EECS 550: Information Theory

Yiwei Fu, Instructor: David Neuhoff

FA 2022

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Lossless Coding . . . . .	1
1.2 Shannon-McMillian Theorem . . . . .	6
1.3 Fixed Length to Variable L ength (FVB) Lossless Source codes . . . . .	9
1.4 Huffman’s Code Design . . . . .	12

Office hours:

# Chapter 1

## 1.1 Lossless Coding

It is a type of data compression.

GOAL to encode data into bits so that

1. bits can be decoded perfectly or with very high accuracy back into original data;
2. we use as few bits as possible.

We need to model for data, a measure of decoding accuracy, a measure of compactness.

MODEL FOR DATA

**Definition 1.1.1.** A *source* is a sequence of i.i.d (discrete) random variables  $U_1, U_2, \dots$

We would like to assume a known alphabet  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_Q\}$  and known probability distribution either through probability mass functions  $p_U(u) = \Pr[U = u]$ .

**Definition 1.1.2.** Source coding

PERFORMANCE MEASURES A measure of compactness (efficiency)

**Definition 1.1.3.** rate = encoding rate = average number of encoded bits per data symbol

Two versions: empirical avg rate  $\langle r \rangle = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N L_k(U_1, \dots, U_k)$ .

Statistical avg rate:

$$\bar{r} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[L_k(U_1, \dots, U_k)]$$

where  $L_K$  is the number of bits out of the encoder after  $U_k$  and before  $U_{k+1}$ .

Accuracy per-letter frequency of error

$$\langle F_{LE} \rangle = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N I(\hat{U}_k = U_k)$$

per-letter error probability

$$p_{LE} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}[I(\hat{U}_k = U_k)] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \Pr(\hat{U}_k = U_k)$$

Fixed-length to fixed-length block codes (FFB)

characteristics

A code is perfectly lossless (PL) if the  $\beta(\alpha(\underline{u})) = \underline{u}$  for all  $\underline{u} \in A_U^k$  (the set of all sequences  $u_1, \dots, u_k$ ).

In order to be perfectly loss,  $\alpha$  must be one-to-one. Encode must assign a distinct code-word ( $L$  bits) to each data sequences. rate =  $L/K$ . We seek  $R_{PL}^*(k)$  the smallest rate of any PL code.

Number of sequences of size  $k = Q^k$ , and number binary sequence of size  $L = 2^L$ . We need  $2^L \gg Q^k$ .

$$\bar{r} = \frac{L}{k} \geq \frac{k \log_2 Q}{k} = \log_2 Q$$

Choose  $\lceil k \log_2 Q \rceil$ , then we have

$$R_{PL}^*(k) = \frac{\lceil k \log_2 Q \rceil}{k} \leq \frac{k \log_2 Q + 1}{k} = \log_2 Q + \frac{1}{k}.$$

$$\log_2 Q \leq R_{PL}^*(k) \leq \log_2 Q + \frac{1}{k}$$

Let  $R_{PL}^*$  be the least rate of any PL FFB code with any  $k$ .  $R_{PL}^*(k) \rightarrow \log_2 Q$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

$$R_{PL}^* = \inf_k R_{PL}^*(k)$$

Now we want rate less and  $\log_2 Q$  almost lossless codes.

$$R_{AL}^* = \inf\{r, \text{there is an FFB code with } \bar{r} \leq n \text{ and arbitrarily small } P_{LE}\}$$

$$= \inf\{r, \text{there is an FFB code with } \bar{r} \leq n \text{ and } P_{LE} < \delta \text{ for all } \delta > 0\}$$

Instead of per-letter probability  $P_{LE}$ , we focus on block error probability  $P_{BE} = \Pr(\hat{\underline{U}} \neq \underline{U})$

**Lemma 1.1.1.**  $P_{BE} \geq P_{LE} \geq \frac{P_{BE}}{k}$

*Proof.* See homework. ■

To analyze, we focus on the set of correctly encoded sequences.  $G = \{\underline{u} : \beta(\alpha(\underline{u})) = \underline{u}\}$

Then we have

$$P_{BE} = 1 - \Pr[U \in G], |G| \leq 2^k, L \geq \lceil \log_2 |G| \rceil.$$

QUESTION How large is the smallest set of sequences with length  $k$  from  $A_U$  with probability  $\approx 1$ ?

We need to use weak law of large numbers (WLLN).

**Theorem 1.1.1.** Suppose  $A_x = \{1, 2, \dots, Q\}$  with probability  $p_1, \dots, p_Q$ . Given  $\underline{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in A_U^k$ .

$$n_q(\underline{u}) := \# \text{times } a_q \text{ occurs in } \underline{u}, \quad f_q(\underline{u}) = \frac{n_q(\underline{u})}{k} = \text{frequency}$$

Fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\Pr[f_q(\underline{u}) \doteq p_q \pm \varepsilon] \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moreover,

$$\Pr[f_q(\underline{u}) \doteq p_q \pm \varepsilon, q = 1, \dots, Q] \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

NOTATION  $a \doteq b \pm \varepsilon \iff |a - b| \leq \varepsilon$

Consider subset of  $A_U^k$  that corresponds to this event  $x$ .

$$T_k = \{\underline{u} : f_q(\underline{u}) \doteq p_q \pm \varepsilon, q = 1, \dots, Q\}.$$

$$\Pr[\underline{U} = \underline{u}] = p(u_1)p(u_2) \dots p(u_k).$$

By WLLN,  $\Pr(T_k) \rightarrow 1$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

KEY FACT all sequences in  $T_k$  have approximately the same probability.

For  $\underline{u} \in T_k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\underline{u}) &= p(u_1)p(u_2) \dots p(u_k) \\ &= p_1^{n_1(\underline{u})} p_2^{n_2(\underline{u})} \dots p_k^{n_k(\underline{u})} \\ &= p_1^{kf_1(\underline{u})} p_2^{kf_2(\underline{u})} \dots p_k^{kf_k(\underline{u})} \\ &\approx \tilde{p}^k \text{ where } \tilde{p} = p_1^{p_1} p_2^{p_2} \dots p_Q^{p_Q}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have  $|T_k| \approx \frac{1}{\tilde{p}^k}$ .

Then we have

$$\bar{r} = \frac{\log_2 |T_k|}{k} = -\frac{k \log_2 \tilde{p}}{k} = -\log_2 \tilde{p}.$$

Is that rate good? Can we do better? Can we have a set  $S$  with probability  $\approx 1$  and significantly smaller?

Since  $\Pr(\underline{U} \in A_U^k \setminus T_k) \approx 0 \implies \Pr(\underline{U} \in S) \approx \Pr(\underline{U} \in S \cap T_k) \approx \frac{|S|}{|T_k|}$ . So when  $k$  is large,  $T_k$  is the smallest set with large probability. And  $R_{AL}^* \approx -\log \tilde{p}$ .

How to express  $\tilde{p}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \tilde{p} &= -\log \prod_{i=1}^Q p_i^{p_i} \\ &= -\sum_{i=1}^Q p_i \log p_i =: \text{entropy} = H. \end{aligned}$$

Some properties of  $H$ :

1. its unit is bits
2.  $H \geq 0$ .
3.  $H = 0 \implies \iff p_q = 1$  for some  $q$ .
4.  $H \leq \log_2 Q$ .
5.  $H = \log_2 Q \iff p_q = \frac{1}{Q}$  for all  $q$ .

Identify the set that WLLN says has probability  $\rightarrow 1$ . Suppose  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  i.i.d. real-valued variables.

$$T = \{\underbrace{x_1 \dots x_n}_{\underline{x}} \in A_X^N : \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \doteq \bar{x} \pm \varepsilon\}$$

is called a typical set.  $\Pr(\underline{X} \in T) \approx 1$  when  $N$  is large.

Now suppose  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  i.i.d.  $A_x$ -valued random variables, function  $g : A_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Consider  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  with  $Y_i = g(X_i)$ .  $Y_i$ 's are i.i.d. random variables.

If  $\mathbb{E}[g(X)]$  is finite then we can apply WLLN that

$$\Pr\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i \doteq \mathbb{E}[Y] \pm \varepsilon\right) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Typical sequences wrt  $g$ :

$$T_{x, p_\lambda, g, \varepsilon}^N = \left\{ \underline{x} : \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(x_i) \doteq \overline{g(X)} \pm \varepsilon \right\}.$$

If  $\mathbb{E}[g(X)]$  is finite then by WLLN we have

$$\Pr(\underline{X} \in T_g) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

**Example 1.1.1** (Indicator function). Suppose  $F \subset A_X$ , and  $g(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in F \\ 0 & x \notin F \end{cases}$ . Then  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(x_i) = f_F(x)$ . Now

$$T_g = \{\underline{x} : f_F(x) \doteq \Pr(X \in F) \pm \varepsilon\}.$$

By WLLN,

$$\Pr(\underline{X} \in T_g) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \implies \Pr(n_F(\underline{X}) \doteq \mathbb{E}[x] \pm \varepsilon) \rightarrow 1.$$

**Example 1.1.2.**  $A_x = \mathbb{R}, g(x) = x^2$ .  $T_g = \{\underline{x} : \}$

**Theorem 1.1.2.** Now suppose  $M$  functions  $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_M$ . Fix  $\varepsilon$ . Then

$$T_{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_M} = \bigcap_{i=1}^M T_{g_i}.$$

$$\Pr(\underline{X} \in T_{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_M}) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\underline{X} \notin T_{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_M}) &= \Pr\left(\underline{X} \in \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^M T_{g_i}\right)^c\right) \\ &= \Pr\left(\underline{X} \in \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^M T_{g_i}^c\right)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^M \Pr(\underline{X} \in T_{g_i}^c) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

### IMPORTANT APPLICATION

Suppose  $A_x = \{a_1, \dots, a_Q\}$  a finite alphabet with probability  $p_1, \dots, p_Q$ . The  $g_q(x)$  be the

indicator of  $a_q$ .  $T_q = \{\underline{x} : f_q(\underline{x}) \doteq p_q \pm \varepsilon\}$ . And  $\tilde{T} = \bigcap_{i=1}^Q T_i = \{\underline{x} : \forall q, f_q(\underline{x}) \doteq p_q \pm \varepsilon\}$ .  $\tilde{T}_{X,p_X,\varepsilon}^N$  very typical sequence. We have

$$\Pr(\underline{X} \in \tilde{T}) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

If  $\underline{x} \in \tilde{T}$ , then  $\underline{x} \in \tilde{T}_g$  for any other  $g$ . Consider any real-valued  $g$ . If  $\underline{x} \in \tilde{T}_\varepsilon$  then  $\underline{x} \in T_{g,\varepsilon c}$  for some  $c$ .

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(x_i) = \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{n_q(\underline{x})}{N} g(Q_q) = \sum_{q=1}^Q (p_q \pm \varepsilon) q(a_q) = \mathbb{E}[g(X)] + \varepsilon \sum_{q=1}^Q g(Q_q)$$

$$\Pr(\underline{X} \in \tilde{T}) \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

If  $\underline{x} \in \tilde{T}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\underline{x}) &= p(x_1)p(x_2) \dots p(x_N) \\ &= p_1^{n_1(\underline{x})} \dots \\ &= p_1^{f_1(\underline{x})N} \dots \\ &\doteq p_1^{(p_1 \pm \varepsilon)N} \dots \\ &\doteq 2^{N(\sum_{q=1}^Q p_q \log p_q \pm \varepsilon \sum_{q=1}^Q \log p_q)} \quad \doteq 2^{-NH \pm N\varepsilon c} \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 1.1.3** (Shannon-McMillian Theorem). Suppose  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  i.i.d,  $A_x = \{a_1, \dots, a_Q\}$  with probability  $p_1, \dots, p_Q$ . Then

1.

$$\Pr(\tilde{X} \in \tilde{T}_\varepsilon^N) \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

2. If  $\underline{x} \in \tilde{T}_\varepsilon^N$ ,  $p(\underline{x}) \doteq 2^{-NH \pm N\varepsilon c}$ .

3.  $|\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^N| \doteq \Pr(\underline{X} \in \tilde{T}_\varepsilon^N) 2^{N(H \pm \varepsilon c)}$ .

*Proof.*

■

## 1.2 Shannon-McMillian Theorem

Is  $\tilde{T}$  essentially a smallest set with probability  $\approx 1$ ?



Yes. Let  $S \in A_x^N$ .

$$\Pr(\underline{X} \in S) = \Pr(X \in S \cap \tilde{T}) + \Pr(X \in S \cap \tilde{T}^c) \doteq |S \cap \tilde{T}| 2^{-NH \pm 2N\epsilon c} + \Pr(\tilde{T}^c) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

**Theorem 1.2.1.** For every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a sequence  $b_{\epsilon,1}, b_{\epsilon,2}, \dots$  s.t.  $b_{\epsilon,N} \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $b_{\epsilon,B} \geq 0$ .

For any  $N$  and any  $S \subset A_X^N$ ,

$$|S| \geq (\Pr(\underline{X} \in S) - b_{\epsilon,N}) 2^{NH - N\epsilon c}.$$

An in hindsight shortcut

Let us directly consider

$$\begin{aligned} T_{S,\epsilon}^N &= \left\{ \underline{x} : p(\underline{x}) \doteq 2^{-N(H \pm \epsilon)} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \underline{x} : -\frac{1}{N} \log p(\underline{x}) \doteq H \pm \epsilon \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \underline{x} : -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log p(x_i) \doteq H \pm \epsilon \right\} \end{aligned}$$

compare  $\tilde{T}_\epsilon^N$  and  $T_{s,\epsilon}^N$ .

**Claim:**  $\tilde{T}_\epsilon^N \subset T_{s,\epsilon}^N$  where  $c = -; \sum_{q=1}^Q \log p_q$ .

Suppose  $\underline{x} \in \tilde{T}_\epsilon^N$ . Show if it is also in  $T_{s,\epsilon}^N$ . Check the following  $p(x) \doteq 2^{-NH \pm N\epsilon c}$ ,  $-\log p(x) \doteq NH \pm N\epsilon c$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
-\log p(\underline{x}) &= -\log \prod_{i=1}^N p(x_i) \\
&= -\log \prod_{q=1}^Q p_q^{n_q(\underline{x})} \\
&= -\log \prod_{q=1}^Q p_q^{N f_q(\underline{x})} \\
&\doteq -\log \prod_{q=1}^Q p_q^{N(p_q \pm \varepsilon)} \\
&\doteq -\sum_{q=1}^Q N(p_q \pm \varepsilon) \log p_q \\
&\doteq NH \pm N\varepsilon \sum_{q=1}^C \log p_k \\
&\doteq NH \pm N\varepsilon c.
\end{aligned}$$

Extreme example:

$$A_x = \{0, 1\}, p_0 = p_1 = \frac{1}{2}, H = 1.$$

$$p(\underline{x}) = 2^{-N}.$$

$$T_{s,\varepsilon}^N = \{\underline{x} : p(\underline{x}) = 2^{-N(H \pm \varepsilon)} = 2^{-N}\} = A_X^N.$$

$$\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^N = \{\underline{x} : n_1(\underline{x}) \doteq N(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)\}.$$

$$|T_{s,\varepsilon}^N| \doteq 2^{N(H \pm \varepsilon)}, |\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^N| \doteq 2^{N(H \pm 2\varepsilon c)}.$$

$T_s$  is called probability typical.  $\tilde{T}$  is called frequency typical.

$$\text{Example } A_x = \{0, 1\}, p_1 = \frac{1}{4}, p_0 = \frac{3}{4}, \tilde{T}_\varepsilon^N = \{\underline{x} : f_1(\underline{x}) \doteq \frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon\}.$$

$$T_{s,\varepsilon}^T = \left\{ \underline{x} : f_1(\underline{x}) = \frac{1}{4} \pm N\varepsilon \log \frac{1-p_1}{p_1} \right\}$$

Typical sequences for an infinite alphabet

There are two cases:  $A_x$  is countably infinite / random variables are continuous

In the first case, frequency typical approach doesn't work. Probabilistic typical approach works just as is.  $H = -\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} p_q \log p_q$  can be infinite.

Let  $S_{\delta,N}$  = size of the smallest set of  $N$  sequences from  $A_x$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ .

Then for any  $0 < \delta < 1$  and any  $h$ ,  $\frac{S_{\delta,N}}{2^{Nh}} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

### 1.3 Fixed Length to Variable Length (FVB) Lossless Source codes

Recall that FFB perfectly lossless has  $R_{PL}^* = \log_2 |A_x|$ , and FFB almost lossless has  $R_{AL}^* = H$ .

FVB perfectly lossless  $R_{VL}^* \leq \log_2 |A_x|$ .

Suppose we have a source with  $A_x = \{a, b, c, d\}$  with probability  $\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}\}$ .

$p(u)$	$u$	code1	code2	code3	code4	code5	code6
$\frac{1}{2}$	$a$	00	0	0	0	0	0
$\frac{1}{4}$	$b$	01	10	10	10	1	01
$\frac{1}{8}$	$c$	10	110	10	11	01	011
$\frac{1}{8}$	$d$	11	111	11	111	10	0111
Rate		2	1.75	1.5	1.625	1.25	1.875

We can see that code 3-5 are all bad.

Suppose 101110101110

Let say if one bit is changed to zero, 101010101110

Code 6 has an advantage that you know 0 represents the start of a codeword.

FVB source code is characterized by

- source length  $k$
- codebook of binary codewords  $C = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{Q^k}\}$ ,  $Q = |A_U|$ .
- encoding rule  $\alpha : A_U^K \rightarrow C$
- decoding rule  $\beta : C \rightarrow A_U^K$ .

The encoder operates in block fashion. The decoder does not.

Distinguish codes that look like code2 and codes that look like code6.

**Definition 1.3.1.** A codebook  $C$  is *prefix-free* if no codeword is the prefix of another.

A prefix-free code is called a prefix code. We will stick to prefix codes until states otherwise. (instantaneously decodable)

We like to draw binary tree diagrams of code.

Code 1:

A prefix is perfectly lossless if and only if  $\alpha$  is 1-to-1. The rate:  $\bar{r}(c) = \frac{\bar{L}}{K} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{\underline{u}} p(\underline{u}) L(\underline{u})$  (length of codeword assigned to  $\underline{u}$ )

$$R_{VL}^*(k) = \min \{ \bar{r}(c) : c \text{ is perfectly lossless FVB with source length } k \}.$$

$$R_{VL}^* = \inf \{ \bar{r}(c) : c \text{ is PL FVB prefix code with any source length} \} = \inf_K R_{VL}^*(k).$$

How does one design a prefix code to have small or smallest rate?

Focus first  $k = 1$ . Shannon's idea:  $L_q \approx -\log_2 p_q$ .

$$\sum_{q=1}^Q p_q L_q \approx -\sum_{q=1}^Q p_q \log p_q = H.$$

*Question.* Is there a prefix code with  $L_q \approx -\log p_q$  for  $q = 1, 2, \dots, Q$ ? Could there be prefix codes with even smaller rate?

**Theorem 1.3.1** (Kraft inequality theorem). *There is a binary prefix code with length  $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_Q$  iff the Kraft sum*

$$\sum_{q=1}^Q 2^{-L_q} \leq 1.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $v_1, \dots, v_Q$  is a prefix code with length  $L_1, \dots, L_Q$ . Let  $L_{\max} = \max_q L_q$ .

From the tree, the number of sequences of length  $L_{\max}$  prefixed by any codeword, is  $\sum_{q=1}^Q 2^{L_{\max} - L_q} \leq 2^{L_{\max}} \implies \sum_{q=1}^Q 2^{-L_q} \leq 1$ . So the Kraft inequality holds. ■

Now suppose

$$L_q = \lceil -\log_2 p_q \rceil, q = 1, \dots, Q. \quad (1.3.1)$$

Is there a code with these lengths? Check Kraft.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q=1}^Q 2^{-L_q} &= \sum_{q=1}^Q 2^{-\lceil -\log p_q \rceil} \\ &\leq \sum_{q=1}^Q 2^{-( -\log p_q )} \\ &\leq \sum_{q=1}^Q 2^{\log p_q} \\ &\leq \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q = 1. \end{aligned}$$

So the Kraft inequality holds.  $\exists$  a prefix code with length  $L_1, \dots, L_Q$  given by (1.3.1), called Shannon-Fano code.

Now the question is how good is this Shannon-Fano Code?

For the Shannon-Fano code, the rate (average length) is

$$\bar{L}_{SF} = \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q \lceil -\log p_q \rceil.$$

We have the following bounds:

$$H = \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q (-\log p_q) \leq \bar{L}_{SF} < \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q (-\log p_q + 1) = H + 1.$$

*Question.* Can we do better now?

We will show that  $\bar{L} \geq H$  for any prefix code.

Let  $C$  be a prefix code with length  $L_1, \dots, L_Q$ . Take the difference  $\bar{L} - H = \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q L_q + \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q \log p_q$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{L} - H &= \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q L_q + \sum_{q=1}^Q p_q \log p_q \\ &= - \sum_q p_q \log \frac{2^{-L_q}}{p_q} \\ &= - \sum_q p_q \ln \frac{2^{-L_q}}{p_q} \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \\ &\geq - \sum_q p_q \left( \frac{2^{-L_q}}{p_q} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \\ &\geq - \frac{1}{\ln(2)} \sum_q 2^{-L_q} + \sum_q p_q \frac{1}{\ln(2)} = \frac{1}{\ln 2} (1 - 1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In homework we will that that  $\bar{L}$  can get very close to  $H + 1$ .

Now allow  $k \geq 1$ . We have a  $C = \{\underline{v}_1, \dots, \underline{v}_{Q^k}\}$  of length  $L_1, \dots, L_{Q^k}$ . We want small

$$\bar{r}(c) = \frac{\bar{L}}{K} = \frac{\sum_u p(\underline{u}) L(\underline{u})}{k}.$$

Shannon-Fano code achieve that

$$H^k \leq \bar{L}_{SF} < H^k + 1 \implies \frac{H^k}{k} \leq \bar{r}_{SF} = \frac{\bar{L}_{SF}}{k} < \frac{H^k}{k} + \frac{1}{k}.$$

Since  $H^k = kH$  we have

$$H \leq \bar{r}_{SF} < H^k + \frac{1}{k}.$$

Similarly we have for any prefix code, we have

$$\bar{r} = \frac{\bar{L}}{K} \geq \frac{H^k}{k} = H.$$

This leads to a new coding theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.2.** *Given i.i.d. source  $U$  with alpha  $A_U$  and entropy  $H$ . We have*

1. *For every  $k$ ,  $R_{VL}^* \leq R_{VL}^*(k) < H + \frac{1}{k}$ .*
2. *For every  $k$ ,  $R_{VL}^*(k) \geq R_{VL}^* \geq H$ .*

Combined we have

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, H \leq R_{VL}^*(k) < H + \frac{1}{k}$$

and

$$R_{VL}^* = H.$$

## 1.4 Huffman's Code Design

Given  $p_1, \dots, p_Q$ , it finds a prefix code with smallest  $\bar{L}$ .

---

### Algorithm 1.4.1 Huffman Code

---

**Input:** Alphabet probability  $\{p_i | i = 1, \dots, Q\}$ , WLOG assume  $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \dots \geq p_Q$ .

**Output:** FVB Codebook for alphabet  $\{a_i | i = 1, \dots, Q\}$ .

```

1: function HUFFMAN( $P_Q = \{p_i | i = 1, \dots, Q\}$ )
2:   if  $Q = 2$  then return  $\{0, 1\}$ 
3:   end if
4:    $p'_{Q-1} \leftarrow p_{Q-1} + p_Q$ 
5:    $P_{Q-1} \leftarrow (P_Q \setminus \{p_{Q-1} + p_Q\}) \cup \{p'_{Q-1}\}$ 
6:    $c_{Q-1} \leftarrow \text{HUFFMAN}(P_{Q-1}) =: \{\underline{v}_1, \dots, \underline{v}_{Q-1}\}$ 
7:    $c_Q \leftarrow \{\underline{v}_1, \dots, \underline{v}_{Q-2}, \underline{v}_{Q-1}0, \underline{v}_{Q-1}1\}$ 
8: end function
```

---

**Proposition 1.4.1.** *If  $c_{Q-1}$  is optimal for  $P_{Q-1}$  then  $c_Q$  is optimal for  $P_Q$ .*

**Example 1.4.1.**

We found that

But there is a tighter upper bound

$$\bar{L}^* \leq \begin{cases} H + p_{\max} & p_{\max} < \frac{1}{2} \\ H + p_{\max} + 0.086 & p_{\max} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{R}_{VL}^*(k) \leq \begin{cases} H + \frac{p_{\max}^k}{k} & (p_{\max})^k < \frac{1}{2} \\ H + \frac{p_{\max}^k}{k} + \frac{0.086}{k} & (p_{\max})^k \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Up till now we've only focused on i.i.d RV's. Now suppose RV's are dependent, then

$$\frac{H^k}{k} < \frac{kH}{k}.$$

For a stationary random process,

$$\frac{H^k}{k} \searrow H_{\infty}.$$

For example, English has

$$H^1 \approx 4.08, H_{\infty} \approx 1.$$

The bits produced by a good lossless source code ( $\bar{r} \approx H$ ) are approximately i.i.d. equiprobable.

Synchronization and transmission entropy

Suppose  $\{01, 001, 101, 110\}$  for  $\{a, b, c, d\}$ .

$\underline{u} = dddddddd\dots, \underline{z} = 110110110110110\dots$

$\underline{z}' = 101101101101\dots, \hat{u} = cccccc\dots$

Now if  $\{1, 01, 001, 000\}$  for  $\{a, b, c, d\}$ . Then the same problem will not happen.