

TODAY

(1)

ENTROPY

• Yesterday: We claimed that $H(X)$ = expected number of bits needed to convey X to receiver who knows P_X .

• Was a lie:

- Problem: $H(X) + H(Y) \neq H(X, Y)$ when
 X, Y independent
according to definition above

- Example: $X = 0$ w.p. $\cdot 99$
 $X = 1$ w.p. $\cdot 01$

- Still need one bit to convey X

- But $H(X_1 \dots X_{100})$ where $X_1 \dots X_{100}$ i.i.d. $\sim P_X$

is much less (Why?)

Correct "Operational" Definition

• $H(X) \triangleq$ amortized expected # bits to convey ^{many copies of X}
 ie, ^{convey} $X_1 \dots X_n$ where $X_1 \dots X_n$ i.i.d. $\sim P_X$

amortized = $\frac{1}{n}$ (# bits) ; take $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$

• let E_n, D_n be functions s.t.

$$E_n: \Sigma^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^*$$

$$D_n: \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow \Sigma^n$$

$$\forall \underline{x} \in \Sigma^n \quad D_n(E_n(\underline{x})) = \underline{x} ; E_n \text{ prefix-free}$$

$$\text{Then } H(X) \triangleq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[|E_n(\underline{x})| \right] \right\}_{\underline{x} = (X_1 \dots X_n) \sim P_X^n}$$

• Prefix-Free: $\mathbb{E} \forall \underline{x}, \underline{y} \quad E(\underline{x}) \text{ not prefix of } E(\underline{y}).$

(2)

"Can we compute $H(X)$ given P_x ?" (in finite time)
(-studied in Inf. Theory as "Single-letter Characterization")

Yes ... as we will see ...

_____ X _____

Suppose $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ (think p small)

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} X = 0 \quad \text{w.p. } 1-p \\ \quad = 1 \quad \text{w.p. } p \end{array} \right]$$

Potential Compression of $X_1 \dots X_n$

$$E(X_1 \dots X_n) = (R; i)$$

$$R = \sum X_i ; \quad i = \text{index of } X_1 \dots X_n$$

among $\binom{n}{k}$ strings of
length n
with k ones.

$$\text{length of compression} = \underbrace{\log n}_{\text{to convey } k} + \log \binom{n}{k}$$

But how large is k ?

"Chernoff Bounds": $E[X_i] = p$ $E[\sum X_i] = np$ (4)

$$\Pr [|\sum X_i - np| \geq \lambda \cdot \sqrt{n}] \leq 2 \cdot e^{-\lambda^2/2}$$

• So, ... ~~w.p.~~ with very high prob. $R \approx pn$

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} R \geq (p-\epsilon)n \\ R \leq (p+\epsilon)n \\ \text{w.p. } 1 - 2^{-\epsilon^2 n} \end{array} \right]$$

$$\log \binom{n}{pn} \approx 2^{h(p) \cdot n}$$

$$h(p) = -p \log_2 p - (1-p) \log_2 (1-p)$$

Exercise: Prove this using Stirling's approx.

$$n! \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n$$

So conclusion:
 $\forall \epsilon$ for sufficient large n

$$H(x) \leq \frac{1}{n} \left[O(\log n) + (h(p) + \epsilon) \cdot n \right]$$

$$\Rightarrow H(x) \leq h(p) \quad \left[\text{taking limits on } \epsilon \text{ \& } n \right].$$

Theorem: $H(X) = h(p)$. [for $X = \text{Bern}(p)$]

Proof: Already seen $H(X) \leq h(p)$.

Converse: (1) Whp $k \in ((p-\epsilon)n, (p+\epsilon)n) \approx pn$

(2) Even if k known to receiver need to distinguish between $\binom{n}{pn}$ possibilities

By "~~C~~" So strings of length $\leq \log \binom{n}{pn} - t$ only occur w.p. $\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot 2^{-t}$

Conclude that w.p. $\geq (1 - 2^{-t})$ ↑

Encoding length $\geq \log \binom{n}{pn} - t$ in any valid encoding.

$$\Rightarrow H(X) \geq \frac{\dim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \binom{n}{pn} - t}{n} = h(p) \cdot n - \epsilon n - t$$

$$\geq h(p)$$

What about non-Bernoulli X ?

$X \in \{1 \dots k\} = \Sigma.$

$P_1 \dots P_k$ ~~denote~~ $P_i \triangleq \Pr[X=i]$

• typical string $\underline{x} \in \Sigma^n$ has $P_1 n$ 1's
 $P_2 n$ 2's
 \vdots
 $P_k n$ k's.

• All strings with these #'s 1's, ..., k's are equally likely.

\Rightarrow Compression length $\approx \log \binom{n}{P_1 n, P_2 n, \dots, P_k n} \pm o(n).$
 $\approx \cancel{h(P_x)} \cdot n \pm h(P_x) \cdot n \pm o(n)$

$h(P_x) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^k P_i \log \frac{1}{P_i}.$

Theorem : $H(x) = \sum_{w \in \Sigma} P_x(w) \cdot \log \frac{1}{P_x(w)}$

Conditional Entropy

$y \in \Omega_y$ $x \in \Omega_x$

(7)

$$H(Y|X) = \sum_{w \in \Omega_x} P_x(w) \cdot H(Y|X=w)$$

$$= \sum_{w \in \Omega_x} \sum_{y \in \Omega_y} P_x(w) \cdot P_{Y|X=w}(y) \cdot \log \frac{1}{P_{Y|X=w}(y)}$$

$$= \sum_{(w,y)} P_{xy}(w,y) \cdot \log \frac{P_x(w)}{P_{xy}(w,y)}$$

Exercise: Verify $H(X,Y) = H(X) + H(Y|X)$.

Exercise: Show that $\underline{x}^* \in \Omega^n$ can be ^{always} compressed ~~deterministically~~ to length $\leq H(x) \cdot n + \epsilon n$ so that decomposition error $\leq \exp(-f(\epsilon, k) \cdot n)$

where $f(\epsilon, k) > 0$ for every $\epsilon > 0 \leq k$.

(more on this next.)

- So far we have talked about expected length of compression. Can we get "always"?

[must allow error - why?]

[what if we allow error $\rightarrow 0$].

Asymptotic Equipartition Principle:

- \forall distribution P_x on finite Ω ,

- $\forall \epsilon$ for sufficiently large n

$\exists S \subseteq \Omega^n$ s.t.

$\forall \omega \in S \bullet \Pr[X = \omega] \in \left[\frac{1}{|\Omega|^{1+\epsilon}}, \frac{1}{|\Omega|^{1-\epsilon}} \right]$

nearly uniform on S

$\bullet \Pr[X \notin S] \leq \epsilon$

[every distribution looks like uniform]

- Exercise: Prove $|S| \approx 2^{H(x) \cdot n}$

- Exercise: Derive AEP

• derive: "always with small error" compression from above