Information and Coding Theory

Lecture 4: October 9, 2014

Lecturer: Madhur Tulsiani

1 Mutual Information

The mutual information between two random variables X and Y is defined by the formula

$$I(X;Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y)$$
⁽¹⁾

where H() denotes the entropy. Mutual information measures how much information in the X about Y (vice versa), and mutual information is not symmetric. Using the *Chain Rule* for entropy H(X,Y) = H(X) + H(Y|X), we have:

$$I(X;Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(Y) - H(Y|X) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(X,Y)$$
(2)

Example 1.1 Consider the random variable (X, Y) with $X \lor Y = 1$, $X \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Y \in \{0, 1\}$ such that:

$$(X,Y) = \begin{cases} 10 & w.p \ 1/3\\ 01 & w.p \ 1/3\\ 11 & w.p \ 1/3 \end{cases}$$

Then, we can calculate the entropy as following:

$$H(X) = \frac{2}{3}\log\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{3}\log3$$
(3)

$$H(Y) = \frac{1}{3}\log 3 + \frac{2}{3}\log \frac{3}{2}$$
(4)

$$H(X,Y) = 3 \times \frac{1}{3} \log 3 = \log 3$$
 (5)

$$I(X;Y) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(X,Y) = \log 3 - \frac{4}{3}\log 2$$
(6)

Let's consider the mutual information I(X; Y|Z) which can be defined as:

$$I(X;Y|Z) = \mathbb{E}_{Z}[I(X|Z=z;Y|Z=z)] = H(X|Z) - H(X|Y,Z) = \mathbb{E}_{Z}[H(X|Z=z) - H(X|Y,Z=z)]$$
(7)

We know that in entropy, we have $H(X|Y) \leq H(X)$, then in mutual information, can we have the similar conclusion that $I(X;Y|Z) \leq I(X;Y)$? The answer is no, let's take a look at the following example

Autumn 2014

Scribe: Hai Wang

Example 1.2 Consider the random variable (X, Y, Z), $X \in \{0, 1\}$, $Y \in \{0, 1\}$ and $Z = X \oplus Y$ such that:

$$(X, Y, Z) = \begin{cases} 000 & w.p \ 1/4 \\ 011 & w.p \ 1/4 \\ 101 & w.p \ 1/4 \\ 110 & w.p \ 1/4 \end{cases}$$

We know in this case, X, Y are independent and thus I(X; Y) = 0, but

$$\begin{split} I(X:Y|Z) &= \mathbb{E}_Z[I(X|Z=z;Y|Z=z)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}I(X|Z=0;Y|Z=0) + \frac{1}{2}I(X|Z=1;Y|Z=1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\log 2 + \frac{1}{2}\log 2 = \log 2 \end{split}$$

Recall that in entropy, we have the following *chain rule*:

$$H(X_1, \dots, X_n) = H(X_1) + H(X_2|X_1) + H(X_3|X_1, X_2) + \dots + H(X_n|X_1, \dots, X_{n-1})$$
(8)

Similarly, in mutual information, we have:

Lemma 1.3 $I((X_1, \ldots, X_n); Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; Y | X_1, \ldots, X_{i-1})$

Proof:

$$I((X_1, \dots, X_n); Y) = H(X_1, \dots, X_n) - H(X_1, \dots, X_n | Y)$$

= $\sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i | X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}) - \sum_{i=1}^n H(X_i | Y, X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})$
= $\sum_{i=1}^n (H(X_i | X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}) - H(X_i | Y, X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}))$
= $\sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; Y | X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})$

Lemma 1.4 (Special case of data processing inequality) Let g be a function of Y, then

$$I(X;Y) \ge I(X;g(Y)).$$

Proof: we first know that H(X|Y, g(Y)) = H(X|Y), since g(Y) is totally determined by Y, then

$$I(X;Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y) = H(X) - H(X|Y,g(Y)) \ge H(X) - H(X|g(Y)) = I(X;g(Y))$$
(9)

Definition 1.5 Suppose I(X;Y) = I(X;g(Y)), then g(Y) is called sufficient statistic to X.

Example 1.6

$$X = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & w.p \ 1/2\\ \frac{1}{3} & w.p \ 1/2 \end{cases}$$

Let Y be a sequence of n tosses of a coin with probability of heads given by X. Let g(Y) be the number of heads in Y.

Exercise 1.7 Prove I(X;Y) = I(X;g(Y)) in the above example.

2 KL-divergence

Let P and Q be two distributions on a universe U, then the KL-divergence between P and Q can be defined as:

$$D(P||Q) = \sum_{x \in U} P(x) \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}$$
(10)

It's easy to check that D(P||Q) and D(Q||P) are not equal.

Example 2.1 Suppose $U = \{a, b, c\}$, and $P(a) = \frac{1}{3}$, $P(b) = \frac{1}{3}$, $P(c) = \frac{1}{3}$ and $Q(a) = \frac{1}{2}$, $Q(b) = \frac{1}{2}$, Q(c) = 0. Then

$$D(P||Q) = \frac{2}{3}\log\frac{2}{3} + \infty = \infty.$$

$$D(Q||P) = \log\frac{3}{2} + 0 = \log\frac{3}{2}.$$

Even though the KL-divergence is not symmetric, it is often used as a measure of "dissimilarity" between two distribution. Towards this, we first prove that it is non-negative and is 0 if and only if P = Q.

Lemma 2.2 Let P and Q be distributions on a finite universe U. Then $D(P||Q) \ge 0$ with equality if and only if P = Q.

Proof: Let $\text{Supp}(P) = \{x : P(x) > 0\}$. Then, we must have $\text{Supp}(P) \subseteq \text{Supp}(Q)$ if $D(P,Q) < \infty$. We can then assume without loss of generality that Supp(Q) = U. Using the fact the log is a concave function, with Jensen inequality, we have:

$$D(P||Q) = \sum_{x \in U} P(x) \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} = \sum_{x \in \text{Supp}(P)} P(x) \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}$$
$$= -\sum_{x \in \text{Supp}(P)} P(x) \log \frac{Q(x)}{P(x)}$$
$$\ge -\log \left(\sum_{x \in \text{Supp}(P)} P(x) \cdot \frac{Q(x)}{P(x)}\right)$$
$$= -\log \left(\sum_{x \in \text{Supp}(P)} Q(x)\right)$$
$$\ge -\log 1 = 0.$$

For the case when D(P||Q) = 0, we note that this implies $P(x) = Q(x) \ \forall x \in \text{Supp}(P)$, which in turn gives that $P(x) = Q(x) \ \forall x \in U$.

We note that KL-divergence also has an interesting interpretation in terms of source coding. Writing

$$D(P||Q) = \sum P(x) \log \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} = \sum P(x) \log \frac{1}{Q(x)} - \sum P(x) \log \frac{1}{P(x)},$$

we can view this as the number of extra bits we use (on average) if we designed a code according to the distribution P, but used it to communicate outcomes of a random variable X distributed according to Q.

We now relate KL-divergence to some other notions of distance between two probability distributions.

Definition 2.3 Let P and Q be two distributions on a finite universe U. Then the total-variation distance between P and Q is defined as

$$\delta_{TV}(P,Q) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \|P - Q\|_1 = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \sum_{x \in U} |P(x) - Q(x)| .$$

The quantity $||P - Q||_1$ is referred to as the ℓ_1 -distance between P and Q.

In many applications, we want to actually bound the ℓ_1 -distance between P and Q but it's easier to analyze the KL-divergence. The following inequality helps relate the two.

Lemma 2.4 (Pinsker's inequality) Let P and Q be two distributions defined on a universe U. Then

$$D(P||Q) \ge \frac{1}{2\ln 2} \cdot ||P - Q||_1^2$$

We will see the proof of this in the next lecture.