

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE

School of Computer and Communication Sciences

Handout 17
Solutions to Midterm

Information Theory and Coding
Oct. 27, 2015

PROBLEM 1.

- (a) From the multinomial formula, for any non-negative x_1, \dots, x_K with $x_1 + \dots + x_K = 1$ we have

$$1 = (x_1 + \dots + x_K)^n = \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_K: \\ n_1 + \dots + n_K = n \\ n_i \geq 0}} \binom{n}{n_1, \dots, n_K} x_1^{n_1} \dots x_K^{n_K} \geq \binom{n}{n_1, \dots, n_K} x_1^{n_1} \dots x_K^{n_K}.$$

- (b) From (a), for any non-negative x_1, \dots, x_n that sum to 1,

$$\log |S_{n_1, \dots, n_K}| = \log \binom{n}{n_1, \dots, n_K} \leq n \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{n_i}{n} \log \frac{1}{x_i}.$$

Choose now $x_i = n_i/n$ to obtain the desired result.

- (c) Consider the following code: given (u_1, \dots, u_n) , compute n_1, \dots, n_K . Describe each of the $n_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, $i = 1, \dots, K-1$, using $\lceil \log(n+1) \rceil$ bits in the usual binary encoding of integers (no need to describe n_K since the n_i 's sum to n). At this moment the decoder will know that the sequence u_1, \dots, u_n belongs to S_{n_1, \dots, n_K} , and thus with further $\lceil \log |S_{n_1, \dots, n_K}| \rceil$ bits we can describe which element of S_{n_1, \dots, n_K} we were given. An alternative solution consists of verifying that the given codeword lengths satisfy the Kraft's inequality: let $\ell_0 := (K-1)\lceil \log(n+1) \rceil$ and $\ell_1(u_1, \dots, u_n) := \lceil \log |S_{n_1, \dots, n_K}| \rceil$ (with n_1, \dots, n_K as before) so that the codeword lengths are

$$\ell(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \ell_0 + \ell_1(u_1, \dots, u_n).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_n} 2^{-\ell(u_1, \dots, u_n)} &= \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_K: \\ n_1 + \dots + n_K = n \\ n_i \geq 0}} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_n \in S_{n_1, \dots, n_K}} 2^{-\ell_0 - \ell_1(u_1, \dots, u_n)} \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_K: \\ n_1 + \dots + n_K = n \\ n_i \geq 0}} 2^{-\ell_0} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_n \in S_{n_1, \dots, n_K}} 1/|S_{n_1, \dots, n_K}| = 2^{-\ell_0} \sum_{\substack{n_1, \dots, n_K: \\ n_1 + \dots + n_K = n \\ n_i \geq 0}} 1. \end{aligned}$$

The last sum contains at most $(n+1)^{K-1}$ terms: for each of n_1, \dots, n_{K-1} there are at most $(n+1)$ choices and once (n_1, \dots, n_{K-1}) is chosen there is but a single choice for n_K . As $2^{\ell_0} \geq (n+1)^{K-1}$ we see that the Kraft's inequality is satisfied and a prefix-free code with the specified lengths exists.

- (d) We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq E[D((X_1, \dots, X_K) \| (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K))] &= \sum_i E[X_i \log(X_i/\mu_i)] = \\ &= -E[h(X_1, \dots, X_n)] + \sum_i E[X_i \log(1/\mu_i)] = -E[h(X_1, \dots, X_n)] + h(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n). \end{aligned}$$

- (e) Let N_i be the number of occurrences of the symbol i in the sequence U_1, \dots, U_n . By (c) and (b)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length}(\mathcal{C}_n(U_1, \dots, U_n)) &\leq (K-1)\lceil \log(1+n) \rceil + \lceil nh(N_1/n, \dots, N_K/n) \rceil \\ &\leq K + (K-1)\log(1+n) + nh(N_1/n, \dots, N_K/n) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $E[N_i] = np_i$ where $p_i = \Pr(U = i)$, and thus by (d) we have

$$\frac{1}{n}E[\text{length}(\mathcal{C}_n(U_1, \dots, U_n))] \leq \frac{K + (K-1)\log(1+n)}{n} + h(p_1, \dots, p_K).$$

Noting that $H(U) = h(p_1, \dots, p_K)$, we demonstrate what was asked.

Observe that in constructing the code \mathcal{C}_n we did not use any knowledge of the statistics of U , but for i.i.d. sources, we see that for large n the code performs as well a code that is designed with the knowledge of the statistics. The ‘universality penalty’ we pay is $O((K \log n)/n)$.

PROBLEM 2.

- (a) Since $\{X_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is stationary, $(U_1, \dots, U_n) = (f(X_1), \dots, f(X_n))$ has the same statistics as $(f(X_{k+1}), \dots, f(X_{k+n})) = (U_{k+1}, \dots, U_{k+n})$. Thus the process $\{U_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is stationary. Consequently, the sequence a_i is non-increasing, and $\lim_i a_i$ exists and is equal to the entropy rate of the process $\{U_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.
- (b) Since $\{X_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is Markov, conditional on X_1 the sequence (X_2, \dots, X_{i+1}) is independent of X_0 . Since (U_2, \dots, U_{i+1}) is a function of (X_2, \dots, X_{i+1}) we thus see that conditional on X_1 , the sequence (U_2, \dots, U_{i+1}) is also independent of X_0 . Consequently, $I(X_0; U_2, \dots, U_{i+1} | X_1) = 0$.
- (c) By stationarity $b_i = H(U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_2, X_1)$. Thus,

$$b_i - H(U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_2, X_1, X_0) = I(X_0; U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_2, X_1).$$

But from (b) and the chain rule we have

$$0 = I(X_0; U_2, \dots, U_{i+1} | X_1) = \sum_{j=2}^{i+1} I(X_0; U_j | U_2, \dots, U_{j-1}, X_1)$$

and conclude that each term in the sum above, in particular $I(X_0; U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_2, X_1)$, equals zero. We thus find that $b_i = H(U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_2, X_1, X_0)$ as claimed.

- (d) From (c) and the fact that U_1 is a function of X_1

$$\begin{aligned} b_i &= H(U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_2, X_1, X_0) = H(U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_1, X_1, X_0) \\ &\leq H(U_{i+1} | U_i, \dots, U_1, X_0) = b_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

- (e) Observe that $d_i = I(X_0; U_i | U_1, \dots, U_{i-1})$. So $d_i \geq 0$, and by the chain rule $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i = I(X_0; U_1, \dots, U_n)$.
- (f) Since $a_i \geq a_{i+1}$ (see comments in (a)) and $b_i \leq b_{i+1}$ (by (d)), $d_{i+1} = a_{i+1} - b_{i+1} \leq a_i - b_i = d_i$.
- (g) From (f) and (e)

$$nd_n \leq d_1 + \dots + d_n = I(X_0; U_1, \dots, U_n) \leq H(X_0) \leq \log |\mathcal{X}|.$$

Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_n = 0$. Consequently, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$.

A process $\{U_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ as in this problem is called a ‘hidden Markov process.’ Observe that for a stationary process the sequence a_n converges to the entropy rate H from above, but in general there is no way how large one should take n to get a good estimate of H . We now see that for hidden Markov processes we have another sequence b_n that converges to H from below, and taking $n = \log |\mathcal{X}|/\epsilon$ guarantees that $b_n \leq H \leq a_n$ with $a_n - b_n \leq \epsilon$.

PROBLEM 3.

- (a) Note that when $W \neq w_0$, we have $W' = W$, and when $W = w_0$ we have $W' = w_0u$ for some $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Thus

$$\text{length}(W') - \text{length}(W) = \mathbf{1}(W = w_0).$$

Thus $E[\text{length}(W')] - E[\text{length}(W)]$ equals $\Pr(W = w_0) = p_0$.

- (b) We have

$$H(W') - H(W) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(w_0u) \log \frac{1}{p(w_0u)} - p_0 \log \frac{1}{p_0}$$

The first sum equals

$$\sum_u p_0 p(u) \log \frac{1}{p_0 p(u)} = p_0 \left[\log \frac{1}{p_0} + H(U) \right],$$

consequently $H(W') - H(W) = p_0 H(U)$.

- (c) The only dictionary with $k = 1$ interior node is $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U}$. For this dictionary $\text{length}(W) = 1$ and $H(W) = H(U)$ so S_1 is true.
- (d) Any dictionary \mathcal{D}' with $k + 1$ interior nodes is obtained from a dictionary \mathcal{D} with k interior nodes by the construction described in the problem. Consequently, from (b), hypothesis S_k , and (a)

$$H(W') = H(W) + p_0 H(U) = E[\text{length}(W)]H(U) + p_0 H(U) = E[\text{length}(W')]H(U)$$

proving S_{k+1} . The statement that S_k is true for all k then follows by induction.

In class we had proved this relationship between $H(W)$, $H(U)$ and $E[\text{length}(W)]$ by a more complicated proof than the one described in this problem.