

# Official solutions to Exercise 17 from Discrete Stochastics and Information Theory

April 19, 2018

Let  $X$  be a discrete random variable with values  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  and the distribution  $\mathbb{P}[X = x_i] = p_i$  where  $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$ .

(a) In part (a) we have to show that  $H(X) \geq 0$  and  $H(X) = 0$  iff  $X$  is almost surely constant.

By the definition of the entropy it holds, that  $H(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n -\log_2(p_i) \cdot p_i$ .

If  $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : p_i \in ]0, 1[$ , then  $\ln(p_i) < 0$  and  $p_i > 0$ . As all summands have the same sign,  $H(X) > 0$  in this case.

Otherwise, if  $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : p_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , (i.e.  $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : p_i = 1$ ) the product  $p_i \cdot \log_2(p_i)$  is zero. Hence their sum is zero and so is  $H(X)$ .

(b) For part (b) we have to show that the maximum of the mapping  $p \mapsto H(p)$  is reached iff  $X$  is uniformly distributed.

**Solution using Lagrange Optimization** The mapping  $p \mapsto H(p) = \sum_{i=1}^n -\ln(p_i) \cdot p_i$  is defined on the following set:

$$\Delta_n = \left\{ (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : p_i \geq 0 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \right\}$$

On  $\text{Int}(\Delta_n) = \Delta_n \setminus \partial\Delta_n^1$ , the entropy  $H$  is  $\mathcal{C}^\infty$  smooth. By Lagrange optimization, we get a necessary condition for extreme values, i.e. that the first partial derivatives of the function

$$L(p) = \sum_{i=1}^n -\log_2(p_i) \cdot p_i + \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i - 1 \right)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The considered topology on  $\Delta$  is the topology induced by the equality constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$ , i.e. the topology in the affine subspace  $\{(p_1, \dots, p_n) \mid \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1\}$ . Alternatively,  $\Delta_n$  can be considered as a  $n - 1$ -dimensional smooth submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with boundary. Local coordinate charts are given by  $\varphi_i : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  with  $\varphi_i(p_1, \dots, p_n) = (p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_n)$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

vanish. So let's compute these derivertives.

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial p_i} = -\log_2(p_i) - \frac{1}{\ln(2)} + \lambda = 0$$

Equivalently,

$$-\log_2(p_i) = \frac{1}{\ln(2)} - \lambda$$

So  $-\log_2(p_i)$  does not depend on  $i$ . As  $-\log_2$  is bijective it follows that  $p_i$  is constant for all  $i$ . Hence, if  $H$  attains a maximum on  $\text{Int}(\Delta_n)$ , this can only happen if  $H$  is uniformly distributed. It remains to show, that this point is in fact a maximum (and not a minimum or a saddle point). For this, we show:

$$H\left(\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n}\right) = \log_2(n) > H(p_1, \dots, p_n) \quad \forall (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \partial\Delta_n \quad (1)$$

The equality of (1) is easy to see by plugging in into the definition of  $H$ . We show the inequality in (1) by iduction.

For  $n = 1$ , there is nothing to show. For  $n = 2$ ,  $\partial\Delta_2 = \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$  and  $\text{Int}(\Delta_2) = \{(p, 1 - p) | p \in ]0, 1[ \}$ . In part (a), we have seen that  $H$  takes its unique minima on the boundary of  $\Delta_2$ .

For the induction step, we consider the following induction hypothesis:

$$\forall m \leq n : H(p) \leq \log_2(m) \leq \log_2(n) \quad \forall p \in \Delta_m \quad (2)$$

It is enough to show that  $H(p) < \log_2(n + 1)$  for  $p \in \partial\Delta_{n+1}$ . So let  $p = (p_1, \dots, p_{n+1}) \in \partial\Delta_{n+1}$ . Because  $p$  lies on the boundary of  $\Delta_{n+1}$ , there exists a  $j \in \{1, \dots, n + 1\}$  such that  $p_j = 0$ . Consider  $\tilde{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_{j-1}, p_{j+1}, \dots, p_{n+1}) \in \Delta_n$ . Then, by the definition of the entropy,  $H(\tilde{p}) = H(p)$ . By induction hypothesis we get  $H(\tilde{p}) \leq \log_2(n) < \log_2(n + 1)$ , which completes the induction proof.

**Solution using Jensen Inequality** Observe that the function  $f : ]0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f(x) = -x \cdot \log_2(x)$  is strictly concave. This is because the second derivertive is strictly negative:

$$f''(x) = (-x \cdot \log_2(x))'' = -\left(x \cdot \frac{1}{x \ln(2)} + \log_2(x)\right)' = -\left(\frac{1}{\ln(2)} + \log_2(x)\right)' = -\frac{1}{x \ln(2)} < 0$$

The continuos continuation of  $f$  to  $[0, 1]$  is still strictly concave. By Jensen, inequality, we have for a  $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \Delta_n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H(p) &= \sum_{i=1}^n -p_i \log_2(p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(p_i) = n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} f(p_i) \\ &\geq n f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} p_i\right) = n f\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = n \cdot \left(-\frac{1}{n} \log_2\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) = \log_2(n) \end{aligned}$$

For strict concave function, equality holds in Jenen's inequality iff  $f(p_1) = \dots = f(p_n)$ , which is only given if  $X$  is uniformly distributed.