

42142 6th February 2020

(1)

A probability distribution is a function  $\nu: \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow [0,1]$  satisfying

$$\sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \nu(t) = 1$$

and we imagine that  $\nu$  is telling us the likelihoods of outcomes  $t$  from some random procedure:  $0 \leq \nu(t) \leq 1$  is the probability that  $t$  is the outcome of the random procedure. We could ask, given  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_p$ , what the likelihood of the outcome belonging to  $A$  is?

It is

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{t \in A} \nu(t)$$

for any  $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_p$ . Our main goal today is to describe and relate two ways of measuring how "uncertain" a probability distribution is: how difficult it is to predict the outcome of the random procedure. At the extremes we have the Lebesgue distribution (most difficult to predict) and the Dirac distributions (easy to predict).

The two ways of measuring uncertainty are total variation distance and entropy.

Total  
Variation  
Distance

Given probability distributions  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  the total variation distance between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is

$$d(\mu, \nu) = \max \{ |\mu(A) - \nu(A)| : A \subset \mathbb{Z}_p \}$$

i.e. the farthest apart  $\mu(A)$  and  $\nu(A)$  can be. This distance is in fact a metric on the set of all probability distributions on  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . Given a probability distribution  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  we are especially interested in

$d(\lambda, \mu)$  where (as usual)  $\lambda$  is the Lebesgue distribution. The

Lebesgue distribution is difficult to predict. We consider another distribution  $\nu$  to be harder to predict the closer it is to  $\lambda$ .

$L^1$  identity

Calculating a max is not very easy: there are many subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . The following theorem gives us an easier way to calculate  $d(\mu, \nu)$ .

Theorem For any probability distributions  $\mu, \nu$  on  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  one has

$$d(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} |\mu(t) - \nu(t)|$$

Example Calculate  $d(\lambda, \delta_0)$ .

Solution: By the theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\lambda, \delta_0) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} |\lambda(t) - \delta_0(t)| \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \left| \frac{1}{p} - \delta_0(t) \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{1}{p} - \delta_0(0) \right| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{p-1} \left| \frac{1}{p} - \delta_0(t) \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{p-1} \left| \frac{1}{p} \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} + \frac{p-1}{p} \right) \\
&= \frac{p-1}{p}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Are they close or far apart? By the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\mu, \nu) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} |\mu(t) - \nu(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} |\mu(t)| + |\nu(t)| \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \mu(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \nu(t) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1
\end{aligned}$$

so distributions  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  on  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  cannot be farther than a distance of one apart. If  $p$  is large then  $\frac{p-1}{p}$  is close to 1, so we can think of  $\lambda$  and  $\delta_0$  as being far apart. This agrees with the idea that  $\lambda$  is unpredictable while  $\delta_0$  is very predictable: being close to  $\lambda$  should mean unpredictable, but  $\delta_0$  is predictable thus far from  $\lambda$ .

Entropy

Entropy, which originated in Shannon's work on statistical mechanics, provides a second means of measuring uncertainty. Given a probability distribution  $\mu: \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  its entropy is

$$H(\mu) = - \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \mu(t) \log \mu(t)$$

a number which we think of as measuring how surprised one can expect to be at the outcome of a random procedure with distribution  $\mu$ .

Example Calculate  $H(\lambda)$  and  $H(\delta_0)$ .

Solution:  $H(\lambda) = - \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \lambda(t) \log \lambda(t) = - \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \frac{1}{p} \log \frac{1}{p} = -p \cdot \frac{1}{p} \log \frac{1}{p} = \log p$

$$H(\delta_0) = - \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \delta_0(t) \log \delta_0(t) = -\delta_0(0) \log \delta_0(0) = -0 \log(0) = 0$$

We should not be surprised at all by the outcome of a random procedure with distribution  $\delta_0$ , but should be very surprised by the outcome of a random procedure with distribution  $\lambda$ .

A relation

We have two notions of uncertainty for a distribution  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{Z}_p$

- distance  $d(\lambda, \mu)$  from  $\lambda$
- entropy

It turns out they are related.

Theorem For every probability distribution  $\mu: \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow [0, 1]$  we have

$$\frac{1}{2(H(\lambda) + 1)} |H(\mu) - H(\lambda)| \leq d(\mu, \lambda) \leq \sqrt{2 |H(\mu) - H(\lambda)|}$$

If  $\mu$  is  $\delta_0$  then  $H(\delta_0) = 0$  and  $d(\mu, \lambda) = \frac{p-1}{p}$  and plugging in

gives

$$\frac{\log p}{2(\log p + 1)} \leq \frac{p-1}{p} \leq \sqrt{2 \log p}$$

There is another way to calculate the total variation distance  $d(\mu, \nu)$ . ④

Given a function  $f: \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  write  $\|f\|_\infty = \max\{|f(t)| : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\}$  for its  $L^\infty$  norm.

Theorem

$$d(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{2} \max\{|\mu(f) - \nu(f)| : \|f\|_\infty \leq 1, f: \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$$