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## Today's Topics

- Entropy review
- Entropy and Data Compression
- Uniquely decodable codes
- Prefix Code
- Average Code Length
- Shannon's First Theorem
- Kraft-McMillan I nequality
- Code Efficiency
- Code Extension


## Entropy H(S)

- Entropy is the average information content of a source

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{H}(S)=\mathrm{E}\left[\mathrm{I}\left(s_{k}\right)\right] \\
& \mathrm{H}(S)=\sum_{\mathrm{k}=0}^{\mathrm{K}-1} p_{k} \log _{2}\left(\frac{1}{p_{k}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Conditional Entropy $\mathrm{H}(\mathrm{Y} \mid \mathrm{X})$

Is the amount of information contained in $Y$ such that $X$ is given

$$
H(Y \mid X)==\Sigma_{j} P\left(X=v_{j}\right) H\left(Y \mid X=v_{j}\right)
$$

## J oint Entropy

Is the amount of information contained in both events $X$ and $Y$

$$
H(X, Y)=-\sum_{x, y} p(x, y) \log p(x, y)
$$

## Chain Rule

## Chain Rule

Relationship between conditional and joint entropy

$$
H(X, Y)=H(X)+H(Y \mid X)
$$

# Entropy, Coding and Data Compression 

## Data vs. Information

- "yes," "not," "yes," "yes," "not" "not" ...
- In ASCII, each item is $3 \cdot 8=24$ bits of data
- But if the only possible answers are "yes" and "not," there is only one bit of information per item


## Compression = Squeezing out the "Air"

- Suppose you want to ship pillows in boxes and are charged by the size of the box

- To use as few boxes as possible, squeeze out all the air, pack into boxes, fluff them up at the other end
- Lossless data compression = pillows are perfectly restored
- Lossy data compression = some damage to the pillows is OK (MP3 is a lossy compression standard for music)
- Loss may be OK if it is below human perceptual threshold
- Entropy is a measure of limit of lossless compression


## Fixed length code

Example: Morse Code

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .08 | .01 | .03 | .04 | .12 | .02 | .02 | .06 | .07 | .00 | .01 | .04 | .02 |
| - | $-\ldots$ | .-- | ..- | . | $\ldots-$. | -- | $\ldots$ | .. | .-- | .-- | ..- | -- |
| N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| .07 | .08 | .02 | .00 | .06 | .06 | .09 | .03 | .01 | .02 | .00 | .02 | .00 |
| .- | --- | .-- | .--- | .- | $\ldots$ | - | ..- | $\ldots-$ | -- | ..-- | .--- | ..-- |

## Example: Telegraphy Source English letters -> Morse Code

Sender: from Hokkaido


Receiver: in Tokyo

# Coding Messages with Fixed Length Codes 

- Example: 4 symbols, A, B, C, D
- $A=00, B=01, C=10, D=11$
- In general, with $n$ symbols, codes need to be of length $\lg n$, rounded up
- For English text, 26 letters + space $=27$ symbols, length $=5$ since $2^{4}<27<2^{5}$
(replace all punctuation marks by space)


## Uniquely decodable codes

- If any encoded string has only one possible source string producing it then we have unique decodablity
- Example of uniquely decodable code is the prefix code


## Prefix Coding (Instantaneous code)

- A prefix code is defined as a code in which no codeword is the prefix of some other code word.
- A prefix code is uniquely decodable.


## Example

|  |  | Prefix Code |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source <br> Symbol | Code A | Code B | Code C |
|  | Symbol Codeword | Symbol Codeword | Symbol Codeword |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $s_{1}$ | 1 | 10 | 01 |
| $s_{2}$ | 00 | 110 | 011 |
| $s_{3}$ | 11 | 111 | 0111 |

Uniquely Decodable Codes

## Decoding of a Prefix Code

Example

## Decision Tree for Code B

| Code B |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Source <br> Symbol <br> $s_{k}$ | Symbol <br> Codeword <br> $c_{k}$ |
| $s_{0}$ | 0 |
| $s_{1}$ | 10 |
| $s_{2}$ | 110 |
| $s_{3}$ | 111 |



- Example : Decode 1011111000
- Answer : $\mathrm{s}_{1} \mathrm{~S}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{0} \mathrm{~s}_{0}$


## Prefix Codes

Only one way to decode left to right when message received

## Example 1

| Symbol | A | B | C | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Probability | .7 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| Code | 0 | 100 | 101 | 110 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Received message:


## Prefix Codes

## Example 2

| Source <br> Symbol <br> $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Code E |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Symbol <br> Codeword <br> $c_{k}$ |  |
| A | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
| B | 100 |  |
| C | 110 |  |
| D | 11 |  |

- IS CODE E A PREFIX CODE?
- NO
- WHY?
- Code of $D$ is a prefix to code of $C$


## Average Code Length

## Information $\xrightarrow{s_{k}}$ Source Source <br> Encoder

- Source has Ksymbols
- Each symbol $s_{k}$ has probability $p_{k}$
- Each symbol $s_{k}$ is represented by a codeword $c_{k}$ of length $I_{k}$ bits
- Average codeword length

$$
L=\sum_{k=0}^{k-1} p_{k} I_{k}
$$

Example: Morse Code

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .08 | .01 | .03 | .04 | .12 | .02 | .02 | .06 | .07 | .00 | .01 | .04 | .02 |
| - | $-\ldots$ | .-- | ..- | . | $\ldots-$. | -- | $\ldots$ | .. | .-- | .- | ..- | -- |
| N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z |
| .07 | .08 | .02 | .00 | .06 | .06 | .09 | .03 | .01 | .02 | .00 | .02 | .00 |
| .- | --- | .-- | .-- | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | - | ..- | $\ldots$ | .-- | ..- | .--- | ..-- |

Average codeword length
$L=\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} p_{k} I_{k} \begin{array}{r}=.08 * 2+.01 * 4+\ldots \ldots \ldots+.02 * 4+.00 * 4 \\ 19\end{array}$

# Shannon's First Theorem: The Source Coding Theorem 


-The outputs of an information source cannot be represented by a source code whose average length is less than the source entropy

## Average Code Length

## Example

Average bits per symbol:

$$
\mathrm{L}=.7 \cdot 1+.1 \cdot 3+.1 \cdot 3+.1 \cdot 3=1.6
$$ bits/symbol (down from 2)

| A | B | C | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .7 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| 0 | 100 | 101 | 110 |

Another prefix code that
is better
$\mathrm{L}=.7 \cdot 1+.1 \cdot 2+.1 \cdot 3+.1 \cdot 3=1.5$

| A | B | C | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .7 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| 0 | 10 | 110 | 111 |

## Source Entropy Examples

## Robot Example

- 4-way random walk

$$
\begin{gathered}
\operatorname{prob}(x=S)=\frac{1}{2}, \operatorname{prob}(x=N)=\frac{1}{4} \\
\operatorname{prob}(x=E)=\operatorname{prob}(x=W)=\frac{1}{8} \\
H(X)=-\left(\frac{1}{2} \log _{2} \frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{4} \log _{2} \frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{8} \log _{2} \frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{8} \log _{2} \frac{1}{8}\right)=1.75 b p s
\end{gathered}
$$

## Source Entropy Examples

Robot Example

## Prefix Codes

|  | fixed-length variable-length |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| symbol $k$ | $p_{k}$ | codeword | codeword |  |
| S | 0.5 | 00 | 0 |  |
| $N$ | 0.25 | 01 | 10 |  |
| $E$ | 0.125 | 10 | 110 |  |
| $W$ | 0.125 | 11 | 111 |  |

symbol stream : SS NW SENNNWSSSNESS fixed length: $\underline{00} \underline{00} \underline{01} \underline{1100} \underline{10} \underline{01} \underline{01} \underline{11} \underline{00} \underline{00} \underline{00} \underline{01} \underline{10} \underline{00} \underline{00}$ variable length: $\underline{0} \underline{10} \underline{111} \underline{0} \underline{110} \underline{10} \underline{10} \underline{111} \underline{0} \underline{0} \underline{10} \underline{110} \underline{0} \underline{0}$

4 bits savings achieved by VLC (redundancy eliminated)

## Entropy, Compressibility, Redundancy

- Lower entropy <=> More redundant <=> More compressible
- Higher entropy <=> Less redundant <=> Less compressible


## Entropy and Compression

- First-order entropy is theoretical minimum on code length when only frequencies are taken into account
- $\mathrm{L}=.7 \cdot 1+.1 \cdot 2+.1 \cdot 3+.1 \cdot 3=1.5$
- First-order Entropy $=1.353$

| A | B | C | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| .7 | .1 | .1 | .1 |
| 0 | 10 | 110 | 111 |

- First-order Entropy of English is about 4 bits/character based on "typical" English texts


## Bits

You are watching a set of independent random samples of $X$ You see that $X$ has four possible values
$P(X=A)=1 / 4 \quad P(X=B)=1 / 4 \quad P(X=C)=1 / 4 \quad P(X=D)=1 / 4$

So you might see output: BAACBADCDADDDA...
You transmit data over a binary serial link. You can encode each reading with two bits (e.g. $A=00, B=01, C=10, D=$ 11)

2 bits on average per symbol
0100001001001110110011111100...

## Fewer Bits

Someone tells you that the probabilities are not equal
$P(X=A)=1 / 2 \quad P(X=B)=1 / 4 \quad P(X=C)=1 / 8 \quad P(X=D)=1 / 8$

## Is it possible...

...to invent a coding for your transmission that only uses
1.75 bits on average per symbol. How?

## Fewer Bits

$$
P(X=A)=1 / 2 \quad P(X=B)=1 / 4 \mid P(X=C)=1 / 8 \quad P(X=D)=1 / 8
$$

## It's possible...

...to invent a coding for your transmission that only uses
1.75 bits on average per symbol.

| A | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| B | 10 |
| C | 110 |
| D | 111 |

(This is just one of several ways)

## Fewer Bits

Suppose there are three equally likely values...

$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}
\hline P(X=A)=1 / 3 & P(X=B)=1 / 3 & P(X=C)=1 / 3 \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

Here's a naïve coding, costing 2 bits per symbol

| A | 00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| B | 01 |
| C | 10 |

Can you think of a coding that would need only 1.6 bits per symbol on average?

In theory, it can in fact be done with 1.58496 bits per symbol.

## Kraft-McMillan Inequality

## K-1 <br> 

- If codeword lengths of a code satisfy the Kraft McMillan's inequality, then a prefix code with these codeword lengths can be constructed.
- For code D
- $2^{-1}+2^{-2}+2^{-3}+2^{-2=9 / 8}$
- This means that Code D IS NOT A PREFIX CODE


## Example

| Source | Code D |
| :--- | :--- |
| Symbol |  |

Codeword
Length
$I_{k}$
1
2
3

| $\mathrm{s}_{3}$ | 11 |
| :--- | :--- |

2

## Use of Kraft-McMillan Inequality

- We may use it if the number of symbols are large such that we cannot simply by inspection judge whether a given code is a prefix code or not
- WHAT Kraft-McMillan I nequality Can Do:
- It can determine that a given code IS NOT A PREFIX CODE
- It can identify that a prefix code could be constructed from a set of codeword lengths
- WHAT Kraft-McMillan I nequality Cannot Do:
- It cannot guarantee that a given code is indeed a prefix code


## Example

| Source Symbo I $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Code E |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Symbol Codewor d $c_{k}$ | Codeword Length $I_{k}$ |
| $\mathrm{s}_{0}$ | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{s}_{1}$ | 100 | 3 |
| $S_{2}$ | 110 | 3 |
| $S_{3}$ | 11 | 2 |

- For code E
- $2^{-1}+2^{-2}+2^{-3}+2^{-3=}$ and hence satisfy Kraft-Mcmillan inequality
- IS CODE E A PREFIX CODE?
- NO
- WHY?
- $\mathrm{s}_{3}$ is a prefix to $\mathrm{S}_{2}$


## Code Efficiency $\eta$



- An efficient code means $\eta \rightarrow 1$


## Examples

| Source <br> Symbol <br> $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Symbol <br> Probability <br> $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Code I |  | Code II |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Symbol <br> Codeword <br> $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Codeword <br> Length <br> $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Symbol <br> Codeword <br> $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}$ | Codeword <br> Length <br> $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{k}}$ |
| $\mathrm{s}_{0}$ | $1 / 2$ | 00 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{1}$ | $1 / 4$ | 01 | 2 | 10 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{2}$ | $1 / 8$ | 10 | 2 | 110 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{~s}_{3}$ | $1 / 8$ | 11 | 2 | 111 | 3 |

- Source Entropy
- $H(S)=1 / 2 \log _{2}(2)+1 / 4 \log _{2}(4)+1 / 8 \log _{2}(8)+1 / \log _{2}(8)$
$=13 / 4 \mathrm{bits} /$ symbol
Code I
$L=2 \times\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{8}\right)=2$
$\eta=\frac{7 / 4}{2}=0.875$

Code II

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L=\left(1 \times \frac{1}{2}+2 \times \frac{1}{4}+3 \times \frac{1}{8}+3 \times \frac{1}{8}\right)=\frac{7}{4} \\
& \eta=\frac{7 / 4}{7 / 4}=1
\end{aligned}
$$

## For a Prefix Code

- Shannon's First Theorem

$$
\mathrm{H}(S) \leq L<\mathrm{H}(S)+1
$$

$$
\left(L=\mathrm{H}(S) \quad \text { if } \quad D_{k}=2^{-I_{k}} \forall k\right.
$$

if $p_{k} \neq 2^{-I_{k}}$ for some $k \Longrightarrow n<1$
However, we may increase efficiency by extending the source

## I ncreasing Efficiency by Source Extension

- By extending the source we may potentially increase efficiency
- The drawback is
- Increased decoding complexity

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{H}\left(S^{n}\right) \leq L_{n}<\mathrm{H}\left(S^{n}\right)+1 \\
& n H(S) \leq L_{n}<n H(S)+1 \\
& H(S) \leq \frac{L_{n}}{n}<\mathrm{H}(S)+\frac{1}{n} \\
& \eta=\frac{H(S)}{L_{n} n} \\
& \eta \rightarrow 1 \text { when } \\
& n \rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extension of a Discrete Memoryless Source

- Treats Blocks of $n$ successive symbols

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left.\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Information } \\
\text { Source }
\end{array} \\
S=\left\{S_{0}, S_{1}, \ldots, S_{K-1}\right.
\end{array}\right\} \\
\operatorname{Pr}\left\{S_{k}\right\}=p_{k}, k=0,1, \ldots, K-1 \\
\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} p_{k}=1
\end{gathered}
$$



## Example

- $\mathrm{S}=\left\{s_{0}, s_{1}, s_{2}\right\}, p_{0}=1 / 4, p_{1}=1 / 4, p_{2}=1 / 2$
- $\mathrm{H}(S)=(1 / 4) \log _{2}(4)+(1 / 4) \log _{2}(4)+(1 / 2) \log _{2}(2)$ $H(S)=3 / 2$ bits


## Second-Order Extended Source

| Symbols of $S^{2}$ | $\sigma_{0}$ | $\sigma_{1}$ | $\sigma_{2}$ | $\sigma_{3}$ | $\sigma_{4}$ | $\sigma_{5}$ | $\sigma_{6}$ | $\sigma_{7}$ | $\sigma_{8}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sequence of Symbols <br> from $S$ | $s_{0} s_{0}$ | $s_{0} s_{1}$ | $s_{0} s_{2}$ | $s_{1} s_{0}$ | $s_{1} s_{1}$ | $s_{1} s_{2}$ | $s_{2} s_{0}$ | $s_{2} s_{1}$ | $s_{2} s_{2}$ |
| $\mathrm{P}\left\{\sigma_{i}\right\}, \mathrm{i}=0,1, \ldots, 8$ | $1 / 16$ | $1 / 16$ | $1 / 8$ | $1 / 16$ | $1 / 16$ | $1 / 8$ | $1 / 8$ | $1 / 8$ | $1 / 4$ |

By Computing: $\mathrm{H}\left(S^{2}\right)=3$ bits

## Summery

- Source Encoding
- Efficient representation of information sources
- Source Coding Requirements
- Uniquely Decodable Codes
- Prefix Codes
- No codeword is a prefix to some other code word

Code Efficiency

$$
\eta=\frac{\mathrm{H}(S)}{L}
$$

Kraft's Inequality

$$
\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} 2^{-I_{k}} \leq 1
$$

$H(S) \leq L<H(S)+1$

End

