

Generalized Statistics Framework for Rate Distortion Theory

R. C. Venkatesan ^{a,*} A. Plastino ^b

^a*Systems Research Corporation, Aundh, Pune 411007, India*

^b*IFLP, National University La Plata & National Research Council (CONICET)
C. C., 727 1900, La Plata, Argentina*

Abstract

Variational principles for the rate distortion (RD) theory in lossy compression are formulated within the ambit of the generalized nonextensive statistics of Tsallis, for values of the nonextensivity parameter satisfying $0 < q < 1$ and $q > 1$. Alternating minimization numerical schemes to evaluate the nonextensive RD function, are derived. Numerical simulations demonstrate the efficacy of generalized statistics RD models.

Key words: Generalized Tsallis statistics, rate distortion, additive duality, compression information, nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm, distortion-compression plane.

PACS: 05.40.-a; 05.20.Gg; 89.70.-a; 89.70.Cf

1 Introduction

The generalized (nonadditive) statistics of Tsallis' [1,2] has recently been the focus of much attention in statistical physics, and allied disciplines. Nonadditive statistics ¹ generalizes the extensive Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics, has much utility in a wide spectrum of disciplines ranging from complex systems and condensed matter physics to financial mathematics ². This paper

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +91-20-25883952.

Email addresses: ravi@systemsresearchcorp.com (R. C. Venkatesan),
plastino@venus.fisica.unlp.edu.ar (A. Plastino).

¹ The terms generalized statistics, nonadditive statistics, and nonextensive statistics are used interchangeably.

² A continually updated bibliography of works related to nonextensive statistics may be found at <http://tsallis.cat.cbpf.br/biblio.htm>.

investigates nonadditive statistics within the context of Rate Distortion (RD) theory in lossy data compression.

RD theory constitutes one of the cornerstones of contemporary information theory [3, 4], and is a prominent example of *source coding*. It addresses the problem of determining the minimal amount of entropy (or information) R that should be communicated over a channel, so that a compressed (reduced) representation of the source (input signal) can be approximately reconstructed at the receiver (output signal) without exceeding a given distortion D .

For a thorough exposition of RD theory Section 13 of [3] should be consulted. Consider a discrete random variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$ ³ called the *source alphabet* or the *codebook*, and, another discrete random variable $\tilde{X} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ which is a compressed representation of X . The compressed representation \tilde{X} is sometimes referred to as the *reproduction alphabet* or the *quantized codebook*. By definition, quantization is the process of approximating a continuous range of values (or a very large set of possible discrete values) by a relatively small set of discrete symbols or integer values.

The mapping of $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ is characterized by a conditional (transition) probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. The information rate distortion function is obtained by minimizing the generalized mutual entropy $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ (defined in Section 2)⁴ over all normalized $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. Note that in RD theory $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ is known as the *compression information* (see Section 4). Here, q is the nonextensivity parameter [1, 2] defined in Section 2.

RD theory has found applications in diverse disciplines, which include data compression and machine learning. Deterministic annealing [5,6] and the information bottleneck method [7] are two influential paradigms in machine learning, that are closely related to RD theory. The representation of RD theory in the form of a variational principle, expressed within the framework of the Shannon information theory, has been established [3]. The computational implementation of the RD problem is achieved by application of the Blahut-Arimoto alternating minimization algorithm [3,8], derived from the celebrated Csiszár-Tusnády theory [9].

Since the work on nonextensive source coding by Landsberg and Vedral [10], a number of studies on the information theoretic aspects of generalized statistics pertinent to coding related problems have been performed by Yamano [11], Furuichi [12], and Suyari [13], amongst others. The source coding theorem, central to the RD problem, has been derived by Yamano [14] using generalized statistics. A preliminary work by Venkatesan [15] has investigated into the re-

³ Calligraphic fonts denote sets.

⁴ The absence of a principled nonextensive channel coding theorem prompts the use of the term mutual entropy instead of mutual information.

formulation of RD theory and the information bottleneck method, within the framework of nonextensive statistics.

Generalized statistics has utilized a number of constraints to define expectation values. The linear constraints originally employed by Tsallis of the form $\langle A \rangle = \sum_i p_i A_i$ [1], were convenient owing to their similarity to the maximum entropy constraints. The linear constraints were abandoned because of difficulties encountered in obtaining an acceptable form for the partition function. These were subsequently replaced by the Curado-Tsallis (C-T) [16] constraints $\langle A \rangle_q = \sum_i p_i^q A_i$. The C-T constraints were later discarded on physics related grounds, $\langle 1 \rangle_q \neq 1$, and replaced by the normalized Tsallis-Mendes-Plastino (T-M-P) constraints [17] $\langle \langle A \rangle \rangle_q = \sum_i \frac{p_i^q}{\sum_i p_i^q} A_i$. The dependence of the expectation value on the normalized *pdf* renders the canonical probability distributions obtained using the T-M-P constraints to be *self-referential*. A fourth form of constraint, prominent in nonextensive statistics, is the optimal Lagrange multiplier (OLM) constraint [18, 19]. The OLM constraint removes the self-referentiality caused by the T-M-P constraints by introducing centered mean values.

A recent formulation by Ferri, Martinez, and Plastino [20] has demonstrated a methodology to “rescue” the linear constraints in maximum (Tsallis) entropy models, and, has related solutions obtained using the linear, C-T, and, T-M-P constraints. This formulation [20] has commonality with the studies of Wada and Scarfone [21], Bashkirov [22], and, Di Sisto *et. al.* [23]. This paper extends the work in [15], by employing the Ferri-Martinez-Plastino formulation [20] to formulate self-consistent nonextensive RD models for $0 < q < 1$ and $q > 1$.

Tsallis statistics is described by two separate ranges of the nonextensivity parameter, i.e. $0 < q < 1$ and $q > 1$. Within the context of coding theory and learning theory, each range of q has its own specific utility. Un-normalized Tsallis entropies take different forms for $0 < q < 1$ and $q > 1$, respectively. For example, as defined in Section 2, for $0 < q < 1$, the generalized mutual entropy is of the form $I_{0 < q < 1}(X; \tilde{X}) = - \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x})}{p(x, \tilde{x})} \right)$.

For $q > 1$, as described in Section 2, the generalized mutual entropy is defined by $I_{q > 1}(X; \tilde{X}) = S_q(X) + S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(X, \tilde{X})$, where $S_q(X)$ and $S_q(\tilde{X})$ are the marginal Tsallis entropies for the random variables X and \tilde{X} , and, $S_q(X, \tilde{X})$ is the joint Tsallis entropy. Unlike the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon case, $I_{0 < q < 1}(X; \tilde{X})$ can never acquire the form of $I_{q > 1}$, and vice versa. While the form of $I_{0 < q < 1}(X; \tilde{X})$ is important in a number of applications of practical interest in coding theory and learning theory, un-normalized Tsallis entropies for $q > 1$ demonstrate a number of important properties such as the *generalized data processing inequality* and the *generalized Fano inequality* [12].

It may be noted that *normalized* Tsallis entropies do exhibit the *generalized data processing inequality* and the *generalized Fano inequality* [11]. However, as pointed out by Abe [24], *normalized* Tsallis entropies do not give rise to experimentally observable quantities.

To reconcile the different forms of the generalized mutual entropy for $0 < q < 1$ and $q > 1$, the *additive duality of nonextensive statistics* [25] is evoked in Section 3. This results in dual Tsallis entropies characterized by re-parameterization of the nonextensivity parameter $q^* = 2 - q$, results in a *dual generalized RD theory*. An important feature of dual Tsallis entropies is the similarity of the forms of the Tsallis entropies with their counterparts in Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics, the difference being $\log(\bullet) \rightarrow \ln_{q^*}(\bullet)$ [26].

In this paper, Tsallis entropies characterized by a nonextensivity parameter q are called *q-Tsallis entropies*. Similarly, those characterized by the re-parameterized nonextensivity parameter q^* are called *q*-Tsallis entropies*. The two forms of Tsallis entropies may be used in conjunction to obtain a self-consistent description of nonextensive phenomena [27].

Summing up, this Section outlines the material presented in this paper. The basic theory of *q-Tsallis entropies* and *q*-Tsallis entropies* are described in Sections 2 and 3 respectively. Section 3 also derives select information theoretic properties for *q*-Tsallis entropies*. Section 4 defines the generalized statistics RD problem, and, describes alternating minimization numerical algorithms within the ambit of nonextensive statistics. The mathematical justification underlying the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm is also derived in Section 4. Section 5 extends prior studies [15] by deriving variational principles for both, a generalized RD theory, and, a dual generalized RD theory. The practical implementation of a nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm is also described in Section 5.

Section 6 presents numerical simulations that demonstrate the efficacy of the generalized RD theory *vis-à-vis* equivalent formulations derived within the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon framework. It is demonstrated that the generalized RD theory possesses a lower threshold for the compression information, as compared with equivalent extensive Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon RD models. *This feature has immense potential significance in data compression applications.* Section 7 concludes this paper by summarizing salient results, and, briefly highlighting qualitative extensions that will be presented in forthcoming publications.

2 Tsallis entropies

By definition, the *un-normalized* Tsallis entropy, is defined in terms of discrete variables as [1, 2]:

$$S_q(X) = -\frac{1 - \sum_x p^q(x)}{1-q}; \sum_x p(x) = 1. \quad (1)$$

The constant q is referred to as the *nonextensivity parameter*. Given two independent variables X and Y , one of the fundamental consequences of nonextensivity is demonstrated by the *pseudo-additivity* relation:

$$S_q(XY) = S_q(X) + S_q(Y) + (1-q) S_q(X) S_q(Y). \quad (2)$$

Here, (1) and (2) imply that extensive statistics is recovered as $q \rightarrow 1$. Taking the limit $q \rightarrow 1$ in (1) and evoking l'Hospital's rule, $S_q(X) \rightarrow S(X)$, i.e., the Shannon entropy. The generalized Kullback-Leibler divergence (K-Ld) is of the form [28, 29]:

$$D_{K-L}^q(p(X) \| r(X)) = \sum_x p(x) \frac{\left(\frac{p(x)}{r(x)}\right)^{q-1} - 1}{q-1}. \quad (3)$$

Akin to the Tsallis entropy, the generalized K-Ld obeys the *pseudo-additivity* relation [29]. Nonextensive statistics is intimately related to *q-deformed* algebra and calculus (see [30] and the references within). The *q-deformed* logarithm and exponential are defined as [30]:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln_q(x) &= \frac{x^{1-q} - 1}{1-q}, \\ \text{and,} \\ \exp_q(x) &= \begin{cases} [1 + (1-q)x]^{1/(1-q)}; & 1 + (1-q)x \geq 0 \\ 0; & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

respectively. Before proceeding further, three important relations from *q-deformed* algebra, employed in this paper, are stated [12, 30]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln_q \left(\frac{x}{y} \right) &= y^{q-1} (\ln_q x - \ln_q y), \\
\ln_q (xy) &= \ln_q x + x^{1-q} \ln_q y, \\
\text{and,} \\
\ln_q \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) &= -x^{q-1} \ln_q x.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The *un-normalized* Tsallis entropy (1), conditional Tsallis entropy, joint Tsallis entropy, and, the generalized K-Ld (3) may thus be written as [12, 28, 29]:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_q(X) &= - \sum_x p(x)^q \ln_q p(x), \\
S_q(\tilde{X}|X) &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x})^q \ln_q p(\tilde{x}|x), \\
S_q(X, \tilde{X}) &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x})^q \ln_q p(x, \tilde{x}) \\
&= S_q(X) + S_q(\tilde{X}|X) = S_q(\tilde{X}) + S_q(X|\tilde{X}), \\
\text{and,} \\
D_{K-L}^q(p(X) \| r(X)) &= - \sum_x p(x) \ln_q \frac{r(x)}{p(x)},
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

respectively. The joint convexity of the generalized K-Ld for $q > 0$ is established by the relation [31, 32]:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{K-L}^q \left(\sum_{\alpha} \eta_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} \parallel \sum_{\alpha} \eta_{\alpha} r_{\alpha} \right) &\leq \sum_{\alpha} \eta_{\alpha} D_{K-L}^q(p_{\alpha} \| r_{\alpha}), \\
\eta_{\alpha} &> 0, \text{ and, } \sum_{\alpha} \eta_{\alpha} = 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In the framework of Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics, the mutual information may be expressed as [3] $I(X; \tilde{X}) = S(X) - S(X|\tilde{X}) = S(\tilde{X}) - S(\tilde{X}|X)$. Within the framework of nonextensive statistics, the mutual entropy is defined by [12]:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_q(X; \tilde{X}) &= S_q(X) - S_q(X|\tilde{X}) = S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(\tilde{X}|X) \\
&= S_q(X) + S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(X, \tilde{X}) = I_q(\tilde{X}; X),
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

contingent to the validity of the inequalities:

$$S_q(X|\tilde{X}) \leq S_q(X), \text{ and, } S_q(\tilde{X}|X) \leq S_q(\tilde{X}). \tag{9}$$

The inequalities (9) do not generally hold true for $0 < q < 1$. Note that (8) is valid for $q > 1$ [12]. For $0 < q < 1$, the *un-normalized* generalized mutual entropy $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ is defined by ⁵:

$$\begin{aligned} I_q(X; \tilde{X}) &= - \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x})}{p(x, \tilde{x})} \right) \\ &= D_{K-L}^q \left(p(X, \tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p(\tilde{X}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

From (10), the symmetry of the generalized mutual entropy is established as:

$$\begin{aligned} I_q(\tilde{X}; X) &= - \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x, \tilde{x})}{p(x)p(\tilde{x})} \right) \\ &= D_{K-L}^q \left(p(X)p(\tilde{X}) \parallel p(X, \tilde{X}) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} - \sum_x p(x) \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x})}{p(x)p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x, \tilde{x})}{p(x)} \right) = - \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})p(x|\tilde{x})}{p(x)p(\tilde{x})} \right) \\ &= D_{K-L}^q \left(p(X, \tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p(\tilde{X}) \right) \\ &\Rightarrow I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = I_q(\tilde{X}; X), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where (a) is a consequence of Bayes' theorem. It may be noted that for *normalized* Tsallis entropies, Yamano [11] has elegantly established the symmetry and validity of (8) for $0 < q < 1$. Further, Furuichi [12] has presented a thorough and exhaustive qualitative extension of the analysis of Daróczy [33], and has proven that (8) and the inequalities (9) hold true for *un-normalized* Tsallis entropies for $q \geq 1$.

3 Dual Tsallis information theoretic measures

This paper makes prominent use of the *additive duality* in nonextensive statistics. Setting $q^* = 2 - q$, from (4) the *dual deformed* logarithm and exponential are defined as:

$$\ln_{q^*}(x) = -\ln_q\left(\frac{1}{x}\right), \text{ and, } \exp_{q^*}(x) = \frac{1}{\exp_q(-x)}. \quad (12)$$

The reader is referred to Naudts [25] for further details.

⁵ The $\log(\bullet)$ in the extensive convex mutual information [3] is replaced by $\ln_q(\bullet)$ (4). Also refer to Theorem 3 in this paper.

A dual Tsallis entropy defined by:

$$S_{q \rightarrow 2-q}(X) = - \sum_x p(x) \ln_{q \rightarrow 2-q} p(x), \quad (13)$$

has already been studied in a maximum (Tsallis) entropy setting (for example, see Wada and Scarfone [26]). It is important to note that the $q^* = 2 - q$ duality has been studied within the Sharma-Taneja-Mittal framework by Kaniadakis, *et. al.* [34]. The following properties, however, have yet to be proven for dual Tsallis entropies: (a) the validity of (8) for dual Tsallis entropies, and, (b) the adherence of the dual Tsallis entropies to the chain rule [3, 12]. The task is undertaken below.

Theorem 1: *The dual Tsallis joint entropy obeys the relation:*

$$\begin{aligned} S_{q \rightarrow 2-q}(X, \tilde{X}) &= S_{q \rightarrow 2-q}(X) + S_{q \rightarrow 2-q}(\tilde{X} | X), \\ \text{where,} \\ S_{q \rightarrow 2-q}(X) &= - \sum_x p(x) \ln_{q \rightarrow 2-q} p(x), \\ \text{and,} \\ S_{q \rightarrow 2-q}(\tilde{X} | X) &= - \sum_x p(x) \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x} | x) \ln_{q \rightarrow 2-q} p(\tilde{x} | x). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Note that $2 - q = q^*$, $\ln_{q \rightarrow 2-q} = \ln_{q^*} = \frac{x^{1-q^*}-1}{1-q^*}$, and, $S_{q \rightarrow 2-q}(\bullet) = S_{q^*}(\bullet)$.

Proof: From (5) and (6):

$$\begin{aligned} S_q(X, \tilde{X}) &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x})^q \ln_q p(x, \tilde{x}) \\ &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x})^q \ln_q (p(x) p(\tilde{x} | x)) \\ &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x})^q \left[\ln_q p(x) + p(x)^{1-q} \ln_q p(\tilde{x} | x) \right] \\ &= \sum_x p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{1}{p(x)} \right) + \sum_x p(x) \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x} | x) \ln_q \left(\frac{1}{p(\tilde{x} | x)} \right) \\ &\Rightarrow S_{q^*}(X, \tilde{X}) = - \sum_x p(x) \ln_{q^*} p(x) - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_{q^*} p(\tilde{x} | x) \\ &= S_{q^*}(X) + S_{q^*}(\tilde{X} | X). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In conclusion, the dual Tsallis entropies acquire a form identical to the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon entropies, with $\ln_{q^}(\bullet)$ replacing $\log(\bullet)$.*

Theorem 2: Let $X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_n$ be random variables obeying the probability distribution $p(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n)$, then we have the chain rule:

$$S_{q^*}(X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n S_{q^*}(X_i | X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1). \quad (16)$$

Proof: Theorem 2 is proved by induction on n . Assuming (16) holds true for some n , (15) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{q^*}(X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_{n+1}) &= \\ S_{q^*}(X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_n) + S_{q^*}(X_{n+1} | X_n, \dots, X_1) & \quad (17) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^n S_{q^*}(X_i | X_{i-1}, \dots, X_1) + S_{q^*}(X_{n+1} | X_n, \dots, X_1), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that (16) holds true for $n + 1$. Theorem 2 implies that the dual Tsallis entropies can support a parametrically extended information theory.

Theorem 3: The dual convex mutual entropy is described by:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{q^*}(X; \tilde{X}) &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x})}{p(x, \tilde{x})} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(q^* \rightarrow q)}{=} S_q(X) + S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(X, \tilde{X}). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{q^*}(X; \tilde{X}) &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x})}{p(x, \tilde{x})} \right) = - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p(\tilde{x}|x)} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \left(\ln_{q^*} p(\tilde{x}) + p(\tilde{x})^{(1-q^*)} \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{1}{p(\tilde{x}|x)} \right) \right) \\ &= - \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \frac{p(\tilde{x})^{q^*-1}}{p(\tilde{x})^{q^*-1}} \frac{p(\tilde{x})^{1-q^*}-1}{1-q^*} + \\ &\quad - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) p(x)^{(1-q^*)} p(\tilde{x}|x)^{(1-q^*)} \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{1}{p(\tilde{x}|x)} \right) \quad (19) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} - \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x})^q \frac{p(\tilde{x})^{1-q}-1}{1-q^*} + \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x)^q p(\tilde{x}|x)^q \ln_q p(\tilde{x}|x) \\ &\Rightarrow I_{q^* \rightarrow q}(X; \tilde{X}) = S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(\tilde{X} | X) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} S_q(X) + S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(X, \tilde{X}) \stackrel{q \rightarrow q^*}{=} I_{q^*}(\tilde{X}; X). \end{aligned}$$

Here, (a) follows from (5), (b) follows from setting $q^* = 2 - q$, and, (c) follows from (8). Theorem 3 acquires a certain significance especially when it may be proven [11] that the convex form of the mutual entropy (10) can never be expressed in the form of Tsallis entropies (8).

Theorem 3 demonstrates that such a relation is indeed possible by commencing with q^* -Tsallis mutual entropy and performing manipulations that scale the mutual entropy from q^* -space to q -space, yielding a form akin to (8). Interchanging the range of values and the connotations of q and q^* respectively, such that $0 < q < 1$ & $q^* > 1$, Theorem 3 may be modified to justify defining the convex q -Tsallis mutual entropy by (10).

4 Nonextensive rate distortion theory and alternating minimization schemes

4.1 Overview of rate distortion theory

For a thorough exposition of RD theory, the interested reader is referred to Section 13 in [3]. Let X be a discrete random variables with a finite set of possible values \mathcal{X} , distributed according to $p(x)$. Here, X is the *source alphabet*. Let \tilde{X} denote the *reproduction alphabet* (a compressed representation of X). The compressed representation is defined through a (possibly stochastic) mapping between each value $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to each value $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. This mapping is characterized by the conditional probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, inducing a probabilistic (soft) partitioning of X . Thus, each value of X is associated with all elements of \tilde{X} with a normalized conditional probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$.

A standard measure that defines the quality of compression is the rate of a *code* with respect to a channel transmitting between X and \tilde{X} . In generalized statistics, this quantity is the generalized mutual entropy $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ ⁶. The quantity $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ is defined as the *compression information*, which is evaluated on the basis of the joint probability $p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)$. Low values of $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ imply a more compact representation, and this better compression. An extreme case would be where \tilde{X} has only one element (cardinality of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = 1$, $|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}| = 1$, resulting in $I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = 0$.

To obtain a deeper insight into the process of RD, the case of $q > 1$ is briefly examined. This is a simple example of nonextensive models that, having nonextensivity parameters in the ranges i) $0 < q < 1$ and ii) $q > 1$, complement each other. The models may help to understand the physics of a certain problems by employing the additive duality. Note that the physics underlying rate distortion remains unchanged regardless of the range of q .

As stated in Sections 1 and 2, the generalized mutual information $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$

⁶ Note that these arguments are adapted from the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon RD model, where $q = 1$

cannot be stated in the form described by (8). Employing (8) and (19), we obtain $I_{q^*}(X; \tilde{X}) \stackrel{q^* \rightarrow q}{=} I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(\tilde{X}|X)$. Let \mathcal{X} be inhabited by a sender and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ by a receiver. Here, $S_q(\tilde{X})$ is the prior uncertainty the receiver has about the sender's signal, which is diminished by $S_q(\tilde{X}|X)$ as the signal is received. The difference yields $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$. As an example, in case there is no communication at all, then $S_q(\tilde{X}|X) = S_q(\tilde{X})$, and, $I_{q^*}(X; \tilde{X}) \stackrel{q^* \rightarrow q}{=} I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = 0$.

Alternatively, if the communication channel is perfect and the received signal \tilde{X} is identical to the signal X at the sender (the *source alphabet* is simply copied as the *reproduction alphabet*), then $S_q(\tilde{X}|X) = 0$ and $I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = S_q(\tilde{X}) = S_q(X)$. In Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics ($q = 1$), this is called the *Shannon upper bound* [3]. In nonextensive statistics, this quantity is hereafter referred to as the *Tsallis upper bound*.

The compression information may always be reduced by using only a single value of \tilde{X} , thereby ignoring the details in X . This requires an additional constraint called the *distortion measure*. The distortion measure is denoted by $d(x, \tilde{x})$ and is taken to be the Euclidean square distance for most problems in science and engineering [3,6].

Given $d(x, \tilde{x})$, the partitioning of X induced by $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ has an expected distortion $D = \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})} = \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) d(x, \tilde{x})$ ⁷. Note that D is the mathematical equivalent to the internal energy in statistical physics.

The RD function is [3, 4]:

$$R_q(D) = \min_{p(\tilde{x}|x): \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})} \leq D} I_q(X; \tilde{X}), \quad (20)$$

where, $R_q(D)$ is the minimum of the *compression information*. As depicted in Fig. 1, $R_q(D)$ is a non-increasing convex function of D in the *distortion-compression plane*. The $R_q(D)$ function separates the *distortion-compression plane* into two regions. The region above the curve is known as the *rate distortion region*, and, corresponds to all achievable *distortion-compression pairs* $\{D; I_q(X; \tilde{X})\}$.

On the other hand, the region below the curve is known as the *non-achievable region*, where compression cannot occur. The major feature of nonextensive RD models is that the RD curves inhabit the non-achievable region of those obtained from Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics. This implies that nonextensive RD models can perform data compression in regimes not achievable by

⁷ Note that in this paper, $\langle \bullet \rangle_{p(\bullet)}$ denotes the expectation with respect to the probability $p(\bullet)$.

equivalent extensive RD models.

Obtaining $R_q(D)$ involves minimization of the nonextensive RD Lagrangian (free energy) is [4]:

$$L_{RD}^q[p(\tilde{x}|x)] = I_q(X; \tilde{X}) + \tilde{\beta} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})}, \quad (21)$$

subject to the normalization of the conditional probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. For linear constraints, $\tilde{\beta} = q\beta$ (see Section 5.1) is the nonextensive inverse temperature, and, β is the inverse temperature in Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics [5, 6]. Note that (21) implies that RD theory is a trade-off between the *compression information* and the expected distortion. Taking the variation of (21) over all normalized distributions $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta L_{RD}^q[p(\tilde{x}|x)] &= \delta I_q(X; \tilde{X}) + \tilde{\beta} \delta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})} = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\delta I_q(X; \tilde{X})}{\delta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})}} &= -\tilde{\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Here, (22) implies that the rate of change of the generalized mutual entropy with respect to the expected distortion is called the RD curve, and a tangent drawn at any point on the RD curve has a slope $-\tilde{\beta}$. To prove that the conditional distribution $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ represents a stationary point of $L_{RD}^q[p(\tilde{x}|x)]$, (21) is subjected to a variational minimization contingent to the normalization of $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. This procedure is detailed in Section 5 of this paper, for both q and q^* Tsallis mutual entropies.

4.2 The nonextensive alternating minimization scheme

The basis for alternating minimization algorithm (a class of algorithms that include the Blahut-Arimoto scheme)⁸ is to find the minimum distance between two convex sets A and B in \mathcal{R}^n ⁹. First, a point $a \in A$ is chosen and a point $b \in B$ closest to it is found. This value of b is fixed and its closest point in A is then found. The above process is repeated till the algorithm converges to a (global) minimum distance.

Extrapolating the Csiszár-Tusnády theory [9] to the nonextensive domain for two convex sets of probability distributions, and using the generalized K-Ld

⁸ See Chapter 13 in [3].

⁹ Note that the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm presented herein is not referred to as the nonextensive Blahut-Arimoto algorithm, despite being an obvious extension, because the Blahut-Arimoto scheme is synonymous with Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics.

(3) and (10) as a distance measure, the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm converges to the minimum $D_{K-L}^q(\bullet)$ between the two convex sets of probability distributions. It is important to note that the nonextensive Pythagorean property (triangular equality), which forms the basis of any extension of the Csiszár-Tusnády theory to the nonextensive regime, has been established by Dukkupati *et. al.* [35].

Before proceeding any further, it is judicious to state the leitmotiv of this Section. The procedure behind the alternating minimization algorithm described herein assumes an *a-priori* minimization of the nonextensive RD Lagrangian (21), with respect to conditional probabilities $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, for all normalized $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, using the calculus of variations. This variational minimization yields a canonical conditional probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. The variational minimization procedure is presented in Section 5.

Here, $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ corresponds to the joint probability $p(x, \tilde{x}) = p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)$, which is employed to evaluate the expected distortion $D = \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})}$. It is important to prove that, $p(\tilde{x})$ is a marginal probability (or marginal) of $p(x, \tilde{x})$. This criterion ensures that extremization with respect to $p(\tilde{x})$ further minimizes (21). Section 5.3 provides a discussion of the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm, from a practitioner's viewpoint. Now a result that establishes the basis for the alternating minimization scheme in the nonextensive regime is stated and proven.

Lemma 1: Let $p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)$ be a given joint distribution. The prior distribution $p(\tilde{x})$ that minimizes $D_{K-L}^q[p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)||p(x)p(\tilde{x})]$ is the marginal distribution to $p^*(\tilde{x})$ corresponding to $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, i.e.:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{K-L}^q(p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)||p(x)p^*(\tilde{x})) &= \\ &= \min_{p(\tilde{x})} D_{K-L}^q(p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)||p(x)p(\tilde{x})), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where:

$$p^*(\tilde{x}) = \sum_x p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x). \quad (24)$$

Proof: The q -deformed difference is defined as [30]:

$$\begin{aligned} x \ominus_q y &= \frac{x-y}{1+(1-q)y} \\ \Rightarrow \ln_q\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) &= \ln_q x \ominus_q \ln_q y = \frac{\ln_q x - \ln_q y}{1+(1-q)\ln_q y} \\ \Rightarrow \ln_q\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) \ominus_q \ln_q\left(\frac{z}{y}\right) &= (\ln_q x \ominus_q \ln_q y) \ominus_q (\ln_q z \ominus_q \ln_q y) \\ &= \frac{\ln_q\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) - \ln_q\left(\frac{z}{y}\right)}{1+(1-q)\ln_q\left(\frac{z}{y}\right)} = \ln_q\left(\frac{x}{z}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

With the aid of (25), the generalized K-Ld in (6) is:

$$D_{K-L}^q(p(X) \| r(X)) = - \langle \ln_q r(x) \ominus_q \ln_q p(x) \rangle_{p(x)}. \quad (26)$$

With the aid of (25) and (26), (23) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{K-L}^q(p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \| p(x)p(\tilde{x})) \ominus_q D_{K-L}^q(p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \| p(x)p^*(\tilde{x})) \\ &= - \left\langle \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p(\tilde{x}|x)} \right) \ominus_q \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})}{p(\tilde{x}|x)} \right) \right\rangle_{p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)} \\ &= - \left\langle \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p^*(\tilde{x})} \right) \right\rangle_{p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)} \\ &= - \sum_{\tilde{x}} \sum_x p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p^*(\tilde{x})} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{\tilde{x}} p^*(\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p^*(\tilde{x})} \right) = D_{K-L}^q(p^*(\tilde{x}) \| p(\tilde{x})) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

From (27), it is required that:

$$p^*(\tilde{x}) = \sum_x p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x). \quad (28)$$

Equivalently, it may be proven that (28) is the marginal distribution that minimizes $\left\langle D_{K-L}^q(p(\tilde{x}|x) \| p^*(\tilde{x})) \right\rangle_{p(x)}$. The result in (28) is not achievable without the aid of q -deformed algebra [30].

It is important to note that Lemma 1 establishes the fact that the nonextensive alternating extremization scheme minimizes the generalized statistics RD Lagrangian (21). Any other form of marginal probability other than (24) could have a two-fold debilitating effect on the generalized statistics RD model presented in this paper. First, Bayes' theorem would be violated thereby invalidating the use of an alternating minimization solution to the nonextensive RD model. Next, the RD Lagrangian (21) could be maximized.

Note that minimum $D_{K-L}^q[p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \| p(x)p(\tilde{x})]$ is exactly the convex generalized mutual entropy $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ calculated on the basis of the joint distribution $p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)$. Thus, $D_{K-L}^q[p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \| p(x)p(\tilde{x})]$ is an upper bound for the *compression information* term $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$, with equality achieved only when $p(\tilde{x})$ is set to the marginal distribution of $p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)$. The above proposition encourages the casting of the generalized RD function as a double minimization:

$$R_q(D) = \min_{\{p(\tilde{x})\}} \min_{\{p(\tilde{x}|x): \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle \leq D\}} D_{K-L}^q[p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \| p(x)p(\tilde{x})]. \quad (29)$$

Given A a set of joint distributions $p(x, \tilde{x})$ with marginal $p(x)$ that satisfy the distortion constraint, and, if B is the set of product distributions $p(\tilde{x})p(x)$

with some normalized $p(\tilde{x})$, then:

$$R_q(D) = \min_{b \in B} \min_{a \in A} D_{K-L}^q[a \| b]. \quad (30)$$

Note that like the Blahut-Arimoto algorithm, the nonextensive alternating minimization scheme does not possess a unique solution. Extension of the above theory to the case of the dual generalized K-Ld is identical and straightforward.

5 Nonextensive rate distortion variational principles

This Section closely parallels the approach followed in Section 13.7 of [3].

5.1 Case for $0 < q < 1$

Lemma 2: The solution to the Lagrangian ¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} L_{RD}^q[p(\tilde{x}|x)] &= \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} \frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} - 1}{q-1} + \\ &+ \tilde{\beta} \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} d(x, \tilde{x}) p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) + \sum_x \lambda(x) \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}|x), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where :

$$\tilde{\beta} = q\beta,$$

is :

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}(-\beta_x^* d(x, \tilde{x}))}{Z(x, \beta_x^*)}.$$

Proof: Taking the variational derivative of (31) and re-arranging, yields:

$$\frac{\delta L_{RD}^q[p(\tilde{x}|x)]}{\delta p(\tilde{x}|x)} = p(x) \left[\frac{q}{q-1} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) + \tilde{\lambda}(x) \right] = 0. \quad (32)$$

In (32), $\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \frac{\lambda(x)}{p(x)} - p(x)^{(1-q)}$. Note that (32) is obtained by employing the relation: $p(\tilde{x}) = \sum_x p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \Rightarrow \frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)^q}{q-1} \frac{\partial p(\tilde{x})^{1-q}}{\partial p(\tilde{x}|x)} = -p(x)^{(1-q)}$. Since $-p(x)^{(1-q)}$

¹⁰ Valid for both discrete and continuous cases

is solely dependent upon $x \in X$, it is amalgamated with $\lambda(x)/p(x)$ to yield $\tilde{\lambda}(x)$. Expanding (32), yields:

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = p(\tilde{x}) \left[\frac{(1-q)}{q} \left\{ \tilde{\lambda}(x) + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) \right\} \right]^{1/(q-1)}. \quad (33)$$

Multiplying the square bracket in (32) by $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, summing over \tilde{x} , and, evoking $\sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}|X=x) = 1$ yields:

$$\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \frac{q}{(1-q)} \aleph_q(x) - \tilde{\beta} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}. \quad (34)$$

Here, $\aleph_q(x) = \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^q$. Thus (33) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\tilde{x}|x) &= \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \{1-(q-1)\beta_x^*(x)d(x, \tilde{x})\}^{1/(q-1)}}{(q\aleph_{RD}(x)/q)^{1/(1-q)}}, \\ \aleph_{RD}(x) &= |\aleph_q(x) + (q-1)\beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}|, \\ \beta_x^*(x) &= \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{q \left(\frac{q\aleph_{RD}(x)}{q} \right)} = \frac{\beta}{|\aleph_q(x) + (q-1)\beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}|}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $\beta_x^*(x)$ is the *nonextensive effective inverse temperature* for a *single source alphabet* $x \in X$. The *net nonextensive effective inverse temperature*, evaluated for all *source alphabets* $x \in X$ is: $\beta^* = \sum_x \beta_x^*(x)$.

Note that (35) expresses $\aleph_{RD}(x)$ in terms of its *absolute value* $|\aleph_q(x) + (q-1)\beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}|$. The rationale for this being that the random nature of the data generating process, certain values of the nonextensivity parameter q and the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon inverse temperature β , could result some *source alphabets* possessing $\aleph_{RD}(x) < 0$, while implementing the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm. Depending upon the nature of the test data, the number of *source alphabets* exhibiting $\aleph_{RD}(x) < 0$ might be non-negligible.

The *absolute value* $|\aleph_{RD}(x)|$ accounts for such possibilities, in order to adhere to physics related considerations. Specifically, as is described in (37) below, the partition function evaluated at a given source alphabet may be expressed as a power of $\aleph_{RD}(x)$. *Within the context of the nonextensive RD theory, negative values of $\aleph_{RD}(x)$ would result in un-physical values of the partition function (i.e. possessing a real and complex component), evaluated at a source alphabet exhibiting such behavior.*

Specifying $q \rightarrow 2 - q^*$ in the numerator of (35) and evoking (4), yields the canonical transition probability:

$$p(\tilde{x} | x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}(-\beta_x^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\tilde{Z}(x, \beta_x^*(x))}. \quad (36)$$

The partition function is for a single *source alphabet* $x \in X$ is:

$$\tilde{Z}(x, \beta_x^*(x)) = \mathfrak{S}_{RD}^{\frac{1}{1-q}}(x) = \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q^*[-\beta_x^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})]. \quad (37)$$

Solutions of (36) are only valid for $\{1 - (1 - q^*) \beta_x^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})\} > 0$, ensuring $p(\tilde{x}|x) > 0$. The condition $\{1 - (1 - q^*) \beta_x^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})\} < 0$ is the *Tsallis cut-off condition* [1, 20]. From (35)-(37), β , $\tilde{\beta}$, $\beta_x^*(x)$, and, β^* relate as:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_x^*(x) &= \frac{\beta}{|\mathbb{N}_q(x) + (q-1)\beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|x)}} = \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\tilde{Z}^{(1-q)}(x, \beta_x^*(x))}, \\ \beta^* &= \sum_x \beta_x^*(x). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The *effective nonextensive RD Helmholtz free energy*¹¹ is [36]:

$$F_{RD}^q(\beta^*) = - \left\langle \frac{1}{\beta_x^*(x)} \ln_q \tilde{Z}(x, \beta_x^*(x)) \right\rangle_{p(x)}. \quad (39)$$

It is important to note that the nonextensive RD Lagrangian in (21) and the *effective generalized RD Helmholtz free energy* in (39) are in fact equivalent. *The former describes the generalized RD theory in terms of both input $x \in X$ and output $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ variables. In contrast, the latter represents a parametric variational principle that solves the generalized RD problem by optimizing over $p(\tilde{x})$.*

This feature is invaluable when performing a qualitative extension of the theory presented in this paper, by applying the mapping approach of Rose [37] (see Section 7 of this paper). In lieu of this fact, the equivalence is derived

¹¹ The term *effective* implies dependence upon the *nonextensive effective inverse temperature* $\beta_x^*(x)$

herein. In a continuous setting, considering all normalized distributions $p(\tilde{x}|x)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{RD}^q [p(\tilde{x}|x)] &= \\
&- \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p(\tilde{x}|x)} \right) dx d\tilde{x} + \tilde{\beta} \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) d(x, \tilde{x}) dx d\tilde{x} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right) dx d\tilde{x} + \tilde{\beta} \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) d(x, \tilde{x}) dx d\tilde{x} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{\exp_{q^*}(-\beta_x^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\tilde{Z}(x, \beta_x^*(x))} \right) dx d\tilde{x} + \tilde{\beta} \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) d(x, \tilde{x}) dx d\tilde{x} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \tilde{Z}^{(q^*-1)}(x, \beta_x^*(x)) (-\beta_x^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) + \\
&\quad - \ln_{q^*} \tilde{Z}(x, \beta_x^*(x))) dx d\tilde{x} + \tilde{\beta} \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) d(x, \tilde{x}) dx d\tilde{x} \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{=} - \int_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q \tilde{Z}(x, \beta_x^*(x)) dx d\tilde{x} \\
&= - \int_x p(x) \ln_q \tilde{Z}(x, \beta_x^*(x)) dx \\
&\stackrel{(e)}{=} - \int_x p(x) \ln_q \left(\int_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}(-\beta_x^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})) d\tilde{x} \right) dx \\
&= L_{RD}^q [p(\tilde{x})].
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Here, (a) follows from (11), (b) follows from (36), (c) follows from (5), (d) follows from (38), and, (e) follows from (37).

5.2 Case for $q > 1$

Lemma 3: The solution to the Lagrangian ¹²

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{RD}^{q^*} [p(\tilde{x}|x)] &= \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} \frac{p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q^*-1} - 1}{q^*-1} + \\
&+ \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} d(x, \tilde{x}) p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) + \sum_x \lambda(x) \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}|x),
\end{aligned}$$

where :

$$\tilde{\beta}_{q^*} = q^* \beta, \tag{41}$$

is :

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q \left(-\beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) \right)}{\tilde{Z}_{2-q} \left(x, \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) \right)}.$$

Proof: In accordance with the procedure employed in Section 5.1, variational minimization of the Lagrangian in (41) yields:

$$\frac{\delta L_{RD}^{q^*} [p(\tilde{x}|x)]}{\delta p(\tilde{x}|x)} = p(x) \left[\frac{q^*}{q^*-1} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q^*-1} + \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} d(x, \tilde{x}) + \tilde{\lambda}(x) \right] = 0. \tag{42}$$

¹² Valid for both discrete and continuous cases

Solving (42) for $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ and obtaining the normalization Lagrange multiplier analogous to the approach in Section 5.1, yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\tilde{x}|x) &= p(\tilde{x}) \left[\frac{(1-q^*)}{q^*} \left\{ \tilde{\lambda}(x) + \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} d(x, \tilde{x}) \right\} \right]^{1/(q^*-1)}, \\
\text{and,} \\
\tilde{\lambda}(x) &= \underbrace{\frac{q^*}{1-q^*} \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q^*}}_{\aleph_{q^*}(x)} - \left\langle \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} d(x, \tilde{x}) \right\rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Here, (43) yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\tilde{x}|x) &= \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q \left(-\beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) \right)}{\left(\frac{q^* \Im_{RD_{2-q}}(x)}{q^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{q-1}}}, \\
\Im_{RD_{2-q}}(x) &= |\aleph_{q^*}(x) + (q^* - 1) \beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}|, \\
\beta_{x_{2-q}}^* &= \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}}{q^* \left(\frac{q^* \Im_{RD_{2-q}}(x)}{q^*} \right)} = \frac{\beta}{|\aleph_{q^*}(x) + (q^* - 1) \beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}|}.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Here, (44) yields:

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q \left(-\beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) \right)}{\tilde{Z}_{2-q} \left(x, \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) \right)}. \tag{45}$$

Solutions of (45) are only valid for $\left\{ 1 - (1-q) \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) \right\} > 0$, ensuring $p(\tilde{x}|x) > 0$. The condition $\left\{ 1 - (1-q) \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) \right\} < 0$ is the *Tsallis cut-off condition* [1, 20] for (45), and, $1 < q < 2$. The partition function is:

$$\tilde{Z}_{2-q} \left(x, \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) \right) = \left(\Im_{RD_{2-q}}(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{q-1}} = \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q \left[-\beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) \right]. \tag{46}$$

From (44)-(47), $\beta, \tilde{\beta}_{q^*}, \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*$, and, $\beta_{2-q}^*(x)$ relate as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) &= \frac{\beta}{|\aleph_{q^*}(x) + (q^* - 1) \beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|x)}} = \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}}{\tilde{Z}_{2-q}^{(1-q^*)} \left(x, \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x) \right)}, \\
\beta_{2-q}^* &= \sum_x \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x).
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

The nonextensive dual RD Helmholtz free energy is [36]:

$$F_{RD}^{q*}(\beta_{2-q}^*) = - \left\langle \frac{1}{\beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x)} \ln_{q^*} \tilde{Z}_{2-q}(x, \beta_{x_{2-q}}^*(x)) \right\rangle_{p(x)}. \quad (48)$$

5.3 Nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm revisited

This sub-Section describes the practical implementation of the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm for the case $0 < q < 1$. This is accomplished using the theory presented in Sections 4.1 and 5.1. For the sake of brevity, the implementation is described in point form:

- *A-priori* specifying the nonextensivity parameter q and the *effective inverse temperature* β_x^* obtained from (38), the expected distortion $D = \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})}$ is obtained. Choosing a random data point in D an initial guess for $p(\tilde{x})$ is made. Eq. (36) is then employed to evaluate the transition probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ (a single data point in the convex set of probability distributions A , described in Section 4.1), that minimizes the generalized K-Ld $D_{K-L}^q(\bullet)$ subject to the distortion constraint.
- Using this value of $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, (28) is employed to calculate a new value of $p(\tilde{x})$ that further minimizes $D_{K-L}^q(\bullet)$.
- The above process is repeated thereby monotonically reducing the right hand side of (29). Using **Lemma 2** ((36)) and (21), the algorithm is seen to converge to a unique point on the RD curve whose slope equals $-\tilde{\beta}$. In principle, for different values of β_x^* (and hence β^*), a full RD curve may be obtained.
- Note that the alternating minimization is performed independently in the two convex sets of probability distributions A and B (see Section 4.1). Specifically, $p(\tilde{x})$ is assumed fixed when minimizing with respect to $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. In the next update step, assuming $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ to be fixed, $p(\tilde{x})$ is minimized through (28). *After this step, $p(\tilde{x})$ is set to the proper marginal of $p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)$.*
- In general, the alternating minimization algorithm only deals with the optimal partitioning of \mathcal{X} (induced by $p(\tilde{x}|x)$), with respect to a fixed set of representatives (\tilde{X} values). This implies that the distortion measure $d(x, \tilde{x})$ is pre-defined and fixed throughout the implementation $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \forall \tilde{x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$.

The alternating minimization algorithm for nonextensive RD theory is described in Algorithm 1 for $0 < q < 1$.

Algorithm 1 Nonextensive Alternating Minimization Scheme for $0 < q < 1$

Input

1. Source distribution $p(x) \in X$.
2. Set of representatives of quantized codebook given by $p(\tilde{x}) \in \tilde{X}$ values.
3. Input Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon *inverse temperature* β .
4. Distortion measure $d(x, \tilde{x})$.
- . Convergence parameter ε .

Output

Value of $R_q(D)$ where its slope equals $-\tilde{\beta} = -q\beta$.

Initialization

Initialize $R_q^o \leftarrow \infty$ and randomly initialize $p(\tilde{x})$ and $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ (to initialize $\beta_x^*(x)$).

While True

- $\beta_x^{*(m)}(x) = \frac{\beta}{|\sum_{\tilde{x}} p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}) \left(\frac{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}|x)}{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x})} \right)^q + (q-1)\beta \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}|X=x)}|} \rightarrow \text{Nonextensive effective inverse temperature} \quad (38)$
 - $p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x} | x) \leftarrow \frac{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}(-\beta_x^{*(m)}(x) d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\tilde{Z}^{(m+1)}(x, \beta_x^{*(m)})}$
 - $p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x}) \leftarrow \sum_x p(x) p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x} | x)$
 - $R_q^{(m+1)}(D) = D_{K-L}^q(p(x) p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x} | x) || p(x) p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x}))$.
 - If $(R_q^{(m)}(D) - R_q^{(m+1)}(D)) \leq \varepsilon$
 - Break
-

6 Numerical simulations and physical interpretations

The qualitative distinctions between nonextensive statistics and extensive statistics is demonstrated with the aid of the respective RD models. To this end, a sample of 500 two-dimensional data points is drawn from three spherical Gaussian distributions with means at $(2, 3.5)$, $(0, 0)$, $(0, 2)$ (the *quantized codebook*). The priors and standard deviations are 0.3, 0.4, 0.3, and, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0, respectively. The distortion measure $d(x, \tilde{x})$ is taken to be the Euclidean square distance. The case $0 < q < 1$ (Section 5.1) is chosen for the numerical study. The axes of the nonextensive RD curves are scaled with respect to those of the extensive Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon RD curve. The numerical simulations are performed for three values of the nonextensivity parameter (i) $q = 0.9$, (ii) $q = 0.75$, and, (iii) $q = 0.5$. *The nonextensive RD model demonstrates extreme sensitivity to the problem size (model complexity) and the nature of the test data.*

Fig.2 depicts the extensive and nonextensive RD curves. Each curve has been generated for values of the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon *inverse temperature* $\beta \in [1, 2.3]$. Note that the nonextensive *inverse temperature* is: $\tilde{\beta} = q\beta$. *It is observed that the nonextensive theory for the nonextensivity parameter q in the range $0 < q < 1$ uniformly exhibit a lower threshold for the minimum*

achievable compression-information in the distortion-compression plane, as compared to the extensive case. Note that in Fig. 2, the RD curve is generated employing (38) for the entire range of the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon inverse temperature $\beta \in [.1, 2.3]$, for the cases (i) $q=0.9$ and (ii) $q = 0.75$. The case for $q = 0.5$ develops a point of inflection for values of $\beta > 1.35$, and the iteration is terminated. This feature is a peculiarity of the particular test data, and, represents the limit of the validity of the present nonextensive RD model, for the specific value of q .

Note that for the nonextensive cases, the slope of the tangent drawn at any point on the nonextensive RD curve is the negative of the nonextensive inverse temperature $-\tilde{\beta} = -q\beta$. At the commencement, the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm solves for the compression phase with the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon inverse temperature $\beta \rightarrow 0$, and, the net nonextensive effective inverse temperature (38) $\beta^* \rightarrow 0$. The compression phase is characterized by all data points "coalescing" around a single data point $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$.

As β and β^* increase, the data points undergo *soft clustering* around the cluster centers, which are the values of \tilde{X} . The *hard clustering* regime signifies regions where $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, $\beta^* \rightarrow \infty$. By definition, in *hard clustering* each data point can lie in one cluster only. On the other hand, in *soft clustering*, a data point may be assigned to more than one clusters, and, the assignment is probabilistic. The hard clustering regime signifies regions where $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, $\beta^* \rightarrow \infty$.

An observation of particular significance is revealed in in Fig.2. Specifically, even for less relaxed distortion constraints $\langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})}$, any nonextensive case for $0 < q < 1$ possesses a lower minimum *compression information* than the corresponding extensive case. The threshold for the minimum achievable *compression information* $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ decreases as $q \rightarrow 0$. Note that all nonextensive RD curves inhabit the non-achievable region for the extensive case. By definition, the *non-achievable region* is the region below a given RD curve, and signifies the domain in the *distortion-compression* plane where compression does not occur.

Further, nonextensive RD models possessing a lower nonextensivity parameter q inhabit the non-achievable regions of nonextensive RD models possessing a higher value of q . These features imply the superiority of nonextensive models to perform data compression *vis-à-vis* any comparable model derived from Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics.

It is observed that the nonextensive RD models undergo compression and clustering more rapidly than the equivalent extensive RD model. A primary cause for such behavior is described in Fig. 3, where the scaled *net nonextensive effective inverse temperatures* $\frac{\beta^*}{\sum_x [\beta_x^*(x)]D}$ are depicted versus the corresponding

inverse temperatures β , with the aid of (38). Here, $\sum_x [\beta_x^*(x)]D$ is the sum of the product of the row vector $[\beta_x^*(x)]$ comprising of $\beta_x^*(x)$ for different *source alphabets* $x \in X$, and the expected distortion D at a given point on the RD curve. The fact that $\sum_x [\beta_x^*(x)]D \gg \beta$ implies that β^* increases rapidly with marginal increases in β . Before proceeding any further, it is important to note that the rationale for the scaling is the "chaotic" nature in certain regions of the graph depicting β^* versus β . The relation between β and $\sum_x [\beta_x^*(x)]D$ is depicted in Fig. 4 for the case $q = 0.9$.

7 Summary and conclusions

Variational principles for a generalized RD theory, and, a scaled generalized RD theory employing the additive duality of nonextensive statistics, have been presented. This has been accomplished using a methodology to "rescue" the linear constraints originally employed by Tsallis [1], formulated in [20]. Select information theoretic properties of dual Tsallis uncertainties have been investigated into. Numerical simulations have proven that the nonextensive RD models demonstrate a lower threshold for the *compression information vis-à-vis* equivalent models derived from Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics. This feature acquires significance in data compression applications.

The nonextensive RD models and the nonextensive alternating minimization numerical scheme studied in this paper represent idealized scenarios, involving well behaved sources and distortion measures. Based on the results reported herein, an ongoing study has treated a more realistic generalized RD scenario by extending the works of Rose [37] and Banerjee *et. al.* [38], and has accomplished a three-fold objective. First, a generalized Bregman RD (GBRD) model has been formulated using the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm as its basis. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_s$ be a subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, where $p(\tilde{x}) \neq 0$ (*the support*). From a computational viewpoint, the GBRD model represents a *non-convex optimization problem*, where the cardinality of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_s$ ($|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_s|$) varies at each distortion level. Next a *Tsallis-Bregman lower bound* for the RD function is derived. *The Tsallis-Bregman lower bound provides a principled theoretical rationale for the lower threshold for the compression information demonstrated by generalized statistics RD models, vis-à-vis equivalent extensive RD models.*

Finally, the problem of rate distortion in lossy data compression is shown to be equivalent to the problem of mixture model estimation in unsupervised learning [39]. This is demonstrated for *q-deformed* exponential families of distributions [40, 41]. The primary rationale for this exercise is to solve the generalized RD problem employing an Expectation-Maximization algorithm [42], using the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm as a basis. A

notable feature of this equivalence specific to nonextensive statistics, where the inverse temperature is uniquely determined by a relation between the marginal probability distribution of the reproduction alphabet and the q -deformed exponential of the conjugate partition function, is derived. Results of these studies will be presented elsewhere.

Acknowledgements

RCV gratefully acknowledges support from *RAND-MSR* contract *CSM-DI & S-QIT-101107-2005*.

References

- [1] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys., **542**, 479 (1988).
- [2] M. Gell-Mann and C. Tsallis, Eds., *Nonextensive Entropy-Interdisciplinary Applications*, Oxford University Press (Oxford, 2004).
- [3] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, John Wiley & Sons (New York, NY, 1991).
- [4] T. Berger, *Rate Distortion Theory*, Prentice-Hall (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1971).
- [5] K. Rose, E. Gurewitz, and G. C. Fox, Phys. Rev. Lett., **65**, 945 (1990).
- [6] K. Rose, Proc. IEEE, **86**,11, 2210 (1999).
- [7] N. Tishby, F. C. Pereira, and W. Bialek, The information bottleneck method, in: Proceedings of the 37th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control and Computing, Urbana, IL, 1999, pp. 368-377.
- [8] R. E. Blahut, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory, **IT18**, 460 (1972).
- [9] I. Csiszár and G. Tusnády, Statistics and Decisions, **1**, 205 (1985).
- [10] P.T. Landsberg and V. Vedral, Phys. Lett. A, **247**, 211 (1998).
- [11] T. Yamano, Phys. Rev. E, **63**, 046105 (2001).
- [12] S. Furuichi, J. Math. Phys., **47**, 023302 (2006).
- [13] H. Suyari, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory, **50**,8, 1783 (2004).
- [14] T. Yamano, Physica A, **305**, 190 (2002).
- [15] R. C. Venkatesan, Nonextensive variational principles for rate distortion theory and the information bottleneck method, in: Proceedings IEEE Symposium on the Foundations of Computational Intelligence (FOCI), Honolulu, HW, 2007, pp. 509-515.
- [16] E. M. F. Curado and C. Tsallis, Journal of Physics A, **24**, L69 (1991).

- [17] C. Tsallis, R.S. Mendes, and A. R. Plastino, *Physica A*, **261**, 534 (1998).
- [18] S. Martínez, F. Nicolás, F. Pennini, and A. Plastino, *Physica A*, **286**, 489 (2000).
- [19] E. K. Lenzi, R. S. Mendes, and L. R. da Silva, *Physica A*, **280**, 337 (2000).
- [20] G. L. Ferri, S. Martinez, and A. Plastino, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theory and Experiment*, **2005(04)**, P04009 (2005).
- [21] T. Wada and A. M. Scarfone, *Eur. Phys. J. B*, **47**, 557 (2005).
- [22] A. G. Bashkirov, *Physica A*, **340**, 153 (2004).
- [23] R. P. Di Sisto, S. Martinez, R. B. Orellana, A. R. Plastino, and A. Plastino, *Physica A*, **265**, 590 (1999).
- [24] S. Abe, *Phys. Rev. E*, **66**, 046134 (2002).
- [25] J. Naudts, *Physica A*, **316**, 323 (2002).
- [26] T. Wada and A. M. Scarfone, *Phys. Lett. A*, **235**, 351 (2005).
- [27] J. Naudts, *Physica A*, **340**, 32 (2004).
- [28] C. Tsallis, *Phys. Rev. E*, **58**, 1442 (1998).
- [29] L. Borland, A. Plastino, and C. Tsallis, *J. Math. Phys.*, **39**, 6490 (1998).
- [30] E. Borges, *Physica A*, **340**, 95 (2004).
- [31] S. Furuichi, *IEEE Trans on Inform. Theory*, **51**, 3638 (2005).
- [32] S. Abe and G. B. Bağcı, *Phys. Rev. E*, **71**, 016139 (2005).
- [33] Z. Daróczy, *Information Control*, **16**, 36 (1970).
- [34] G. Kaniadakis, M. Lissia, and A. M. Scarfone, *Phys. Rev. E*, **71**, 048128 (2005).
- [35] A. Dukkipati, M. Narasimha Murty, and S. Bhatnagar, *Physica A*, **361**, 124 (2006).
- [36] C. Beck and F. Shögl, *Thermodynamics of Chaotic Systems - An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, 1993).
- [37] K. Rose, *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, **40**, 6, 1939 (1994).
- [38] A. Banerjee, S. Merugu, I. Dhillon, and J. Ghosh, *J. Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, **6**, 1705 (2005).
- [39] R. M. Neal and G. E. Hinton, A view of the EM algorithm that justifies incremental, sparse, and other variants. in: M. I. Jordan (Ed.), *Learning in Graphical Models*, pp. 355-368, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998.
- [40] K. S. Azoury and M. K. Warmuth, *Machine Learning*, **43**, 3, 211 (2001).
- [41] J. Naudts, *Rev. Math. Phys.*, **16**, 809 (2004).
- [42] G. J. McLachlan and T. Krishnan, *The EM Algorithm and Extensions*, John Wiley & Sons (New York, N. Y., 1996).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1: Schematic diagram for rate distortion curve.

Fig. 2: Generalized statistics rate distortion curves. Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon model (solid line), generalized RD model for $q = 0.9$ (dash-dots), $q = 0.75$ (dashes), and $q = 0.5$ (dots).

Fig. 3: Curves for scaled *net nonextensive inverse temperature* $\sum_x \frac{\beta^*}{[\beta_x^*(x)]D}$ v/s

Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon *inverse temperature* β for generalized RD theory. Curve for $q = 0.9$ (solid line), $q = 0.75$ (dash-dots), and, $q = 0.5$ (dots). Here $\sum_x [\beta_x^*(x)]D$ is the sum of the product of the row vector of $\beta_x^*(x)$ (signifying $\beta_x^*(x)$ at each *source alphabet* $x \in X$), and D is the expected distortion.

Fig. 4: Sample curve for *net nonextensive inverse temperature* $\sum_x \frac{\beta^*}{[\beta_x^*(x)]D}$ v/s

Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon *inverse temperature* β , for $q = 0.9$.







