ENTROPY RATE FOR HIDDEN MARKOV CHAINS WITH RARE TRANSITIONS

YUVAL PERES AND ANTHONY QUAS

ABSTRACT. We consider Hidden Markov Chains obtained by passing a Markov Chain with rare transitions through a noisy memoryless channel. We obtain asymptotic estimates for the entropy of the resulting Hidden Markov Chain as the transition rate is reduced to zero.

Let (X_n) be a Markov chain with finite state space S and transition matrix P(p) and let (Y_n) be the Hidden Markov chain observed by passing (X_n) through a homogeneous noisy memoryless channel (i.e. Y takes values in a set T, and there exists a matrix Q such that $\mathbb{P}(Y_n = j | X_n = i, X_{-\infty}^{n-1}, X_{n+1}^{\infty}, Y_{n+1}^{n-1}) = Q_{ij})$. We make the additional assumption on the channel that the rows of Q are distinct. In this case we call the channel statistically distinguishing.

We assume that P(p) is of the form I + pA where A is a matrix with negative entries on the diagonal, non-negative entries in the off-diagonal terms and zero row sums. We further assume that for small positive p, the Markov chain with transition matrix P(p) is irreducible. Notice that for Markov chains of this form, the invariant distribution $(\pi_i)_{i\in S}$ does not depend on p. In this case, we say that for small positive values of p, the Markov chain is in a *rare transition regime*.

We will adopt the convention that H is used to denote the entropy of a finite partition, whereas h is used to denote the entropy of a process (the *entropy rate* in information theory terminology). Given an irreducible Markov chain with transition matrix P, we let h(P) be the entropy of the Markov chain (i.e. $h(P) = -\sum_{i,j} \pi_i P_{ij} \log P_{ij}$ where π_i is the (unique) invariant distribution of the Markov chain and as usual we adopt the convention that $0 \log 0 = 0$). We also let $H_{\text{chan}}(i)$ be the entropy of the output of the channel when the input symbol is i (i.e. $H_{\text{chan}}(i) = -\sum_{j \in T} Q_{ij} \log Q_{ij}$). Let h(Y) denote the entropy of Y (i.e. $h(Y) = -\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{w \in T^N} \mathbb{P}(Y_1^N = w) \log \mathbb{P}(Y_1^N = w)$).

Theorem 1. Consider the Hidden Markov Chain (Y_n) obtained by observing a Markov chain with irreducible transition matrix P(p) = I + Ap through a statistically distinguishing channel with transition matrix Q. Then there exists a constant C > 0 such that for all small p > 0,

(1)
$$h(P(p)) + \sum_{i} \pi_i H_{chan}(i) - Cp \le h(Y) \le h(P(p)) + \sum_{i} \pi_i H_{chan}(i),$$

where $(\pi_i)_{i \in S}$ is the invariant distribution of P(p).

Date: December 10, 2010.

AQ's research was supported by NSERC; The authors thank BIRS where this research was conducted.

If in addition the channel has the property that there exist i, i' and j such that $P_{ii'} > 0, Q_{ij} > 0$ and $Q_{i'j} > 0$, then there exists a constant c > 0 such that

(2)
$$h(Y) \le h(P(p)) + \sum_{i} \pi_i H_{chan}(i) - cp.$$

The entropy rate in the rare transition regime was considered previously in the special case of a 0–1 valued Markov Chain with transition matrix $P(p) = \begin{pmatrix} 1-p & p \\ p & 1-p \end{pmatrix}$ and where the channel was the binary symmetric channel with crossover probability ϵ (i.e. $Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1-\epsilon & \epsilon \\ \epsilon & 1-\epsilon \end{pmatrix}$). It is convenient to introduce the notation $g(p) = -p \log p - (1-p) \log(1-p)$. In [4], Nair, Ordentlich and Weissman proved that $g(\epsilon) - (1-2\epsilon)^2 p \log p/(1-\epsilon) \le h(Y) \le g(p) + g(\epsilon)$. For comparison, with our result, this is essentially of the form $g(\epsilon) + a(\epsilon)g(p) \le h(Y) \le g(p) + g(\epsilon)$ where $a(\epsilon) < 1$ but $a(\epsilon) \to 1$ as $\epsilon \to 0$ (i.e. $h(Y) = g(p) + g(\epsilon) - O(p \log p)$). A second paper due to Chigansky [1] shows that $g(\epsilon) + b(\epsilon)g(p) \le h(Y)$ for a function $b(\epsilon) < 1$ satisfying $b(\epsilon) \to 1$ as $\epsilon \to 1/2$ (again giving an $O(p \log p)$ error). Our result states in this case that there exist C > c > 0 such that $g(p) + g(\epsilon) - Cp \le h(Y) \le g(p) + g(\epsilon) - cp$ (i.e. $h(Y) = g(p) + g(\epsilon) - \Theta(p)$).

We note that as part of the proof we attempt a reconstruction of (X_n) from the observed data (Y_n) . In our case, the reconstruction of the *n*th symbol of X_n depended on past and future values of Y_m . A related but harder problem of filtering is to try to reconstruct X_n given only Y_1^n . This problem was addressed in essentially the same scenario by Khasminskii and Zeitouni [3], where they gave a lower bound for the asymptotic reconstruction error of the form $Cp|\log p|$ for an explicit constant C (i.e. for an arbitrary reconstruction scheme, the probability of wrongly guessing X_n is bounded below in the limit as $n \to \infty$ by $Cp|\log p|$). Our scheme shows that if one is allowed to use future as well as past observations then the asymptotic reconstruction error is O(p). This was previously observed by Shue, Anderson and DeBruyne in [5] who used a similar scheme to ours.

Before giving the proof of the theorem, we discuss the strategy. We start from the equality

(3)
$$h(X) + h(Y|X) = h(X,Y) = h(Y) + h(X|Y).$$

Since h(X) and h(Y|X) are known to be h(P(p)) and $\sum_i \pi_i H_{\text{chan}}(i)$, the estimates for the entropy of Y are obtained by estimating h(X|Y). The inequality (1) is equivalent to showing that $0 \le h(X|Y) \le Cp$ for some C > 0. The lower bound here is trivial, whereas the main part of the proof is the upper bound for h(X|Y) (giving a lower bound for h(Y)). The second part of the proof, showing (2) lowering the upper bound for h(Y) under additional conditions, is proved by showing $h(X|Y) \ge cp$ for some c > 0.

We explain briefly the underlying idea of the upper bound h(X|Y) = O(p). Since the transitions in the (X_n) sequence are rare, given a realization of (Y_n) , the Y_n values allow one to guess (using the statistical-distinguishing property) the X_n values from which the Y_n values are obtained. This provides for an accurate reconstruction except that where there is a transition in the X_n 's there is some uncertainty as to its location as estimated using the Y_n 's. It turns out that by using maximum likelihood estimation, the transition locations may be pinpointed up to an error with exponentially small tail. Since the transitions occur with rate p, there is an O(p) entropy error in reconstructing (X_n) from (Y_n) . We make use of a number of notational conventions, some standard and others less so. Firstly we shall write denote events by set notation so that $\{X_0 = X_2\}$ denotes the event that the random variables X_0 and X_2 agree. We make extensive use of relative entropy. For two partitions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} , the relative entropy is defined by $H(\mathcal{Q}|\mathcal{P}) = H(\mathcal{P} \lor \mathcal{Q}) - H(\mathcal{P})$. When conditioning, we shall not distinguish between random variables and the partitions and σ -algebras that they induce (so that for example $H(X_0^{N-1})$ is $-\sum_{w \in S^N} \mathbb{P}(X_0^{N-1} = w) \log \mathbb{P}(X_0^{N-1} = w)$ and $H(X_0|Y)$ is the conditional entropy of X_0 relative to the σ -algebra generated by $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. On the other hand if A is an event, we use $H(\mathcal{P}|A)$ to mean the entropy of the partition with respect to the conditional measure $\mathbb{P}_A(B) = \mathbb{P}(A \cap B)/\mathbb{P}(A)$. For jointly stationary processes $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, the relative entropy of the processes is given by $h(Y|X) = h((X_n, Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) - h((X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \lim_{N \to \infty} (1/N)(H(X_0^{N-1} \lor Y_0^{N-1}) - H(X_0^{N-1})) = \lim_{N \to \infty} (1/N)H(Y_0^{N-1}|X_{-\infty}^{\infty}) = H(Y_0|X_{-\infty}^{\infty}, Y_{-\infty}^{-1}).$

Given a measurable partition \mathcal{Q} of the space, an event A and a σ -algebra \mathcal{F} we will write $H(\mathcal{Q}|\mathcal{F}|A)$ for the entropy of \mathcal{Q} relative to \mathcal{F} with respect to \mathbb{P}_A . In the case where A is \mathcal{F} -measurable (as will always be the case in what follows), we have

$$H(\mathcal{Q}|\mathcal{F}|A) = \int \left(-\sum_{B \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{P}(B|\mathcal{F}) \log \mathbb{P}(B|\mathcal{F})\right) d\mathbb{P}_A.$$

If A_1, \ldots, A_k form an \mathcal{F} -measurable partition of the space, then we have the following equality:

(4)
$$H(\mathcal{Q}|\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(A_j) H(\mathcal{Q}|\mathcal{F}|A_j).$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Note that $((X_n, Y_n))_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ forms a Markov chain with transition matrix \overline{P} given by $\overline{P}_{(i,j),(i',j')} = P_{ii'}Q_{i'j'}$ and invariant distribution $\overline{\pi}_{(i,j)} = \pi_i Q_{ij}$. The standard formula for the entropy of a Markov chain then gives $h(X,Y) = h(P(p)) + \sum_i \pi_i H_{\text{chan}}(i)$. Since h(X,Y) = h(Y) + h(X|Y), one obtains

(5)
$$h(Y) = h(X, Y) - h(X|Y) = h(P(p)) + \sum_{i} \pi_i H_{\text{chan}}(i) - h(X|Y).$$

This establishes the upper bound in the first part of the theorem.

We now establish the lower bound. We are aiming to show h(X|Y) = O(p) (for which it suffices to show $H(X_0^{L-1}|Y) = O(Lp)$ for some L). Setting $L = |\log p|^4$ and letting \mathcal{P} be a suitable partition, we estimate $H(X_0^{L-1}|Y, \mathcal{P})$ and use the inequality

(6)
$$H(X_0^{L-1}|Y) \le H(X_0^{L-1}|Y,\mathcal{P}) + H(\mathcal{P}).$$

We define the partition \mathcal{P} as follows: Set $K = |\log p|^2$ and let $\mathcal{P} = \{E_{\rm m}, E_{\rm b}, E_{\rm g1}, E_{\rm g2}\}$. Here $E_{\rm m}$ (for many) is the event that there are at least two transitions in X_0^{L-1} , $E_{\rm b}$ (for boundary) is the event that there is exactly one transition and that it takes place within a distance K of the boundary of the block and finally $E_{\rm g}$ (for good) is the event that there is at most one transition and if it takes place, then it occurs at a distance at least K from the boundary of the block. This will later be subdivided into $E_{\rm g1}$ and $E_{\rm g2}$.

If $E_{\rm m}$ holds then we bound the entropy contribution by the entropy of the equidistributed case whereas if $E_{\rm b}$ holds, there are 2K|S|(|S|-1) = O(K) possible values

of X_0^{L-1} . This yields the following estimates:

(7)
$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\rm m}) = O(p^2 L^2) = o(p)$$

(8)
$$H(X_0^{L-1}|E_{\rm m}) \le L \log |S|$$

(9)
$$\mathbb{P}(E_{\rm b}) = O(pK)$$

(10)
$$H(X_0^{L-1}|E_b) = O(\log K).$$

It follows that $\mathbb{P}(E_q) = 1 - O(pK)$. Given that the event E_g holds, the sequence X_0^{L-1} belongs to $B = \{a^L : a \in S\} \cup \{a^i b^{L-i} : a, b \in S, K \le i \le L - K\}.$

Given a sequence $u \in B$, the log-likelihood of u being the input sequence yield-ing the output Y_0^{L-1} is $L_u(Y_0^{L-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \log Q_{u_iY_i}$. We define Z_0^{L-1} to be the sequence in B for which $L_Z(Y_0^{L-1})$ is maximized (breaking ties lexicographically if necessary). We will then show using large deviation methods that when E_g holds, Z_0^{L-1} is a good reconstruction of X_0^{L-1} with small error.

We calculate for $u, v \in B$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L_{v}(Y_{0}^{L-1}) \geq L_{u}(Y_{0}^{L-1}) | X_{0}^{L-1} = u\right)$$
$$=\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \log(Q_{v_{i}Y_{i}}/Q_{u_{i}Y_{i}}) \geq 0 | X_{0}^{L-1} = u\right)$$
$$=\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i\in\Delta} \log(Q_{v_{i}Y_{i}}/Q_{u_{i}Y_{i}}) \geq 0 | X_{0}^{L-1} = u\right)$$

where $\Delta = \{i : u_i \neq v_i\}$. For each $i \in \Delta$, given that $X_0^{L-1} = u$, we have that $\log(Q_{v_iY_i}/Q_{u_iY_i})$ is an independent random variable taking the value $\log(Q_{v_ij}/Q_{u_ij})$ with probability Q_{u_ij} .

It is well known (and easy to verify using elementary calculus) that for a given probability distribution π on a set T, the probability distribution σ maximizing $\sum_{j \in T} \pi_j \log(\sigma_j / \pi_j)$ is $\sigma = \pi$ (for which the maximum is 0). Accordingly we see that given that $X_0^{L-1} = u$, $L_v(Y_0^{L-1}) - L_u(Y_0^{L-1})$ is the sum of $|\Delta|$ random variables, each having one of |S|(|S|-1) distributions, each with negative expectation. It follows from Hoeffding's Inequality [2] that there exist C > 0 and $\eta < 1$ independent of p such that $\mathbb{P}(L_v(Y_0^{L-1}) \ge L_u(Y_0^{L-1}) | X_0^{L-1} = u) \le C\eta^{|\Delta|}$. We deduce that for $u, v \in B$

(11)
$$\mathbb{P}(Z_0^{L-1} = v | X_0^{L-1} = u) \le C \eta^{\delta(u,v)}.$$

where $\delta(u, v)$ is the number of places in which u and v differ.

We split E_q into two subsets:

$$\begin{split} E_{\mathrm{g1}} &= E_g \cap \{ \delta(X_0^{L-1}, Z_0^{L-1}) < K \}; \text{ and } \\ E_{\mathrm{g2}} &= E_g \cap \{ \delta(X_0^{L-1}, Z_0^{L-1}) \geq K \}. \end{split}$$

Since there are less than $|S|^2 L$ elements in B, we see using (11) and recalling that $K = |\log p|^2$ that

(12)
$$\mathbb{P}(E_{g2}) \le |S|^2 L C \eta^K = o(p)$$

 $H(X_0^{L-1}|E_{g2}) \le \log(|S|^2L).$ (13)

Combining (12) with (9) and (7) we see that $\mathbb{P}(E_{g1}) = 1 - O(pK)$. We then obtain

(14)
$$H(\mathcal{P}) = O(pK\log(pK)) = o(pL).$$

Conditioned on being in E_{g1} , if $Z_0 = Z_{L-1}$ then $X_0^{L-1} = Z_0^{L-1}$ so we have

(15)
$$H(X_0^{L-1}|Z_0^{L-1} \vee \mathcal{P}|E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 = Z_{L-1}\}) = 0.$$

Given that E_{g1} holds, if $X_0^{L-1} = a^i b^{L-i}$ then Z_0^{L-1} must be of the form $a^j b^{L-j}$ for some j satisfying -K < j - i < K. Denote this difference j - i by the random variable N. We have

$$H(X_0^{L-1}|Y_0^{L-1} \lor \mathcal{P}|E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\})$$

$$\leq H(X_0^{L-1}|Z_0^{L-1} \lor \mathcal{P}|E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\})$$

$$= H(N|Z_0^{L-1} \lor \mathcal{P}|E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\})$$

$$\leq H(N|E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\}).$$

where the first inequality follows because Z_0^{L-1} is determined by Y_0^{L-1} so the partition generated by Y_0^{L-1} is finer than that generated by Z_0^{L-1} ; and the equality follows because given Z_0^{L-1} and conditioned on being in E_{g1} , knowing N is sufficient to reconstruct X_0^{L-1} so the partition generated by N is the same as the partition generated by X_0^{L-1} .

Since $E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\} = E_{g1} \cap \{X_0 \neq X_{L-1}\}$, we have for |k| < K, $\mathbb{P}(N = k | E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\}) = \mathbb{P}(N = k | E_{g1} \cap \{X_0 \neq X_{L-1}\})$. From (11) this is bounded above by $C\eta^{|k|}$. Since a distribution with these bounds has entropy bounded above independently of p, it follows from this that $H(N|E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\}) = O(1)$ and hence that

(16)
$$H(X_0^{L-1}|Y_0^{L-1} \vee \mathcal{P}|E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\}) = O(1).$$

Finally we have $\mathbb{P}(E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\}) = O(pL)$ We now have $H(X_0^{L-1}|Y_0^{L-1}) \leq H(X_0^{L-1}|Y_0^{L-1} \vee \mathcal{P}) + H(\mathcal{P})$. We estimate the right side using (4), splitting the space up into the sets E_b , E_m , E_{g2} , $E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 = C_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \in Z_0\}\}$ Z_{L-1} and $E_{g1} \cap \{Z_0 \neq Z_{L-1}\}$. All of these sets are $Y_0^{L-1} \vee \mathcal{P}$ measurable. Calculating the contribution to the entropy from each of the sets, each part contributes at most O(pL) yielding the estimate $H(X_0^{L-1}|Y_0^{L-1}) = O(pL)$, so that h(X|Y) = O(p)as required. This completes the first part of the proof.

For the second part of the proof, suppose that the additional properties are satisfied (the existence of i, i' and j such that $P_{ii'} > 0, Q_{ij} > 0$ and $Q_{i'j} > 0$). We need to show that $h(X|Y) \ge cp$ for some c > 0 or equivalently that $H(X_0|Y, X_{-\infty}^{-1}) \ge cp$. In fact, we show the stronger statement: $H(X_0|Y, (X_n)_{n\neq 0}) \geq cp$. Let A be the event that $X_{-1} = i$ and $X_1 = i'$ and $Y_0 = j$. We now estimate $H(X_0|Y, (X_n)_{n \neq 0}|A)$. For $x \in A$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_0 = i | Y, (X_n)_{n \neq 0})(x) = \frac{P_{ii} P_{ii'} Q_{ij}}{P_{ii} P_{ii'} Q_{ij} + P_{ii'} P_{i'i'} Q_{i'j} + \sum_{k \notin \{i,i'\}} P_{ik} P_{ki'} Q_{kj}}$$
$$\mathbb{P}(X_0 = i' | Y, (X_n)_{n \neq 0})(x) = \frac{P_{ii} P_{ii'} Q_{ij} + P_{ii'} P_{i'i'} Q_{i'j}}{P_{ii} P_{ii'} Q_{ij} + P_{ii'} P_{i'i'} Q_{i'j} + \sum_{k \notin \{i,i'\}} P_{ik} P_{ki'} Q_{kj}}.$$

As $p \to 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}(X_0 = i | Y, (X_n)_{n \neq 0})(x) \to Q_{ij}/(Q_{ij} + Q_{i'j})$ and $\mathbb{P}(X_0 = i | Y, (X_n)_{n \neq 0})(x) \to Q_{ij}/(Q_{ij} + Q_{i'j})$ $i'|Y, (X_n)_{n\neq 0})(x) \to Q_{i'j}/(Q_{ij}+Q_{i'j})$. From this we see that $H(X_0|Y, (X_n)_{n\neq 0})|A)$ converges to a non-zero constant as $p \to 0$. Since A has probability $\Omega(p)$, applying (4) we obtain the lower bound $h(X|Y) \ge cp$. From this we deduce the claimed upper bound for h(Y):

$$h(Y) \le h(X) + \sum_{i} \pi_i H_{\text{chan}}(i) - cp.$$

In this case we therefore have $h(Y) = h(X) + \sum_{i} \pi_{i} H_{\text{chan}}(i) + \Theta(p)$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

References

- 1. P. Chigansky, *The entropy rate of a binary channel with slowly switching input*, Available on arXiv: cs/0602074v1, 2006.
- W. Hoeffding, Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 58 (1963), 13–30.
- R. Z. Khasminskii and O. Zeitouni, Asymptotic filtering for finite state Markov chains, Stochastic Process. Appl. 63 (1996), 1–10.
- C. Nair, E. Ordentlich, and T. Weissman, Asymptotic filtering and entropy rate of a hidden Markov process in the rare transitions regime, International Symposium on Information Theory, 2005, pp. 1838–1842.
- L. Shue, B. Anderson, and F. DeBruyne, Asymptotic smoothing errors for hidden Markov models, IEEE Trans. Signal Processing 48 (2000), 3289–3302.

MICROSOFT RESEARCH, ONE MICROSOFT WAY, REDMOND, WA 98052, USA *E-mail address*: peres(a)microsoft.com

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC V8W 3R4, CANADA

E-mail address: aquas(a)uvic.ca