

Practical Renyi Entropy Estimation from Birthday Paradox

Maciej Skorski

University of Luxembourg

maciej.skorski@gmail.com

Abstract

Entropy Estimation is an important problem with many applications in cryptography, statistic, machine learning. Although the estimators optimal with respect to the sample complexity have been recently developed, there are still some challenges we address in this paper.

The contribution is a novel estimator which is built directly on the birthday paradox. The analysis turns out to be considerably simpler and offer superior confidence bounds with explicit constants. We also discuss how streaming algorithm can be used to massively improve memory consumption. Last but not least, we study the problem of estimation in low or moderate regimes, adapting the estimator and proving rigorous bounds.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Approximation algorithms analysis

Keywords and phrases Entropy Estimation, Streaming Algorithms

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.Submitted.2020.

1 Introduction

In the entropy estimation problem one seeks to approximately compute the Renyi entropy of some *unknown* distribution X while observing only its samples. This is a fundamental problem in many areas such as data analysis and anomaly detection [14, 17], machine learning and data analysis [27, 12, 23, 18, 20, 25, 19], security and cryptography [15, 26, 3, 24, 9, 10, 6, 4, 8].

In this paper we revisit some practical aspects of this problem and propose a more efficient estimator.

1.1 Related Work

1.1.1 Distribution Testing

The case of testing closeness of distributions to being uniform under ℓ_2 norm is known to be equivalent to estimating collision entropy [5]. However this doesn't generalize to higher orders, in general the ℓ_d distance from the uniform distribution is not a function of Renyi entropy of order d , but rather a complicated

1.1.2 Stream frequency estimators

Empirical frequency estimators are very important for big data problems, the research started in [2] and was finalized with optimal bounds in [11]. Although the problem looks similar to entropy estimation, in frequency estimators we compute *moments of an empirical distribution* while in entropy estimation we (equivalently) compute *moments of unknown probability distributions*. Since the empirical distribution still has bias wrt the true sampling distribution, there is no direct reduction. Furthermore, the state-of-art estimators [1, 22] don't actually have a compatible expressions because of the median trick involved.



© M., Skorski;

licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics

LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

■ Listing 1 Estimator of d -th moment

```

def MomentEstimator(x,d,dlt,eps):
    # x[1],x[2],... are observed samples
    # C[n,d] is the set of d-combinations out of [1,2,...,n]
    # eps is the relative error
    # 1-delta is the confidence
    n_batches = 8*log[2/dlt]/(3*eps**2)
    n_0 = floor(n/n_0)
    for b = 0..n_batches-1:
        y[1]..y[n_0] = x[n_0*b+1]..x[n_0*(b+1)] // get batch
        m[b] = size{(i_1,...,i_d) in C[n,d]: y[i_1] = y[i_2] = ... y[i_d]}
        m[b] = m[b] / binom[n_0,d]
    return mean(m[b] for b in 0..n_batches-1)

```

1.2 Dedicated Works on Entropy Estimation

The state-of-art bounds have been obtained in [1, 22] and shown to be asymptotically optimal.

The contribution of this paper is a slightly different estimator which allows for a simpler and elegant analysis, giving superior confidence bounds at the same time.

As the estimator computes just means and doesn't depend on the so called *median trick* we are able to connect it to stream frequency estimators and sketch an memory efficient implementation.

Finally we rigorously discuss estimation in low and moderate entropy regimes, which can be done much faster.

1.3 Results

1.3.1 Birthday-paradox Estimator

We analyze an estimator for Renyi entropy based on *birthday paradox*, which simply computes the number of collisions occurring between tuples. The pseudocode appears in Listing 1.

The theoretical analysis of the algorithm turns out to be much simpler and offering superior confidence bounds when compared to the state-of-art estimators. In particular we recover the optimal sample complexity $\tilde{O}\left(2^{(1-d^{-1}) \cdot H_d(X)}\right)$ known from previous works [1]. We stress that one of our technical contribution is *eliminating* the median trick which has been used to amplify the confidence of auxiliary estimators [1, 22].

► **Theorem 1.** *For any discrete distribution X , integer $d \geq 2$, precision $\epsilon > 0$ and confidence parameter $\delta > 0$ the algorithm in Listing 1 with probability $1 - \delta$ estimates $\sum_x P_x(x)^d$ up to a relative error given*

$$n \geq \frac{16d \log(2/\delta)}{3\epsilon^2} \cdot \left(\sum_x P_x(x)^d \right)^{-\frac{1}{d}}$$

independent samples x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n from X on the input. In particular it produces $\frac{\epsilon}{d-1}$ -additive error to the Renyi entropy H_d of X given that

$$n \geq \frac{16d \log(2/\delta)}{3\epsilon^2} \cdot 2^{(1-d^{-1}) \cdot H_d(X)}$$

1.4 Learning Moderate Entropy Regimes

Note that Theorem 1 promises a speedup with respect to the pesymistic sample complexity $\tilde{O}(2^{(1-d^{-1})H_0(X)})$ where H_0 is the log of the support of X in *small or moderate entropy regimes*. However we don't know in advance whether we can safely assume $H_d(X) < t_0$ or not. We discuss how to adapt our algorithm to gradually test and increase the threshold, so that the upper bound is met. The overhead in the number of necessary samples is only $O(\log \log |\text{dom}(X)|)$. This is discussed in Section 3.4.

1.5 Memory Efficient Algorithm

Last but not least we comment on the memory complexity. Although the algorithm in Listing 1 can be implemented in $\tilde{O}(2^{(1-d^{-1})H_d(X)})$, our results imply *much better strategy*. Namely, on each batch i the estimator can be equivalently written as

$$\mathbf{E}\tilde{p}_i = \binom{n}{d}^{-1} \sum_x \binom{n_x}{d} \quad (1)$$

Where n_x is the number of occurrences of symbol x and x^d denotes a falling factorial. This can be reduced to the problem of *frequency moment estimation in stream*

2 Preliminaries

We consider discrete random variables X , the set of its values is denoted by $\text{dom}(X)$ and its probability mass function by p_X .

► **Definition 2** (Frequency Moment). *The d -th frequency moment of a random variable X is defined as $\sum_x P_x(x)^d$. We also denote the d -th norm of P_X as $\|P_X\| = (\sum_x P_x(x)^d)^{1/d}$.*

► **Definition 3** (Renyi Entropy). *Let X be a random variable over a discrete alphabet \mathcal{X} . The Renyi entropy of order d is defined as*

$$\mathbf{H}_d(X) = \frac{1}{1-d} \log \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_X(x)^d \right). \quad (2)$$

3 Proofs of Results

3.1 Eliminating Median Trick

It has been popular in many works on algorithms to use the so called median trick [13] to amplify the estimator confidence. It reduces the problem to finding an approximation with confidence $2/3$, which is usually done by a second moment method (Czebyszev inequality); boosting the confidence to any $\delta > 0$ costs a multiplicative factor $O(\log(1/\delta))$ in the number of samples.

► **Proposition 4.** *Suppose that an algorithm \tilde{A} estimates in some interval range with probability $1/4$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$, repeating independently $O(\log(1/\delta))$ times \tilde{A} and taking the median of all outputs we get an estimate in the same range which is correct with probability $1 - \delta$.*

Let A be the real quantity to be estimated. The approximation with constant confidence can be obtained by the Chebyszev inequality which states that $\Pr[|\tilde{A} - A| > \epsilon] < \mathbf{MSE}(\tilde{A})/\epsilon^2$. When the estimator is unbiased, that is $\mathbf{E}\tilde{A} = A$ we have $\mathbf{MSE}(\tilde{A}) = \mathbf{Var}(\tilde{A})$ and instead of medians we can simply amply means combined with Bernstein inequality.

► **Proposition 5** (Bernstein's inequality [7, 21]). *Let \tilde{A}_i be IID with mean A , let $\epsilon > 0$ be a relative error and let variance of \tilde{A}_i be at most $B \cdot (\mathbf{E}A)^2$. Then*

$$\Pr \left[\left| m^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{A}_i - A \right| > \epsilon \cdot A \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{m\epsilon^2}{2B + 2B\epsilon/3} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{3m\epsilon^2}{8B} \right).$$

where the second inequality is true when $\epsilon \leq 1$.

In particular we see that a) For some optimization of the constant in the median trick see the discussion in [21].

Why is better because the median trick internally reduces to deviations from the mean + doesn't quite capture the variance information.

3.2 Second Moments - Collision Entropy (Second Moments)

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be observed symbols. Let $C_{i,j}$ indicate whether X_i and X_j collides, that is

$$C_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & X_i = X_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

With this notation we clearly have

► **Proposition 6.** *With notation as above, the second-moment estimator for p_X equals*

$$\tilde{p} = \binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{i < j} C_{i,j}. \quad (4)$$

It is straightforward to see that the estimator is unbiased

► **Proposition 7.** *For every $i \neq j$ we have $\mathbb{E}C_{i,j} = \sum_x p_X(x)^2$.*

Note that $C_{i,j}$ in general are not independent, and in fact are *positively* associated. We can however bound their mixed moment

► **Proposition 8.** *Let $i < j < k$, then $\mathbb{E}C_{i,j}C_{j,k} = \sum_x p_X(x)^3$.*

Proof. Conditioning on $X_j = x$ we have $C_{i,j}C_{j,k} = 1$ if and only if $X_i = x$ and $X_k = x$. Since $i < j < k$ these two events (conditioned on $X_j = x$) are independent and hold both with probability $p_X(x)$. Then the claim follows by the total probability law. ◀

► **Remark 9** (Positive correlation). Jensen's inequality implies $\sum_x p_X(x)^3 \geq (\sum_x p_X(x)^2)^2$, thus $\mathbf{Cov}(C_{i,j}, C_{j,k}) \geq 0$.

By combining Proposition 7 and Proposition 8 we obtain

► **Proposition 10** (Variance estimation). *We have*

$$\mathbf{Var} \left(\sum_{i < j} C_{i,j} \right) \leq \binom{n}{2} \sum_x p_X(x)^2 + 2 \binom{n}{2} (n-2) \sum_x p_X(x)^3 + \binom{n}{2} \binom{n-2}{2} \sum_x p_x^4.$$

In particular

$$\mathbf{Var}(\tilde{p}) \leq \frac{\sum_x p_X(x)^2 + 2(n-2) \sum_x p_X(x)^3 + \binom{n-2}{2} \sum_x p_x^4}{\binom{n}{2}}$$

Proof. Since $C_{i,j}$ are boolean, Proposition 7 bounds the variance of $C_{i,j}$ which correspond to $\binom{n}{2}$ terms as $i < j$. Then Proposition 8 bounds the covariance of $C_{i,j}$ and $C_{j,k}$ which appears in $n^3 = 2!\binom{n}{2}(n-2)$ terms; it is also possible to get pairs $C_{i,j}$ and $C_{i',j'}$ where $i < j$, $i' < j'$ are all distinct in $\binom{4}{2} \cdot \binom{n}{4}$ ways (and then random variables are independent). The bound follows now from the variance sum law. The second follows from the definition of \tilde{p} and scaling the variance. For the sanity check, note that $\binom{n}{2} + 2!\binom{n}{2}(n-2) + \binom{n}{2}\binom{n-2}{2}$ equals $\binom{n}{2} \cdot (1 + 2(n-2) + \binom{n-2}{2})$ which is $\binom{n}{2}^2$, the total number of terms in the variance sum formula. ◀

3.3 Higher Moments - General Case

For a tuple $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_d)$ let $C_{\mathbf{i}}$ indicate whether all X_i collides. It is clear that

► **Proposition 11.** *With notation as above, the d -th moment estimator for p_X equals*

$$\tilde{p} = \binom{n}{d}^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{i}=(i_1,\dots,i_d): 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_d \leq n} C_{\mathbf{i}}. \quad (5)$$

that is the summation is over ordered tuples of distinct indices.

Similarly as before, it is straightforward to see that the estimator is unbiased.

► **Proposition 12.** *For every $i \neq j$ we have $\mathbb{E}C_{i,j} = \sum_x p_X(x)^2$. In particular \tilde{p} is unbiased.*

This is actually a special case ($k = d$) of the more general result below.

► **Proposition 13** (Collision patterns). *Let $\mathbf{i} = i_1, \dots, i_d$ and $\mathbf{j} = j_1, \dots, j_d$ be tuples of distinct indices. Suppose that exactly $k \geq 0$ of entries in \mathbf{i} collides with some entries in \mathbf{j} , that is $|\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}| = k$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[C_{\mathbf{i}}C_{\mathbf{j}}] = \sum_x p_X(x)^{2d-k}.$$

Proof. Consider the case $k = 0$ which means that \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} do not share a common index; it is easy to see that the formula is true. Consider now $k > 0$ which means that \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} overlaps. We have $X_i = X_j$ for all $i \in \mathbf{i}$ and $j \in \mathbf{j}$. Conditioning on the common value of X_i and X_j

$$\mathbb{E} \left[C_{\mathbf{i}}C_{\mathbf{j}} \middle| X_{\mathbf{i}} = X_{\mathbf{j}} = \underbrace{x, \dots, x}_{2d-k} \right] = p_X(x)^{2d-k}.$$

because we have exactly $2d - k$ distinct variables X_i or X_j and all are equal to x . The claim follows now by aggregating over possible values of x . ◀

► **Proposition 14** (Number of terms). *They are $\binom{n}{d}\binom{d}{k}\binom{n-d}{d-k}$ unordered distinct tuples \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} which satisfy $|\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}| = k$. The number of ordered tuples equals $\binom{n}{2d-k}$.*

Proof. Recall that \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} are d -combinations out of n . To enumerate tuples such that $|\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{j}| = k$ note it suffices to choose \mathbf{i} one in $\binom{n}{d}$ ways, then choose k common elements in $\binom{d}{k}$ ways and then choose remaining $\mathbf{j} \setminus \mathbf{i}$ elements in $\binom{n-d}{d-k}$ ways. This gives the formula. ◀

By combining Proposition 12, Proposition 13 and Proposition 14 we derive the following variance formula. The proof is analogous as in Proposition 10.

► **Proposition 15** (Variance estimation). *With the summation convention as in Proposition 11*

$$\text{Var} \left(\sum_i C_i \right) \leq \binom{n}{d} \sum_{k=1}^d \binom{d}{k} \binom{n-d}{d-k} \sum_x p_X(x)^{2d-k}$$

In particular

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{p}) \leq \frac{\sum_{k=0}^d \binom{d}{k} \binom{n-d}{d-k} \sum_x p_X(x)^{2d-k}}{\binom{n}{d}}.$$

► **Remark 16.** For a sanity check note that $\sum_{k=0}^d \binom{d}{k} \binom{n-d}{d-k} = \binom{n-d+d}{d} = \binom{n}{d}$ by the binomial theorem. This means that all terms in the variance sum law have been taken into account.

Finally we simplify formula further to show how it depends on the d -th moment only. We will use the standard fact from calculus about α -summable sequences.

► **Proposition 17** ([16]). *The mapping $d \rightarrow (\sum_x p_X(x)^\alpha)^{1/\alpha}$ for any nonnegative weights $p_X(x)$ is decreasing in $\alpha \geq 1$.*

► **Corollary 18** (Variance estimation). *Let $\|p\|_d = (\sum_x p_X(x)^d)^{1/d}$. Then*

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{p}) \leq \frac{\|p\|_d^{2d} \sum_{k=0}^d \binom{d}{k} \binom{n-d}{d-k} \|p\|_d^{-k}}{\binom{n}{d}}$$

and in particular we have

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{p}) \leq \binom{n}{d}^{-1} \cdot 2\|p\|_d^d, \quad n > 2d^2.$$

► **Remark 19.** Consider the term $k = d$, it contributes to the variance at least $\Omega(\|p\|_d^{-d})$.

Proof. By Proposition 17 we can write $\sum_x p_X(x)^{2d-k} \leq (\sum_x p_X(x)^d)^{2-\frac{k}{d}}$, plugging this and rearranging terms we obtain the first inequality. Next, observe that $Q_k = \binom{d}{k} \binom{n-d}{d-k}$ attains its maximum at $k = d$ provided that $n > (d+1)^2$; indeed $Q_{k+1} = Q_k \cdot \frac{d-k}{k+1} \cdot \frac{d-k}{n-2d+k+1}$ and thus Q_{k+1}/Q_k decreases in k as both factors decreases; thus $Q_{k+1}/Q_k < Q_0/Q_1 = d^2/(n-2d+1) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ given our assumption on n and d . Now we can estimate $Q_{k+1} \leq 2^{-k} \cdot Q_0$ which means $\binom{d}{k} \binom{n-d}{d-k} \|p\|_d^{-k} \leq 2\|p\|_d^{-d}$ (sum of the geometric progression) which implies the second inequality. ◀

Now using Proposition 5 we conclude our main result.

► **Corollary 20.** *Theorem 1 holds with n such that $n \geq \frac{16 \log(2/\delta)}{3\epsilon^2} \cdot (\sum_x p_X(x)^d)^{-1}$.*

Proof. Choose n_0 so that the bound in Corollary 18 is at most $(\mathbf{E}\tilde{p})^2 = \|p\|_d^{-d}$; by the elementary inequality $\binom{n}{d} > (n/d)^d$ it suffices to satisfy

$$n_0 > 2d \cdot \|p\|_d^{-1}.$$

To apply Proposition 5 we divide the samples into batches of length n_0 and choose $\lceil n/n_0 \rceil$ accordingly to get ϵ error and $1 - \delta$ confidence. We shall note that in terms of entropy $\|p\|_d^d = 2^{-\frac{H_d(X)}{d-1}}$ so that $\|p\|_d = 2^{-\frac{d-1}{d} \cdot H_d(X)}$. ◀

3.4 Learning Moderate Entropy Regimes with Early Stopping

Let $p = \sum_x p_X(x)^d$ be the unknown moment to estimate and \tilde{p} be the actual estimator. We will use the estimator to *gradually test* whether p is big or not.

► **Proposition 21** (Small values don't give high estimates). *Set parameters assuming $p \geq p_0$ so that $\epsilon = 1$ and δ is a small number. Suppose that $p = p_0\gamma$, where $\gamma < 1/2$ is some constant. Then $\tilde{p} \leq 2p_0$ with probability $1 - \delta$.*

Proof. Suppose not, then $\tilde{p} = \epsilon' \cdot p_0$ for some constant $\epsilon' \geq 2\gamma$. But we still have $\mathbf{E}\tilde{p} = p$, in particular

$$\Pr[\tilde{p} > \epsilon' \cdot p_0] \leq \Pr[\tilde{p} - p > (\epsilon' - \gamma) \cdot p_0] \leq \Pr[\tilde{p} - p > \epsilon'/2 \cdot p_0]$$

When we use Proposition 5 to estimate this probability, the bound on the number B for \tilde{p} differs from that of $p \geq p_0$ by a factor $p_0/p = \gamma^{-1}$. Suppose that $\epsilon' = 2$. In Proposition 5 we use the tail bound $2 \exp\left(-\frac{m\epsilon^2}{2B+2B\epsilon/3}\right)$. We get the same dependency on ϵ and increase B because of $\gamma < 1$, therefore get same bounds as before. ◀

This result guarantees that we can gradually test whether $p_0 < 2^{-\lambda}$ for $\lambda = 1, 2, \dots$, with constant multiplicative error. By doing this we lose in confidence at most $H_0(X) \cdot \delta$, thus the number of samples should be increased by a factor of $O(\log \log \text{dom}(X))$ to preserve the confidence. Once we know the interval for p , up to a multiplicative factor, we can set up the estimator as usual.

3.5 Stream Estimation

The quantity $\binom{n_x}{d}$ is a polynomial of order d in n_x , similar to those considered in streaming estimators.

The best streaming algorithms for estimating the frequency moments give the bound $\tilde{O}(|\text{dom}(X)|^{1-2/k})$ to approximate empirical sum of k -th powers $\sum_x n_x^k$. Our sum can be transformed to a combination of such expressions, via change of bases. Indeed, we have

► **Proposition 22.** *For any natural k it holds that*

$$x^k = \sum_{j=0}^k S(k, j) j! \binom{x}{j}$$

where $S(k, j)$ are Stirling numbers of the second kind.

Now applying the state-of-art stream estimators to each combination we see that the complexity is dominated by the case $k = d$. Thus we can reduce the memory usage to about $\tilde{O}(|\text{dom}(X)|^{1-2/k})$.

4 Conclusion

References

- 1 Jayadev Acharya, Alon Orlitsky, Ananda Theertha Suresh, and Himanshu Tyagi. Estimating rényi entropy of discrete distributions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 63(1):38–56, 2016.
- 2 Noga Alon, Yossi Matias, and Mario Szegedy. The space complexity of approximating the frequency moments. *Journal of Computer and system sciences*, 58(1):137–147, 1999.

- 3 Erdal Arikan. An inequality on guessing and its application to sequential decoding. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 42(1):99–105, 1996. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/18.481781>, doi: 10.1109/18.481781.
- 4 Boaz Barak, Yevgeniy Dodis, Hugo Krawczyk, Olivier Pereira, Krzysztof Pietrzak, François-Xavier Standaert, and Yu Yu. Leftover hash lemma, revisited. In *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2011 - 31st Annual Cryptology Conference, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, August 14-18, 2011. Proceedings*, pages 1–20, 2011. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22792-9_1, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22792-9_1.
- 5 Tugkan Batu, Lance Fortnow, Ronitt Rubinfeld, Warren D Smith, and Patrick White. Testing that distributions are close. In *Proceedings 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 259–269. IEEE, 2000.
- 6 Charles H. Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Claude Crépeau, and Ueli M. Maurer. Generalized privacy amplification. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 41(6):1915–1923, 1995. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/18.476316>, doi:10.1109/18.476316.
- 7 Sergei Bernstein. On a modification of chebyshev’s inequality and of the error formula of laplace. *Ann. Sci. Inst. Sav. Ukraine, Sect. Math*, 1(4):38–49, 1924.
- 8 Yevgeniy Dodis and Yu Yu. Overcoming weak expectations. In *Theory of Cryptography - 10th Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2013, Tokyo, Japan, March 3-6, 2013. Proceedings*, pages 1–22, 2013. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36594-2_1, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-36594-2_1.
- 9 Manjesh Kumar Hanawal and Rajesh Sundaresan. Guessing revisited: A large deviations approach. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 57(1):70–78, 2011. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2010.2090221>, doi:10.1109/TIT.2010.2090221.
- 10 Russell Impagliazzo and David Zuckerman. How to recycle random bits. In *30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA, 30 October - 1 November 1989*, pages 248–253, 1989. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1989.63486>, doi:10.1109/SFCS.1989.63486.
- 11 Piotr Indyk and David Woodruff. Optimal approximations of the frequency moments of data streams. In *Proceedings of the thirty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 202–208, 2005.
- 12 R. Jenssen, K. E. Hild, D. Erdogmus, J. C. Principe, and T. Eltoft. Clustering using renyi’s entropy. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks, 2003.*, volume 1, pages 523–528 vol.1, 2003. doi:10.1109/IJCNN.2003.1223401.
- 13 Mark R Jerrum, Leslie G Valiant, and Vijay V Vazirani. Random generation of combinatorial structures from a uniform distribution. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 43:169–188, 1986.
- 14 Petr Jizba, Hagen Kleinert, and Mohammad Shefaat. Rényi’s information transfer between financial time series. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 391(10):2971 – 2989, 2012. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378437112000131>, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2011.12.064>.
- 15 Donald E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 3: (2Nd Ed.) Sorting and Searching*. Addison Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Redwood City, CA, USA, 1998.
- 16 Şükran Konca, Mochammad Idris, and Hendra Gunawan. p -summable sequence spaces with inner products. *Bitlis Eren University Journal of Science and Technology*, 5(1):37–41, 2015.
- 17 Ke Li, Wanlei Zhou, Shui Yu, and Bo Dai. Effective ddos attacks detection using generalized entropy metric. In *Algorithms and Architectures for Parallel Processing, 9th International Conference, ICA3PP 2009, Taipei, Taiwan, June 8-11, 2009. Proceedings*, pages 266–280, 2009. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03095-6_27, doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-03095-6_27.
- 18 Bing Ma, Alfred Hero, John Gorman, and Olivier Michel. Image registration with minimum spanning tree algorithm. In *Proceedings 2000 International Conference on Image Processing (Cat. No. 00CH37101)*, volume 1, pages 481–484. IEEE, 2000.

- 19 Yishay Mansour, Mehryar Mohri, and Afshin Rostamizadeh. Multiple source adaptation and the rényi divergence. In *UAI 2009, Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, Montreal, QC, Canada, June 18-21, 2009*, pages 367–374, 2009. URL: https://dslpitt.org/uai/displayArticleDetails.jsp?mmnu=1&smnu=2&article_id=1600&proceeding_id=25.
- 20 Huzefa Neemuchwala, Alfred O. Hero III, Sakina Zabuawala, and Paul L. Carson. Image registration methods in high-dimensional space. *Int. J. Imaging Systems and Technology*, 16(5):130–145, 2006. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ima.20079>, doi:10.1002/ima.20079.
- 21 Wojciech Niemiro and Piotr Pokarowski. Fixed precision mcmc estimation by median of products of averages. *Journal of applied probability*, 46(2):309–329, 2009.
- 22 Maciej Obremski and Maciej Skorski. Rényi Entropy Estimation Revisited. In Klaus Jansen, José D. P. Rolim, David Williamson, and Santosh S. Vempala, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2017)*, volume 81 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 20:1–20:15, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2017. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. URL: <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2017/7569>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2017.20.
- 23 Liam Paninski. Estimation of entropy and mutual information. *Neural Comput.*, 15(6):1191–1253, June 2003. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/089976603321780272>, doi:10.1162/089976603321780272.
- 24 C. E. Pfister and W. G. Sullivan. Rényi entropy, guesswork moments, and large deviations. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 50(11):2794–2800, 2004. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2004.836665>, doi:10.1109/TIT.2004.836665.
- 25 Prasanna K. Sahoo and Gurdial Arora. A thresholding method based on two-dimensional renyi’s entropy. *Pattern Recognition*, 37(6):1149–1161, 2004. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2003.10.008>, doi:10.1016/j.patcog.2003.10.008.
- 26 Paul C. van Oorschot and Michael J. Wiener. Parallel collision search with cryptanalytic applications. *J. Cryptology*, 12(1):1–28, 1999. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/PL00003816>, doi:10.1007/PL00003816.
- 27 Dongxin Xu. *Energy, Entropy and Information Potential for Neural Computation*. PhD thesis, Gainesville, FL, USA, 1998. AAI9935317.