

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 statistics¹, which 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 mathematics². This

* Corresponding author.

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>.

paper 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, 13], and Suyari [14], amongst others. The source coding theorem, central to the RD problem, has been derived by Yamano [15] using generalized statistics. A preliminary work by Venkatesan [16] 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) [17] 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 [18] $\langle \langle A \rangle \rangle_q = \sum_i \frac{p_i^q}{\sum_i p_i^q} A_i$. 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 [19, 20]. 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 [21] 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 [21] has commonality with the studies of Wada and Scarfone [22], Bashkirov [23], and, Di Sisto *et. al.* [24]. This paper extends the work in [16], by employing the Ferri-Martinez-Plastino formulation [21] 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]. As pointed out by Abe [25], normalized Tsallis entropies do not possess Lesche stability. However, for applications in communications theory and learning theory, the local stability criterion of Yamano [26] may be evoked to justify the use of normalized Tsallis entropies described in terms of *escort probabilities*. Ongoing studies, which will be reported elsewhere, have established the relation between the solutions of generalized RD theory for un-normalized Tsallis entropies using linear constraints that are reported in this paper, and, normalized Tsallis entropies using T-M-P constraints defined in terms of *escort probabilities*, in a manner similar to that employed by Wada and Scarfone [27].

To reconcile the different forms of the generalized mutual entropy for $0 < q < 1$ and $q > 1$, the *additive duality of nonextensive statistics* [28] 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 $\log(\bullet) \rightarrow \ln_{q^*}(\bullet)$ [27].

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 [29].

Summing up, this Section outlines the material presented in this paper. The basic theory of *q-Tsallis entropies*, and, *q*-Tsallis entropies* is 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 basis underlying nonextensive alternating minimization algorithms (rate distortion), and subsequently, alternating maximization algorithms (channel capacity), is also derived in Section 4. This is accomplished in Lemma 1 of this paper, by extending the positivity conditions in Lemma 13.8.1 in [3] to the case of Tsallis statistics. Section 5 extends prior studies [16] 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 [30, 31]

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

Akin to the Tsallis entropy, the generalized K-Ld obeys the *pseudo-additivity* relation [31]. Nonextensive statistics is intimately related to *q-deformed* algebra and calculus (see [32] and the references within). The *q-deformed* logarithm and exponential are defined as [32]

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

respectively. Before proceeding further, three important relations from *q-deformed* algebra, employed in this paper, are stated [12, 32]

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

The un-normalized Tsallis entropy (1), conditional Tsallis entropy, joint Tsallis entropy, and, the generalized K-Ld (3) may thus be written as [12, 30, 31]

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

respectively. The joint convexity of the generalized K-Ld for $q > 0$ is established by the relation [33, 34]

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

In the framework of Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics, the mutual information may be expressed as [3] $I(X; \tilde{X}) = S(X) - S(X|\tilde{X}) = S(\tilde{X}) - S(\tilde{X}|X) = I(\tilde{X}; X)$. This is the manifestation of the symmetry of the mutual information within the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon model. Within the framework of nonextensive statistics, the inequalities (*sub-additivities*)

$$S_q(X|\tilde{X}) \leq S_q(X), \text{ and, } S_q(\tilde{X}|X) \leq S_q(\tilde{X}), \tag{8}$$

do not generally hold true for $0 < q < 1$. Note that (8) is only valid for $q > 1$ as noted by Furuichi [12]. The *sub-additivities* (8) are required to hold true,

for the generalized mutual entropy to be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} I_q(X; \tilde{X}) &= S_q(X) - S_q(X|\tilde{X}) = S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(\tilde{X}|X) \\ &= S_q(X) + S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(X, \tilde{X}) = I_q(\tilde{X}; X); q > 1. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Note that Furuichi [12] has presented a thorough and exhaustive qualitative extension of the analysis of Daróczy [35], and has proven that (9) holds true for un-normalized Tsallis entropies for $q \geq 1$. Further, for normalized Tsallis entropies, Yamano [11] has elegantly established the symmetry described by (9) in the range $0 < q < 1$.

The un-normalized generalized mutual entropy $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$, in the range $0 < q < 1$, is defined by the generalized K-Ld between the the joint probability $p(X, \tilde{X})$ and the marginal probabilities $p(X)$ and $p(\tilde{X})$, respectively ⁵

$$\begin{aligned} I_q(X; \tilde{X}) &= - \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x})}{p(x, \tilde{x})} \right) \\ &= D_{K-L}^q [p(X, \tilde{X}) \| p(X)p(\tilde{X})] \\ &= \left\langle D_{K-L}^q [p(\tilde{X}|X) \| p(\tilde{X})] \right\rangle_{p(x)}; 0 < q < 1. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The *sub-additivities* (8) do not generally hold true in the range $0 < q < 1$. This forecloses the prospect of transparently establishing the symmetry of the generalized mutual entropy in the range $0 < q < 1$, in the manner akin to (9), and, the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon model.

From (10), the symmetry of the generalized mutual entropies $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ and $I_q(\tilde{X}; X)$ may be summarized as

$$\begin{aligned} I_q(X; \tilde{X}) &= D_{K-L}^q [p(X, \tilde{X}) \| p(X)p(\tilde{X})] \\ &= \left\langle D_{K-L}^q [p(\tilde{x}|x) \| p(\tilde{x})] \right\rangle_{p(x)} = \left\langle D_{K-L}^q [p(x|\tilde{x}) \| p(x)] \right\rangle_{p(\tilde{x})} \\ &= D_{K-L}^q [p(\tilde{X}, X) \| p(\tilde{X})p(X)] = I_q(\tilde{X}; X). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

It is important to note that the generalized K-Ld (6) $D_{K-L}^q[p(X)||r(X)]$ is not symmetric. However, as described in (11), if X and \tilde{X} are discrete random variables with marginal's $p(X)$ and $p(\tilde{X})$ and joint distribution $p(X, \tilde{X})$, then the generalized mutual entropy for $0 < q < 1$ defined in terms of the

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.

generalized K-Ld is symmetric. This is a consequence of the Kolmogorov theorem which states that joint distributions are always invariant to the ordering of the random variables [36]. Specifically, the generalized K-Ld between $p(X, \tilde{X})$ and $p(X)p(\tilde{X})$ is identical to the generalized K-Ld between $p(\tilde{X}, X)$ and $p(\tilde{X})p(X)$. The symmetry between the two distinct forms of generalized mutual entropy for $0 < q < 1$ and $q^* > 1$, in a manner analogous to (9) and the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon case, may be proven with the aid of the *additive duality*. The proof for this symmetry relation is identical to the derivation of Theorem 3 in Section 3 of this paper, and may be obtained on interchanging the nonextensivity parameters q and $q^* = 2 - q$, wherever they occur in (19).

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 [29] for further details.

A dual Tsallis entropy defined by

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

has already been studied in a maximum (Tsallis) entropy setting (for example, see Wada and Scarfone [27]). It is important to note that the $q^* = 2 - q$ duality has been studied within the Sharma-Taneja-Mittal framework by Kaniadakis, *et. al.* [37]. The following properties, however, have yet to be proven for dual Tsallis entropies: (a) the validity of (9) 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*

$$S_{q^*}(X, \tilde{X}) = S_{q^*}(X) + S_{q^*}(\tilde{X}|X). \quad (14)$$

Note that $q^* = 2 - q$, $\ln_{q^*} x = \frac{x^{1-q^*}-1}{1-q^*}$.

Proof: From (5) and (6)

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

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*

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

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

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

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 generalized mutual entropy is described by⁶

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{q^*}(X; \tilde{X}) &= - \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) \ln_{q^*} \left(\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x})}{p(x, \tilde{x})} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(q^* \rightarrow q)}{=} S_q(X) + S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(X, \tilde{X}) = I_q(X; \tilde{X}); 0 < q^* < 1, \text{ and, } q > 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Note that in this paper, $q^ \rightarrow q$ denotes re-parameterization of the nonextensivity parameter defining the information theoretic quantity from q^* to q by*

⁶ Here " \rightarrow " denotes a re-parameterization of the nonextensivity parameter, and, is not a limit.

setting $q^* = 2 - q$. Likewise, $q \rightarrow q^*$ denotes re-parameterization from q to q^* by setting $q = 2 - q^*$.

Proof:

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

Here, (a) follows from (5), (b) follows from setting $q^* = 2 - q$, and, (c) follows from (9). Theorem 3 acquires a certain significance especially when it may be proven [11] that the convex form of the generalized mutual entropy (10) can never be expressed in the form of Tsallis entropies (9).

Theorem 3 demonstrates that such a relation is indeed possible by commencing with q^* -Tsallis mutual entropy and performing manipulations that scale the generalized mutual entropy from q^* -space to q -space, yielding a form akin to (9). 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). Let, $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ and $\tilde{X} = \{\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_m\}$, $m < n$. By definition, the partitioning of X dictates the manner in which each element of the *source alphabet* X relates to each element of the *compressed representation* \tilde{X} . In RD

theory, the partitioning is dictated by the normalized transition probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. When the assignment of the elements of $X \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ is probabilistic, then the partitioning is referred to as *soft partitioning*. When the assignment is deterministic, it is referred to as *hard partitioning*. Initially, RD undergoes a soft partitioning, and then as the process progresses, hard partitioning occurs.

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 $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ ⁷. 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 thus 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 $I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = 0$.

The physics underlying RD remains unchanged regardless of the range of q . However, the generalized mutual entropy possesses different properties for nonextensivity parameters in i) $0 < q < 1$ and ii) $q > 1$ respectively. For example, information theoretic and physics based features intrinsic to RD theory, that may not be comprehensively described using one range of nonextensivity parameter, may be analyzed with greater coherence using the *additive duality*. To obtain a deeper insight into the generic process of nonextensive RD, the case of $q > 1$ is briefly examined.

This is a simple example where nonextensive models, having nonextensivity parameters in the ranges i) $0 < q < 1$ and ii) $q > 1$, may be employed to complement each other. The models may help to understand the physics of a certain problems by employing the additive duality. In this case, the two different ranges of q are employed with the aid of the *additive duality*, to qualitatively and quantitatively describe the extreme limits (scenarios) of the generalized RD model, using a *sender-receiver* description. These extreme limits are: i) no communication between \mathcal{X} and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, and, ii) perfect communication between \mathcal{X} and $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, respectively.

Specifically, in Section 5.1 of this paper, the mathematical (quantitative) analysis of the generalized RD model is performed in the range $0 < q < 1$ using the generalized mutual entropy described by (10). However, a deeper qualitative description of the process may be obtained by complementing the form of the generalized mutual entropy used in Section 5.1, with the form of the generalized mutual entropy valid in the range $q > 1$ (described by (9)), with the aid of the *additive duality*. As stated in Sections 1 and 2, the generalized mutual entropy $I_q(X; \tilde{X})$ cannot be stated in the form described by (9) for $0 < q < 1$. Employing the definition of the generalized mutual entropy for

⁷ Note that these arguments are adapted from the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon RD model, where $q = 1$.

$q > 1$ (9), we obtain $I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = S_q(\tilde{X}) - S_q(\tilde{X}|X)$. 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, $I_q(X; \tilde{X}) = 0$.

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 $D = \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})} = \sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) d(x, \tilde{x})$ ⁸. Note that D is mathematically 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*. This implies that $R_q(D)$ is the minimum achievable nonextensive *compression information*, where the minimization is carried out over all normalized transition probabilities $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, for which the distortion constraint is satisfied. 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

⁸ Note that in this paper, $\langle \bullet \rangle_{p(\bullet)}$ denotes the expectation with respect to the probability $p(\bullet)$.

by equivalent extensive RD models.

Obtaining $R_q(D)$ involves minimization of the nonextensive RD Lagrangian (free energy) [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. Here, $\tilde{\beta} = q\beta$ (see Section 5.1) is a Lagrange multiplier called the *nonextensive trade-off parameter*, where, β is the *inverse temperature* in Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics [5, 6]. Note that $\tilde{\beta}$ is the nonextensive mathematical equivalent of the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon *inverse temperature* β . It is important to note that $\tilde{\beta}$ and β have different physical connotations. The definition $\tilde{\beta} = q\beta$ is specific to this paper, and is chosen to facilitate comparison between the extensive and nonextensive RD models. More complex forms of the *nonextensive trade-off parameter* have been investigated into. The results of this study will be reported elsewhere.

Here, (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)⁹ is to find the minimum distance between two convex sets A and B in \mathcal{R}^n ¹⁰. First, a point $a \in A$ is chosen and a

⁹ See Chapter 13 in [3].

¹⁰ Note that the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm presented herein is not referred to as the nonextensive Blahut-Arimoto algorithm, despite being an obvi-

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-Tusnádý theory [9] to the nonextensive domain for two convex sets of probability distributions, and considering the generalized mutual entropy (10) as a distance measure between the joint probability $p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)$, and the marginal probabilities $p(x)$ and $p(\tilde{x})$ [3, 9], by extending the definition of the generalized K-Ld (3), the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm converges to the minimum $D_{K-L}^q[\bullet]$ between the two convex sets of probability distributions ($p(\tilde{x}|x)$ and $p(\tilde{x})$, respectively). It is important to note that the nonextensive Pythagorean identity (triangular equality), which forms the basis of any extension of the Csiszár-Tusnádý theory to the nonextensive regime, has been established by Dukkhipati *et. al.* [38].

Before proceeding any further, it is judicious to state the leitmotif 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 positivity condition for nonextensive alternating minimization schemes, central to RD theory, is proven. Subsequently, this result is extended to establish the positivity condition for nonextensive alternating maximization schemes, required for calculating the channel capacity (Lemma 13.8.1 in [3]).

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.

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

ous extension, because the Blahut-Arimoto scheme is synonymous with Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics.

where

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

Also

$$-\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x)}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})} \right) = -\max_{p(x|\tilde{x})} \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})} \right), \quad (25)$$

where by the Bayes theorem

$$p^*(x|\tilde{x}) = \frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)}{\sum_x p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)}. \quad (26)$$

Note that (25) forms the basis for the computational implementation of the channel capacity within the Tsallis statistics framework.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{K-L}^q \left[p(X, \tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p(\tilde{X}) \right] - D_{K-L}^q \left[p(X, \tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p^*(\tilde{X}) \right] \\ &= -\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) + \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) \\ &= -\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \left[\ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) - \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} -\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \frac{\ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) - \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right)}{1 + (1-q) \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right)} \left[1 + (1-q) \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) \right] \\ &= -\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p^*(\tilde{x})} \right) \left[1 + (1-q) \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} -\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p^*(\tilde{x})} \right) \frac{\left[\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) + (1-q) \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) \right]}{\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x})} \quad (27) \\ &= -\sum_{\tilde{x}} \underbrace{\sum_x p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)}_{p^*(\tilde{x})} \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})}{p^*(\tilde{x})} \right) \left[1 + (q-1) \left(-\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q \left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})} \right) \right) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} D_{K-L}^q \left[p^*(\tilde{X}) \parallel p(\tilde{X}) \right] \\ &\times \left[1 + (q-1) D_{K-L}^q \left[p(X, \tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p^*(\tilde{X}) \right] \right] > 0; \\ &\forall \begin{cases} 0 < q < 1, \\ 0 < D_{K-L}^q \left[p(X, \tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p^*(\tilde{X}) \right] < 1, \\ 0 < D_{K-L}^q \left[p^*(\tilde{X}) \parallel p(\tilde{X}) \right] < 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here, (a) sets up the expression to employ the q -deformed algebra definition $\frac{[\ln_q a - \ln_q b]}{[1 + (1-q)\ln_q b]} = \ln_q\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)$, by multiplying and dividing by $\left[1 + (1-q)\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})}\right]$, (b) follows by multiplying and dividing $\left[1 + (1-q)\ln_q\left(\frac{p^*(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})}\right)\right]$ by $p(x,\tilde{x})$ and summing over x and \tilde{x} . Note that $\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) = 1$, (c) establishes the positivity condition and proves that

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

The second part of Lemma 1 is proven as follows, based on the validity of (24). From (24) and (26)

$$p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) = p(\tilde{x})p^*(x|\tilde{x}) \quad (29)$$

Thus, the positivity condition is established as

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})}\right) + \max_{p(x|\tilde{x})} \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \\ & = - \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \left[\ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})}\right) - \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} - \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \frac{\ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})}\right) - \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right)}{1 + (1-q)\ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right)} \left[1 + (1-q)\ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \right] \\ & = - \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x|\tilde{x})}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \left[1 + (1-q)\ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \right] \\ & = - \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x|\tilde{x})}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \frac{\left[\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) + (1-q) \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \right]}{\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x})} \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{=} - \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x})p^*(x|\tilde{x}) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x|\tilde{x})}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \left[\sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) + (1-q) \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x)p(x)}{p(\tilde{x})p(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \right] \quad (30) \\ & = \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \left(- \sum_x p^*(x|\tilde{x}) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(x|\tilde{x})}{p^*(x|\tilde{x})}\right) \right) \\ & \quad \times \left[1 + (q-1) \left(- \sum_{x,\tilde{x}} p(x,\tilde{x}) \ln_q\left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x,\tilde{x})}\right) \right) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{=} \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) D_{K-L}^q \left[p^*(X|\tilde{X} = \tilde{x}) \parallel p(X|\tilde{X} = \tilde{x}) \right] \\ & \quad \times \left[1 + (q-1) D_{K-L}^q \left[p(X,\tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p(\tilde{X}) \right] \right] > 0; \\ & \forall \begin{cases} 0 < q < 1, \\ 0 < D_{K-L}^q \left[p(X;\tilde{X}) \parallel p(X)p(\tilde{X}) \right] < 1, \\ 0 < D_{K-L}^q \left[p^*(X|\tilde{X} = \tilde{x}) \parallel p(X|\tilde{X} = \tilde{x}) \right] < 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here, (a) sets up the expression to employ the q -deformed algebra definition $\frac{[\ln_q a - \ln_q b]}{[1 + (1-q)\ln_q b]} = \ln_q\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)$, by multiplying and dividing by $\left[1 + (1-q)\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}\right]$, (b)

evokes (29) followed by multiplying and dividing $\left[1 + (1 - q) \ln_q \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x})p(x)}{p(x, \tilde{x})}\right)\right]$ by $p(x, \tilde{x})$ and summing over x and \tilde{x} . Note that $\sum_{x, \tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) = 1$, (c) establishes the positivity condition.

Here, the two parts of Lemma 1 ((23) and (25)) provide a generalized statistics framework for deriving both alternating minimization and alternating maximization schemes, using the celebrated Csiszár-Tusnády theory. Note that the results in Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon statistics is obtained by setting $q = 1$ (see Lemma 13.8.1 in [3]).

Lemma 1 is of great importance in deriving generalized statistics extensions of the Expectation Maximization (EM) algorithm [39]. The complete efficacy of Lemma 1 will be demonstrated in a future publication, which studies the information bottleneck method [7] within the framework of Tsallis statistics.

The positivity conditions (27) and (30) cannot be derived without the aid of q -deformed algebra [32]. It is important to note that the first part of Lemma 1 establishes the fact that the marginal probability $p^*(\tilde{x})$, defined by (24), minimizes the generalized mutual entropy and hence the generalized statistics RD Lagrangian (21), for the range $0 < q < 1$. Any other form of marginal probability other than (24), which may be obtained without the use of q -deformed algebra, could have a two-fold debilitating effect on the generalized statistics RD model presented in this paper, and the results of Lemma 1. First, Bayes' theorem (26) would be violated. Next, the possibility exists wherein the RD Lagrangian (21) could be maximized instead of being minimized, for certain values of q .

Specifically, if the rules of q -algebra are neglected, an expression of the form: $p^*(\tilde{x}) = \sum_x p(x)^{\alpha(q)} p(\tilde{x}|x)^{\beta(q)}$, where $\alpha(q)$ and $\beta(q)$ are some functions of the nonextensivity parameter q , is obtained. Apart from violating (26), such a form of $p^*(\tilde{x})$ could result in a *maximization* of (21) for certain values of q , thereby invalidating the nonextensive alternating minimization procedure.

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

$$R_q(D) = \min_{\{p(\tilde{x})\}} \min_{\{p(\tilde{x}|x): \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle \leq D\}} D_{K-L}^q \left[p(X) p(\tilde{X}|X) \parallel p(X) p(\tilde{X}) \right]. \quad (31)$$

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

$$R_q(D) = \min_{b \in B} \min_{a \in A} D_{K-L}^q[a \| b]. \quad (32)$$

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 mutual entropy (parameterized by $q^* = 2 - q$) 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: Variational minimization of the Lagrangian ¹¹

$$\begin{aligned} L_{RD}^q[p(\tilde{x}|x)] &= \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) \frac{\left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})}\right)^{q-1} - 1}{q-1} \\ &+ \tilde{\beta} \sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} d(x, \tilde{x}) p(x) p(\tilde{x}|x) + \sum_x \lambda(x) \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}|x), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

yields the canonical conditional probability $p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}(-\beta^*(x)d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\tilde{Z}(x, \beta^*(x))}$, where, $\tilde{\beta} = q\beta$, $\beta^*(x) = \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{(1-q)\lambda(x)}$, $\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \frac{\lambda(x)}{p(x)}$, and, $\sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) = 1$.

¹¹ Valid for both discrete and continuous cases

Proof: Taking the variational derivative of (33) for each x and \tilde{x} , yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\delta L_{RD}^q[p(\tilde{x}|x)]}{\delta p(\tilde{x}|x)} = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial p(\tilde{x}|x)} \left[\frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)^q p(\tilde{x})^{1-q} - 1}{q-1} \right] + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) p(x) + \lambda(x) = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow \frac{qp(x)}{(q-1)} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} + \frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)^q}{(q-1)} \frac{\partial p(\tilde{x})^{1-q}}{\partial p(\tilde{x}|x)} + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) p(x) + \lambda(x) = 0 \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\Rightarrow} \frac{qp(x)}{(q-1)} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} + \frac{p(x)p(\tilde{x}|x)^q}{(q-1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial p(\tilde{x}|x)} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)^{1-q} p(x)^{1-q}}{p(x|\tilde{x})^{1-q}} \right) \\
& \quad + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) p(x) + \lambda(x) = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow \frac{qp(x)}{(q-1)} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} + \frac{(1-q)p(x)}{(q-1)} \left(\frac{p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})} \right)^{1-q} + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) p(x) + \lambda(x) = 0 \\
& \Rightarrow p(x) \left[\frac{1}{(q-1)} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) + \frac{\lambda(x)}{p(x)} \right] = 0 \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\Rightarrow} p(x) \left[\frac{1}{(q-1)} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) + \tilde{\lambda}(x) \right] = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

In (34), (a) follows from Bayes rule by setting $p(\tilde{x}) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)p(x)}{p(x|\tilde{x})}$, and, (b) follows by defining $\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \frac{\lambda(x)}{p(x)}$. Thus, (34) yields

$$\left[\frac{1}{(q-1)} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q-1} + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) + \tilde{\lambda}(x) \right] = 0. \tag{35}$$

Expanding (35), yields

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = p(\tilde{x}) \left[(1-q) \left\{ \tilde{\lambda}(x) + \tilde{\beta} d(x, \tilde{x}) \right\} \right]^{\frac{1}{q-1}}. \tag{36}$$

Multiplying the square bracket in (35) by $p(\tilde{x}|x)$, summing over \tilde{x} , and, evoking $\sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}|X=x) = 1$ yields

$$\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \frac{1}{(1-q)} \aleph_q(x) - \tilde{\beta} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}. \tag{37}$$

Here, $\aleph_q(x) = \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^q$. Thus (36) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
p(\tilde{x}|x) &= \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \{1 - (q-1)\beta^*(x)d(x, \tilde{x})\}^{1/(q-1)}}{(\Im_{RD}(x))^{1/(1-q)}}, \\
\Im_{RD}(x) &= \aleph_q(x) + (q-1) \tilde{\beta} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)} = (1-q) \tilde{\lambda}(x), \\
\beta^*(x) &= \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\Im_{RD}(x)} = \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\aleph_q(x) + (q-1) \tilde{\beta} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where $\beta^*(x)$ is the *effective nonextensive trade-off parameter* for a *single source alphabet* $x \in X$. The *net effective nonextensive trade-off parameter*, evaluated

for all *source alphabets* $x \in X$ is: $\beta^* = \sum_x \beta^*(x)$. Note that the parameter $\beta^*(x)$ explicitly manifests the *self-referential* nature of the canonical transition probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$.

The present case differs from the analysis in [21] in the sense that $\beta^*(x)$ is to be evaluated for each *source alphabet* $x \in X$. Thus, the so-called *parametric perspective* employed in [21], by *a-priori* defining a range for $\beta^*(x) \in [0, \infty]$ is not possible. Instead the canonical transition probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ has to be evaluated for each $\beta^*(x)$ for all $x \in X$, and, for each $\tilde{\beta}$. This feature represents a pronounced qualitative and quantitative distinction when studying the stationary point solutions of conditional probabilities, as compared with stationary point solutions of marginal probabilities.

Specifying $q = 2 - q^*$ in the numerator of (38) and evoking (4), yields the canonical transition probability

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}[-\beta^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})]}{\sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}[-\beta^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})]} = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}[-\beta^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})]}{\tilde{Z}(x, \beta^*(x))}. \quad (39)$$

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

$$\tilde{Z}(x, \beta^*(x)) = \mathfrak{S}_{RD}^{\frac{1}{1-q}}(x) = \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}[-\beta^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})]. \quad (40)$$

Solutions of (39) are only valid for $\{1 - (1 - q^*) \beta^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})\} > 0$, ensuring $p(\tilde{x}|x) > 0$. This is the *Tsallis cut-off condition* [1, 21]. The condition $\{1 - (1 - q^*) \beta^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})\} \leq 0$ requires setting $p(\tilde{x}|x) = 0$. From (38)-(40), $\tilde{\beta}$, β^* , and, $\beta^*(x)$ relate as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^*(x) &= \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\mathfrak{N}_q(x) + (q-1)\beta^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})_{p(\tilde{x}|x)}} = \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\tilde{Z}^{(1-q)}(x, \beta^*(x))}, \\ \beta^* &= \sum_x \beta^*(x). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

5.2 Case for $q > 1$

As discussed in Sections 2 and 3 (Theorem 3) of this paper, use of the *additive duality* is required to express the generalized mutual entropy for the range of the nonextensivity parameter $q > 1$ as: $D_{K-L}^{q^*}[p(X, \tilde{X})||p(X)p(\tilde{X})]$. This is done in accordance with the form required for the nonextensive alternating minimization procedure (31) (Section 4.2) described in $q^* - space$, and, the convention followed in [3].

Lemma 3: Variational minimization of the Lagrangian ¹²

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

yields the canonical conditional probability $p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q(-\beta_{2-q}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\tilde{Z}_{2-q}(x, \beta_{2-q}^*(x))}$, where, $\tilde{\beta}_{q^*} = q^* \beta$, $\beta_{2-q}^*(x) = \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}}{(1-q^*)\lambda(x)}$, $\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \frac{\lambda(x)}{p(x)}$, and, $\sum_x \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(x, \tilde{x}) = 1$.

Proof: In accordance with the procedure employed in Section 5.1, variational minimization of the Lagrangian in (42) yields

$$\frac{\delta L_{RD}^{q*} [p(\tilde{x}|x)]}{\delta p(\tilde{x}|x)} = p(x) \left[\frac{1}{q^* - 1} \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q^* - 1} + \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} d(x, \tilde{x}) + \tilde{\lambda}(x) \right] = 0. \quad (43)$$

Solving (43) for $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ and obtaining the normalization Lagrange multiplier analogous to the approach in Section 5.1, yields

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

and,

$$\tilde{\lambda}(x) = \frac{1}{1 - q^*} \underbrace{\sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \left(\frac{p(\tilde{x}|x)}{p(\tilde{x})} \right)^{q^*}}_{\aleph_{q^*}(x)} - \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}. \quad (44)$$

Here, (44) yields

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q(-\beta_{2-q}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\Im_{RD}^*(x)^{\frac{1}{q^* - 1}}},$$

$$\Im_{RD}^*(x) = \aleph_{q^*}(x) + (q^* - 1) \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}, \quad (45)$$

$$\beta_{2-q}^*(x) = \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}}{\Im_{RD}^*(x)} = \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}}{\aleph_{q^*}(x) + (q^* - 1) \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}}.$$

Here, (45) yields

$$p(\tilde{x}|x) = \frac{p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q(-\beta_{2-q}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\tilde{Z}_{2-q}(x, \beta_{2-q}^*(x))}. \quad (46)$$

¹² Valid for both discrete and continuous cases

Solutions of (46) are only valid for $\{1 - (1 - q) \beta_{2-q}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})\} > 0$, ensuring $p(\tilde{x}|x) > 0$. This is the *Tsallis cut-off condition* [1, 21] for (46), for the range $1 < q < 2$. The condition $\{1 - (1 - q) \beta_{2-q}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x})\} \leq 0$ requires setting $p(\tilde{x}|x) = 0$. The partition function is

$$\tilde{Z}_{2-q}(x, \beta_{2-q}^*(x)) = (\mathfrak{S}_{RD}^*(x))^{\frac{1}{1-q^*}} = \sum_{\tilde{x}} p(\tilde{x}) \exp_q \left[-\beta_{2-q}^*(x) d(x, \tilde{x}) \right]. \quad (47)$$

From (45)-(47), $\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}$, β_{2-q}^* , and, $\beta_{2-q}^*(x)$ relate as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{2-q}^*(x) &= \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}}{\mathfrak{N}_{q^*}(x) + (q^*-1) \tilde{\beta}_{q^*} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(\tilde{x}|X=x)}} = \frac{\tilde{\beta}_{q^*}}{\tilde{Z}_{2-q}^{(1-q^*)}(x, \beta_{2-q}^*(x))}, \\ \beta_{2-q}^* &= \sum_x \beta_{2-q}^*(x). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

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 nonextensive trade-off parameter* for a single *source alphabet* $\beta^*(x)$ obtained from (38) for all *source alphabets*, the expected distortion $D = \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p(x, \tilde{x})}$ is obtained. Choosing a random data point in $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ (the convex set of probability distributions B , described in Sections 4.1 and 4.2), an initial guess for $p(\tilde{x})$ is made. Eq. (39) 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 Sections 4.1 and 4.2), 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 (31). Using **Lemma 2** ((39)) 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 $\beta^*(x)$ obtained for all *source alphabets*, 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 4.2). Specif-

ically, $p(\tilde{x})$ 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).

- 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 $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\forall \tilde{x} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$.

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 *nonextensive trade-off parameter* $\tilde{\beta}(= q\beta)$, where, β is the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon *inverse temperature*.
4. Distortion measure $d(x, \tilde{x})$.
5. Convergence parameter ε .

Output

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

Initialization

Initialize $R_q^{(0)}$ and randomly initialize $p(\tilde{x})$ and $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ (to initialize $\beta^{*(0)}(x)$).

While True

- $\beta^{*(m)}(x) = \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{\sum_{\tilde{x}} p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}) \left(\frac{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}|x)}{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x})} \right)^q + (q-1)\tilde{\beta} \langle d(x, \tilde{x}) \rangle_{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}|X=x)}} \rightarrow \text{Effective nonex-}$

tensive trade-off parameter for a single source)(41)

- $p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x}|x) \leftarrow \frac{p^{(m)}(\tilde{x}) \exp_{q^*}(-\beta^{*(m)}(x)d(x, \tilde{x}))}{\tilde{Z}^{(m+1)}(x, \beta^{*(m)})}$

- $p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x}) \leftarrow \sum_x p(x) p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x}|x)$

$$R_q^{(m+1)}(D) = D_{K-L}^q \left[p(x) p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x}|x) || p(x) p^{(m+1)}(\tilde{x}) \right].$$

If $(R_q^{(m)}(D) - R_q^{(m+1)}(D)) \leq \varepsilon$

Break

- Test Tsallis cut-off condition.

- $\tilde{\beta} \leftarrow \tilde{\beta} + \delta \tilde{\beta}$

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 nonextensive RD numerical simulations are performed for three values of the nonextensivity parameter (i) $q = 0.85$, (ii) $q = 0.70$, and, (iii) $q = 0.5$, respectively. *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* $\beta \in [1, 2.2]$. Note that in this paper, the *nonextensive trade-off parameter* is: $\tilde{\beta} = q\beta$. *It is observed that the nonextensive RD theory exhibits a lower threshold for the minimum achievable compression-information in the distortion-compression plane, as compared to the extensive case, for all values of q in the range $0 < q < 1$.* The nonextensive RD curves are *upper bounded* by the Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon RD curve.

Specifically, as described in Section 5.3 of this paper, first the transition probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$ is obtained by solving (39), followed by a correction of the marginal probability $p(\tilde{x})$ using (24). This process is iteratively applied for each individual value of $\tilde{\beta}$ till convergence is reached. The value of $\tilde{\beta}$ is then marginally increased, resulting in the nonextensive RD curve. This is the crux of the nonextensive alternating minimization procedure. The nonextensive RD curves in Fig. 2 are truncated, by terminating the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm when the *Tsallis cut-off condition* is breached.

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 trade-off parameter $-\tilde{\beta} = -q\beta$. Data clustering may be construed as being a form of lossy data compression [40]. At the commencement, the nonextensive alternating minimization algorithm solves for the compression phase with $\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow 0$. The compression phase is characterized by all data points "coalescing" around a single data point $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$, in order to achieve the most compact representation ($R_q(D) \rightarrow 0$).

As $\tilde{\beta}$ increases, the data points undergo *soft clustering* around the cluster centers. By definition, in *soft clustering*, a data point $x \in X$ is assigned to a given cluster whose centers are $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{X}$ through a normalized transition probability $p(\tilde{x}|x)$. The *hard clustering* regime signifies regions where $\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow \infty$. By definition, in *hard clustering* the assignment of data points to clusters is deterministic.

An observation of particular significance is revealed 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.

7 Summary and conclusions

Variational principles for a generalized RD theory, and, a *dual* 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 [21]. 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 [41] and Banerjee *et. al.* [42], 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 with increase in the *nonextensive trade-off parameter*. 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 [43]. This is demonstrated for *q-deformed* exponential families of distributions [44, 45]. The primary rationale for this exercise is to solve the generalized RD problem employing an Expectation-Maximization-*like* algorithm [39], using the results of Lemma 1 as a basis. Results of these studies will be presented elsewhere.

Acknowledgements

RCV gratefully acknowledges support from *RAND-MSR* contract *CSM-DI & S-QIT-101107-2005*. Comments from the anonymous referees are gratefully acknowledged.

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 (1984).
- [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] S. Furuichi, Linear Algebra and its Applications, **418**, 821 (2006).
- [14] H. Suyari, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory, **50**,8, 1783 (2004).
- [15] T. Yamano, Physica A, **305**, 190 (2002).

- [16] 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, HI, 2007, pp. 509-515.
- [17] E. M. F. Curado and C. Tsallis, Journal of Physics A, **24**, L69 (1991).
- [18] C. Tsallis, R.S. Mendes, and A. R. Plastino, Physica A, **261**, 534 (1998).
- [19] S. Martínez, F. Nicolás, F. Pennini, and A. Plastino, Physica A, **286**, 489 (2000).
- [20] E. K. Lenzi, R. S. Mendes, and L. R. da Silva, Physica A, **280**, 337 (2000).
- [21] G. L. Ferri, S. Martinez, and A. Plastino, J. Stat. Mech.: Theory and Experiment, **2005(04)**, P04009 (2005).
- [22] T. Wada and A. M. Scarfone, Eur. Phys. J. B, **47**, 557 (2005).
- [23] A. G. Bashkirov, Physica A, **340**, 153 (2004).
- [24] R. P. Di Sisto, S. Martinez, R. B. Orellana, A. R. Plastino, and A. Plastino, Physica A, **265**, 590 (1999).
- [25] S. Abe, Phys. Rev. E, **66**, 046134 (2002).
- [26] T. Yamano, Phys. Lett. A, **329**, 268 (2004).
- [27] T. Wada and A. M. Scarfone, Phys. Lett. A, **235**, 351 (2005).
- [28] J. Naudts, Physica A, **316**, 323 (2002).
- [29] J. Naudts, Physica A, **340**, 32 (2004).
- [30] C. Tsallis, Phys. Rev. E, **58**, 1442 (1998).
- [31] L. Borland, A. Plastino, and C. Tsallis, J. Math. Phys., **39**, 6490 (1998).
- [32] E. Borges, Physica A, **340**, 95 (2004).
- [33] S. Furuichi, IEEE Trans on Inform. Theory, **51**, 3638 (2005).
- [34] S. Abe and G. B. Bağcı, Phys. Rev. E, **71**, 016139 (2005).
- [35] Z. Daróczy, Information Control, **16**, 36 (1970).
- [36] M. Li and P. Vitanyi, *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications*, Springer Verlag (New York, NY, 1997).
- [37] G. Kaniadakis, M. Lissia, and A. M. Scarfone, Phys. Rev. E, **71**, 048128 (2005).
- [38] A. Dukkipati, M. Narasimha Murty, and S. Bhatnagar, Physica A, **361**, 124 (2006).
- [39] G. J. McLachlan and T. Krishnan, *The EM Algorithm and Extensions*, John Wiley & Sons (New York, N. Y., 1996).

- [40] D. J. C. MacKay, *Information Theory, Inference, and Learning Algorithms* Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, UK, 2003).
- [41] K. Rose, IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory, **40**,6,1939 (1994).
- [42] A. Banerjee, S. Merugu, I. Dhillon, and J. Ghosh, J. Machine Learning Research (JMLR), **6**, 1705 (2005).
- [43] 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.
- [44] K. S. Azoury and M. K. Warmuth, Machine Learning, **43**,3, 211 (2001).
- [45] J. Naudts, Rev. Math. Phys., **16**, 809 (2004).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1: Schematic diagram for rate distortion curve.

Fig. 2: Rate distortion curves. Boltzmann-Gibbs-Shannon model (solid line), generalized statistics RD model for $q = 0.85$ (dash-dots), $q = 0.70$ (dashes), and, $q = 0.5$ (dots).



