

“Coding” Interpretation of Entropy

Cross Entropy

PA154 Jazykové modelování (2.1)

Pavel Rychlý

pary@fi.muni.cz

March 2, 2017

Source: Introduction to Natural Language Processing (600.465)
Jan Hajič, CS Dept., Johns Hopkins Univ.
www.cs.jhu.edu/~hajic

- The least (average) number of bits needed to encode a message (string, sequence, series, ...) (each element having being a result of a random process with some distribution p): $= H(p)$
- Remember various compressing algorithms?
 - ▶ they do well on data with repeating (= easily predictable = low entropy) patterns
 - ▶ their results though have high entropy \Rightarrow compressing compressed data does nothing

PA154 Jazykové modelování (2.1)

Cross Entropy

2/12

Coding: Example

- How many bits do we need for ISO Latin 1?
 - ▶ \Rightarrow the trivial answer: 8
- Experience: some chars are more common, some (very) rare:
 - ▶ ... so what if we use more bits for the rare, and less bits for the frequent? (be careful: want to decode (easily)!)
 - ▶ suppose: $p('a') = 0.3$, $p('b') = 0.3$, $p('c') = 0.3$, the rest: $p(x) \cong .0004$
 - ▶ code: 'a' \sim 00, 'b' \sim 01, 'c' \sim 10, rest: $11b_1b_2b_3b_4b_5b_6b_7b_8$
 - ▶ code 'acbbébaac':

00	10	01	01	<u>1100001111</u>	10	01	00	00	10
a	c	b	b	é	c	b	a	a	c
 - ▶ number of bits used: 28 (vs. 80 using “naive” coding)
- code length $\sim -\log(\text{probability})$

PA154 Jazykové modelování (2.1)

Cross Entropy

3/12

Entropy of Language

- Imagine that we produce the next letter using

$$p(l_{n+1}|l_1, \dots, l_n),$$

where l_1, \dots, l_n is the sequence of **all** the letters which had been uttered so far (i.e. n is really big!); let's call l_1, \dots, l_n the **history** $h(h_{n+1})$, and all histories H :

- Then compute its entropy:
 - ▶ $-\sum_{h \in H} \sum_{l \in A} p(l, h) \log_2 p(l|h)$
- Not very practical, isn't it?

PA154 Jazykové modelování (2.1)

Cross Entropy

4/12

Cross-Entropy

- Typical case: we've got series of observations
 $T = \{t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, \dots, t_n\}$ (numbers, words, ...; $t_1 \in \Omega$);
estimate (sample): $\forall y \in \Omega: \tilde{p}(y) = \frac{c(y)}{|T|}$,
def. $c(y) = |\{t \in T; t = y\}|$
- ... but the true p is unknown; every sample is too small!
- Natural question: how well do we do using \tilde{p} (instead of p)?
- Idea: simulate actual p by using a different T (or rather: by using different observation we simulate the insufficiency of T vs. some other data (“random” difference))

PA154 Jazykové modelování (2.1)

Cross Entropy

5/12

Cross Entropy: The Formula

- $H_{p'}(\tilde{p}) = H(p') + D(p' || \tilde{p})$

$$H_{p'}(\tilde{p}) = -\sum_{x \in \Omega} p'(x) \log_2 \tilde{p}(x)$$
- p' is certainly not the true p , but we can consider it the “real world” distribution against which we test \tilde{p}
- note on notation (confusing ...): $\frac{p}{p'} \leftrightarrow \tilde{p}$, also $H_{T'}(p)$
- (Cross)Perplexity: $G_{p'}(p) = G_{T'}(p) = 2^{H_{p'}(\tilde{p})}$

PA154 Jazykové modelování (2.1)

Cross Entropy

6/12

Conditional Cross Entropy

- So far: "unconditional" distribution(s) $p(x), p'(x) \dots$
- In practice: virtually always conditioning on context
- Interested in: sample space Ψ , r.v. $Y, y \in \Psi$;
context: sample space Ω , r.v. $X, x \in \Omega$;
"our" distribution $p(y|x)$, test against $p'(y, x)$, which is taken from some independent data:

$$H_{p'}(p) = - \sum_{y \in \Psi, x \in \Omega} p'(y, x) \log_2 p(y|x)$$

Computation Example

- $\Omega = \{a, b, \dots, z\}$, prob. distribution (assumed/estimated from data): $p(a) = .25, p(b) = .5, p(\alpha) = \frac{1}{64}$ for $\alpha \in \{c..r\}, = 0$ for the rest: s,t,u,v,w,x,y,z
- Data (test): barb $p'(a) = p'(r) = .25, p'(b) = .5$
- Sum over Ω :
 α **a b c d e f g ... p q r s t ... z**
 $-p'(\alpha) \log_2 p(\alpha)$ **.5 + .5 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 1.5 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 2.5**
- Sum over data:
 i/s_i **1/b 2/a 3/r 4/b**
 $-\log_2 p(s_i)$ **1 + 2 + 6 + 1 = 10** $(1/4) \times 10 = 2.5$

Cross Entropy: Usage

- Comparing data??
 - NO!** (we believe that we test on **real** data!)
- Rather: comparing distributions (**vs.** real data)
- Have (got) 2 distributions: p and q (on some Ω, X)
 - which is better?
 - better: has lower cross-entropy (perplexity) on real data S
- "Real" data: S

$$H_S(p) = -1/|S| \sum_{i=1..|S|} \log_2 p(y_i|x_i) \quad H_S(q) = -1/|S| \sum_{i=1..|S|} \log_2 q(y_i|x_i)$$

Sample Space vs. Data

- In practice, it is often inconvenient to sum over the space(s) Ψ, Ω (especially for cross entropy!)
- Use the following formula:
 $H_{p'}(p) = - \sum_{y \in \Psi, x \in \Omega} p'(y, x) \log_2 p(y|x) = -1/|T'| \sum_{i=1..|T'|} \log_2 p(y_i|x_i)$
- This is in fact the normalized log probability of the "test" data:

$$H_{p'}(p) = -1/|T'| \log_2 \prod_{i=1..|T'|} p(y_i|x_i)$$

Cross Entropy: Some Observations

- $H(p) < = > ??$ $H_{p'}(p) : \text{ALL!}$
- Previous example:
 $p(a) = .25, p(b) = .5, p(\alpha) = \frac{1}{64}$ for $\alpha \in \{c..r\}, = 0$ for the rest: s,t,u,v,w,x,y,z
 $H(p) = 2.5 \text{ bits} = H(p')(\text{barb})$
- Other data: probable: $(\frac{1}{8})(6 + 6 + 6 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 6 + 6) = 4.25$
 $H(p) < 4.25 \text{ bits} = H(p')(\text{probable})$
- And finally: abba: $(\frac{1}{4})(2 + 1 + 1 + 2) = 1.5$
 $H(p) > 1.5 \text{ bits} = H(p')(\text{abba})$
- But what about: baby $-p'('y') \log_2 p('y') = -.25 \log_2 0 = \infty (??)$

Comparing Distributions

- $p(\cdot)$ from previous example: $H_S(p) = 4.25$
 $p(a) = .25, p(b) = .5, p(\alpha) = \frac{1}{64}$ for $\alpha \in \{c..r\}, = 0$ for the rest: s,t,u,v,w,x,y,z
- $q(\cdot)$ (conditional; defined by a table):

$q(\cdot) \rightarrow$	a	b	e	l	o	p	r	other
a	0	.5	0	0	0	.125	0	0
b	1	0	0	0	1	.125	0	0
e	0	0	0	1	0	.125	0	0
l	0	.5	0	0	0	.125	0	0
o	0	0	0	0	0	.125	1	0
p	0	0	0	0	0	.125	0	1
r	0	0	0	0	0	.125	0	0
other	0	0	1	0	0	.125	0	0

$(1/8) (\log(p|oth.) + \log(r|p) + \log(o|r) + \log(b|o) + \log(a|b) + \log(b|a) + \log(l|b) + \log(e|l))$
 $(1/8) (0 + 3 + 0 + 0 + 1 + 0 + 1 + 0)$
 $H_S(q) = .625$