# ГОДИШНИК НА СОФИЙСКИЯ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ "СВ. КЛИМЕНТ ОХРИДСКИ" ФАКУЛТЕТ ПО МАТЕМАТИКА И ИНФОРМАТИКА Том 99

ANNUAIRE DE L'UNIVERSITE DE SOFIA "ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI"
FACULTE DE MATHEMATIQUES ET INFORMATIQUE
Tome 99

## SOME RESULTS FOR IDENTIFICATION FOR SOURCES AND ITS EXTENSION TO LIAR MODELS <sup>1</sup>

ZLATKO VARBANOV

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

The classical transmission problem deals with the question how many possible messages can we transmit over a noisy channel? Transmission means there is an answer to the question "What is the actual message?" In the identification problem we deal with the question how many possible messages the receiver of a noisy channel can identify? Identification means there is an answer to the question "Is the actual message u?". Here u can be any member of the set of possible messages.

Let  $(\mathcal{U}, P)$  be a source, where  $\mathcal{U} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}, P = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_N\}$ , and let  $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_N\}$  be a binary prefix code (PC) for this source with  $||c_u||$  as length of  $c_u$ . Introduce the random variable U with  $\text{Prob}(U = u) = p_u$  for  $u = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and the random variable C with  $C = c_u = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{u||c_u||})$  if U = u.

We use the PC for noiseless identification, that is user u wants to know whether the source output equals u, that is, whether C equals  $c_u$  or not. The user iteratively checks whether C coincides with  $c_u$  in the first, second, etc. letter and stops when the first different letter occurs or when  $C = c_u$ .

What is the expected number  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P, u)$  of checkings?

In order to calculate this quantity we introduce for the binary tree  $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ , whose leaves are the codewords  $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_N$ , the sets of leaves  $C_{ik} (1 \leq i \leq N; 1 \leq k)$ , where  $C_{ik} = \{c \in \mathcal{C} : c \text{ coincides with } c_i \text{ exactly until the } k$ 'th letter of  $c_i\}$ . If C

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Supported by COMBSTRU Research Training Network HPRN-CT-2002-00278.

takes a value in  $C_{uk}$ ,  $0 \le k \le ||c_u|| - 1$ , the answers are k times "Yes" and 1 time "No". For  $C = c_u$  the

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P,u) = \sum_{k=0}^{||c_u||-1} P(C \in \mathcal{C}_{uk})(k+1) + ||c_u|| P_u.$$

For a code C

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P) = \max_{1 \ge u \ge N} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P, u)$$

is the expected number of checkings in the worst case and

$$L(P) = \min_{\mathcal{C}} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P)$$

is this number for the best code.

#### 2. RESULTS FOR UNIFORM DISTRIBUTION

Let  $P^N = \{\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{1}{N}\}$ . We construct a prefix code  $\mathcal{C}$  in the following way. In each node (starting at the root) we split the number of remaining codewords in proportion as close as possible to  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ .

It is known [1] that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N) = 2 \tag{2.1}$$

Also, in [2] was stated the problem to estimate an universal constant  $A = \sup L(P)$  for general  $P = (P_1, \ldots, P_N)$ . We compute this constant for uniform distribution and this code C.

Using decomposition formula for trees, we obtain the following recursion

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N) = \frac{\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil}{N} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^{\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil}) + 1, L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^2) = 1$$
(2.2)

From (2) follows that the worst case for  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N)$  is when  $N = 2^k + 1$ , for any integer k. We compute the exact value for  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N)$  in this case and obtain

$$\sup_{N} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^{N}) = 2 + \frac{\log_{2}(N-1) - 2}{N}$$

Also, we consider the case where not only the source outputs but the users occur at random. In addition to the source  $(\mathcal{U}, P)$  and random variable U, we are given  $(\mathcal{V}, Q), \mathcal{V} \equiv \mathcal{U}$  with random variable V independent of U and defined by  $\operatorname{Prob}(V = v) = Q_v$  for  $v \in V$ . The source encoder knows the value u of U but not that of V, which chooses the user v with probability  $Q_v$ . Again let  $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, \ldots, c_N\}$  be a binary prefix code and let  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P, u)$  be the expected number of checkings on

code C for user u. Instead of  $L_C(P) = \max_{u \in U} L_C(P, u)$  we can consider the average number of expected checkings (also called average identification length):

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P,Q) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_v L_{\mathcal{C}}(P,v); \quad L(P,Q) = \min_{\mathcal{C}} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P,Q)$$

Special case is the case Q = P. Here

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} P_u L_{\mathcal{C}}(P, u); \quad L(P, P) = \min_{\mathcal{C}} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P, P)$$

and for uniform distribution we have

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N, P^N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N, u)$$

We calculate exact values of  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N)$  and  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N,P^N)$  for some N and summarize them in Table 1 (for  $N=2^k,L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N)=L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N,P^N)=2-\frac{2}{N}$  [1]).

TABLE 1 - some exact values for uniform distribution,  $2^k < N < 2^{k+1}, k \ge 3$ 

N	$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N)$	$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N,P^N)$
$2^{k} + 1$	$2 + \frac{\log_2(N-1)-2}{N}$	$2 + \frac{log_2(N-1)-2}{N^2}$
$2^k + 2^{k-1} - 1$	2	$2 - \frac{5(N+1) - 3\log_2(\frac{2N+2}{3})}{3N^2}$
$2^k + 2^{k-1}$	$2-\frac{1}{N}$	$2-rac{5}{3N}$
$2^k + 2^{k-1} + 1$	$2 + \frac{\log_2(\frac{N-1}{12})}{N}$	$2 - \frac{(5N-2) - 3log_2(\frac{N-1}{12})}{3N^2}$
$2^{k+1}-1$	$2-\frac{1}{N}$	$2 - \frac{2N - \log_2(N+1) + 1}{N^2}$

#### 3. EXTENSION TO LIAR MODELS

Suppose that when user u iteratively checks whether C coincides with  $c_u$  in the first, second, etc. letter, for some reasons he obtains wrong information in any position. Then there is a lie(error) in this position of the codeword. In this model

with lies, the user knows only that the general number of lies is at most e and no information for the positions of lies.

Let  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P,u) = L_{\mathcal{C}}(P)$  for any  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ . In this case, we denote by  $L_{\mathcal{C}}(P;e)$  the expected number of checkings if there are at most e lies. Then, to be sure for the correct answer in any position the user needs of e+1 the same answers ("Yes" or "No"). If the user has done 2e+1 questions for any position he gets exact information for the value in this position. Therefore, there exists trivial upper bound

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P;e) \le (2e+1)L_{\mathcal{C}}(P)$$

Clearly, this upper bound can be improved by decreasing the number of remaining lies. The following algorithm can be used for any  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ :

**Step 0**: BEGIN i := 1, Checkings := 0, actual message := v;

**Step 1**: If  $i > ||c_v||$  then Step 3. Otherwise, check codeword position i until e+1 the same answers. Let t be the number of obtained answers "Yes" and f be the number of obtained answers "No":

**Step 2**: Checkings := Checkings + (t+f). If t > f, then e := e-f, i := i+1, Step 1. Otherwise, the actual message  $v \neq u$ ;

Step 3: END.

Let v be the current checked codeword and let i be the first position in which  $c_u$  and  $c_v$  differ (if  $c_u = c_v$  then  $i = ||c_u||$ ). We can see that the worst case with respect by e is when all lies(errors) occur in position i. In this case

Checkings = (e+1)(i-1) + (2e+1).1 = e(i+1) + i.

If there is a lie in any position m  $(1 \le m \le i-1)$ , for every position j  $(m+1 \le j \le i)$  the user needs of e the same answers. Then

Checkings = (m-1)(e+1) + (e+2) + (i-m-1)e + (2e-1) = e(i+1) + m < e(i+1) + i

Therefore, if  $k = ||c_u||$  and  $P_{ui} = P(C \in C_{ui})$ , for the worst case we obtain the following upper bound

$$L_{\mathcal{C}}(P;e) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} P_{ui}(e(i+2)+i+1) + (e(k+1)+k)P_{u}$$

$$= e \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} P_{ui}(i+2) + e(k+1)P_{u} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} P_{ui}(i+1) + kP_{u}$$

$$= e \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (P_{ui}(i+1) + P_{ui}) + e(k+1)P_{u} + L_{\mathcal{C}}(P)$$

$$= e \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} P_{ui}(i+1) + kP_{u}\right) + e \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} P_{ui} + P_{u}\right) + L_{\mathcal{C}}(P)$$

$$= eL_{\mathcal{C}}(P) + e + L_{\mathcal{C}}(P) = (e+1)L_{\mathcal{C}}(P) + e$$

Let  $M_{\mathcal{C}}(P;e)=(e+1)L_{\mathcal{C}}(P)+e$ . Then from (1) follows that for uniform distribution  $P^N$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} M_{\mathcal{C}}(P^N; e) = 3e + 2$$

Let consider other distribution P when all individual probabilities are powers of  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

$$P_u = \frac{1}{2^{\ell_u}}, \quad u \in \mathcal{U} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$$

We know that there is a prefix code C with codeword lengths  $||c_u|| = \ell_u$  and for such code  $L_C(P, u) = 2(1 - P_u)$  [2]. Therefore

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} L_{\mathcal{C}}(P) = 2$$

and again for  $M_{\mathcal{C}}(P;e)$  we obtain

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} M_{\mathcal{C}}(P; e) = 3e + 2$$

Also, for general distribution  $P = (P_1, P_2, ..., P_N)$  we know that  $L(P) \leq 3([1], Theorem 3)$ . Therefore, for L(P; e) (the expected number of checkings for the best code C and at most e lies) we obtain that

$$L(P;e) \le 4e + 3$$

### REFERENCES

- Ahlswede, R., B. Balkenhol, C. Kleinewächter. Identification for sources. General Theory of Information Transfer and Combinatorics. Contributions of members of a ZiF Research Group 2001-2004, Bielefeld, 40–49.
- Ahlswede, R. Identification entropy. General Theory of Information Transfer and Combinatorics, Contributions of members of a ZiF Research Group 2001-2004, Bielefeld, 487–503.

Received on October 3, 2006

Department of Mathematics and Informatics Veliko Tarnovo University 5000 Veliko Tarnovo BULGARIA E-mail: vtgold@yahoo.com