

# The method of the likelihood and the Fisher information in the construction of physical models

E.W. Piotrowski<sup>1</sup>, J. Śladkowski<sup>2</sup>, J. Syska<sup>2,\*</sup>, S. Zając<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Mathematics, The University of Białystok, PL-15424 Białystok, Poland

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, Uniwersytecka 4, 40-007 Katowice, Poland

Received XXXX, revised XXXX, accepted XXXX

Published online XXXX

PACS 03.65.Bz, 03.65.Ca, 03.65.Sq, 02.50.Rj

\* Corresponding author: e-mail jacek.syska@us.edu.pl, Phone +xx-xx-xxxxxxx, Fax +xx-xx-xxx

The subjects of the paper are the likelihood method (LM) and the expected Fisher information ( $FI$ ) considered from the point of view of the construction of the physical models which originate in the statistical description of phenomena. The master equation case and structural information principle are derived. Then, the phenomenological description of the information transfer is presented. The extreme physical information (EPI) method is reviewed. As if marginal, the statistical interpretation of the amplitude of the system is given. The formalism developed in this paper would be also applied in quantum information processing and quantum game theory.

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

**1 Introduction.** The subjects of the paper are the likelihood method (LM) and the expected Fisher information ( $FI$ ),  $I$ , considered from the point of view of the construction of the physical models, which originate in the statistical description of phenomena. The  $FI$  had been introduced by Fisher [1] as a part of the new technique of parameter estimation of models which undergo the statistical investigation in the language of the maximization of the value of the likelihood function  $L$  (signed below as  $P$ ). The notion of the  $FI$  is also connected with the Cramér-Rao inequality, being the *maximal* inverse of the possible value of the mean-square error of the unbiased estimate from the true value of the parameter. The set  $\Theta = (\theta_n)$  of the parameters<sup>1</sup> composes the components in the statistical space  $\mathcal{S}$ . Under the regularity conditions the expected  $FI$  (here be-

cause of the summation over  $n$ , the *channel capacity*):

$$I \equiv \sum_{n=1}^N \int d^N \mathbf{y} \frac{-\partial^2 \ln P(\mathbf{y}; \Theta)}{\partial \theta_n^2} P(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{n=1}^N \int d^N \mathbf{y} \left( \frac{\partial \ln P(\mathbf{y}; \Theta)}{\partial \theta_n} \right)^2 P(\mathbf{y}) \quad (1)$$

is the variance of the score function  $S(\Theta) \equiv \partial \ln P(\Theta) / \partial \Theta$  [2]. It describes the local properties of  $P(\mathbf{y}; \theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)$  which is the joint probability (density) of the  $N$  data values  $\mathbf{y} \equiv (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_N)$ , but is understood as a function of the parameters  $\theta_n$ . Below with  $\mathbf{x}_n \equiv \mathbf{y}_n - \theta_n$  we note the added fluctuations of the data  $\mathbf{y}_n$  from  $\theta_n$ .

The development of the statistical methods introduced by Fisher [1] has followed along two different routes. The first one, of the differential geometry origin, began when C.R. Rao [4] noticed that the  $FI$  matrix defines a Riemannian metric. For a short review of the following work, until the consistent definition of the  $\alpha$ -connection on the statistical spaces see [5]. The second one is based on the construction of the information (entropical) principles and we will describe this approach in details. It was put forward by Frieden and his coauthors, especially Soffer [3], and is known under the notion of the extreme physical informa-

<sup>1</sup> In the most general case of the estimation procedure the dimensions of  $\Theta \equiv (\theta_i)_1^k$  and the sample  $\mathbf{y} \equiv (\mathbf{y}_n)_1^N$  are usually different, yet because  $(\theta_i)$  is below the set of physical "positions" of a physical nature (e.g. positions in the case of an equation of motion or energies in the case of a statistical physics generating equation [3]) we have  $E(\mathbf{y}_n) = \theta_n$  and the dimensions of  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  are the same, i.e.  $k = N$ .

Copyright line will be provided by the publisher

tion (EPI). Frieden began the construction of the physical models by obtaining the kinetic term from the  $FI^2$ .

Then he postulated the variational (scalar) information principle (IP) and internal (structural) one. Each of the IP has the universal form, yet its realization depends on the particular phenomenon. The variational IP leads to the dispersion relation proper for the system. The structural IP describes the inner characteristics of the system and enabled [3] the fixing of the relation between the  $FI$  (the channel capacity)  $I$  and the *structural information* ( $SI$ )  $Q$  [7]. The interesting point is that a lot of calculations is performed when the so called physical information  $K$  is partitioned equally into  $I$  and  $Q$  (or with the factor  $1/2$ ), having the total value equal to zero. The method is fruitful as Frieden derived

<sup>2</sup> Let for a system the square distance between two of its states denoted by  $q(\mathbf{x})$  and  $q'(\mathbf{x}) = (q + dq)(\mathbf{x})$  could be written in the Euclidean form  $ds^2 = \int_X d\mathbf{x} dq dq$  where  $X$  is the space of the positions  $\mathbf{x}$  (in one measurement). Supposing that the states are described by the probability distributions we compare it with the distance  $ds^2 = \frac{1}{4} \int_X d\mathbf{x} \frac{dp dp}{p(\mathbf{x})}$  in the space  $S$  with the Fisher-Rao metric [6], where  $p(\mathbf{x})$  and  $p' = (p + dp)(\mathbf{x})$  are the probability distributions for these two states. Then we notice that these two formulas for  $ds^2$  coincide if  $q(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{p(\mathbf{x})}$ . **In this way the notion of the amplitude  $q(\mathbf{x})$  appears naturally from the Riemannian, Fisher-Rao metric of the space  $S$ .** It satisfies the condition:  $\int_X d\mathbf{x} p(\mathbf{x}) = \int_X d\mathbf{x} q(\mathbf{x}) q(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ .

Now, let the sample of dimension  $N$  be "collected" by the system and  $q_n$  are the real amplitudes and  $p_{x_n}(\mathbf{x}_n)$  are the probability distributions with the property of the *shift invariance*  $p_{x_n}(\mathbf{x}_n) = p_{x_n}(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_n) = p_n(\mathbf{y}_n|\theta_n)$  where  $\mathbf{x}_n \equiv \mathbf{y}_n - \theta_n$ . Assuming that the data are collected independently which gives the *factorization property*  $P(\mathbf{y}) \equiv P(\mathbf{y}|\Theta) = \prod_{n=1}^N p_n(\mathbf{y}_n|\theta_n)$ , where  $\theta_m$  has no influence on  $\mathbf{y}_n$  for  $m \neq n$ , and using the chain rule  $\partial/\partial\theta_n = \partial/\partial(\mathbf{y}_n - \theta_n) \partial(\mathbf{y}_n - \theta_n)/\partial\theta_n = -\partial/\partial(\mathbf{y}_n - \theta_n) = -\partial/\partial\mathbf{x}_n$ , the transition from the statistical form of  $FI$  given by Eq.(1) to its kinematical form given below by the first possibility:

$$I = 4 \sum_{n=1}^N \int d\mathbf{x}_n \left( \frac{\partial q_n}{\partial \mathbf{x}_n} \right)^2 \text{ or } 4N \sum_{n=1}^{N/2} \int d\mathbf{x} \frac{\partial \psi_n^*(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \frac{\partial \psi_n(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \quad (2)$$

is performed [3]. The second possibility is achieved [3] as follows: Using the amplitudes  $q_n$ , the wave function  $\psi_n$  could be constructed as  $\psi_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(q_{2n-1} + i q_{2n})$ , where  $n = 1, 2, \dots, N/2$  with the number of the real degrees of freedom being twice the complex ones. With this, the first kinematical form of  $I$  in Eq.(2) could be rewritten in the second form, where additionally the index  $n$  has been dropped from the integral as the range of all  $\mathbf{x}_n$  is the same. Finally, the total probability law for all data gives  $p(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^N p_{x_n}(\mathbf{x}_n|\theta_n) P(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N q_n^2$ , where we have chosen  $P(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{N}$  [3]. All of these lead to  $p(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N/2} \psi_n^* \psi_n$ . With the shift invariance condition and the factorization property,  $I$  does not depend on the parameter set  $(\theta_n)$  [2], and the wave functions  $\psi_n$  do not depend on these parameters, i.e. (expected) positions, also [3]. From this summary of the Frieden method we notice that although the wave functions  $\psi_n$  are complex the quantum mechanics is really the statistical method.

(i) the Klein-Gordon eq. for the field with the rank  $N$  (for the scalar field  $N = 2$ ), (ii) the Dirac eq. for the spinorial field with  $N = 8$ , (iii) the Rarita-Schwinger eq. for higher  $N$  and (iv) the Maxwell eqs. for  $N = 4$ . The generality of the method enables to describe the general relativity theory and take into account gauge symmetry also [3]. Using the information principles (IPs), Frieden gave the information theory based method of obtaining the Heisenberg principle which from the statistical point of view is the kind of the Cramér-Rao theorem with the  $FI$  of the system written, after the Fourier transformation, in the momentum representation<sup>3</sup>. Then the formalism enabled both to obtain the upper bound for the rate of the changing of the entropy of the analyzed system and to derive the classical statistical physics also [3].

In our paper we develop the less informational approach to the construction of the IP using the notion of the *total physical information* ( $TPI$ ),  $K = Q + I$  [7], instead of the change of the physical information  $K = I - J$  introduced in [3]. This difference does not affect the derivation of the equation of motion (or generating eq.) for the problems analyzed until now [3], yet the change of the notion of  $K$  to  $TPI$  with its partition into the kinematical and structural degrees of freedom, goes closely with the recent attempts of the construction of the principle of entropy (information) partition. In Section 2.2 we will derive the structural IP from the analysis of the Taylor expansion for the log-likelihood function. Our approach to the IP results also in the change of the understanding of the essence of the information (entropy) transfer in the process of measurement when this transfer from the structural to the kinematical degrees of freedom takes place. We will discuss it in Section 3. Despite the differences we still call this approach the Frieden one and the method the EPI estimation. Finally, with the interpretation of  $I$  as the kinematical term of the theory, the statistical proof on the impossibility of the derivation of the wave mechanics and field theories for which the rank  $N$  of the field is finite from the classical mechanics, was given [7].

**2 The master equations vs structural information principle** The maximum likelihood method (MLM) is based on the set of  $N$  likelihood equations [1]:

$$S(\Theta) |_{\Theta=\hat{\Theta}} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \Theta} \ln P(\Theta) |_{\Theta=\hat{\Theta}} = 0, \quad (3)$$

where the MLM's set of  $N$  estimators  $\hat{\Theta} \equiv (\hat{\theta}_n)_1^N$  is its solution. These  $N$  conditions for the estimates maximize the likelihood of the sample.

**2.1 The master equations.** Yet, we could approach to the estimation differently. So, after the Taylor expanding of  $P(\hat{\Theta})$  around the true value of  $\Theta$  and integrating over the

<sup>3</sup> In reality the Fourier transformation forms the type of the entanglement between the variables of the system.

sample space we obtain:

$$\int d^N \mathbf{x} \left( P(\hat{\Theta}) - P(\Theta) \right) = \int d^N \mathbf{x} \left( \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,n'=1}^N \frac{\partial^2 P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_{n'} \partial \theta_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) (\hat{\theta}_{n'} - \theta_{n'}) + \dots \right) \quad (4)$$

where the notation  $P(\Theta) \equiv P(\hat{\Theta}) |_{\Theta}$  has been used. When the integration over the whole sample space is performed then neglecting the higher order terms<sup>4</sup> and using the normalization condition  $\int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta) = \int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\hat{\Theta}) = 1$  we see that the LHS of Eq.(4) is equal to zero. Hence we obtain the result which for the locally unbiased estimators [5] and after postulating the zeroing of the integrand at the RHS, takes for particular  $n$  and  $n'$  the following microscopic form of the *master equation*:

$$\frac{\partial^2 P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_{n'} \partial \theta_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) (\hat{\theta}_{n'} - \theta_{n'}) = 0. \quad (5)$$

When the parameter  $\theta_n^\nu$  has the Minkowskian index  $\nu$  then  $P = \prod_{n=1}^N p_n(x_n^\nu)$  and Eq.(5) leads, after the transition to the Fisherian variables (as in Footnote 2), to the form of the equation of conservation of flow:

$$\frac{\partial p_n(x_n^\mu)}{\partial t_n} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\partial p_n(x_n^\mu)}{\partial x_n^i} \hat{v}_n^i = 0, \quad \hat{v}_n^i \equiv \frac{\hat{\theta}_n^i - \theta_n^i}{\hat{\theta}_n^0 - \theta_n^0}, \quad (6)$$

where  $t_n \equiv x_n^0$ . Here  $\theta_n^i$  and  $\theta_n^0$  are the expected position and time of the system, respectively and index  $n$  could be omitted.

## 2.2 The information principle. The EPI method.

Using  $\ln P$  instead of  $P$  and after the Taylor expanding of  $\ln P(\hat{\Theta})$  around the true value of  $\Theta$  and integrating with the  $d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta)$  measure over the sample space we obtain (instead of Eq.(4)) the equation of the EPI method of the model estimation:

$$\int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta) \left( \ln \frac{P(\hat{\Theta})}{P(\Theta)} - R_3 - \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial \ln P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta) \sum_{n,n'=1}^N \frac{\partial^2 \ln P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_{n'} \partial \theta_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) (\hat{\theta}_{n'} - \theta_{n'}) \quad (7)$$

with  $P(\Theta) \equiv P(\hat{\Theta}) |_{\Theta}$ . The term on the LHS of Eq.(7) has the form of the modified relative entropy. Let us define the (observed) structure  $\mathfrak{tF}$  of the system as follows:

$$\mathfrak{tF} \equiv \ln \frac{P(\hat{\Theta})}{P(\Theta)} - R_3. \quad (8)$$

When we define  $\tilde{Q}$  as

$$\tilde{Q} = \int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta) \left( \mathfrak{tF} - \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{\partial \ln P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) \right) \quad (9)$$

<sup>4</sup> Which is exact even at the density level if only  $P(\hat{\Theta}) \in \mathcal{S}$  has not higher than the 2-order jets at  $\Theta$ .

then we obtain the structural equation of the IP form:

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{Q} &= \tilde{\mathcal{I}} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2} \int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta) \sum_{n,n'=1}^N \left( -\frac{\partial^2 \ln P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_{n'} \partial \theta_n} \right) (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) (\hat{\theta}_{n'} - \theta_{n'}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Now, let us postulate the validity of Eq.(10) on the microscopic level:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{LHS} &\equiv \sum_{n=1}^N 2 \frac{\partial \ln P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) - \sum_{n=1}^N 2 \frac{\mathfrak{tF}}{N} \\ &= \sum_{n,n'=1}^N \mathfrak{iF}_{nn'} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) (\hat{\theta}_{n'} - \theta_{n'}) \equiv \Delta_{RHS}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

As the inverse of the covariance matrix the (observed) Fisher information matrix:

$$\mathfrak{iF} = \left( -\frac{\partial^2 \ln P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_{n'} \partial \theta_n} \right) \quad (12)$$

is symmetric and positively defined. It follows that there is an orthogonal matrix  $U$  such that  $\Delta_{RHS}$  in Eq.(11) and hence  $\Delta_{LHS}$  also, could be written in the normal form:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n,n'=1}^N \mathfrak{iF}_{nn'} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n) (\hat{\theta}_{n'} - \theta_{n'}) \\ \equiv \Delta_{RHS} = \Delta_{LHS} = \sum_{n=1}^N m_n \hat{v}_n^2, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $\hat{v}_n$  are some functions of  $\hat{\theta}_n$ -s and  $m_n$  are the elements (obtained for  $\Delta_{LHS}$ ) of the positive diagonal matrix  $\mathfrak{mF}$  which because of the equality (13) has to be equal to the diagonal matrix obtained for  $\Delta_{RHS}$ , i.e.:

$$\mathfrak{mF} = D^T U^T \mathfrak{iF} U D. \quad (14)$$

Here  $D$  is the scaling diagonal matrix with the elements  $d_n \equiv \sqrt{\frac{m_n}{\lambda_n}}$  and  $\lambda_n$ -s are the eigenvalues of  $\mathfrak{iF}$ . Finally, we could rewrite Eq.(14) in the form of the Frieden structural microscopic IP:

$$\mathfrak{qF} + \mathfrak{iF} = 0, \quad (15)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{qF} = -U (D^T)^{-1} \mathfrak{mF} D^{-1} U^T. \quad (16)$$

The existence of the normal form (13) is a very strong condition which makes the whole Frieden analysis possible. Two particular assumptions lead to the simple physical cases. When the structure  $\mathfrak{tF} = 0$  then from Eq.(11) we obtain a form of the "master equation" (compare with Eq.(5)) with:

$$\mathfrak{mF} = \text{diag} \left( 2 \frac{\partial \ln P(\Theta)}{\partial \theta_n} \right), \quad \hat{v}_n = \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n}, \quad \mathfrak{tF} = 0 \quad (17)$$

and  $d_n = \sqrt{2 \frac{\partial \ln P}{\partial \theta_n} / \lambda_n}$ . If we instead suppose that the distribution is *regular* [2] then with  $\frac{\partial \ln P}{\partial \theta_n} = 0$  for all  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , we see from Eq.(11) that ( $d_n = \sqrt{2/\lambda_n}$ ):

$$\mathfrak{rF} = (2 \delta_{nn'}) , \quad \hat{v}_n = \sqrt{\frac{\mathfrak{tF}}{N}} . \quad (18)$$

After integrating Eq.(15) with the measure  $d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta)$  we recover the integral structural IP (postulated previously in [3] although in a different form and interpretation but) in exactly the same form as in [7]:

$$Q + I = 0 , \quad (19)$$

where  $I$  is the Fisher information channel capacity:

$$I = \int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta) \sum_{n,n'=1}^N (\mathfrak{iF})_{nn'} \quad (20)$$

and  $Q$  is the  $SI$ :

$$Q = \int d^N \mathbf{x} P(\Theta) \sum_{n,n'=1}^N (\mathfrak{qF})_{nn'} . \quad (21)$$

The IP given by Eq.(19) is the structural equation of many current physical models.

**3 The information transfer** As  $I$  is the infinitesimal type of the Kulback-Leibler entropy [3] which in the statistical estimation is used as a tool in the model choosing procedure, hence the conjecture appears that  $I$  could be (after imposing the variational and structural IPs) the cornerstone of the equation of motion (or generating equation) of the physical system. These equations are to be the best from the point of view of the IPs what is the essence of the Frieden's EPI. The inner statistical thought in the Frieden method is that the probing (sampling) of the space-time by the system (even when not subjected to the real measurement) is performed by the system alone, that using its proper field (and connected amplitudes) of rank  $N$ , which is the size of the sample, probes with its kinematical "Fisherian" degrees of freedom the position space accessible for it. The transition from the statistical form (1) of the  $FI$  to its kinematical representations (2) is given in Footnote 2. Let us consider the following informational scheme of the system. Before the measurement takes place the system has  $I$  of the system which is contained in the kinematical degrees of freedom and  $Q$  of the system contained in the structural degrees of freedom, as in Figure 1a. Now, let us "switch on" the measurement during which the *transfer of the information* ( $TI$ ) follows the rules (see Figure 1b):

$$J \geq 0 \text{ hence } \delta I = I' - I \geq 0 , \quad \delta Q = Q' - Q \leq 0 , \quad (22)$$

where  $I'$ ,  $Q'$  are the  $FI$  and  $SI$  after the measurement, respectively and  $J$  is the  $TI$ . We postulate that in the measurement the  $TI$  is ideal at the "point"  $q$ , i.e. we have that  $Q = Q' + J = Q + \delta Q + J$  hence  $\delta Q = -J$ . This means

that the whole change of the  $SI$  at the "point"  $q$  is transferred. On the other hand at the "point"  $i$  the rule for the  $TI$  is that  $I' \leq I + J$  hence  $0 \leq \delta I = I' - I \leq J$ . Therefore, as  $J \geq 0$  we obtain that  $|\delta I| \leq |\delta Q|$ , the result which is sensible as in the measurement information might be lost. In the ideal measurement we have obtained that  $\delta Q = -\delta I$ .

Previously we postulated the existence of the additive total physical information ( $TPI$ ) [7]:

$$K = Q + I . \quad (23)$$

In [8] the intuitive condition that  $K \geq 0$  was chosen leading to the following form of the structural IP:

$$\kappa Q + I = 0 \quad (24)$$

or

$$Q + I = 0 \text{ for } \kappa = 1 , \quad (25)$$

which we now derived in Eq.(19). In the case of Eq.(25) we obtain that  $K$  is equal to

$$K = Q + I = 0 \text{ for } \kappa = 1 . \quad (26)$$

The structural (internal) IP in Eq.(24) [7] is operationally equivalent to the one postulated by Frieden [3], hence it has at least the same predictive power. For the short description of the difference between both approaches see [7]. The other IP is the scalar (variational) one. It has the form [7]:

$$\delta K = \delta(Q + I) = 0 \Rightarrow K = Q + I \text{ is extremal} \quad (27)$$


The principles (24) and (27) are the cornerstone of the Frieden EPI. They form the set of two differential equations for the amplitudes  $q_n$  which could be consistent, leading for  $\kappa = 1$  or  $1/2$  to many well known models of the field theory and statistical physics [3], as we mentioned in the Introduction. It could be instructive to recalculate them again using the new interpretation of  $K$  [8].

Finally, let us notice that in the concordance with the postulated behavior of the system in the measurement, we have obtained  $\delta I \leq J = -\delta Q$  from which it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} K' = I' + Q' &\leq (I + J) + (Q - J) = I + Q = K \\ &\Rightarrow K' \leq K . \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In the case of  $\delta I = -\delta Q$  we obtain  $K' = K$ . Then it means that the  $TPI$  remains unchanged in the ideal measurement ( $\delta I = -\delta Q$ ) which, if performed on the intrinsic level of sampling the space by the system alone (and not by the observer), could possibly lead to the variational IP given by Eq.(27).

**4 Conclusions** The overwhelming impression of the EPI is that the  $TPI$  is the ancestor of the Lagrangian [3]. As the Fisherian statistical formalism and hence the  $IP$ s lie here really as the background of the description of the physical system it is not the matter of interpretation only especially that the structural  $IP$  (which is very close to the approach used in [7,8]) was derived in Section 2.2. In



**Figure 1** Panel: (a) The system before the measurement:  $Q$  is the  $SI$  of the system contained in the structural degrees of freedom and  $I$  is the  $FI$  of the system contained in the kinematical degrees of freedom. (b) The system after the measurement:  $Q'$  is the  $SI$  and  $I'$  is the  $FI$  of the system;  $\delta Q = Q' - Q \leq 0$  and  $\delta I = I' - I \geq 0$  as the transfer of the information ( $TI$ ) in the measurement takes place with  $J \geq 0$ . In the ideal measurement  $\delta I = -\delta Q$ .

the result, we have proved that the whole work of Frieden with our equation of motion (or generating equation) (10) lie inside the same EPI type of the statistical modification of LM. In the contrary the master equation (4) lies in the other kind of the classical statistics estimation, closer to the stochastic processes, than the EPI method. Besides, for the exponential models with quadratic ( $k = 2$ ) Taylor expansion, the simple microscopic forms (17) and (18) are also given in Section 2.2. Yet e.g. for the family of the distributions with  $k > 2$  and for the mixture family models [5] the further investigations are needed. Here the alternative way of solving the  $IPs$  equations (24) and (27) given by Frieden seems more appealing, as besides the boundary conditions, it is not restricted to the particular shape of the distributions.

The presented version of the EPI also has, as the original one [3] has, the ability of the synonymous description of the unmeasured and measured system, but additionally it is characterized by the more precise distinction of these two situations [8]. It is connected with the meaning of  $K$  as the  $TPI$  which enables the precise discrimination of the inner "measurement" performed by the system alone from the one performed by an observer. Next, the chosen form of the internal IP (24), suggests entanglement of the observational space of the data with the whole unobserved space of positions of the system [8]. This situation is also a little bit different than in [3] where (also because of the interpretation of  $K$ ) the entanglement with the part of the unobserved configuration only was seen. E.g. in the description of the EPR-Bohm effect our approach describes the entanglement which takes place between the projection of the spin of the observed particle and the unobserved joint configuration of the system [8]. Yet, the shared feature is that  $Q^5$  does not represent the  $SI$  of the system only but the information on the entanglement seen in the correlations of the data in the measurement space also. Therefore in general the EPI could be used as the tool in the estimation of the entangled states. Our result is that the source of the (self)entanglement could be understood as the consequence of the partition of the Taylor expansion of the log-likelihood. Now, for further development of the EPI the differential geometry language [5] of the  $IPs$  is needed.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. in [3] the scalar field case is analyzed for which  $Q$  is connected with the rest mass of the particle.

Finally, let us at least mention that there are other fields of science where EPI could be used, e.g. the econophysics [3, 9, 10]. We envisage that the formalism developed in this paper would be applied in quantum information processing and quantum game theory also [9, 10].

**Acknowledgements** This work is supported by L.J.CH.. This work was supported in part by the scientific network *Laboratorium Fizycznych Podstaw Przetwarzania Informacji* sponsored by the *Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education* (decision no 106/E-345/BWSN-0166/2008) and by the University of Silesia grant.

## References

- [1] R.A. Fisher, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. **222**, 309 (1922). R.A. Fisher, Statistical methods and scientific inference, 2nd edn. (London, Oliver and Boyd, 1959).
- [2] Y. Pawitan, In all likelihood: Statistical modelling and inference using likelihood, (Oxford Univ. Press, 2001).
- [3] B.R. Frieden, Found. Phys. **16**, 883 (1986); Phys. Rev. A **41**, 4265 (1990). B.R. Frieden, B.H. Soffer, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 2247 (1995). B.R. Frieden, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 022107 (2002). B.R. Frieden, A. Plastino, A.R. Plastino and B.H. Soffer, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 046128 (2002); Phys. Lett. A **304**, 73 (2002). B.R. Frieden, Science from Fisher information: A unification, (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004).
- [4] C.R. Rao, Bulletin of the Calcutta Math. Soc. **37**, 81-91 (1945).
- [5] B. Efron, Ann. Statistics **3**, 1189 (1975). A.P. Dawid, Ann. Statistics **3**, 1231 (1975); Ann. Statistics **5**, 1249 (1977). S. Amari, Ann. Statistics **10**, 357 (1982). H. Nagaoka and S. Amari, Technical Report METR 82-7, Dept. of Math. Eng. and Instr. Phys, Univ. of Tokyo, (1982). A. Fujiwara and H. Nagaoka, Phys. Lett. A **201**, 119 (1995); J. Math. Phys. **40**, 4227 (1999). K. Matsumoto, PhD thesis, Univ. of Tokyo, (1998). S. Amari, H. Nagaoka, Methods of information geometry, (Oxford Univ. Press, 2000).
- [6] I. Bengtsson, K. Życzkowski, Geometry of quantum states, (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006).
- [7] J. Syska, Phys. Stat. Sol.(b), **244**, No.7, 2531-2537 (2007)/DOI 10.1002/pssb.200674646.
- [8] D. Mroziakiewicz, Master thesis, (in Polish) unpublished, Inst. of Physics, Univ. of Silesia, Poland, (2008).
- [9] E. W. Piotrowski, J. Śladowski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **42**, 1089 (2003).

- [10] E. W. Piotrowski, J. Sładkowski and J. Syska, presented at the SIGMAPHI 2008 conference, to appear in Central European Journal of Physics.