

An information-theoretic proof of the Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem

Venkat Anantharam
EECS Department
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720, U.S.A.

Abstract

The Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem states that the effective resistance across any pair of nodes in a resistive network is a concave function of the edge resistances. We give an information-theoretic proof of this result, building on the theory of the Gaussian free field. This also allows us to prove an extension of the result to determinants of matrices of cross effective resistances.

1 Introduction

Consider a connected undirected graph $G := (V, E)$ with no self-loops. Here V is a finite set, whose elements will be called vertices or nodes, and E is a finite set, whose elements will be called edges. Each edge $e \in E$ corresponds to an unordered pair (i, j) with $i, j \in V$, $i \neq j$ and an index in $\{1, \dots, n_{(i,j)}\}$ for some $n_{(i,j)} \geq 1$ depending only on the unordered pair (i, j) and defined only if there is an edge corresponding to (i, j) . Thus an edge is between a pair of nodes, but we allow for multiple edges between any pair of nodes. To each edge $e \in E$ we associate a resistance $R_e > 0$. The resulting weighted graph will be called a resistive network.

Figure 1 illustrates a resistive network with vertex set $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and six edges, the resistance of each of which is indicated.

The Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem [7] states that in a resistive network the effective resistance across any pair of nodes is a concave function of the edge resistances. To understand this statement we need to recall the concept of effective resistance across a pair of nodes. For this we need some familiarity with basic circuit theory notions, which are well-explained, for instance, in the book of Doyle and Snell [2]. Consider distinct nodes $a, b \in V$ and imagine that a unit current source is placed across them, injecting current 1 at node a and extracting it at




Figure 1: A resistive network with vertex set $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and six edges, the resistance of each of which is indicated. The effective resistances can be computed to be $R_{12}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{11}{17}$, $R_{13}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{11}{17}$, $R_{14}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{29}{17}$, $R_{23}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{10}{17}$, $R_{24}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{22}{17}$, and $R_{34}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{24}{17}$.

node b . Kirchhoff's current law (which states that the net current entering each node will be 0) and Kirchhoff's voltage law (which states that the sum of voltage drops around any circuit will be 0) will then result in a unique assignment of voltages to each node if we set the voltage at node b to 0. The effective resistance across the pair of distinct nodes $a, b \in V$ is then defined to be the voltage at node a . This is just a mathematical statement, of course, the physically relevant statement being that the effective resistance across the pair distinct nodes $a, b \in V$ is this voltage divided by the unit source current. From this description, it is straightforward to argue that the same effective resistance results if the roles of a and b are interchanged, so the effective resistance only depends on the unordered pair (a, b) .

In the example of Figure 1 there are $6 = \binom{4}{2}$ effective resistances to be computed, with their values being as indicated in the caption of the figure.

2 Existing proofs

The proof of the Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem in [7] is circuit-theoretic in nature. It is proposed that a specific ideal transformer structure be appended to the network with edge resistances $(\hat{R}_e := R_e + \bar{R}_e, e \in E)$, with a switch that, when open, results in the effective resistance across (a, b) being that of the network with edge resistances $(\hat{R}_e, e \in E)$, denoted by $\hat{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}}$, while, when closed, leads to this effective resistance being replaced by the sum of the effective resistance across (a, b) when the edge resistances are $(R_e, e \in E)$ to that when the edge resistances are $(\bar{R}_e, e \in E)$, i.e. by $R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}}$. Here $R_e > 0$ and $\bar{R}_e > 0$ for all $e \in E$. It is physically obvious that closing the switch results in a smaller effective resistance, since it can be thought of, informally, as being equivalent to replacing an infinite resistance across some edge with zero resistance, and the effective resistance is a monotone increasing function of the individual edge resistances.

Now, since the effective resistance scales linearly when all the edge resistances are scaled by the same amount, the inequality $\hat{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}} \geq R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}}$ that was just proved is enough to establish the claimed concavity. Rather than appealing just to this physical intuition, a circuit-theoretic argument, based on replacing a two-terminal circuit by its so-called T-structure is given in [7] to give a mathematical proof of the claimed result. For the details, see [7].

An elementary proof of the Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem was subsequently given by Melvin [6] based on Kirchhoff's current law and the minimum energy principle of Thomson, which, in the scenario where a unit current source is placed across the pair of distinct nodes $a, b \in V$ in a resistive network, states that among all the resulting current flows that satisfy Kirchhoff's current law the unique one that satisfies Kirchhoff's voltage law will be the one for which the total power dissipated in the network, i.e. $\sum_{e \in E} I_e^2 R_e$, is minimized. See [2, Sec. 3.5] for more details. Here, by a current flow we mean $(I_e, e \in E)$ where $I_e \in \mathbb{R}$ is the current along edge e in some fixed orientation (for instance, fixing some ordering on the vertex set V allows us to think of each edge as having a natural orientation). Note that since only the square of the current appears in the use of Thomson's principle, the choice of orientation of the edges is irrelevant. Also note that the resulting effective resistance would then just be $R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} = \sum_{e \in E} I_e^2 R_e$ for the current flow $(I_e, e \in E)$ that minimizes power dissipation, because the total power dissipated in the network, i.e. $\sum_{e \in E} I_e^2 R_e$, is that dissipated by a unit current flowing into the effective resistance R_{ab}^{eff} .

We may now give a proof of the Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem as follows (this is basically the argument in [6]). Given the choices of edge resistances $(R_e, e \in E)$

and $(\bar{R}_e, e \in E)$, where $R_e > 0$ and $\bar{R}_e > 0$ for each $e \in E$, let $\hat{R}_e := R_e + \bar{R}_e$ for $e \in E$ and also consider the choice of edge resistances $(\hat{R}_e, e \in E)$. Let $(I_e, e \in E)$, $(\bar{I}_e, e \in E)$, and $(\hat{I}_e, e \in E)$ be the current flows in the respective scenarios that obey Kirchhoff's current law and the Thomson minimum energy principle, when a unit current source injects current at node a and extracts it at node b . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}} &= \sum_{e \in E} \hat{I}_e^2 \hat{R}_e \\
&= \sum_{e \in E} \hat{I}_e^2 R_e + \sum_{e \in E} \hat{I}_e^2 \bar{R}_e \\
&\geq \sum_{e \in E} I_e^2 R_e + \sum_{e \in E} \bar{I}_e^2 \bar{R}_e \\
&= R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the minimum energy principle. After this the theorem follows by the same linear scaling argument used in [7].

3 A probabilistic point of view

The proof of the Shannon-Hagelberger theorem in [6], which is essentially reproduced entirely above, is as simple as it gets, so it might seem to be the last word on the story. Nevertheless, given that Shannon is widely recognized as the creator of information theory, one is led to observe that there has not been even a whiff of information theory in the discussion so far. The main contribution of this paper is to point out that, from the appropriate viewpoint, the Shannon-Hagelberger theorem can be thought of as a theorem of information theory.

To start with, to every resistive network we can associate a multivariate Gaussian random variable $(X_e, e \in E)$, where the components are independent mean-zero Gaussian random variables with respective variances R_e .

Since we allow for multiple edges, we need to define the notion of a walk in the graph G more carefully than in the situation without multiple edges. By a walk we mean a sequence $w := (v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(w)-1}, e_{n(w)-1}, v_{n(w)})$, where $n(w) \geq 1$, $v_k \in V$ for $0 \leq k \leq n(w)$, $e_k \in E$ for $0 \leq k \leq n(w) - 1$, and the vertex pair corresponding to e_k is (v_k, v_{k+1}) for $0 \leq k \leq n(w) - 1$. A simple closed walk, also called a circuit, is a walk c with $n(c) \geq 2$ and $v_{n(c)} = v_0$, and where no vertex appears more than once. It can be checked that in a circuit no edge can appear more than once. Let \mathcal{C} denote the set of all circuits in the graph. This is a finite set.

We next pick an arbitrary ordering on V , the set of vertices. For a walk $w := (v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(w)-1}, e_{n(w)-1}, v_{n(w)})$ and $0 \leq k \leq n(w) - 1$, we write $\epsilon_{w,k} = 1$ if $v_{k+1} > v_k$ and $\epsilon_{w,k} = -1$ if $v_k > v_{k+1}$ in the chosen ordering on V . For any circuit $c = (v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(c)-1}, e_{n(c)-1}, v_{n(c)} = v_0) \in \mathcal{C}$, let A_c denote the event that $\sum_{k=0}^{n(c)-1} \epsilon_{c,k} X_{e_k} = 0$. We now condition on the occurrence of the event $\cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} A_c$. Let $(U_e, e \in E)$ have the law of the conditional distribution of $(X_e, e \in E)$ under this conditioning, i.e.

$$(U_e, e \in E) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_e, e \in E \mid \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} A_c).$$

Note that $(U_e, e \in E)$ is also a multivariate Gaussian, and that we have $\sum_{k=0}^{n(c)-1} \epsilon_{c,k} U_{e_k} = 0$ for all $c = (v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(c)-1}, e_{n(c)-1}, v_{n(c)} = v_0) \in \mathcal{C}$.

Let us now pick some $v_* \in V$ and set $\eta_{v_*} = 0$. A consequence of the fact that $\sum_{k=0}^{n(c)-1} \epsilon_{c,k} U_{e_k} = 0$ for all $c = (v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(c)-1}, e_{n(c)-1}, v_{n(c)} = v_0) \in \mathcal{C}$ is that we can define a multivariate Gaussian $(\eta_v, v \in V)$ by defining

$$\eta_v := \sum_{k=0}^{n(w)-1} \epsilon_{w,k} U_{e_k}$$

for any walk $w := (v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(w)-1}, e_{n(w)-1}, v_{n(w)})$ such that $v_0 = v_*$ and $v_{n(w)} = v$. The point is that the same η_v results, irrespective of the choice of the walk. The multivariate Gaussian $(\eta_v, v \in V)$ is called the Gaussian free field associated to the given resistive network. As defined, this concept seems to depend on the choice of v_* , but it should be apparent that what is really important are the differences $\eta_b - \eta_a$ for distinct $a, b \in V$, which will be the same irrespective of the choice of v_* . The Gaussian free field is an object that is widely studied in probability theory in many contexts, see e.g. [3, Chap. 6], [4, Sec. 2.8], [5, Sec. 9.4], [8, Sec. 1.5.2].

For any distinct pair of vertices $a, b \in V$, we now define $U_{a \rightarrow b} := \eta_b - \eta_a$. It can be checked that for an edge $e = (i, j)$ we have $U_{i \rightarrow j} = U_e$ if $i < j$ and $U_{i \rightarrow j} = -U_e$ if $j < i$ in the chosen ordering on V . Note also that $U_{b \rightarrow a} = -U_{a \rightarrow b}$. It is known that for any distinct pair of vertices $a, b \in V$ the random variable $U_{a \rightarrow b}$ is a mean zero Gaussian random variable with variance R_{ab}^{eff} . See [4, Prop. 2.24] for more details.

In the example of Figure 1, suppose we choose the natural ordering on the vertices and number the $(1, 2)$ edge as 1, the two $(1, 3)$ edges as 2 and 3 respectively, the $(2, 3)$ edge as 4, the $(2, 4)$ edge as 5, and the $(3, 4)$ edge as 6. The random variables $(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6)$ are then independent Gaussians with mean zero and variances 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 3 respectively. We can compute the conditional covariance matrix of these random variables conditioned on requiring zero

sums over all circuits, i.e. conditioned on $X_1 + X_4 - X_2 = 0$, $X_2 - X_3 = 0$, and $X_4 + X_6 - X_5 = 0$. It can be verified that the conditional variances of each of the random variables X_1 through X_6 , subject to this conditioning, equal the respective effective resistances as listed in the caption of the figure.

4 An information-theoretic proof

We write $h(Z)$ for the differential entropy of the real-valued random variable Z . We write $h(Z|A)$ for the conditional differential entropy of Z conditioned on the event A . We write $h(Z|W)$ for the conditional differential entropy of Z given W when (Z, W) are jointly defined in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

We are now in a position to give an information-theoretic proof of the Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem. Given the choices of edge resistances $(R_e, e \in E)$ and $(\bar{R}_e, e \in E)$, where $R_e > 0$ and $\bar{R}_e > 0$ for each $e \in E$, let $\hat{R}_e := R_e + \bar{R}_e$ for $e \in E$ and also consider the choice of edge resistances $(\hat{R}_e, e \in E)$. Consider a multivariate Gaussian random variable $(X_e, e \in E)$, where the components are independent mean-zero Gaussian random variables with respective variances R_e and another multivariate Gaussian random variable $(\bar{X}_e, e \in E)$, where the components are independent mean-zero Gaussian random variables with respective variances \bar{R}_e , and assume that $(X_e, e \in E)$ and $(\bar{X}_e, e \in E)$ are independent. Define $(\hat{X}_e, e \in E)$ by $\hat{X}_e = X_e + \bar{X}_e$ for $e \in E$. Then in $(\hat{X}_e, e \in E)$ the components are independent mean-zero Gaussian random variables with respective variances \hat{R}_e .

For any circuit

$c = (v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(c)-1}, e_{n(c)-1}, v_{n(c)} = v_0) \in \mathcal{C}$, let A_c denote the event that $\sum_{k=0}^{n(c)-1} \epsilon_{c,k} X_{e_k} = 0$, let \bar{A}_c denote the event that $\sum_{k=0}^{n(c)-1} \epsilon_{c,k} \bar{X}_{e_k} = 0$, and let \hat{A}_c denote the event that $\sum_{k=0}^{n(c)-1} \epsilon_{c,k} \hat{X}_{e_k} = 0$.

We may then define $(U_e, e \in E) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_e, e \in E | \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} A_c)$, $(\bar{U}_e, e \in E) \stackrel{d}{=} (\bar{X}_e, e \in E | \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{A}_c)$, and $(\hat{U}_e, e \in E) \stackrel{d}{=} (\hat{X}_e, e \in E | \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \hat{A}_c)$, with $(U_e, e \in E)$ being independent of $(\bar{U}_e, e \in E)$.

Note now that for any distinct vertices $a, b \in V$ we have, for any walk $w :=$

$(v_0, e_0, v_1, e_1, \dots, v_{n(w)-1}, e_{n(w)-1}, v_{n(w)})$ with $v_0 = a$ and $v_{n(w)} = b$, the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
h(\hat{U}_{a \rightarrow b}) &= h\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n(w)-1} \epsilon_{w,k} \hat{U}_{e_k}\right) \\
&= h\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n(w)-1} \epsilon_{w,k} \hat{X}_{e_k} \mid \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \hat{A}_c\right) \\
&= h\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n(w)-1} \epsilon_{w,k} (X_{e_k} + \bar{X}_{e_k}) \mid \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \hat{A}_c\right) \\
&\geq h\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n(w)-1} \epsilon_{w,k} (X_{e_k} + \bar{X}_{e_k}) \mid \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} A_c, \cap_{c \in \mathcal{C}} \bar{A}_c\right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} h\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n(w)-1} \epsilon_{w,k} U_{e_k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n(w)-1} \epsilon_{w,k} \bar{U}_{e_k}\right) \\
&= h(U_{a \rightarrow b} + \bar{U}_{a \rightarrow b}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows because the conditioning reduces entropy, and step (a) follows from the assumption that $(X_e, e \in E) \sqcup (\bar{X}_e, e \in E)$, the A_c are defined purely in terms of $(X_e, e \in E)$ and the \bar{A}_c purely in terms of $(\bar{X}_e, e \in E)$, and from the assumption that $(U_e, e \in E) \sqcup (\bar{U}_e, e \in E)$. Since we are conditioning on an event, we need an argument for why the conditioning reduces entropy; this is given in the appendix.

Now, $U_{a \rightarrow b}$ and $\bar{U}_{a \rightarrow b}$ are independent mean-zero Gaussian random variables with variances R_{ab}^{eff} and $\bar{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}}$ respectively, while $\hat{U}_{a \rightarrow b}$ is a mean-zero Gaussian random variable with variance $\hat{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}}$. It follows that $\hat{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}} \geq R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}}$, after which an argument based on the linear scaling of effective resistances when all the edge resistances are scaled by the same amount completes the information-theoretic proof of the Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem.

5 Concluding remarks

The purpose of writing this article was mostly to go on a whimsical stroll. What we have discovered is the curious fact that a theorem co-authored by Shannon, which on the face of it has no connections with information theory, is really a theorem in information theory after all.

However, the new proof scheme also provides additional information, generalizing the Shannon-Hagelbarger theorem, which, to the best of our knowledge,

appears to be new. For instance, given four nodes $a, b, c, d \in V$, not necessarily distinct, we may define a cross effective resistance between $a \rightarrow b$ and $c \rightarrow d$ by $R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} := E[U_{a \rightarrow b} U_{c \rightarrow d}]$. In the resistive network this has the interpretation of the voltage drop from node c to node d when a unit current is injected at node a and extracted at node b , see [4, Prop. 2.24 (ii)].

With the setting and notation as in Section 4, a similar calculation would then lead to the inequality

$$h(\hat{U}_{a \rightarrow b}, \hat{U}_{c \rightarrow d}) \geq h(U_{a \rightarrow b} + \bar{U}_{a \rightarrow b}, U_{c \rightarrow d}, \bar{U}_{c \rightarrow d}),$$

for joint entropies. This then corresponds to the inequality

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} \hat{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}} & \hat{R}_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} \\ \hat{R}_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} & \hat{R}_{cd}^{\text{eff}} \end{bmatrix} \geq \det \begin{bmatrix} R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{ab}^{\text{eff}} & R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} \\ R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} & R_{cd}^{\text{eff}} + \bar{R}_{cd}^{\text{eff}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Note that $\begin{bmatrix} R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} & R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} \\ R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} & R_{cd}^{\text{eff}} \end{bmatrix}$ is positive semidefinite, because it is the covariance matrix of the random vector $\begin{bmatrix} U_{a \rightarrow b} \\ U_{c \rightarrow d} \end{bmatrix}$. Note that the square root of $\det \begin{bmatrix} R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} & R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} \\ R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} & R_{cd}^{\text{eff}} \end{bmatrix}$ scales linearly when all the resistances in the network are scaled by the same constant. Recall Minkowski's determinantal inequality for positive semidefinite matrices, which states that for $n \times n$ positive semidefinite matrices K_1 and K_2 we have $(\det(K_1 + K_2))^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq (\det K_1)^{\frac{1}{n}} + (\det K_2)^{\frac{1}{n}}$. Putting these together, we can conclude from the inequality (1) that $\sqrt{\det \begin{bmatrix} R_{ab}^{\text{eff}} & R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} \\ R_{a \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow d}^{\text{eff}} & R_{cd}^{\text{eff}} \end{bmatrix}}$ is a concave function of the individual edge resistances. For a proof of the Minkowski determinantal inequality based on the entropy power inequality, see [1, Thm. 7].

A similar argument for multiple choices of ordered pairs of vertices shows that the n -th root of the determinant of cross effective resistances corresponding to any n such ordered pairs is a concave function of all the individual edge resistances in the resistive network.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by the NSF grants CCF-1901004 and CIF-2007965. Thanks to Devon Ding for reading a draft of this document for a sanity check.

Appendix

We prove the claim that the conditioning reduces entropy in the calculation in the main text. Suppose W and \bar{W} are mean zero Gaussian random variables in \mathbb{R}^n with $W \perp \bar{W}$, and let $\hat{W} := W + \bar{W}$. Let \hat{V} be any scalar random variable such that (\hat{V}, W, \bar{W}) is jointly Gaussian. Then we have the inequality $h(\hat{V}|\hat{W} = 0) \geq h(\hat{V}|W = 0, \bar{W} = 0)$ for conditional differential entropies. To see this, note that $h(\hat{V}|\hat{W} = \hat{w})$ is the same for all \hat{w} , and $h(\hat{V}|W = w, \bar{W} = \bar{w})$ is the same for all (w, \bar{w}) . Thus $h(\hat{V}|\hat{W} = 0) \geq h(\hat{V}|W = 0, \bar{W} = 0)$ follows from $h(\hat{V}|\hat{W}) \geq h(\hat{V}|W, \bar{W})$, which is what one usually means when saying that conditioning reduces entropy.

References

- [1] Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. “Determinantal inequalities via information theory.” *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 384-392, July 1988.
- [2] Peter G. Doyle and J. Laurie Snell. *Random Walks and Electrical Networks*. The Carus Mathematical Monographs, No. 22, Mathematical Association of America, 1984.
- [3] Gregory F. Lawler. *Random Explorations*. Student Mathematical Library, Vol. 98, American Mathematical Society, 2022.
- [4] Russell Lyons and Yuval Peres. *Probability on Trees and Networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [5] Svante Janson. *Gaussian Hilbert Spaces*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Vol. 129. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [6] H. M. Melvin. “On the concavity of resistance functions.” *Journal of Applied Physics*, Vol. 27, pp. 658-659, 1956.
- [7] C. E. Shannon and D. W. Hagelbarger. “Concavity of resistance functions.” *Journal of Applied Physics*, Vol. 27, pp. 42-43, 1956.
- [8] Wendelin Werner and Ellen Powell. “Lecture notes on the Gaussian free field.” arXiv:2004.04720v2 [math.PR]