

Inference by Conversion

Jani Lahtinen

Abstract— We are discussing a modeling technique based on the idea to generate data sequences with a number of suggested models. These sequences are transformed, or converted, into an observed data sequence by a suitable function, or a program. The motivation for doing so is in cases where the likelihood of observed data is hard to compute, which is circumvented with an indirect approximation by trying to replicate the data. It is shown that this approach produces desirable metrics on the models of interest and a consistent method for model selection, at least in some cases.

Keywords— Kolmogorov complexity, algorithmic information theory, data compression, randomness, randomized algorithms, statistical inference, model selection, minimum description length, Bayesian data analysis, prediction.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE probability of an observation, given the model, is sometimes difficult to evaluate. A method for estimating this likelihood is proposed by generating data with suggested models, hereafter referred to as *replicas*, and comparing them to the original data. The comparison of the models is done much in the spirit of *minimum description length principle* [11]. One could also consider the *statistical ensemble methods* relatives to the presented one [9].

An example will clarify the point: we attempt to infer the generating dynamics of a moving particle. The particle begins its movement from a random initial point and then follows a distinct trajectory. The motion will then be considered to be due to one of many possible models of which we wish to find the correct one. However, the dynamical process which governs the action of the particle will not be time-invertible and thus cannot be traced back to its origin when only the final resting place of the particle is seen. The lack of invertibility prevents us from computing the probability of the observations.

Let us assume that the experiment was to project the particle through an intermediate layer of some substance. The two considered hypotheses are that either the particle passed straight through, or the medium interfered in it disrupting the path according to random scattering.

We shall tackle this problem by generating a large number of replicas with the two models a large set of replicas of the particle, all stationed at their random initial locations, which are then simulated according to the rules of dynamics of each model in question. The plausibility of a model is judged by the average distance between the replicas and the original observation. The closest model can *et pleno jure* be taken as the best estimate.

The above moving particle example can be seen in a much broader sense as a type of a problem where it is natural to attempt a forward procedure of modelling, instead

of the backwards tracing: we generate by simulation samples x that are matched to the observed data y , and the goal is to get the simulated samples as close as possible to the original data. We can formally show that this comparison indeed does result in a plausible model selection scheme.

II. MINIMUM DESCRIPTION LENGTH PRINCIPLE

The conversion problem outlined in the introduction can be formally abstracted and discussed both as a problem in the algorithmic theory of information and in the theory of probability. We first continue briefly with the former.

The algorithmic minimum description length principle states that the optimal predicted model is the one which generates the observed data with the shortest description in terms of computer programs. This means that the complexity of a string of symbols y given another x , is the length of the program that reads x and outputs y , [11], [8].

By a *collective* $x \in \mathcal{C}^n$ we mean a string of n symbols from some set \mathcal{S} , ($\mathcal{C} = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}^n \cup \mathcal{C}^{\infty}$), which represents a sequence of random samples from some distribution such that for all measurable sets A , $\mathbb{P}(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \#(A, x_{1:n})/n$, where the $\#(A, z)$ is the number of times an element of the set A occurs in the sequence z . Also randomness here should be understood so that our form of a collective is both a Martin–Löf random sequence and a Kolmogorov–Loveland collective [8].

Thus a collective is a sequence of symbols in which the order of the symbols is irrelevant. Two collectives are considered equivalent, denoted by $x \sim y$, if they represent the same probability distribution, i.e. they have the same limit measures for all sets. Thus for the purpose of inference we do not need to model the order in which the samples appear in the data sequence, but only the underlying distribution; and we want to establish a connection between two sequences which leads to a slightly altered form of the Kolmogorov complexity:

Definition 1: The *algorithmic conversion complexity* $CC(y|x)$ of collectives x and y is the length of the shortest program that reads the collective x and outputs a collective z , such that $z \sim y$.

This is similar to the standard Kolmogorov complexity in being noncomputable, but it is also different: from the definition it follows that for all collectives $z \sim y$ implies $CC(y|x) = CC(z|x)$, and thus CC operates on equivalence classes of infinite sequences and compresses out the random part.

Consider the following communication event: Alice and Bob both have access to a source producing a string x . Alice wants to transmit to Bob a string y , but instead of the string itself she transmits to Bob the description of the function, which Bob can apply on the string x to ob-

tain y . Furthermore Alice might be able to send Bob for each symbol x_i individually a description of the function f_i , which, when applied on x_i , would produce the symbol y_i . The average amount of transmitted bits is the average $\mathbb{E}\{C(f_i)\}$ over the transmitted functions during the transaction of the Kolmogorov complexities C of the functions. If the sequence $y = x$, then no bits need be transmitted —Bob already knows y .

We can therefore take as the set of possible models those probability distributions that are defined by collectives, infinite sequences of random samples from the distributions of the samples. Our minimum conversion description length principle would then be to choose the model with the least conversion complexity. A finite sequence can be extended to an infinite collective by repeating it infinitely many times.

Note that in case \mathcal{S} is uncountable there is an assumption of neighborhood included such that for any element A , such that $\mu(A) > 0$, of the σ -algebra of \mathcal{S} there are elements of A in the collective, and also that for uncountable sample spaces almost surely no symbol in a collective is repeated.

III. CONVERSION COMPLEXITY

From the perspective of probability theory we are given two measures μ and ν on \mathcal{S} , and we wish to find a transformation T , which operates on the sets such that $\mu(T(A)) = \nu(A)$ (or vice versa) for all $A \in \mathcal{S}$.

Definition 2: The *dual* (from μ to ν with \mathcal{F}) is the measure on \mathcal{F} , $f \in \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\mu(x) = \int_{\mathcal{F}} \nu(f(x)) d\phi. \quad (1)$$

$\phi(f|x)$ is a probability of the function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $x \in \mathcal{S}$ is in its domain.

This definition actually poses possibly an infinite number of constraints, if the σ -algebras are infinite.

The dual exists if for each y in the support of μ , $\text{supp}\{\mu\}$, there exists an element of $\text{supp}\{\nu\}$ and a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f(x) = y$. Also the dual is not unique, which is easily demonstrated: let the sample spaces of both distributions be \mathbb{R} , and let the set \mathcal{F} be the set of affine transformations on \mathbb{R} . If the distributions $\nu(y) = \delta(y - y_0)$ and $\mu(x) = \delta(x - x_0)$, then any δ -function on \mathcal{F} assigning positive probability to a transform of the form $ay_0 + b = x_0$, for some constants a and b , is an admissible dual kernel.

If we can get a dual in one direction we should be able to construct one to the other direction as well; that is, we need an inverse of the dual.

Definition 3: If for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$ for which $\phi(f|x) > 0$ for any x there exists a $f^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}$ then the *inverse dual* ϕ^\dagger is defined as $\phi^\dagger(f|x) = \phi(f^{-1}|f(x))$, and zero if $f^{-1} \notin \mathcal{F}$.

It is also a formal inverse, which is the content of the following theorem:

Theorem 1: $\phi^{\dagger\dagger} = \phi$.

Proof: If for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $f^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\phi^{\dagger\dagger}(f|x) = \phi^\dagger(f^{-1}|f(x)) = \phi((f^{-1})^{-1} \circ f(x)) = \phi(f|x)$. ■

A. Minimal Dual

For the dual one needs the total knowledge of both μ and ν on the whole of \mathcal{S} , which is hardly the case in statistical inference. Thus we use the least conversion complexity principle in Section II: a collective x transformed to a collective y . A practical construction of a dual in this restricted sense, based on observations and their replicas, is done with the minimal description length principle.

We write $x_{1:m}^\alpha$ for the sequence $x_{1:m}$ repeated α times. When α is not an integer then we mean $x_{1:m}$ repeated $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ times concatenated with $m(\alpha - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor)$ first elements from the sequence $x_{1:m}$. A k -*matching* of $x_{1:m}$ and $y_{1:n}$ is a multiset R_k of k pairs of $x_{1:m}^\alpha$ and y_j^β , such that each element x_i^α and y_j^β appears exactly once in some pair, and $m\alpha = n\beta = k$.

Take a complexity (an energy, or a cost) function $C : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and define $C(b|a) := \min_f C(f, a)$ such that $f(a) = b$, and ∞ if no such f exists, (or equivalently we simply define the function C on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$).

We then have a set of source points x and targets y , but we still do not know which elements in x are mapped to which ones in y . Define the *conversion complexity* S of collectives $x_{1:m}$ and $y_{1:n}$:

Definition 4: For collectives $x \in \mathcal{C}^m$ and $y \in \mathcal{C}^n$

$$S(y|x) = \frac{1}{k} \min_{R_k} \left\{ \sum_{(a,b) \in R_k} C(b|a) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where $k = \text{lcm}(m, n)$ is the least common multiple of m and n .

This is the total average complexity of mapping elements in the collective x to y by functions in \mathcal{F} . The minimization problem in (2) is called the (non-fixed destination) *point-to-point connection* problem in computational complexity theory, and in general it is known to be NP-complete. Fortunately there is an effective approximation algorithm operating in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log n)$ as a function of the number of samples [6].

As was said, the conversion complexity is in a form of an average of C . Rigorously speaking it is the mean over a specific dual:

Theorem 2: If $|S(y|x)| < \infty$, then there exists a dual ϕ such that $S(y|x) = \mathbb{E}\{C\}$.

Proof: Define the converging sequence of matchings R_1, R_2, \dots obtained from the process $n \rightarrow \infty$. For any subset $A \subseteq Y$ define the subset $B_n = \{b \in X | a \in A, (a, b) \in R_n\}$. Then $B_n \rightarrow B$. Now $\nu_n(A) \rightarrow \nu(A)$ where $\nu_n(A) = \#(A, y_{1:n})/n$, and $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$. Then for $F_n = \{f | a \in A, b \in B_n, f = \arg \min_f C(f, a|b)\}$ the measure $\phi_n(F_n, A)$ converges to $\phi(F, A)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. ■

The limit dual in Theorem 2 is called *minimal* relative to C . From here on when we write ϕ we always mean the minimal dual.

B. Convergence of S

Next we show that the conversion complexity converges with a proper selection of C , and we also obtain an average bound. Results of convergence bounds such as these are quite common in learning theory (see for example [3]), and

we follow similar lines of reasoning. The most significant difference is that our set of models, within which the bound is obtained, is the set of all models represented by finite (or infinite) sequences of random samples.

We need the following lemma due to Hoeffding [7]:

Lemma 1: For a bounded random variable X ($a \leq X \leq b$) with zero mean for all $s > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}\{e^{sX}\} \leq \exp\{s^2(b-a)^2/8\}$.

A very common assumption in learning theory is that the cost function is bounded; that is:

Definition 5: The complexity function C is of *bounded complexity* if there exist constants \underline{C} and \overline{C} for all $a, b \in \mathcal{S}$, $\underline{C} \leq C(b|a) \leq \overline{C}$.

With the Lemma 1 we can show that when the number of observations increases, the value of S approaches the asymptotic value at rate proportional to $1/\sqrt{n}$.

Theorem 3: For all collectives x and y with bounded complexity function there exists a constant c for all n such that, the expectation over the random variables $x_{1:m}$ and $y_{1:n}$, $\mathbb{E}\{|S(y|x) - S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})|\} \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$.

Proof: Introducing independent duplicate collectives y' and x' , and denoting the sums $S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n}) = \sum_i p_i C_i$ and $S(y'_{1:n}|x'_{1:n}) = \sum_i p'_i C'_i$, we get:

$$\mathbb{E}\{|S(y|x) - S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})|\} \quad (3)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}\{|S(y'_{1:n}|x'_{1:n}) - S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})|\} \quad (4)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \left| \sum_i (p_i C_i - p'_i C'_i) \right| \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Because C is of bounded complexity every term $p_i C_i$ and $p'_i C'_i$ must be bounded between some \underline{M} and \overline{M} . Let $c = \overline{M} - \underline{M}$. Also since the duplicates are independent $\mathbb{E}\{p_i C_i - p'_i C'_i\} = 0$. Therefore $|\sum_i (p_i C_i - p'_i C'_i)| \leq nc$. Now by Lemma 1:

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{ \exp\left\{ s \sum_i (p_i C_i - p'_i C'_i) \right\} \right\} \leq e^{ns^2 c^2/8} \quad (6)$$

$$\implies \left| \sum_i (p_i C_i - p'_i C'_i) \right| \leq \frac{n}{s} + \frac{sc^2}{8}. \quad (7)$$

By assigning $s = (\sqrt{2} + 1)\sqrt{8n/c^2}$ we get

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left\{ \left| \sum_i (p_i C_i - p'_i C'_i) \right| \right\} \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (8)$$

In Theorem 3 we use bounded complexity functions, which means that either the function is bounded, or the sample space \mathcal{S} is finite and C is finite within \mathcal{S} . The following theorem expands it slightly to include infinite sample spaces but with *universal* C , which then is allowed to increase indefinitely:

Definition 6: The function C is *universal* if $|\mathbb{E}\{C(b|a)\}| < \infty$ over all distributions on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 4: If C is universal, then for all collectives x and y there exists a constant c for all n such that $\mathbb{E}\{|S(y|x) - S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})|\} \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}}$.

Proof: Write $X = \cup_i x_i$ and $Y = \cup_j y_j$ for the supports of the distributions represented by x and y . Take a sequence $\mathcal{A} = A_1, A_2, \dots$ of subsets of $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$, ($A_i = (X_i, Y_i)$) that are mutually exclusive such that $\cup_i A_i = X \times Y$. Denote $\mathbb{P}(A_i) = q_i$. This sequence exists because of the universality condition of C . Now use Theorem 3 on each subset to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\{|S(y|x) - S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})|\} \quad (9)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}\{|S(y'_{1:n}|x'_{1:n}) - S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})|\} \quad (10)$$

$$= \sum_i q_i \mathbb{E}\{|S(y'_{1:n}|x'_{1:n}) - S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})|\} \quad (11)$$

$$\leq \sum_i q_i \frac{c_i}{\sqrt{n}} \quad (12)$$

for some sequence c_i . Because the sets A_i are of bounded complexity the value c_i is obtained by some element $(x, y) \in A_i$, and since C is universal the sum $\sum_i q_i c_i$ converges to a value $c < \infty$. ■

As a corollary to the theorems above we finally obtain the result that S converges when C is suitably chosen:

Corollary 1: If C is universal, then for all collectives x, y , $S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:n})$ converges to $S(y|x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

C. Universality and Regularity

The property of universality was defined in the sections above for the immediate use in Theorems 3 and 4. In addition we will define regularity to mean normalizability of a probability distribution defined on \mathcal{S} . Here, we investigate these notions further. We will need the usual definitions

Definition 7: 1. $f(u) = o(g(u))$

$\iff \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} f(u)/g(u) = 0$.

2. $f(u) = \mathcal{O}(g(u))$

$\exists \alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} f(u)/g(u) = \alpha$.

Let us then reparametrize the complexity C with a volume preserving (Jacobian determinant ± 1) indexing function $v : [L, U] \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ such that $u_1 \leq u_2 \implies C(v(u_1, x)|x) \leq C(v(u_2, x)|x)$, and also define $D(u|x)$ as the set of all $b \in Y$ for which $C(b|x) = C(v(u, x)|x)$ (if \mathcal{S} is infinite then possibly $L = -\infty$ and/or $U = \infty$). The elements are thus grouped and sorted by their complexity relative to a given element x . Likewise define the function $C_\epsilon(x) := \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} C(v|x)/|v|^\epsilon$ (the purpose of this will become apparent in the proof of Theorem 5). Then we will make the same reordering of C_ϵ relative to the parameter x : $\omega : [L, U] \rightarrow X$ such that $w_1 \leq w_2 \implies C_\epsilon(\omega(w_1)) \leq C_\epsilon(\omega(w_2))$, and write $E(w)$ as the set of all $a \in X$ for which $C_\epsilon(a) = C_\epsilon(\omega(w))$.

The following is a standard result in the theory of integrals to get a sufficient condition for the convergence of an integral:

Lemma 2: $\int |f(u)| du < \infty \iff \exists \alpha > 1$ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} |u|^\alpha f(u) < \infty$.

With the aid of this lemma we can have a criterion for universality:

Theorem 5: C is universal iff, $\forall x \in \mathcal{S}, \forall \epsilon > 0$ such that $|C(v|x)| = \mathcal{O}(|u|^\epsilon)$ and $\forall \epsilon > 0, \forall \delta > 0$ such that $|C_\epsilon(\omega)| = \mathcal{O}(|\omega|^\delta)$.

Proof: We use Lemma 2. First for all distributions μ on $v([L, U])$ there exists $\alpha > 1$ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} |u|^\alpha \mu(v) < \infty$. Universality in turn means that there is a $\beta > 1$ for all μ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} |u|^\beta \mu(v) C(v|x) < \infty$. Choose $\delta := \alpha - \beta$. Then $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} |u|^\alpha \mu(v) |u|^\delta C(v|x) < \infty$, and for $\forall \delta < 0$ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} |u|^\delta C(v|x) < \infty$, from which we get $\forall \epsilon > 0$ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} |u|^{-\epsilon} C(v|x) < \infty$. The second condition follows similarly by noticing that $C_\epsilon(x) = |u|^{-\epsilon} C(v|x)$ to which Lemma 2 is again applied. ■

From Theorem 5 it follows that if C is universal, then so is C^k for any $k > 0$.

The definition of regularity implies that the conversion complexity defined in (2) generates a probability function.

Definition 8: C is λ -regular on \mathcal{S} if for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|D(u|x)\| e^{-\lambda C(v(u)|x)} du < \infty. \quad (13)$$

As in Theorem 5 we have a comparable result with regular complexity functions:

Theorem 6: C is λ -regular on \mathcal{S} iff for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$, $\lambda C(v|x) - \log \|D(u|x)\| > 1 + o(\log |u|)$.

Proof: $\exists \alpha > 1$ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} |u|^\alpha \|D(u|x)\| \exp(-\lambda C(v|x)) < \infty$. Therefore $\exists \alpha > 1$ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \log |u| + \log \|D(u|x)\| - \lambda C(v|x) < \infty$, and thus $\exists \alpha > 1$ such that $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} (\lambda C(v|x) - \log \|D(u|x)\|) / \log |u| = \alpha$. ■

A logarithmic function of u would be universal, and with the added condition of Theorem 6 it is also regular. The constraint for universality is an upperbound for the growth in complexity, whereas the constraint for regularity is a lower bound. A complexity function can have any combination of the properties: universal but not regular, regular but not universal, universal and regular, or neither universal nor regular.

D. S as a Similarity Measure

In cases such as cluster, or image analysis, one needs a measure of similarity between sets, or images as it were [10]. There is a treatise on the behaviour of these in the framework of Kolmogorov complexity in [1]. But here the function $S(\cdot|\cdot)$ can be treated as a measure of similarity between collectives.

Often such measures of similarity are required to be monotonic; i.e. similarity of a set does not decrease by taking the union with a third set. Here we, however, do not quite have such a strong relation, and we have to settle at a weaker weighted form. Let us define the operation $+$ for collectives: if $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $z = x + y$ then z contains the symbols in x and y such that for all measurable sets A , $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \#(A, z_{1:l})/l = \lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} (\#(A, x_{1:m}) + \#(A, y_{1:n})) / (m + n)$, or more precisely, $x + y$ is an equivalence class of collectives from which z is a member.

Theorem 7: (Weighted monotonicity) $(m + n)S(y_{1:m} + z_{1:n}|x) \leq mS(y_{1:m}|x) + nS(z_{1:n}|x)$.

Proof: Let

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S(y_{1:m}|x_{1:k}) \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{a \in y} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_y(y_i|u) C(y_i|u) du \quad (15)$$

$$= S(y_{1:m}|x), \quad (16)$$

and likewise

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S(z_{1:n}|x_{1:k}) \quad (17)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{b \in z} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_z(z_i|u) C(z_i|u) du \quad (18)$$

$$= S(z_{1:n}|x) \quad (19)$$

then

$$mS(y_{1:m}|x) + nS(z_{1:n}|x) \quad (20)$$

$$= \sum_{a \in y} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_y(y_i|u) C(y_i|u) du \quad (21)$$

$$= S(y_{1:m}|x) + \sum_{b \in z} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_z(z_i|u) C(z_i|u) du \quad (22)$$

$$= S(z_{1:n}|x). \quad (23)$$

However since the minimization of R_y and R_z separately does not reach the global maximum of R_{y+z} the theorem is proved. ■

The relation in Theorem 7 is an equality when the samples are from the same equivalence class of collectives.

Theorem 8: If $z \sim y$ then $S(y|x) = S(z|x)$.

Proof: Because of $z \sim y$, we may assume that $y_{1:m} = z_{1:n}^k$ for some k , and

$$S(y_{1:m}|x) = \frac{1}{kn} \sum_{a \in y} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_y(y_i|u) C(y_i|u) du \quad (24)$$

$$= \frac{1}{kn} k \sum_{a \in z} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_z(z_i|u) C(z_i|u) du \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in z} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \phi_z(z_i|u) C(z_i|u) du = S(z_{1:n}|x). \quad (26)$$

We define the measure S^\dagger that is obtained by the minimization process in Equation (2) with $C^\dagger(f, x) = C(f^{-1}, f(x))$, if there is an inverse f^{-1} , and ∞ otherwise.

Theorem 9: If \mathcal{F} is closed under inversion, $S^\dagger(x|y) = S(y|x)$.

Proof: By definition $C^\dagger(x|y) = C(y|x)$, and therefore by the minimization in (2), $S^\dagger(x|y) = S(y|x)$. ■

And finally we can see that S is in fact a metric on the space of probability distributions, at least on the set where models are represented by sample sequences:

Theorem 10: If $C(\cdot|\cdot)$ is a metric on \mathcal{S} , then $S(\cdot|\cdot)$ is a metric on \mathcal{C} .

Proof:

1. $\forall a, b \in \mathcal{S} : C(a|b) \geq 0 \implies S(y|x) \geq 0$, and $\forall a \in \mathcal{S} : C(a|a) = 0 \implies \forall x \in \mathcal{C} : S(x|x) = 0$.

2. $\forall a, b \in \mathcal{S} : C(a|b) = C(b|a) \implies \forall x, y \in \mathcal{C} : S(y|x) = S(x|y)$.

3. $\forall a, b, c \in \mathcal{S} : C(a|b) + C(b|c) \geq C(a|c) \implies \forall x, y, z \in \mathcal{C} : S(x|y) + S(y|z) \geq S(x|z)$. \blacksquare

The Kullback-Leibler divergence $KL(\nu|\mu) = \mathbb{E}\{\log \nu(y) - \log \mu(y)\}$ can be obtained as a special case by setting $C(a|b) = \log \nu(a) - \log \mu(a)$. Then $S(y|x) = KL(\nu|\mu)$. The heuristic difference between the Kullback–Leibler distance and S is that KL measures the difference between the code lengths of the elements in the sample space, while S is the amount of complexity that it takes to transform sample sets from one distribution to another.

E. Partition Function

We introduce a conditional probability of the given observations y with matching R converted from x with conservative, regular, but not necessarily universal, C as follows

$$\mathbb{P}(y_{1:n}, R|x, \beta) \propto e^{-\beta \sum_R C(b|a)}. \quad (27)$$

By \propto we mean equal up to division by the normalizing constant.

When the matching R is chosen by the maximum probability we write in shorthand

$$\mathbb{P}(y_{1:n}|x, \beta) = \frac{e^{-\beta S(y_{1:n}|x)}}{Z_\beta^n(x)}, \quad (28)$$

where $Z_\beta^n(x)$ is the *partition function*, which is:

$$Z_\beta^n(x) = \int_{\mathcal{C}^n} e^{-\beta S(y|x)} dy. \quad (29)$$

Theorem 11: If C is λ -regular with $\lambda \leq 1$, then $Z_\beta^n(x)$ converges with all $n = 1, 2, \dots$, $\beta \geq \lambda$ and $x \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof: Since $\mathbb{P}(y, R|x, \beta) \propto \exp\{-\beta \sum_R C(b|a)\} = \prod_R e^{-\beta C(b_i|a_j)}$, then $\int \prod_R e^{-\beta C(b_i|a_j)} db_1 \dots db_n$ converges as the individual terms converge with a regular C . \blacksquare

IV. BAYESIAN THEORY OF INFERENCE

The Bayesian theory has risen as the contemporary theory of statistical inference [4]. In Bayesian data analysis one calculates the posterior probability of a model θ given the data y and the prior probabilities $\mathbb{P}(\theta)$.

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta|y) \propto \mathbb{P}(y|\theta)\mathbb{P}(\theta), \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\theta)$ is called *prior*, $\mathbb{P}(y|\theta)$ is the *evidence* or *likelihood*, and $\mathbb{P}(\theta|y)$ the *posterior*.

Sometimes the likelihood term $\mathbb{P}(y|\theta)$ may not be easily calculated, and we can use the replication method. Intuitively we describe the system under replication such that the system θ will first produce a sample x with some probability, which the measurement process itself corrupts the sample into an observation y , $|y| = n$. Then $\mathbb{P}(y|x, \zeta)$, parametrized by ζ , gives the probability of the observation y instead of the "true" x . We can in the most general setting make dependent on each specific model. The function complexity C_ζ is in the Bayesian formalism the negative logarithm of the prior probability of the function f .

We need a complexity function which is bounded from below, and thus without loss of generality we may assume that $C \geq 0$, and $C(f) = 0$ iff f is the identity function on \mathcal{S} . We call such a C *conservative*. A conservative C is either universal or regular, or both.

The posterior probability of the parameters is

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta, \zeta, x_{1:m}|y_{1:n}, \beta) \propto \mathbb{P}(y_{1:n}|x_{1:m}, \beta, \zeta) \mathbb{P}(x_{1:m}|\theta) \mathbb{P}(\theta, \zeta). \quad (31)$$

A. Simulated Annealing Inference

If we are indeed interested in the probability of the observations given the parameter but are unable to compute it directly, we can utilize the standard theory of simulated annealing. In this we want to minimize the value of some functions by allowing stochastic transitions from the current solution, and with reducing the temperature, we can stiffen the system to the global minimum with a good probability, provided the annealing was slow enough. Here a similar concept is at hand. We tighten the conversion complexity to finally allowing only identity maps, and thus the minimal conversion is no conversion at all.

Theorem 12: If C is conservative

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\theta|y_{1:n}, \beta) \propto \mathbb{P}(y|\theta) \mathbb{P}(\theta). \quad (32)$$

Proof: When $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathbb{P}(y_{1:n}|x_{1:m}, \beta, \zeta)$ approaches the δ -distribution such that $\delta(y_{1:n}, x_{1:m}) = 0$ iff $y_{1:n} \not\sim x_{1:m}$. Further

$$\int \int \mathbb{P}(y_{1:n}|x_{1:m}, \zeta) \mathbb{P}(x_{1:m}|\theta) \mathbb{P}(\theta, \zeta) dx_1 \dots dx_m d\zeta = \int \mathbb{P}(y|\theta) \mathbb{P}(\theta, \zeta) d\zeta = \mathbb{P}(y|\theta) \mathbb{P}(\theta). \quad \blacksquare$$

Note that we have the result independently of $\mathbb{P}(\theta, \zeta)$ for any θ when the temperature is decreased. This method is usable when the original likelihood $\mathbb{P}(y|\theta)$ is hard to compute but the replica probability $\mathbb{P}(x|\theta)$ can be computed more easily.

B. Inference by Increasing the Number of Replicas

Another approach is to make sufficiently many replicas such that the measure $S(y_{1:n}|x_{1:m})$ is no longer a random variable, and it can be considered as the probability of producing a sample from the distribution of θ , which is then converted into an observation y .

Theorem 13:

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\theta, \zeta, x_{1:m}|y, \beta) \propto \mathbb{P}(y|\theta, \beta, \zeta) \mathbb{P}(\theta, \zeta). \quad (33)$$

Proof: When $m \rightarrow \infty$ the probability $\mathbb{P}(x_{1:m}|\theta) \rightarrow 1$ since the samples x are drawn from the distribution $\mathbb{P}(\cdot|\theta)$. Also since we consider an infinite sample to be equivalent with the distribution from which they were drawn we can write $\mathbb{P}(y|\theta, \beta, \zeta)$ for the conditional probability of the data, given the replicas. \blacksquare

This differs from the method in the previous subsection in that the replication is emphasized and modeled, whereas in simulated annealing the replication was used as a means to an end: obtaining the posterior for θ only.

This method can be used when both of the likelihood functions $\mathbb{P}(y|\theta)$ and $\mathbb{P}(x|\theta)$ are in general hard to compute, as opposed to the simulated annealing approach, where it is computable at least for the generated samples.

V. EXAMPLE

We will illustrate the ideas with an analytic example: Consider distributions on $(0, \infty)$ and take the set \mathcal{F} as the set of multiplication by scalar: $f_\alpha(x) = \alpha x$. The complexities of f_α are defined by

$$C(f_\alpha) = |\log \alpha|, \quad (34)$$

which is universal and λ -regular (with $\lambda > 1$) for distributions on $(0, \infty)$. The origin is removed from the sample space in order to have universality of C nicely. Now the identity map f_1 will be assigned the minimal complexity.

We have the triangle inequality with equality. Let us assume that $a \leq b \leq c$:

$$C(a|b) + C(b|c) = \left| \log \frac{b}{a} \right| + \left| \log \frac{c}{b} \right| \quad (35)$$

$$= \log b - \log a + \log c - \log b \quad (36)$$

$$= \log \frac{c}{a} = C(a|c). \quad (37)$$

When the distributions μ and ν have no atoms, and their supports are connected, we can show that the minimal dual can be chosen as a continuous function ψ .

Proposition 1: If $b_1 \leq b_2$ then $\psi(b_1) \leq \psi(b_2)$.

Proof: In the following assume that $b_1 \leq b_2$ and $a_1 = \psi(b_1) \leq a_2 = \psi(b_2)$. We need to check the following four cases:

i) $a_1 \leq b_1$ and $b_2 \leq a_2$. Then

$$C(b_1|a_2) + C(b_2|a_1) \quad (38)$$

$$= C(b_1|b_2) + C(b_2|a_2) + C(b_2|b_2) + C(b_1|a_1) \quad (39)$$

$$= C(b_1|a_1) + C(b_1|a_1) + 2C(b_1|b_2) \quad (40)$$

$$\leq C(b_1|a_1) + C(b_2|a_2). \quad (41)$$

ii) $b_1 \leq a_1$ and $a_2 \leq b_2$. Then

$$C(b_1|a_2) + C(b_2|a_1) \quad (42)$$

$$= C(b_1|a_1) + C(a_1|a_2) + C(b_2|a_2) + C(a_2|a_1) \quad (43)$$

$$= C(b_1|a_1) + C(b_2|a_2) + 2C(a_1|a_2) \quad (44)$$

$$\leq C(b_1|a_1) + C(b_2|a_2). \quad (45)$$

iii) $b_1 \leq a_1$ and $a_1 \leq b_2 \leq a_2$. Then

$$C(b_1|a_2) + C(b_2|a_1) \quad (46)$$

$$= C(b_1|b_2) + C(b_2|a_2) + C(b_2|a_1) \quad (47)$$

$$= C(b_1|a_1) + C(a_1|b_2) + C(b_2|a_2) + C(b_2|a_1) \quad (48)$$

$$= C(b_1|a_1) + C(b_2|a_1) + 2C(a_1|b_2) \quad (49)$$

$$\leq C(b_1|a_1) + C(b_2|a_2). \quad (50)$$

iv) $b_1 \leq a_1$ and $b_2 \leq a_1$. Then

$$C(b_1|a_2) + C(b_2|a_1) \quad (51)$$

$$= C(b_1|a_1) + C(a_1|a_2) + C(b_2|a_1) \quad (52)$$

$$= C(b_1|a_1) + C(b_2|a_2). \quad (53)$$

Therefore, if the optimal matching contains the pairs (a_1, b_2) and (a_2, b_1) they can be changed to (a_1, b_1) and

(a_2, b_2) , and thus the minimal dual will preserve the order of the samples. \blacksquare

Next let us consider uniform distributions with a parameter $\theta > 0$:

$$\mu(x|\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\theta} & \text{if } x \in (0, \theta] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (54)$$

We write the true value of θ with $\hat{\theta}$. When the functions are scalar multiplications, and because the matching is order-preserving we have at the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ the matching defined by a continuous function $\psi(x) = \hat{\theta}/\theta x$, and then

$$S(y|x) = \int_0^\theta \mathbb{P}(u) C(\psi|u) du \quad (55)$$

$$= \int_0^\theta \frac{1}{\theta} \left| \log \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\theta} \right) \right| du \quad (56)$$

$$= \left| \log \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}}{\theta} \right) \right|. \quad (57)$$

This is a proper metric for the considered distributions. Thus the minimal conversion complexity estimate (or equivalently the maximum posterior likelihood estimate) of θ is $\hat{\theta}$ for a sufficiently large data set, giving a consistent estimator.

VI. DISCUSSION

Our conversion method relies on the possibility of generating samples from the suggested distribution. For practical purpose also a finite amount of samples, and therefore the problem of sampling a number of independent samples from a distribution is here the same as in general sampling methods [5], [2].

The author is preparing a second article dealing with an application of the methods presented here. In it we will show a practical computational inversion of the parameters of dynamic systems, which is a difficult task by most other methods.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that models can be effectively compared and ipso facto selected by a complexity weighted conversion, even in cases where direct inference by likelihoods fails. This leads to a metric measure on collectives, which are sample sequences drawn at random from the models under consideration. The convergence of this measure is also guaranteed under proper assumptions on the underlying complexity measure of the individual elements. We can then make the inference in the Bayesian framework.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank prof. Jorma Rissanen, Dr. Jukka Heikkonen and Dr. Aki Vehtari for fruitful discussion and helpful advice concerning statistical inference. Also the general atmosphere of the Laboratory of Computational Engineering is appreciated. And finally I am indebted to prof. Leo Ojala for inspiration in the early years of my studies without which this formal work would not have materialized.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.H. Bennett, P. Gács, M. Ling, P.M.B. Vitányi and W.H. Zurek, *Information Distance*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, Vol 44, No. 4, July 1998.
- [2] C.P. Robert and G. Casella *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods*, Springer Verlag 1999.
- [3] L. Devroye and G. Lugosi *Combinatorial Methods in Density Estimation*, Springer Verlag 2001.
- [4] A. Gelman, J.B. Carlin, H.S. Stern, and D.R. Rubin *Bayesian Data Analysis*, Chapman & Hall 1995.
- [5] S. Geman and D. Geman *Stochastic relaxation, Gibbs distributions and the Bayesian restoration of images*, IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 1984.
- [6] M.X. Goemans and D.P. Williamson, *A General Approximation Technique for Constrained Forest Problems*, SIAM Journal on Computing, 24, 296–317, 1995
- [7] Hoeffding, W, *Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables*, JASA 53, p. 13-30, 1963.
- [8] M. Li and P. Vitanyi. *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications*. Springer Verlag 1997.
- [9] H. Lappalainen and J. Miskin *Ensemble Learning*, in M. Girolami (Ed.), *Advances in Independent Component Analysis*, Springer 2000.
- [10] J. Puzicha, T. Hofmann, and J. Buhmann *Non-parametric similarity measures for unsupervised texture segmentation and image retrieval*, In Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition 1997.
- [11] J. Rissanen. *Lectures on Statistical Modeling Theory*. Tampere University of Technology 1999.