

# Chapter 5

# Probability

We have been considering a model of an information handling system in which symbols from an input are encoded into bits, which are then sent across a “channel” to a receiver and get decoded back into symbols. See Figure 5.1.




Figure 5.1: Communication system

In earlier chapters of these notes we have looked at various components in this model. Now we return to the source and model it more fully, in terms of probability distributions.

The source provides a symbol or a sequence of symbols, selected from some set. The selection process might be an experiment, such as flipping a coin or rolling dice. Or it might be the observation of actions not caused by the observer. Or the sequence of symbols could be a model of some object, such as characters from text, or pixels from an image.

We consider only cases with a finite number of symbols to choose from, and only cases in which the symbols are both mutually exclusive (only one can be chosen at a time) and exhaustive (one is actually chosen). Each choice constitutes an “outcome” and our objective is to trace the sequence of outcomes, and the information that accompanies them, as the information travels from the input to the output. To do that, we need to be able to say what the outcome is, and also our knowledge about some properties of the outcome.

If we know the outcome, we have a perfectly good way of denoting the result. We can simply name the symbol chosen, and ignore all the rest of the symbols, which were not chosen. But what if we do not yet know the outcome, or are uncertain to any degree? How are we supposed to express our state of knowledge if there is uncertainty? We will use the mathematics of probability for this purpose.

---

Author: [Paul Penfield, Jr.](#)

This document: <http://www.mtl.mit.edu/Courses/6.050/2006/notes/chapter5.pdf>

Version 1.3, February 28, 2006. Copyright © 2006 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

[Start of notes](#) · [back](#) · [next](#) | [6.050J/2.110J home page](#) | [Site map](#) | [Search](#) | [About this document](#) | [Comments and inquiries](#)

To illustrate this important idea, we will use examples based on the characteristics of MIT students. The official count of students at MIT<sup>1</sup> for Fall 2005 includes the data in Table 5.1, which is reproduced in Venn diagram format in Figure 5.2.

	Women	Men	Total
Freshmen	467	534	1,001
Undergraduates	1,765	2,301	4,066
Graduate Students	1,785	4,355	6,140
Total Students	3,550	6,656	10,206

Table 5.1: Demographic data for MIT, Fall 2005




Figure 5.2: A Venn diagram of MIT student data, with areas roughly proportional to the sizes of the subpopulations.

Suppose an MIT freshman is selected (the symbol being chosen is an individual student, and the set of possible symbols is the 1001 freshmen), and you are not informed who it is. You wonder whether it is a woman or a man. Of course if you knew the identity of the student selected, you would know the gender. But if not, how could you characterize your knowledge? What is the likelihood, or probability, that a woman was selected?

Note that 47% of the 2005 freshman class (467/1,001) are women. This is a fact, or a statistic, which may or may not represent the probability the freshman chosen is a woman. If you had reason to believe that all freshmen were equally likely to be chosen, you might decide that the probability of it being a woman is 47%. But what if you are told that the selection is made in the corridor of McCormick Hall (a women's dormitory)? In that case the probability that the freshman chosen is a woman is probably higher than 47%. Statistics and probabilities can both be described using the same mathematics (to be developed next), but they are different things.

<sup>1</sup>all students: <http://web.mit.edu/registrar/www/stats/yreportfinal.html>,

all women: <http://web.mit.edu/registrar/www/stats/womenfinal.html>

## 5.1 Events

Like many branches of mathematics or science, probability theory has its own nomenclature in which a word may mean something different or more specific than its everyday meaning. Consider the two words **event**, which has several everyday meanings, and **outcome**. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary gives these definitions that are closest to the technical meaning in probability theory:

- **outcome**: something that follows as a result or consequence
- **event**: a subset of the possible outcomes of an experiment

In our context, **outcome** is the symbol selected, whether or not it is known to us. While it is wrong to speak of the outcome of a selection that has not yet been made, it is all right to speak of the set of possible outcomes of selections that are contemplated. In our case this is the set of all symbols. As for the term **event**, its most common everyday meaning, which we do not want, is something that happens. Our meaning, which is quoted above, is listed last in the dictionary. We will use the word in this restricted way because we need a way to estimate or characterize our knowledge of various properties of the symbols. These properties are things that either do or do not apply to each symbol, and a convenient way to think of them is to consider the set of all symbols being divided into two subsets, one with that property and one without. When a selection is made, then, there are several events. One is the outcome itself. This is called a **fundamental event**. Others are the selection of a symbol with particular properties.

Even though, strictly speaking, an event is a set of possible outcomes, it is common in probability theory to call the experiments that produce those outcomes events. Thus we will sometimes refer to a selection as an event.

For example, suppose an MIT freshman is selected. The specific person chosen is the outcome. The fundamental event would be that person, or the selection of that person. Another event would be the selection of a woman (or a man). Another event might be the selection of someone from California, or someone older than 18, or someone taller than six feet. More complicated events could be considered, such as a woman from Texas, or a man from Michigan with particular SAT scores.

The special event in which any symbol at all is selected, is certain to happen. We will call this event the **universal event**, after the name for the corresponding concept in set theory. The special "event" in which no symbol is selected is called the **null event**. The null event cannot happen because an outcome is only defined after a selection is made.

Different events may or may not overlap, in the sense that two or more could happen with the same outcome. A set of events which do not overlap is said to be **mutually exclusive**. For example, the two events that the freshman chosen is (1) from Ohio, or (2) from California, are mutually exclusive.

Several events may have the property that at least one of them happens when any symbol is selected. A set of events, one of which is sure to happen, is known as **exhaustive**. For example, the events that the freshman chosen is (1) younger than 25, or (2) older than 17, are exhaustive, but not mutually exclusive.

A set of events that are both mutually exclusive and exhaustive is known as a **partition**. The partition that consists of all the fundamental events will be called the **fundamental partition**. In our example, the two events of selecting a woman and selecting a man form a partition, and the fundamental events associated with each of the 1001 personal selections form the fundamental partition.

A partition consisting of a small number of events, some of which may correspond to many symbols, is known as a **coarse-grained partition** whereas a partition with many events is a **fine-grained partition**. The fundamental partition is as fine-grained as any other. The partition consisting of the universal event (together with the null event) is as coarse-grained as any.

Although we have described events as though there is always a fundamental partition, in practice this partition need not be used.

## 5.2 Known Outcomes

Once you know an outcome, it is straightforward to denote it. You merely specify which symbol was selected. If the other events are defined in terms of the symbols, you then know which of those events has occurred. However, until the outcome is known you cannot express your state of knowledge in this way. And keep in mind, of course, that your knowledge may be different from another person's knowledge, i.e., knowledge is subjective, or as some might say, "observer-dependent."

Here is a more complicated way of denoting a known outcome, that is useful because it can generalize to the situation where the outcome is not yet known. Let  $i$  be an index running over a partition. Because the number of symbols is finite, we can consider this index running from 0 through  $n - 1$ , where  $n$  is the number of events in the partition. Then for any particular event  $A_i$  in the partition, define  $p(A_i)$  to be either 1 (if the corresponding outcome is selected) or 0 (if not selected). Within any partition, there would be exactly one  $i$  for which  $p(A_i) = 1$  and all the other  $p(A_i)$  would be 0. This same notation can apply to events that are not in a partition—if the event  $A$  happens as a result of the selection, then  $p(A) = 1$  and otherwise  $p(A) = 0$ .

It follows from this definition that  $p(\text{universal event}) = 1$  and  $p(\text{null event}) = 0$ .

## 5.3 Unknown Outcomes

If the symbol has not yet been selected, or you do not yet know the outcome, then each  $p(A)$  can be given a number between 0 and 1, higher numbers representing a greater belief that this event will happen, and lower numbers representing a belief that this event will probably not happen. If you are certain that some event  $A$  is impossible then  $p(A) = 0$ . If and when the outcome is learned, each  $p(A)$  can be adjusted to 0 or 1. Again note that  $p(A)$  depends on your state of knowledge and is therefore subjective.

The ways these numbers should be assigned to best express our knowledge will be developed in later chapters. However, we do require that they obey the fundamental axioms of probability theory, and we will call them probabilities (the set of probabilities that apply to a partition will be called a probability distribution). By definition, for any event  $A$

$$0 \leq p(A) \leq 1 \tag{5.1}$$

In our example, we can then characterize our understanding of the gender of a freshman not yet selected (or not yet known) in terms of the probability  $p(W)$  that the person selected is a woman. Similarly,  $p(CA)$  might denote the probability that the person selected is from California.

To be consistent with probability theory, if some event  $A$  happens only upon the occurrence of any of certain other events  $A_i$  that are mutually exclusive (for example because they are from a partition) then  $p(A)$  is the sum of the various  $p(A_i)$  of those events:

$$p(A) = \sum_i p(A_i) \tag{5.2}$$

where  $i$  is an index over the events in question. This implies that for any partition, since  $p(\text{universal event}) = 1$ ,

$$1 = \sum_i p(A_i) \tag{5.3}$$

where the sum here is over all events in the partition.

## 5.4 Joint Events and Conditional Probabilities

You may be interested in the probability that the symbol chosen has two different properties. For example, what is the probability that the freshman chosen is a woman from Texas? Can we find this,  $p(W, TX)$ , if we

know the probability that the choice is a woman,  $p(W)$ , and the probability that the choice is from Texas,  $p(TX)$ ?

Not in general. It might be that 47% of the freshmen are women, and it might be that (say) 5% of the freshmen are from Texas, but those facts alone do not guarantee that there are any women freshmen from Texas, let alone how many there might be.

However, if it is known or assumed that the two events are independent (the probability of one does not depend on whether the other event occurs), then the probability of the joint event (both happening) can be found. It is the product of the probabilities of the two events. In our example, if the percentage of women among freshmen from Texas is known to be the same as the percentage of women among all freshmen, then

$$p(W, TX) = p(W)p(TX) \quad (5.4)$$

Since it is unusual for two events to be independent, a more general formula for joint events is needed. This formula makes use of “conditional probabilities,” which are probabilities of one event given that another event is known to have happened. In our example, the conditional probability of the selection being a woman, given that the freshman selected is from Texas, is denoted  $p(W | TX)$  where the vertical bar, read “given,” separates the two events—the conditioning event on the right and the conditioned event on the left. If the two events are independent, then the probability of the conditioned event is the same as its normal, or “unconditional” probability.

In terms of conditional probabilities, the probability of a joint event is the probability of one of the events times the probability of the other event given that the first event has happened:

$$\begin{aligned} p(A, B) &= p(B)p(A | B) \\ &= p(A)p(B | A) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Note that either event can be used as the conditioning event, so there are two formulas for this joint probability. Using these formulas you can calculate one of the conditional probabilities from the other, even if you don’t care about the joint probability.

This formula is known as Bayes’ Theorem, after Thomas Bayes, the eighteenth century English mathematician who first articulated it. We will use Bayes’ Theorem frequently. This theorem has remarkable generality. It is true if the two events are physically or logically related, and it is true if they are not. It is true if one event causes the other, and it is true if that is not the case. It is true if the outcome is known, and it is true if the outcome is not known.

Thus the probability  $p(W, TX)$  that the student chosen is a woman from Texas is the probability  $p(TX)$  that a student from Texas is chosen, times the probability  $p(W | TX)$  that a woman is chosen given that the choice is a Texan. It is also the probability  $P(W)$  that a woman is chosen, times the probability  $p(TX | W)$  that someone from Texas is chosen given that the choice is a woman.

$$\begin{aligned} p(W, TX) &= p(TX)p(W | TX) \\ &= p(W)p(TX | W) \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

As another example, consider the table of students above, and assume that one is picked from the entire student population “at random” (meaning with equal probability for all individual students). What is the probability  $p(M, G)$  that the choice is a male graduate student? This is a joint probability, and we can use Bayes’ Theorem if we can discover the necessary conditional probability.

The fundamental partition in this case is the 10,206 fundamental events in which a particular student is chosen. The sum of all these probabilities is 1, and by assumption all are equal, so each probability is  $1/10,206$  or about 0.01%.

The probability that the selection is a graduate student  $p(G)$  is the sum of all the probabilities of the 6,184 fundamental events associated with graduate students, so  $p(G) = 6,184/10,320$ .

Given that the selection is a graduate student, what is the conditional probability that the choice is a man? We now look at the set of graduate students and the selection of one of them. The new fundamental partition is the 6,140 possible choices of a graduate student, and we see from the table above that 4,355 of these are men. The probabilities of this new (conditional) selection can be found as follows. The original choice was “at random” so all students were equally likely to have been selected. In particular, all graduate students were equally likely to have been selected, so the new probabilities will be the same for all 6,140. Since their sum is 1, each probability is  $1/6,140$ . The event of selecting a man is associated with 4,355 of these new fundamental events, so the conditional probability  $p(M | G) = 4,355/6,140$ . Therefore from Bayes’ Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} p(M, G) &= p(G)p(M | G) \\ &= \frac{6,140}{10,206} \times \frac{4,355}{6,140} \\ &= \frac{4,355}{10,206} \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

This problem can be approached the other way around: the probability of choosing a man is  $p(M) = 6,656/10,206$  and the probability of the choice being a graduate student given that it is a man is  $p(G | M) = 4,355/6,656$  so (of course the answer is the same)

$$\begin{aligned} p(M, G) &= p(M)p(G | M) \\ &= \frac{6,656}{10,206} \times \frac{4,355}{6,656} \\ &= \frac{4,355}{10,206} \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

## 5.5 Averages

Suppose we are interested in knowing how tall the freshman selected in our example is. If we know who is selected, we could easily discover his or her height (assuming the height of each freshmen is available in some data base). But what if we have not learned the identity of the person selected? Can we still estimate the height?

At first it is tempting to say we know nothing about the height since we do not know who is selected. But this is clearly not true, since experience indicates that the vast majority of freshmen have heights between 60 inches (5 feet) and 78 inches (6 feet 6 inches), so we might feel safe in estimating the height at, say, 70 inches. At least we would not estimate the height as 82 inches.

With probability we can be more precise and calculate an estimate of the height without knowing the selection. And the formula we use for this calculation will continue to work after we learn the actual selection and adjust the probabilities accordingly.

Suppose we have a partition with events  $A_i$  each of which has some value for an attribute like height, say  $h_i$ . Then the average value (also called the expected value)  $H_{av}$  of this attribute would be found from the probabilities associated with each of these events as

$$H_{av} = \sum_i p(A_i)h_i \tag{5.9}$$

where the sum is over the partition.

This sort of formula can be used to find averages of many properties, such as SAT scores, weight, age, or net wealth. It is not appropriate for properties that are not numerical, such as gender, eye color, personality, or intended scholastic major.

Note that this definition of average covers the case where each event in the partition has a value for the attribute like height. This would be true for the height of freshmen only for the fundamental partition. We would like a similar way of calculating averages for other partitions, for example the partition of men and women. The problem is that not all men have the same height, so it is not clear what to use for  $h_i$  in Equation 5.9.

The solution is to define an average height of men in terms of a finer grained partition such as the fundamental partition. Bayes' Theorem is useful in this regard. Note that the probability that freshman  $i$  is chosen given the choice is known to be a man is

$$p(A_i | M) = \frac{p(A_i)p(M | A_i)}{p(M)} \quad (5.10)$$

where  $p(M | A_i)$  is particularly simple—it is either 1 or 0 depending on whether freshman  $i$  is a man or a woman. Then the average height of male freshmen is

$$H_{av}(M) = \sum_i p(A_i | M)h_i \quad (5.11)$$

and similarly for the women,

$$H_{av}(W) = \sum_i p(A_i | W)h_i \quad (5.12)$$

Then the average height of all freshmen is given by a formula exactly like Equation 5.9:

$$H_{av} = p(M)H_{av}(M) + p(W)H_{av}(W) \quad (5.13)$$

These formulas for averages are valid if all  $p(A_i)$  for the partition in question are equal (e.g., if a freshman is chosen “at random”). But they are more general—they are also valid for any probability distribution  $p(A_i)$ .

The only thing to watch out for is the case where one of the events has probability equal to zero, e.g., if you wanted the average height of freshmen from Nevada and there didn't happen to be any.

## 5.6 Information

We want to express quantitatively the information we have or lack about the choice of symbol. After we learn the outcome, we have no uncertainty about the symbol chosen or about its various properties, and which events might have happened as a result of this selection. However, before the selection is made or at least before we know the outcome, we have some uncertainty. How much?

After we learn the outcome, the information we now possess could be told to another by specifying the symbol chosen. If there are two possible symbols (such as heads or tails of a coin flip) then a single bit could be used for that purpose. If there are four possible events (such as the suit of a card drawn from a deck) the outcome can be expressed in two bits. More generally, if there are  $n$  possible outcomes then  $\log_2 n$  bits are needed.

The notion here is that the amount of information we learn upon hearing the outcome is the minimum number of bits that could have been used to tell us, i.e., to specify the symbol. This approach has some merit but has two defects.

First, an actual specification of one symbol by means of a sequence of bits requires an integral number of bits. What if the number of symbols is not an integral power of two? For a single selection, there may not be much that can be done, but if the source makes repeated selections and these are all to be specified, they can be grouped together to recover the fractional bits. For example if there are five possible symbols, then three bits would be needed for a single symbol, but the 25 possible combinations of two symbols could be communicated with five bits (2.5 bits per symbol), and the 125 combinations of three symbols could get by with seven bits (2.33 bits per symbol). This is not far from  $\log_2(5)$  which is 2.32 bits.

Second, different events may have different likelihoods of being selected. We have seen how to model our state of knowledge in terms of probabilities. If we already know the result (one  $p(A_i)$  equals 1 and all others equal 0), then no further information is gained because there was no uncertainty before. Our definition of information should cover that case.

Consider a class of 32 students, of whom two are women and 30 are men. If one student is chosen and our objective is to know which one, our uncertainty is initially five bits, since that is what would be necessary to specify the outcome. If a student is chosen at random, the probability of each being chosen is  $1/32$ . The choice of student also leads to a gender event, either “woman chosen” with probability  $p(W) = 2/32$  or “man chosen” with probability  $p(M) = 30/32$ .

How much information do we gain if we are told that the choice is a woman but not told which one? Our uncertainty is reduced from five bits to one bit (the amount necessary to specify which of the two women it was). Therefore the information we have gained is four bits. What if we are told that the choice is a man but not which one? Our uncertainty is reduced from five bits to  $\log_2(30)$  or 4.91 bits. Thus we have learned 0.09 bits of information.

The point here is that if we have a partition whose events have different probabilities, we learn different amounts from different outcomes. If the outcome was likely we learn less than if the outcome was unlikely. We illustrated this principle in a case where each outcome left unresolved the selection of an event from an underlying, fundamental partition, but the principle applies even if we don’t care about the fundamental partition. The information learned from outcome  $i$  is  $\log_2(1/p(A_i))$ . Note from this formula that if  $p(A_i) = 1$  for some  $i$ , then the information learned from that outcome is 0 since  $\log_2(1) = 0$ . This is consistent with what we would expect.

If we want to quantify our uncertainty before learning an outcome, we cannot use any of the information gained by specific outcomes, because we would not know which to use. Instead, we have to average over all possible outcomes, i.e., over all events in the partition with nonzero probability. The average information per event is found by multiplying the information for each event  $A_i$  by  $p(A_i)$  and summing over the partition:

$$I = \sum_i p(A_i) \log_2 \left( \frac{1}{p(A_i)} \right) \quad (5.14)$$

This quantity, which is of fundamental importance for characterizing the information of sources, is called the **entropy** of a source. The formula works if the probabilities are all equal and it works if they are not; it works after the outcome is known and the probabilities adjusted so that one of them is 1 and all the others 0; it works whether the events being reported are from a fundamental partition or not.

In this and other formulas for information, care must be taken with events that have zero probability. These cases can be treated as though they have a very small but nonzero probability. In this case the logarithm, although it approaches infinity for an argument approaching infinity, does so very slowly. The product of that factor times the probability approaches zero, so such terms can be directly set to zero even though the formula might suggest an indeterminate result, or a calculating procedure have a “divide by zero” error.

## 5.7 Properties of Information

It is convenient to think of physical quantities as having dimensions. For example, the dimensions of velocity are length over time, and so velocity is expressed in meters per second. In a similar way it is convenient to think of information as a physical quantity with dimensions. Perhaps this is a little less natural, because probabilities are inherently dimensionless. However, note that the formula uses logarithms to the base 2. The choice of base amounts to a scale factor for information. In principle any base could be used, and related to our definition by the identity

$$\log_k(x) = \frac{\log_2(x)}{\log_2(k)} \quad (5.15)$$



With base-2 logarithms the information is expressed in bits. Later, we will find natural logarithms to be useful.

If there are two events in the partition with probabilities  $p$  and  $(1 - p)$ , the information per symbol is

$$I = p \log_2 \left( \frac{1}{p} \right) + (1 - p) \log_2 \left( \frac{1}{1 - p} \right) \quad (5.16)$$

which is shown, as a function of  $p$ , in Figure 5.3. It is largest (1 bit) for  $p = 0.5$ . Thus the information is a maximum when the probabilities of the two possible events are equal. Furthermore, for the entire range of probabilities between  $p = 0.4$  and  $p = 0.6$  the information is close to 1 bit. It is equal to 0 for  $p = 0$  and for  $p = 1$ . This is reasonable because for such values of  $p$  the outcome is certain, so no information is gained by learning it.

For partitions with more than two possible events the information per symbol can be higher. If there are  $n$  possible events the information per symbol lies between 0 and  $\log_2(n)$  bits, the maximum value being achieved when all probabilities are equal.




Figure 5.3: Entropy of a source with two symbols as a function of  $p$ , one of the two probabilities

## 5.8 Efficient Source Coding

If a source has  $n$  possible symbols then a fixed-length code for it would require  $\log_2(n)$  (or the next higher integer) bits per symbol. The average information per symbol  $I$  cannot be larger than this but might be smaller, if the symbols have different probabilities. Is it possible to encode a stream of symbols from such a source with fewer bits on average, by using a variable-length code with fewer bits for the more probable symbols and more bits for the less probable symbols?

---

Certainly. Morse Code is an example of a variable length code which does this quite effectively. There is a general procedure for constructing codes of this sort which are very efficient (in fact, they require an average of less than  $I + 1$  bits per symbol, even if  $I$  is considerably below  $\log_2(n)$ ). The codes are called Huffman codes after MIT graduate David Huffman (1925 - 1999), and they are widely used in communication systems. See Section [5.10](#).

## 5.9 Detail: Life Insurance

An example of statistics and probability in everyday life is their use in life insurance. We consider here only one-year term insurance (insurance companies are very creative in marketing more complex policies that combine aspects of insurance, savings, investment, retirement income, and tax minimization).

When you take out a life insurance policy, you pay a premium of so many dollars and, if you die during the year, your beneficiaries are paid a much larger amount. Life insurance can be thought of in many ways.

From a gambler's perspective, you are betting that you will die and the insurance company is betting that you will live. Each of you can estimate the probability that you will die, and because probabilities are subjective, they may differ enough to make such a bet seem favorable to both parties (for example, suppose you know about a threatening medical situation and do not disclose it to the insurance company). Insurance companies use mortality tables such as Table 5.2 (shown also in Figure 5.4) for setting their rates. (Interestingly, insurance companies also sell annuities, which from a gambler's perspective are bets the other way around—the company is betting that you will die soon, and you are betting that you will live a long time.)

Another way of thinking about life insurance is as a financial investment. Since insurance companies on average pay out less than they collect (otherwise they would go bankrupt), investors would normally do better investing their money in another way, for example by putting in in a bank.

Most people who buy life insurance, of course, do not regard it as either a bet or an investment, but rather as a safety net. They know that if they die, their income will cease and they want to provide a partial replacement for their dependents, usually children and spouses. The premium is small because the probability of death is low during the years when such a safety net is important, but the benefit in the unlikely case of death may be very important to the beneficiaries. Such a safety net may not be necessary for very rich people (who can afford the loss of income), single people without dependents, or older people whose children have grown up.

Figure 5.4 and Table 5.2 show the probability of death during one year, as a function of age, for the cohort of U. S. residents born in 1988 (data from The Berkeley Mortality Database<sup>2</sup>).




Figure 5.4: Probability of death during one year for U. S. residents born in 1988.

<sup>2</sup>The Berkeley Mortality Database can be accessed online: <http://www.demog.berkeley.edu/bmd/states.html>

Age	Female	Male	Age	Female	Male	Age	Female	Male
0	0.008969	0.011126	40	0.000945	0.002205	80	0.035107	0.055995
1	0.000727	0.000809	41	0.001007	0.002305	81	0.038323	0.061479
2	0.000384	0.000526	42	0.00107	0.002395	82	0.041973	0.067728
3	0.000323	0.000415	43	0.001144	0.002465	83	0.046087	0.074872
4	0.000222	0.000304	44	0.001238	0.002524	84	0.050745	0.082817
5	0.000212	0.000274	45	0.001343	0.002605	85	0.056048	0.091428
6	0.000182	0.000253	46	0.001469	0.002709	86	0.062068	0.100533
7	0.000162	0.000233	47	0.001616	0.002856	87	0.06888	0.110117
8	0.000172	0.000213	48	0.001785	0.003047	88	0.076551	0.120177
9	0.000152	0.000162	49	0.001975	0.003295	89	0.085096	0.130677
10	0.000142	0.000132	50	0.002198	0.003566	90	0.094583	0.141746
11	0.000142	0.000132	51	0.002454	0.003895	91	0.105042	0.153466
12	0.000162	0.000203	52	0.002743	0.004239	92	0.116464	0.165847
13	0.000202	0.000355	53	0.003055	0.00463	93	0.128961	0.179017
14	0.000263	0.000559	54	0.003402	0.00505	94	0.142521	0.193042
15	0.000324	0.000793	55	0.003795	0.005553	95	0.156269	0.207063
16	0.000395	0.001007	56	0.004245	0.006132	96	0.169964	0.221088
17	0.000426	0.001161	57	0.004701	0.006733	97	0.183378	0.234885
18	0.000436	0.001254	58	0.005153	0.007357	98	0.196114	0.248308
19	0.000426	0.001276	59	0.005644	0.008028	99	0.208034	0.261145
20	0.000406	0.001288	60	0.006133	0.008728	100	0.220629	0.274626
21	0.000386	0.00131	61	0.006706	0.009549	101	0.234167	0.289075
22	0.000386	0.001312	62	0.007479	0.010629	102	0.248567	0.304011
23	0.000396	0.001293	63	0.008491	0.012065	103	0.263996	0.319538
24	0.000417	0.001274	64	0.009686	0.013769	104	0.280461	0.337802
25	0.000447	0.001245	65	0.011028	0.015702	105	0.298313	0.354839
26	0.000468	0.001226	66	0.012368	0.017649	106	0.317585	0.375342
27	0.000488	0.001237	67	0.013559	0.019403	107	0.337284	0.395161
28	0.000519	0.001301	68	0.014525	0.020813	108	0.359638	0.420732
29	0.00055	0.001406	69	0.015363	0.022053	109	0.383459	0.439252
30	0.000581	0.001532	70	0.016237	0.023393	110	0.408964	0.455882
31	0.000612	0.001649	71	0.017299	0.025054	111	0.437768	0.47619
32	0.000643	0.001735	72	0.018526	0.027029	112	0.466216	0.52
33	0.000674	0.00179	73	0.019972	0.029387	113	0.494505	0.571429
34	0.000705	0.001824	74	0.02163	0.032149	114	0.537037	0.625
35	0.000747	0.001859	75	0.023551	0.035267	115	0.580645	0.75
36	0.000788	0.001904	76	0.02564	0.038735	116	0.588235	1
37	0.00083	0.001961	77	0.027809	0.042502	117	0.666667	1
38	0.000861	0.002028	78	0.030011	0.046592	118	0.75	0
39	0.000903	0.002105	79	0.032378	0.051093	119	0.5	0

Table 5.2: Mortality table for U. S. residents born in 1988

## 5.10 Detail: Efficient Source Code

Sometimes source coding and compression for communication systems of the sort shown in Figure 5.1 are done together (it is an open question whether there are practical benefits to combining source and channel coding). For sources with a finite number of symbols, but with unequal probabilities of appearing in the input stream, there is an elegant, simple technique for source coding with minimum redundancy.

### Example of a Finite Source

Consider a source which generates symbols which are MIT letter grades, with possible values A, B, C, D, and F. You are asked to design a system which can transmit a stream of such grades, produced at the rate of one symbol per second, over a communications channel that can only carry two boolean digits, each 0 or 1, per second.<sup>3</sup>

First, assume nothing about the grade distribution. To transmit each symbol separately, you must encode each as a sequence of bits (boolean digits). Using 7-bit ASCII code is wasteful; we have only five symbols, and ASCII can handle 128. Since there are only five possible values, the grades can be coded in three bits per symbol. But the channel can only process two bits per second.

However, three bits is more than needed. The entropy, assuming there is no information about the probabilities, is at most  $\log_2(5) = 2.32$  bits. This is also  $\sum_i p(A_i) \log_2(1/p(A_i))$  where there are five such  $p_i$ , each equal to  $1/5$ . Why did we need three bits in the first case? Because we had no way of transmitting a partial bit. To do better, we can use “block coding.” We group the symbols in blocks of, say, three. The information in each block is three times the information per symbol, or 6.97 bits. Thus a block can be transmitted using 7 boolean bits (there are 125 distinct sequences of three grades and 128 possible patterns available in 7 bits). Of course we also need a way of signifying the end, and a way of saying that the final word transmitted has only one valid grade (or two), not three.

But this is still too many bits per second for the channel to handle. So let’s look at the probability distribution of the symbols. In a typical “B-centered” MIT course with good students, the grade distribution might be as shown in Table 5.3. Assuming this as a probability distribution, what is the information per symbol and what is the average information per symbol? This calculation is shown in Table 5.4. The information per symbol is 1.840 bits. Since this is less than two bits perhaps the symbols can be encoded to use this channel.

A	B	C	D	F
25%	50%	12.5%	10%	2.5%

Table 5.3: Distribution of grades for a typical MIT course

Symbol	Probability	Information	Contribution to average
	$p$	$\log\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)$	$p \log\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)$
A	0.25	2 bits	0.5 bits
B	0.50	1 bit	0.5 bits
C	0.125	3 bits	0.375 bits
D	0.10	3.32 bits	0.332 bits
F	0.025	5.32 bits	0.133 bits
Total	1.00		1.840 bits

Table 5.4: Information distribution for grades in an average MIT distribution

<sup>3</sup>Boolean digits, or binary digits, are usually called “bits.” The word “bit” also refers to a unit of information. When a boolean digit carries exactly one bit of information there may be no confusion. But inefficient codes or redundant codes may have boolean digit sequences that are longer than the minimum and therefore carry less than one bit of information per bit. This same confusion attends other units of measure, for example meter, second, etc.

## Huffman Code

David A. Huffman (August 9, 1925 - October 6, 1999) was a graduate student at MIT. To solve a homework assignment for a course he was taking from Prof. Robert M. Fano, he devised a way of encoding symbols with different probabilities, with minimum redundancy and without special symbol frames, and hence most compactly. He described it in *Proceedings of the IRE*, September 1962. His algorithm is very simple. The objective is to come up with a “codebook” (a string of bits for each symbol) so that the average code length is minimized. Presumably infrequent symbols would get long codes, and common symbols short codes, just like in Morse code. The algorithm is as follows (you can follow along by referring to Table 5.5):

1. **Initialize:** Let the partial code for each symbol initially be the empty bit string. Define corresponding to each symbol a “symbol-set,” with just that one symbol in it, and a probability equal to the probability of that symbol.
2. **Loop-test:** If there is exactly one symbol-set (its probability must be 1) you are done. The codebook consists of the codes associated with each of the symbols in that symbol-set.
3. **Loop-action:** If there are two or more symbol-sets, take the two with the lowest probabilities (in case of a tie, any choice is OK). Prepend the codes for those in one symbol-set with 0, and the other with 1. Define a new symbol-set which is the union of the two symbol-sets just processed, with probability equal to the sum of the two probabilities. Replace the two symbol-sets with the new one. The number of symbol-sets is thereby reduced by one. Repeat this loop, including the loop test, until only one symbol-set remains.

Note that this procedure generally produces a variable-length code. If there are  $n$  distinct symbols, at least two of them have codes with the maximum length.

For our example, we start out with five symbol-sets, and reduce the number of symbol-sets by one each step, until we are left with just one. The steps are shown in Table 5.5, and the final codebook in Table 5.6.

Start: (A='-' p=0.25) (B='-' p=0.5) (C='-' p=0.125) (D='-' p=0.1) (F='-' p=0.025)  
 Next: (A='-' p=0.25) (B='-' p=0.5) (C='-' p=0.125) (D='1' F='0' p=0.125)  
 Next: (A='-' p=0.25) (B='-' p=0.5) (C='1' D='01' F='00' p=0.25)  
 Next: (B='-' p=0.5) (A='1' C='01' D='001' F='000' p=0.5)  
 Final: (B='1' A='01' C='001' D='0001' F='0000' p=1.0)

Table 5.5: Huffman coding for MIT course grade distribution, where ‘-’ denotes the empty bit string

Symbol	Code
A	0 1
B	1
C	0 0 1
D	0 0 0 1
F	0 0 0 0

Table 5.6: Huffman Codebook for typical MIT grade distribution

Is this code really compact? The most frequent symbol (B) is given the shortest code and the least frequent symbols (D and F) the longest codes, so on average the number of bits needed for an input stream which obeys the assumed probability distribution is indeed short, as shown in Table 5.7.

Compare this table with the earlier table of information content, Table 5.4. Note that the average coded length per symbol, 1.875 bits, is greater than the information per symbol, which is 1.840 bits. This is because the symbols D and F cannot be encoded in fractional bits. If a block of several symbols were considered

Symbol	Code	Probability	Code length	Contribution to average
A	01	0.25	2	0.5
B	1	0.50	1	0.5
C	001	0.125	3	0.375
D	0001	0.1	3.32	0.4
F	0000	0.025	5.32	0.1
Total		1.00		1.875 bits

Table 5.7: Huffman coding of typical MIT grade distribution

together, the average length of the Huffman code could be closer to the actual information per symbol, but not below it.

The channel can handle two bits per second. By using this code, you can transmit over the channel slightly more than one symbol per second on average. You can achieve your design objective.

There are at least six practical things to consider about Huffman codes:

- A burst of D or F grades might occur. It is necessary for the encoder to store these bits until the channel can catch up. How big a buffer is needed for storage? What will happen if the buffer overflows?
- The output may be delayed because of a buffer backup. The time between an input and the associated output is called the “latency.” For interactive systems you want to keep latency low. The number of bits processed per second, the “throughput,” is more important in other applications that are not interactive.
- The output will not occur at regularly spaced intervals, because of delays caused by bursts. In some real-time applications like audio, this may be important.
- What if we are wrong in our presumed probability distributions? One large course might give fewer A and B grades and more C and D. Our coding would be inefficient, and there might be buffer overflow.
- The decoder needs to know how to break the stream of bits into individual codes. The rule in this case is, break after ‘1’ or after ‘0000’, whichever comes first. However, there are many possible Huffman codes, corresponding to different choices for 0 and 1 prepending in step 3 of the algorithm above. Most do not have such simple rules. It can be hard (although it is always possible) to know where the inter-symbol breaks should be put.
- The codebook itself must be given, in advance, to both the encoder and decoder. Generally this is done by transmitting the codebook over the channel once.

### Another Example

Freshmen at MIT are on a “pass/no-record” system during their first semester on campus. Grades of A, B, and C are reported on transcripts as P (pass), and D and F are not reported (for our purposes we will designate this as no-record, N). Let’s design a system to send these P and N symbols to a printer at the fastest average rate. Without considering probabilities, 1 bit per symbol is needed. But the probabilities (assuming the typical MIT grade distribution in Table 5.3) are  $p(P) = p(A) + p(B) + p(C) = 0.875$ , and  $p(N) = p(D) + p(F) = 0.125$ . The information per symbol is therefore not 1 bit but only 0.544 bits. Huffman coding on single symbols does not help. We need to take groups of bits together. For example eleven grades as a block would have 5.98 bits of information and could in principle be encoded to require only 6 bits to be sent to the printer.