Constructive approximations of the $q = 1/2$ MaxEnt distribution from redundant and noisy data

L.Rebollo-Neira

NCRG, Aston University

Birmingham B4 7ET, United Kingdom

A. Plastino

Instituto de Física La Plata (IFLP)

Universidad Nacional de La Plata and CONICET*

C.C. 727, 1900 La Plata, Argentina

arXiv:math-ph/0405017v1 7 May 2004

Abstract

The problem of constructing the $q = 1/2$ non-extensive maximum entropy distributions from redundant and noisy data is considered. A strategy is proposed, which evolves through the following steps: i)independent constraints are first pre-selected by recourse to a data-independent technique to be discussed here. ii)the data are a posteriori used to determine the parameters of the distribution by a previously introduced forward approach. iii) A backward approach is proposed for reducing the parameters of such distribution. The previously introduced forward approach is generalised here in order to make it suitable for dealing with very noisy data.

PACS: 05.20.-y, 02.50.Tt, 02.30.Zz, 07.05.Kf

---

*Argentina's National Research Council

I. INTRODUCTION

Among the generalised non-extensive MaxEnt distributions, which are defined in terms of a parameter q [1–3] the corresponding to the value $q = 1/2$ has played a particular role in diverse contexts [4–9].

In this paper we focus on developing strategies for constructing the $q = 1/2$ distribution which is involved in a very special type of inverse problem: the problem of constructing such a distribution on the basis of redundant and noisy data (by noise we mean errors resulting from the random process associated to the experimental measurement procedure).

It is appropriate to start by discussing why we shall restrict consideration to the particular value $q = 1/2$.

The problem of determining a p^q probability distribution maximising the entropy

$$S_q = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} p_n^q - \sum_{n=1}^{N} p_n}{1 - q}$$

with constraints

$$f_i^o = \sum_{n=1}^{N} p_n^q f_{i,n} \quad ; \quad i = 1, \ldots, M$$

$$1 = \sum_{n=1}^{N} p_n^q$$

has been shown in [6] to be numerically equivalent to determining the probability distribution $\tilde{p}$ minimising

$$||\tilde{p}||_{\frac{1}{q}}^{\frac{1}{q}} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tilde{p}_n^{1/q}$$

with constrains

$$f_i^o = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tilde{p}_n f_{i,n} \quad ; \quad i = 1, \ldots, M.$$

$$1 = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tilde{p}_n.$$

Since $\tilde{p}_n > 0$ it is true that $||\tilde{p}||_{\frac{1}{q}}$ is the $\frac{1}{q}$-norm of $\tilde{p}$. Thus, the problem of choosing the parameter q is equivalent to deciding which norm one wants to minimise as preserving the 1-norm of the distribution. In order to analyse the situation further let us joint all constrains together by defining a $(M+1) \times N$ matrix $\tilde{A}$ of elements $\tilde{A}_{i,n} = f_{i,n}$; ; $i = 1, \ldots, M$; ; $n = 1, \ldots, N$ and $\tilde{A}_{M+1,n} = 1$; $n = 1, \ldots, N$.

Hence, the constraints are expressed in the form

$$f^o = \widetilde{A}p,$$

where f^o is a vector of $(M+1)$ components $f_1^o, \ldots, f_M^o, 1$. It is well know from linear algebra that the general solution to this under-determined linear system can be expressed as

$$\tilde{p} = \widetilde{A'}^{-1} f^o + p'$$

where $\widetilde{A'}^{-1}$ is the pseudo inverse of $\widetilde{A}$, and p' a vector in the null space of matrix $\widetilde{A}$. Consequently, the problem of deciding on the q-parameter is tantaumont to just choosing a vector p' in the null space of $\widetilde{A}$. In particular, the choice $q = 1/2$ (which as already discussed is equivalent to minimising the 2-norm of the $\tilde{p}$ distribution) implies to set $p' = 0$. This follows from the fact that, since vector $\widetilde{A}^{-1} f^o$ and vector p' are orthogonal with each other one has

$$||\tilde{p}||_2^2 = ||\widetilde{A}^{-1} f^o||_2^2 + ||p'||_2^2.$$

Hence, by setting $p' = 0$ the solution of minimum 2-norm is obtained. For a number of reasons, that we spell out below, we believe that this leads to the most suitable choice for the parameter q in relation to our problem. Indeed,

- The under-determined problem we have to solve is of the following especial nature: We have less independent equation than unknowns, but there is a large number of redundant equations and a number of irrelevant ones [7]. If the data were noiseless, the role of such equations would be simply to verify the ability of the distribution to make correct predictions. Since the data are noisy we use all the equations with the purpose of reducing the effect of the noise, but not as independent constraints (in most cases the number of Lagrange multiplies is much less that the actual number of available constraints). Our task is to identify a subset of such independent constraints. The predictive power of our solution is assessed a posteriori by its capability of predicting the denoised data.

- The constraints typically represent measurements obtained as a function of some variable parameters: Intensity vs. diffraction angle, magnetisation vs. magnetic field etc. [12,13]. It is then natural to represent such measurements as linear functionals on the identical vector. Each linear functional provides a projection on the particular parameter value which is specified by

the measurement instrument state [12]. It is clear then that in the space of the data it is appropriate to define a distance through the norm induced by the inner product. In our formalism both the space of the data and the space of the system are assumed to be Hilbert spaces. The only $1/q$-norm induced by a Hilbert space is the one corresponding to $q = 1/2$.

- As mentioned above, to choose a value of q other than $q = 1/2$ would imply to let the corresponding distribution have a component in the null space of the transformation generated by the constraints. In the type of problem described in the previous item such a null space is of a 'chaotic' nature (in the sense that arbitrarily small numerical perturbation on any of the elements of matrix $\widetilde{A}$ would produce and enormous distortion in the solution). We certainly wish to avoid this.

Unfortunately, in our context deciding on the appropriate q-value of the distribution we wish to construct does not solve the problem of its optimal construction. While it is true that the problem of determining the $q = 1/2$ distribution from a fixed set of constraints is a simple linear problem [5], the problem becomes highly non linear when this distribution is to be determined optimally from a subset of constraints which are taken out of a much larger set of possible ones.

Consider that from a set of M constraints we want to select a subset of k ones and associate a parameter (Lagrange multipliers) to each equation. Let us indicate as $p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}$ the distribution associated to the corresponding k equations. Hence the problems we have to face are the following a) the selection of the optimal k constraints b) the estimation of the corresponding k parameters determining the distribution. In order to address these problems let us specify the meaning of 'optimal selection' in our context: *we say that a selection is optimal if it yields a distribution capable of satisfactorily predicting all the available data involving the minimum number of parameters.* Unfortunately the search for such an optimal selection is not in general possible, as it poses a NP-hard problem, i.e., unreachable in polynomial time with classical computers [10,11]. Hence we are forced to ascertain suitable suboptimal strategies, which also poses an open problem because there is not a unique way of constructing suboptimal solutions.

In some recent publications we have introduced a suboptimal iterative strategy, which is only optimal at each iteration step [7,8]. Such an approach is a forward data dependent approach for subset selection. At each iteration the indices obtained in the previous steps are fixed, and a new

index is chosen in such a way that the distance between the observed data and the ones predicted by the physical model is minimised. Since the selection is only optimal at each step, the selected set of indices is, of course, not optimal in the above specified sense. Some indices that are relevant at a particular step may become much less relevant at the end of the process. It is then natural to try and eliminate the parameters corresponding to such indices. Again, the process of reducing parameters in an optimal way is in general an NP-problem and we need to address it by suboptimal strategies. Here we propose a strategy for reducing parameters that we call backward selection. This new approach provides both the criterion for selecting the parameters to be deleted and the technique for properly modifying the ones to be retained. An approach for selecting independent constraints in the absence of data will also be advanced here, with the aim of designing a new suboptimal strategy consisting of the following steps:

i)Before the experiment is carried out we select a subset of indices corresponding to independent constrains.

ii)The forward selection approach proposed in [8] is then applied for selecting indices, from the pre-selected set, in order to construct the distribution when the data are available.

iii)Finally the backward selection approach is applied in order to reduce further the number of parameter of the distribution. Such backward selection is made possible in a fast an efficient way by means of a backward adaptive biorthogonalization technique.

Before advancing the above described new strategy we would like to discuss how is possible to adapt the strategy of [8] so as to make it suitable when dealing with very noisy data. This is achieved by introducing a vectorial space with inner product defined with respect to a measure depending on the experimental data, or their corresponding statistics.

The paper is organised as follows: The generalisation of the previous approach, to turn it suitable when dealing with very noisy data, is introduced in section II. Section III discusses the criteria for selecting relevant constraints. First the selection criterion proposed in [7] is generalised and a numerical experiment is presented in order to illustrate the advantage of such a generalisation. We then discuss a new data independent selection criterion. In section IV we introduce a backward procedure for eliminating constraints and, consequently, for properly adapting the concomitant parameters of the distribution. Sections III and IV provide the foundations of a new strategy that we illustrate by a numerical example in Section IV. The conclusions are drawn in section V.

II. GENERALISING THE PREVIOUS APPROACH

Let us assume that we are given M pieces of data $f_1^o, f_2^o, \ldots, f_i^o, \ldots f_M^o$, each of which is the expectation value of a random variable that takes values $f_{i,n}$; $n = 1, \ldots, N$ according to the $q = 1/2$ probability distribution $p_n^{\frac{1}{2}}$; $n = 1, \ldots, N$ [7,8] i.e.,

$$f_i^o = \sum_{n=1}^{N} p_n^{\frac{1}{2}} f_{i,n} \quad ; \quad i = 1, \ldots, M. \tag{1}$$

The data $f_1^o, f_2^o, \ldots, f_i^o, \ldots f_M^o$ will be represented as components of a vector $|f^o\rangle_\mu$ in a vector space, say $\mathcal{D}^M$. A central aim of this contribution is to allow for the possibility of assigning a different weight to each data. Accordingly, the inner product in $\mathcal{D}^M$, that we indicate as $_\mu\langle .|.\rangle_\mu$, is defined with respect to a measure $\mu(m)$ as follows: For every f and g in $\mathcal{D}^M$

$$_\mu\langle f|g\rangle_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \overline{f}_i \, g_i \, \mu_i \tag{2}$$

where $\overline{f}_i$ indicates the complex conjugate of f. In the present situation we deal with real vectors, thereby, $\overline{f}_i \equiv f_i$. The data space, with the corresponding associated measure, will be denoted as $\mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$ and the standard orthogonal basis in $\mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$ will be represented by vectors $|i\rangle_\mu$; $i = 1, \ldots, M$. The identity operator in $\mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$ is thus expressed as:

$$\hat{I}_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{M} |i\rangle_\mu \, \mu_i \, _\mu\langle i|, \tag{3}$$

with vectors $|i\rangle_\mu; i = 1, \ldots, M$ satisfying the relations

$$\mu_i \, _\mu\langle i|j\rangle_\mu = \delta_{i,j} \quad (\text{or } 0 \text{ if } \mu_i = 0). \tag{4}$$

Accordingly, vector $|f^o\rangle_\mu$ is expressed

$$|f^o\rangle_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{M} |i\rangle_\mu \, \mu_i \, _\mu\langle i|f^o\rangle_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mu_i \, f_i^o |i\rangle_\mu. \tag{5}$$

The measure μ, rendering a weighted distance between two vectors in $\mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$, will be chosen in relation to the observed data. For example, if the variances of the data are known and we denote by σ_i^2 the variance of data f_i^o, the choice $\mu_i = \sigma_i^{-2}$, gives rise to the square distance between $|f^o\rangle_\mu$ and $|g\rangle_\mu \in \mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$ as given by:

$$|||f^o\rangle_\mu - |g\rangle_\mu||^2 = \, _\mu\langle f^o - g|f^o - g\rangle_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{M} (f_i^o - g_i)^2 \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}. \tag{6}$$

The above distance is known to be optimal, in a maximum likelihood sense, if the data errors are Gaussian distributed [14].

The space of the physical system is considered to be the Euclidean N-dimensional real space $\mathcal{R}^N$. The standard orthogonal basis in $\mathcal{R}^N$ will be indicated by vectors $|n\rangle$; $n = 1, \ldots, N$, so that every vector $|r\rangle \in \mathcal{R}^N$ is represented as:

$$|r\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \langle n|r\rangle |n\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} r_n |n\rangle. \tag{7}$$

For any two vectors $|v\rangle$ and $|r\rangle$ in $\mathcal{R}^N$ the inner product is defined as:

$$\langle v|r\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \langle v|n\rangle \langle n|r\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} v_n r_n. \tag{8}$$

Using the adopted vector notation, equations (1) are recast:

$$|f^o\rangle_\mu = \hat{A}_\mu |p^{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle \tag{9}$$

with

$$|p^{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} |n\rangle \langle n|p^{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} p_n^{\frac{1}{2}} |n\rangle \tag{10}$$

and operator $\hat{A}_\mu : \mathcal{R}^N \to \mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$ given by

$$\hat{A}_\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{N} |f_n\rangle_\mu \langle n|. \tag{11}$$

Vectors $|f_n\rangle_\mu \in \mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$ are defined in such a way that $_\mu\langle i|f_n\rangle_\mu = f_{i,n}$, i.e.,

$$|f_n\rangle_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{M} |i\rangle_\mu \mu_{i\mu} \langle i|f_n\rangle_\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \mu_i f_{i,n} |i\rangle_\mu. \tag{12}$$

In the line of [7], in order to determine the MaxEnt $|p^{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle$ distribution we consider as constraint of the optimisation precess a subset of k equations (1) labelled by indices l_j ; $j = 1, \ldots, k$. This leads to the following expression for the distribution:

$$|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}\rangle = \left(\frac{1}{N} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{k} {}_\mu\langle g|l_j\rangle_\mu \,\, {}_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu\right) \sum_{n=1}^{N} |n\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \hat{A}_\mu^\dagger |l_j\rangle_\mu \,\, {}_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu. \tag{13}$$

with

$$|g\rangle_\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{N} |f_n\rangle_\mu \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{N} \hat{A}_\mu |n\rangle. \tag{14}$$

The superscript k in $|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}\rangle$ given above indicates that the distribution is built out of k constraints. The Lagrange multiplier vector $|\lambda^{(k)}\rangle$ is determined by the requirement that $|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}\rangle$ predicts a complete data vector $|f^p\rangle_\mu = \hat{A}_\mu|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}\rangle \in \mathcal{D}^M(\mu)$ minimising the distance to the observed vector $|f^o\rangle_\mu$. This is actually the prescription given in [7]. Nevertheless, the fact that here the distance is defined with respect to a measure, which we propose to be dependent on the experimental data, implies that the formalism of [7] needs to be adapted to this requirement. In subsequent sections we discuss how this can be achieved in an straightforward manner by means of a recursive biorthogonalization technique for computing the Lagrange multipliers which determine $|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}\rangle$.

A. Determination of Lagrange multipliers

In order to estimate the Lagrange multipliers determining (13) we minimise the distance between the prediction through the physical model and observed data. As discussed in [7,8] this entails to determine the Lagrange multipliers as

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} |\alpha_{l_j}\rangle_\mu {}_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^{(k)}\rangle_\mu = \hat{F}_k|\lambda^{(k)}\rangle_\mu = \hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu, \tag{15}$$

where we have denoted: $\hat{F}_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k} |\alpha_{l_j}\rangle_\mu\langle l_j|$, with

$$|\alpha_{l_j}\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} |f_n\rangle_\mu {}_\mu\langle f_n|l_j\rangle - \frac{1}{N}|g\rangle_\mu {}_\mu\langle g|l_j\rangle. \tag{16}$$

Vector $|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu$ is obtained from the data vector as $|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu = |f^o\rangle_\mu - \frac{|g\rangle_\mu}{N}$ and $\hat{P}_{V_k}$ is the orthogonal projector onto the subspace spanned by $|\alpha_{l_j}\rangle_\mu$; $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Here we wish this projector to account for the different weights of the data. This will be achieved by recurse to a biorthogonalization technique [15] which, as applied in this context, produces biorthogonal vectors dependent on the weight assigned to each data.

Given a set of vectors $|\alpha_{l_n}\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, M$ we set $|\psi_{l_1}\rangle_\mu = |\alpha_1\rangle_\mu$ and inductively define vectors $|\tilde{\psi}_{k+1}\rangle_\mu$ as

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{k+1}\rangle_\mu = \frac{|\psi_{k+1}\rangle_\mu}{|||\psi_{k+1}\rangle_\mu||^2} \tag{17}$$

with

$$|\psi_{k+1}\rangle_\mu = |\alpha_{l_{k+1}}\rangle_\mu - \hat{P}_{V_k}|\alpha_{l_{k+1}}\rangle_\mu. \tag{18}$$

8

The dual vectors $_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k+1}|$; $n = 1, \ldots, k+1$ which are obtained from the recursive equations

$$_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k+1}| = {_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k}|} - {_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k}|\alpha_{l_{k+1}}\rangle_\mu}{_\mu\langle\tilde{\tilde{\psi}}_{k+1}|} \quad ; \quad n = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_{k+1}}^{k+1}| = \frac{_\mu\langle\psi_{k+1}|}{_\mu\langle\psi_{k+1}|\alpha_{l_{k+1}}\rangle_\mu} = \frac{_\mu\langle\psi_{k+1}|}{_\mu\langle\psi_{k+1}|\psi_{k+1}\rangle_\mu} = {_\mu\langle\tilde{\tilde{\psi}}_{k+1}|}, \tag{19}$$

satisfy the following properties

- a) are biorthogonal with respect to vectors $|\alpha_{l_n}\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, k+1$, i.e.,

$$_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k+1}|\alpha_{l_m}\rangle_\mu = \delta_{l_m, l_n} \quad ; \quad n = 1, \ldots, k+1 \ ; \ m = 1, \ldots, k+1 \tag{20}$$

- b) provide a representation of the orthogonal projection operator onto V_{k+1} as given by:

$$\hat{P}_{V_{k+1}} = \sum_{n=1}^{k+1} |\alpha_{l_n}\rangle_{\mu\mu}\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k+1}| = \hat{P}_{V_{k+1}}^\dagger = \sum_{n=1}^{k+1} |\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k+1}\rangle_{\mu\mu}\langle\alpha_{l_n}|. \tag{21}$$

The proof of a) and b) parallels that of [15,16], for the case of the standard Euclidean measure.

It follows from (21) and (15) that the Lagrange multipliers yielding $|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k+1)}\rangle$ are obtained according to the recursive relation

$$_\mu\langle l_n|\lambda^{(k+1)}\rangle_\mu = \langle l_n|\lambda^{(k)}\rangle_\mu - {_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k}|\alpha_{l_{k+1}}\rangle_{\mu\mu}}\langle l_{k+1}|\lambda^{(k+1)}\rangle_\mu \quad ; \quad n = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$_\mu\langle l_{k+1}|\lambda^{(k+1)}\rangle_\mu = {_\mu\langle\tilde{\tilde{\psi}}_{k+1}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu}, \tag{22}$$

with $_\mu\langle l_1|\lambda^{(1)}\rangle_\mu = \frac{_\mu\langle\alpha_{l_1}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu}{|||\alpha_{l_1}\rangle_\mu||^2}$.

In writing down the above equations we confidently assume that the indices l_n ; $n = 1, \ldots, k+1$ are given to us. Of course, we must choose them somehow. How? The question does not possess a unique suitable answer, though. We tackle this problem below.

III. SELECTION OF INDICES

The problem of deciding on the indices l_n ; $n = 1, \ldots, k$ to be considered in the construction of the $|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}\rangle$ distribution is far from be a simple one. One would like, of course, to choose the smallest set of indices allowing to minimise the distance between the observed vector and the physical model. Unfortunately, as already mentioned the search for a global minimum is an NP-hard problem in most cases. A sensible simplification is obtained by resigning the goal of global minimisation and

accepting a less ambitious suboptimal solution which arises from the following iterative procedure: At each iteration the indices obtained in the previous steps are fixed, and a new index is chosen so as to minimise the distance between the data vector and the vector predicted by the physical model. This is basically the strategy of the forward selection approach proposed in [7,8]. Such strategy, useful indeed in many situations, is just one among the many possible suboptimal strategies that one can envisage. Here we advance a new approach which is built out of two main ingredients: i)A data independent technique for selecting constraints to be discussed in section III B, and ii)A backward selection approach for reducing the number of parameters of a given distribution. To address the latter we need a technique evolving in the reverse direction with respect the forward technique of [7,8]. In this case the two challenges we have to face are: a)The one of deciding on the parameters to be eliminated b)The one of appropiertely modifying the parameters one wishes to retain. These two points are addressed in section III C by recurse to a backward birthogonalization approach. Before advancing the new strategy we would like to illustrate how the forward selection approach of [7,8], can be adapted in an straightforward manner in order to make it suitable when dealing with very noisy data. This is the subject of the section III A.

A. Data dependent selection criterion

As proposed in [7,8] a set of sub-indices l_n ; $n = 1, \ldots, k+1$ can be iteratively determined by selecting, at iteration $k+1$, the index l_{k+1} corresponding to a vector $|\alpha_{l_{k+1}}\rangle_\mu$ (Cf. Eq.(16)) that minimises the norm of the residual resulting when approximating the observed data by the physical model. This process is tantamount to selecting the index l_{k+1} that maximizes the functionals [7]:

$$e_n = |_\mu\langle\tilde\psi_n|\tilde f^o\rangle_\mu|^2 \quad ; \quad n = 1, \ldots, M, \tag{23}$$

with $|\tilde\psi_n\rangle_\mu = \frac{|\psi_n\rangle_\mu}{|||\psi_n\rangle_\mu||}$ and $|\psi_n\rangle_\mu = |\alpha_n\rangle_\mu - \hat P_{V_k}|\alpha_n\rangle_\mu$.

At this point, we would like to illustrate the advantage of allowing different weights for each data. We use the same example as in [7] i.e., the data are generated as:

$$f_i^o = \sum_{n=1}^{50} p_n f_{i,n} + \epsilon_i \quad ; \quad i = 1, \ldots, 100, \tag{24}$$

with p_n represented by the continuous line of Figure 1, and $f_{i,n} = \exp(-nx_i)$; $x_i = 0.01 * i$; $i = 1, \ldots, 100$; $n = 1, \ldots, 50$. This is an extremely bad conditioned problem. In order to have a good

approximation of the distribution of Figure 1, it was assumed in [7] that we know the data within an uncertainty of 0.1%. Here we consider the errors to be much larger. Each data is distorted by a zero mean Gaussian distributed random variable of variance σ_i^2 corresponding to 20% of the data value. If, as in [7], we consider an uniform measure ($\mu = 1$) the approximation we obtain is represented by the dotted lines of Figure 1a (for 2 different realizations of the data). As we clearly gather from Figure 1b, by considering a nonuniform measure given as $\mu_i = \sigma_i^{-2}$; $i = 1, \ldots, 100$ the approximation is enormously improved and becomes stable against different realization of the data.

B. Data independent selection criterion

This alternative criterion for selecting indices is independent on the actual data. It is meant to speed up the posterior selection process and is grounded on the fact that redundant equations arise as a consequence of physical model. Hence, redundancy can be detected without the actual realization of the experimental measurements. In our formalism each constraint, say the l_k-one is associated to a vector $|\alpha_{l_k}\rangle_\mu$. Hence the problem of discriminating linearly independent constraints is equivalent to the problem of discriminating linearly independent vectors. We address this problem by recourse to a recently introduce technique [17], which allows for a hierarchical selection giving rise to a stable inverse problem. The goal is achieved by selecting, at each step, the index l_k maximising the ratios:

$$r_n = \frac{|||\psi_n\rangle_\mu||^2}{|||\alpha_n\rangle_\mu||^2} \qquad ; \qquad n = 1 \ldots, M. \tag{25}$$

This data independent technique for eliminating redundancy makes the posterior data processing much faster, as the selection of indices for constructing the distribution can be carried out only on those indices rendering independent vectors. There is also room for different post-processing strategies because, specially when the data are very noisy, the number of required Lagrange multipliers happens to be smaller than the number of indices rendering 'numerical independence'. One possibility is to apply the selection criterion discussed in the previous section, but only on the preselected indices. Additional reduction of Lagrange Multipliers is made possible by a backward strategy to be introduced in the next section.

C. Reducing Lagrange Multipliers

As already discussed, the fact that Lagrange Multipliers are associated to constraints that are selected on a step by step basis implies that at the end of the selection precess some Lagrange Multipliers may have diminished relevance. To be in a position to eliminate Lagrange Multiplier of little relevance we need to develop an appropriate technique.

Consider that we wish to reduce the number k of Lagrange multipliers characterising a $|p^{\frac{1}{2}(k)}\rangle$ distribution. Even if we know which particular parameters should be disregarded the actual process of removing them yields a non-linear problem. The non-linearity follows from (15) where the Lagrange multipliers in the left hand side of the equations are the coefficients of a linear superposition of non-orthogonal vectors. The right hand side indicates that such a superposition is the orthogonal projection of the vector $|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu$ onto the subspace generated by vectors $|\alpha_{l_j}\rangle_\mu$; $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Thus, within the framework of this Communication, the decision of eliminating some Lagrange multipliers comes along with the aim of leaving the vector orthogonal projection onto the reduced subspace. This entails that we must recalculate the remaining Lagrange multipliers. The need for recalculating coefficients of a non-orthogonal linear expansion, when eliminating some others, is discussed in [18] where a backward biorthogonalization approach is advanced. Such a technique, that we describe next, has been devised in order to modify biorthogonal vectors so as to appropriately represent the orthogonal projector onto a reduced subspace.

Let us recall that $V_k = \mathrm{span}\{|\alpha_{l_1}\rangle_\mu, \ldots, \alpha_{l_k}\rangle_\mu\}$ and let $V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}$ denote the subspace which is left by removing the vector $|\alpha_{l_j}\rangle_\mu$ from V_k, i.e,

$$V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}} = \mathrm{span}\{|\alpha_{l_1}\rangle_\mu, \ldots, |\alpha_{l_{j-1}}\rangle_\mu, |\alpha_{l_{j+1}}\rangle_\mu, \ldots, |\alpha_{l_k}\rangle_\mu\}. \tag{26}$$

We have already discussed how to construct the orthogonal projector onto V_k (Cf. Eq. (21)). In order to represent the orthogonal projector onto the reduced subspace $V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}$ the corresponding biorthogonal vectors $|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^k\rangle_\mu$ need to be modified as established by the following theorem.

Theorem 1: Given a set of vectors $|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^k\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, k$ biorthogonal to vectors $|\alpha_{l_n}\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, k$ and yielding a representation of $\hat{P}_{V_k}$ as given in (21), a new set of biorthogonal vectors $|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k/j}\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, j-1, j+1, \ldots, k$ yielding a representation of $\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}$ as given by

$$\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}} = \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq j}}^{k} |\alpha_{l_n}\rangle_{\mu\mu}\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k/j}| = \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq j}}^{k} |\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k/j}\rangle_{\mu\mu}\langle\alpha_{l_n}|. \tag{27}$$

can be obtained from vectors $|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^k\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, k$ through the following equations:

$$|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k/j}\rangle_\mu = |\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^k\rangle_\mu - \frac{|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_j}^k\rangle_{\mu\ \mu}\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_j}^k|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^k\rangle_\mu}{|||\tilde{\alpha}_{l_j}^k\rangle_\mu||^2} \quad ; \quad n = 1, \ldots, j-1, j+1, \ldots, k. \tag{28}$$

The proof of this Theorem, as well as the proof of the Corollary 2 below, are given in [16,18].

Corollary 1: Let the Lagrange multiplier vector $|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu$ satisfying (15) be given. Then, the Lagrange multiplier vector $|\lambda^{k/j}\rangle_\mu$ giving rise to the orthogonal projector onto the reduced subspace $V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}$ is obtained from the previous $|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu$ as follows:

$$_\mu\langle l_n|\lambda^{k/j}\rangle_\mu = {}_\mu\langle l_n|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu - \frac{_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_n^k|\tilde{\alpha}_{l_j}^k\rangle_{\mu\ \mu}\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu}{|||\tilde{\alpha}_{l_j}^k\rangle_\mu||^2}. \tag{29}$$

The proof trivially stems from (15) using (28)in (27), since $\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu = \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq j}}^k |\alpha_{l_n}\rangle_{\mu\ \mu}\langle l_n|\lambda^{k/j}\rangle_\mu$ implies $_\mu\langle\tilde{\alpha}_{l_n}^{k/j}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu = {}_\mu\langle l_n|\lambda^{k/j}\rangle_\mu$ □

Corollary 2: The following relation between $||\hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||$ and $||\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||$ holds:

$$||\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||^2 = ||\hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||^2 - \frac{|_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu|^2}{|||\tilde{\alpha}_{l_j}^k\rangle_\mu||^2}. \tag{30}$$

Corollary 1 gives us a prescription to modify the Lagrange multipliers characterising a k-parameters distribution, if one of such multipliers is to be removed. Nevertheless, still the question has to be addressed as to how to choose the Lagrange multiplier to be disregarded. Corollary 2 suggests how the selection can be made optimal. The following proposition is in order.

Proposition 1: Let the Lagrange multipliers $_\mu\langle l_n|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, k$ and $_\mu\langle l_n|\lambda^{k/j}\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \ldots, j-1, j+1, \ldots, k$ be obtained from (15) and (29) respectively. The Lagrange multiplier $_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu$ to be removed for minimising the norm of the residual error $|\Delta\rangle_\mu = \hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu - \hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu$ is the one yielding a minimum value of the quantities

$$\frac{|_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu|^2}{|||\tilde{\alpha}_{l_j}^k\rangle_\mu||^2} \quad ; \quad j = 1, \ldots M. \tag{31}$$

Proof: Since on the one hand $\hat{P}_{V_k}\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}} = \hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}\hat{P}_{V_k} = \hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}$ and on the oder hand orthogonal projectors are idempotent we have:

$$||\hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu - \hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||^2 = {}_\mu\langle\tilde{f}^o|\hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu - {}_\mu\langle\tilde{f}^o|\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu = ||\hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||^2 - ||\hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||^2.$$

$$\tag{32}$$

Making use of (30), we further have

$$||\hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu - \hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||^2 = \frac{|_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu|^2}{|||\tilde{\alpha}^k_{l_j}\rangle_\mu||^2}. \tag{33}$$

It follows then that $||\hat{P}_{V_k}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu - \hat{P}_{V_{k/\alpha_{l_j}}}|\tilde{f}^o\rangle_\mu||^2$ is minimum if $\frac{|_\mu\langle l_j|\lambda^k\rangle_\mu|^2}{|||\tilde{\alpha}^k_{l_j}\rangle_\mu||^2}$ is minimum $\square$

Successive applications of criterion (31) lead to an algorithm for recursive backward approximations of the distribution. Indeed, let us assume that at the first iteration we eliminate the jth-constraint yielding a minimum of (31). We then construct the new reciprocal vectors (28) and the corresponding new Lagrange multipliers as prescribed in (29). The process is to be stopped if the approximated distribution fails to predict the observed data within the required margin.

D. Numerical example

We illustrate here an strategy consisting of the following steps: i)We use the data independent selection criterion for discriminating independent constraints. ii)We apply the data dependent selection criterion on the previously selected indices. iii)The number of Lagrange multipliers obtained at step ii) is reduced and the remaining multipliers re-computed.

We consider the example described below.

The physical model yielding the matrix elements $f_{i,n}$ is given by the Lorentzian decays:

$$f_{i,n} = \frac{1}{1 + 0.01 * (i - 100 - n)^2} \quad ; \quad i = 1, \dots, 700 \quad ; \quad n = 1, \dots, 450. \tag{34}$$

We construct 700 vectors $|\alpha_n\rangle_\mu$; $n = 1, \dots, 700$ as prescribed in (16) and select indices corresponding to the linearly independent vectors by the above descried technique for eliminating redundancy. Out of the redundant set of 700 vectors we found 100 linearly independent ones, up to a good precision, which is assessed by the biorthogonality quality of the corresponding basis and its reciprocal (dual). The experimental measures were generated considering that the distribution characterising the physical system is the sum of 5 Gaussian functions represented by the continuous line of Figure 2. Each data was distorted by a random error of variance σ_i^2 corresponding to 10% of the data value. A realization of these data is shown in Figure 3. The inversion problem in this example is much more stable than the one of the previous example so that the results do not vary much by weighting the data. Hence in order to illustrate this strategy we use an uniform measure in all the involved procedures. Out of the pre-selected linearly independent vectors, by using the data dependent strategy, we selected between 8 and 12 (depending on the particular realization of the data) to be able to predict

the 700 pieces of data within the uncertainty up to which the data were generate, i.e., we require that $|||f^p\rangle_\mu - |f^o\rangle_\mu||^2 < |||\epsilon\rangle_\mu||^2$ where $|\epsilon\rangle_\mu$ is a vector of components $\epsilon_i = t\sigma_i$ where, in general, t is real number in the interval $[1\,,\,3]$. In this case we first set $t = 1.1$ The approximation of the corresponding distribution is depicted by the dotted lines of Figure 2a (for 5 different realization of the data). We then increased the value of t up to $t = 2$ and applied the proposed strategy for reducing Lagrange multipliers. In spite of the fact that the number of parameters was significantly reduced, (only 5 were kept) as it can be seen in Figure 2b the distribution is still a good approximation of the original one. The inference to the the data by this distribution is also of great quality. As shown in Figure 4 the predicted date are really close to the noiseless ones. Notice that, by recourse to our approach, we are able to de-noise and compress 700 data by using only 5 Lagrange Multiplies.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have considered the problem of constructing the $q = 1/2$ MaxEnt distribution from redundant and noisy data. A previously developed approach has been generalised here in order to be able to incorporate, in a straightforward manner, *information on the data errors*. The advantage of this generalised approach, when dealing with very noisy data, has been illustrated by a numerical simulation.

Additionally, a new strategy for selecting relevant constraints has been advanced. The corresponding implementation consists of two different steps. The first step is independent of the actual data, as it operates by discriminating independent equations *on the basis of the physical model*. The data are used, a posteriori, to reduce further the number of constraints. The latter process is carried out through a forward and backward procedure as follows: First the selection is made starting from an initial constraint and incorporating others, one by one, till the observed data are predicted within a predetermined precision. Afterwards, the number of parameters of the distribution is reduced further by applying a backward selection criterion for eliminating some of the Lagrange multipliers and recalculating the remaining ones. It should be stressed that the combination of the forward and backward procedures is not, in general, equivalent to stopping the forward approach at a corresponding earlier stage. The irreversibility of the process is a consequence of the fact that, due to the complexity of the problem, the implementation of a selection criterion aiming at global optimisation is not possible. The strategies we have presented here are only optimal at each operational step. Hence, they do not

generate reversible procedures.

Considering the complexity of the mathematical problem which is posed by the aim of constructing, in an optimal way, the $q = 1/2$ MaxEnt distribution from redundant and noisy constraints, we believe that the well founded suboptimal strategies we have employed here should be of utility in a broad range of situations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Figure. 1a: The theoretical distribution is represented by the solid line. Each dotted line corresponds to the approximation we obtain by using an uniform measure ($\mu = 1$) for 2 different realization of the data.

Figure 1b: The theoretical distribution is represented by the solid line. Each dotted line corresponds to the approximation we obtain (for 5 different realization of the experiment) by weighting each data with a measure $\mu_i = \sigma_i^{-2}$.

Figure. 2a: The theoretical distribution is represented by the solid line. The dotted lines correspond to the approximation we obtain for 5 different realisations of the data. Each line is constructed by iteratively selecting constraints out of the reduced set obtained by the data independent technique.

Figure. 2b: The theoretical distribution is represented by the solid line. Each dotted line represents the approximation of the corresponding one in Figure 2a, after the elimination of some parameters.

Figure 3: The simulated data after distortion by random noise.

Figure 4: The theoretical data are represented by the continuous line. The dotted line corresponds of the predictions obtained by means of the approximation of Figure 2b.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Tsallis, *J. Stat. Phys.* **52**, 479 (1988).

[2] C. Tsallis, Fractals **6**, 539 (1995), and references therein.

[3] A. R. Plastino and A. Plastino, *Phys. Lett. A* **177**, 177 (1993).

[4] B. M. R. Boghosian, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, 4754 (1996).

[5] L. Rebollo-Neira, A. Plastino, J. Fernandez-Rubio, *Physica A* 258, 458, (1998).

[6] L. Rebollo-Neira, J. Fernandez-Rubio, A. Plastino, *Physica A*, 261, 555, (1998).

[7] L. Rebollo-Neira, A. Plastino, *Phys. Rev. E*, **65, 1**, 11113 (2002).

[8] L. Rebollo-Neira, A. Plastino, *Phys. Rev. E*, **66, 3**, (2002).

[9] B. R. La Cour, W. C. Schieve, *Phys. Rev. E*, **62, 5**, 7494 (2000).

[10] S. Smale, "Mathematical Problems for the Next Century", *Math. Intelligencer*, **20,2** 7-15, (1998).

[11] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, "Quantum Computation and Quantum Information", Cambridge University Press. (2000).

[12] A. Plastino, L. Rebollo-Neira, A. Alvarez. *Physical Review A* 40, 1644-1650, (1989).

[13] L. Rebollo-Neira, A. G. Constantinides, A. Plastino, A. Alvarez, R. Bonetto, M. Iñiguez Rodriguez. *Journal of Physics D*,30, 17, 2462-2469, (1997).

[14] J. M. Bernardo, A.F.M. Smith, "Bayesian theory", John Wiley, Chichester, (1994).

[15] L. Rebollo-Neira, "Recursive Biorthogonalization and orthogonal projectors", math-ph/0209026 (2002).

[16] L. Rebollo-Neira, "On non orthogonal signal representation", in "Progress in Mathematical Physics", Nova Science Publishers, NY, to be published.

[17] L. Rebollo-Neira, *IEE Proceedings - Vision, Image and Signal Processing*, 51,1, 31 (2004).

[18] L. Rebollo-Neira, "Backward adaptive biorthogonalization", *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, in press (2004) math-ph/0211066